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1

INTRODUCTION

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

§2. “Democracy” as practiced today no longer means what it once meant. Nor is it the best political system ever discovered.
It is only a \textit{code} word, concealing from prudish consciences the never-ending civil strife of thieves and mobsters, attempting “legally” \textit{at least} to rob each other! Only the “innocent” may think otherwise, as they try to push through the day shivering under the tatters of honor they still dare to call decent clothes! The “heads” are called upon to devise the “laws” of this \textit{universal} transaction, \textit{never} hesitating to offer to the dogs even their own faithful agents, if it serves their own skins and infernal plans! Which they do with absolute relish, for the benefits it accords them! The “protection services” once offered exclusively by the mafia in Chicago are now offered by governments everywhere, on the principle of “if you cannot (or don’t want to) beat them, join them”! This is the first naked truth about the state of our world!

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

§4. In ancient truly democratic times \textit{everybody} knew who really the master was: the Demos, the \textit{General Assembly of Citizens}, \textit{not} a wily representation of them acting in collusion for their own rather than for the interests of the Demos. And Demos did \textit{not} then mean the power of the majority voting in office the most accomplished demagogue promising flippantly vacuous castles in the air for all, without persuasively stating the exact source and manner of collecting the means, which always means all the unmentionable possible and impossible ways of stealing from each other and mainly from the weak and the uninformed;
it meant instead the now long-forgotten ethical and moral and in the final analysis TheoLogical General Commonweal that held them together as a mutually trusting society of free men willing for it to put on the line even life and limb. That was why even Themistocles the victor general of the battle at Salamis was late in life called to account for abusing the public trust, from which he escaped to Persia! That was why the brilliant general Alcibiades was recalled from Sicily to answer profanity charges, from which he too escaped to Persia! What then held the Demos-Polis together was the manly common straight spine of Faith in God and propriety! The blasphemers were expelled, not allowed to continue corrupting the morals! One heartily wishes to see that kind of Democracy somewhere restored, there erectly to run!

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

§6. Today, Greece, roughly the one six hundredth of the world, is a good example of what transpires everywhere. After all, it is not for nothing that in the name of advancing world trade nothing produced anywhere is nearly never stopped at her border! By deceit you can slide through with anything! Graft greases the entrance to country, license, office! The whole “system” is so well greased that only the tiniest fraction of corruption gets caught and makes it to the press; and never, God forbid, is a name mentioned—except when, rarely, it is thought necessary to show that “something” gets done! You see, behind such “honorable”, formal transactions, there always lurks an illustrious name! You see, today Greece proudly boasts of “Independent Commissions” instituted by parliamentary law to protect the so-called “individual personal data”, i.e., all, and especially the grand malefactors and their malfeasances! It is important that their penal record remain spotless! How else can they carry on with their “service” to society? Why do I mention today’s Greece as example of the world? Not only because it is by such people that in her parliament do members get “democratically” elected, but also because in her universities professors do not get appointed without the approval of their students!!! Because parliament, professors and students have advanced such a concept of “academic freedom” that within the campuses every punk, anarchist and hoodlum is guaranteed impunity, but a reasoned dissenting opinion is persecuted with howls and immediate physical attack to person! How do ignoramuses elect professors, you will ask! How else can “professors” get elected do you suppose? Do the students demand the best and hardest studies? No!!! They expect just to pass easy exams, get their “diplomas”, and on that “sufficient” typical ground and the proper amount of grease paid for by their parents to get appointed in a public position, paid by even less educated near idiots, from which position they look down on the populace
as well as expect to get rich by their own getting greased and finally pensioned at the earliest possible, on the highest possible pension! This is the present Greek-style paradise on Earth! So, who cares about the one promised for real, life long, hard work in Heaven? Am I too hard on professors, not educating Greek society, except for just this expectation? Not a bit! Just tell me, in which Church do people fail to prostrate themselves in front of the high priests, appointed to their offices secretly? Do I really mix salt and pepper, now saying no good the election by ignoramuses, now saying no good the exclusion of ignoramuses from the election process? What I attack in both cases is the exclusion of public election by those of granite hard knowledge of all pertinent facts! In both cases, people are elected whose competence and Faith in Logos is neither secured nor guaranteed that it will only advance the true intellectual-spiritual needs of society. I refuse

1 I shall not tire trying to explain the exact meaning and content of this unique word in the human mouth. It is by the latest Heraclitean. Its use in the opening phrase of the Gospel according to St. John, translated in English as Word, is a distortion, due at best to the total inability of a Jew to understand and then convey by means of just one Greek word to other Jews the very deepest, most fundamental Ground on which all we know is erected. Had he understood more of the Essence of Logos, he would certainly have had a great deal more to say, just in order that he explain himself, about the meaning he attached to the word. Without such explanation, the reader is very hard put to understand anything more than the ordinary, everyday meaning people attach to it, relating to the logia, the sayings, either of men or of the Lord. Even if St. John had fully understood Heraclitus’s meaning of the word, he most certainly could not have expected that at least the Jewish recipients of his Gospel would be fully familiar with Heraclitean usage. On that distortion was later based the still surviving Christian ecclesiastical meaning of the word, that “theologians” continue to refuse to broaden to all its full meaning. Logos is not just the product of God’s or man’s mouth, and so, it may not just be confined to, at best as another word for, Jesus Christ as the second, strictly Incarnate Person of the Holy Trinity. As a product of man’s mouth, Logos becomes blasphemous nonsense if it fails to deliver to the listener (which involves both him and the speaker) not just the sound of the word uttered, but the entire Being, the Ὑμῶν, that alone by His being there, makes complete sense of everything. Heraclitus was such a succinct and austere philosopher that he realized that human speech may only be completely respected if it does not ever fail to contain in itself the recognition and cognizance of that Ground to which alone always tuned, human speech ceases to become a blasphemy
to draw any distinction between intellectual and spiritual needs. Those who do are exactly those who brought the world to the precipice of the final catastrophe! In both cases, that of universities and that of Churches, people remain ignorant of intellectual and spiritual facts fundamental to their own well being! This is the reason the world balances so precariously at the edge of the precipice! The peoples of the world ignorant of those facts generally elect and offer undeserved respect to “leaders” leading by opinion poll, totally unable and unwilling to lead them upward, as that is really hard work; willing only to let them slide down, as that increases the “fun” of everyone! Don’t we see just this in amusement parks everywhere? No wonder our world life has become just such an amusement park—or have we made the Earth only a lunatic asylum? In light of the material in the footnote just inserted, the source of our problems now stands starkly naked in front all having eyes to see, and consciences thin skinned enough to feel the prick! Anger and all silence therefrom shall inform the feeler of his true disposition in the face of Logos and the hard facts!

and becomes a Hymn. If we truly honor the ancient Greeks for having taught us how to think, we most certainly may not fail to heed Heraclitus. With him, St. John’s opening makes full sense only if it refers to the Ever-present, Complete, Perfect, Omniscient, Omnipotent Deity, Father, Creator and Inspirer of all that is good. The division of the Deity to Trinity, ceases to be blasphemy only if it is understood as a recognition of the distinct functions of Reasoning, Acting and Inspiring that Christians, in ancient custom, personified, but are certainly wrong if they understand them as distinct Logous (plural accusative of Logos) united only by Love. The functions are distinct, but the fully intellectual-spiritual Fundamental Essence of the Deity remains indivisible! Indismissibly does the entire Deity reason, act, inspire Self and believers! This is why the Lord “wondered” at, that is, chastised, the Disciples for asking Him to show them the Father! The Lord was not just the Incarnate Second Person distinct from the other two, but the Entire Indivisible Deity! Anything else that drives wedges in the Holy Trinity is blasphemous, whenever it is contained or implied, whenever it is distortedly understood! The Churches, their doctors, and the professors that all sprang therefrom are responsible for the fact that for two thousand years they have neglected to “knock faithfully at the door” requesting the Lord to help them understand what most definitely are not mysteries, that is to say, dark, unilluminated areas of the Deity, that is All Pure Intellectual-Spiritual Light Understand this, Brother, and you shall not fail to understand what I here attempt to express in human words.
§7. Twenty five centuries ago, Heraclitus, the prime sage of his time, established at the center of everything the Logos. Today, in the name of “science”, itself based on logic, that is nothing if not the method of Logos to set all things in order, our honored sages try to persuade us that Logos is out of the question, that we have no option other than believing in total purposelessness, that is the other name of nihilism. As for the past frontier, that ought by right to be fully within the scope of science to investigate, in the face on the one hand of the Einsteinian indeterminacy coming under the more familiar name of spacetime relativity, and on the other the Heisenbergian indeterminacy coming under the name of the uncertainty principle incorporated in quantum mechanics, that, too, has been expelled beyond the limits of our reach! The sages give it all up, including (though of that they strangely remain, or so they seem fully unaware) foremost their own sagacity, in the limelight of which they bask well fed by those who truly pay the cost. If Steven Weinberg can be taken as a representative example\(^2\), they declare themselves uncommonly happy, though they believe themselves and the entire universe around them as having come from nothing and are/is being destined to nothing, between which ends one despite all his best efforts can not but produce absolutely nothing! Thoughtfully, one cannot fail to ask, sadly, whether these latter day nihilist sages do not

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

§8. R. A. Lyttleton\(^3\), under this quote from Albert Einstein: “if most of us are ashamed of shabby clothes and shoddy furniture, let us be more ashamed of shabby ideas and shoddy philosophies”, has produced an article in which, drawing a line between complete disbelief and complete certainty, transposing them in a cloud he calls bottomless emotional pit of pride and prejudice, makes what seems to be a reasonable appeal to stay clear of both those ends, however attractive they may appear, in order that we not fall down into those bottomless pits. But set those points to be the one the Heraclitean belief in Logos, and the other the current belief in purposelessness that is nothing if not the negation of Logos based on Logos that also contains according to them their “logic” of “science”, where will you reasonably rather stand? What sort of “Logos” can it be that produces a “science” rejecting it? Can you possibly like that enough to stand by it, even if not on it? And if you, scared of that madness, try to escape to the other end, how indeed can you reasonably be charged of getting emotional for standing firmly on the point of Logos? Is not Logos the negation of emotion, the perfect coolheadedness? Hard indeed to kick against nails! Tell now yourself who does the kicking! Lyttleton did not think of that dilemma to try to give us his suggestion! As for “shabby ideas and shoddy philosophies”, be patient. For now, let us only add that, even as faith in Logos and Logos Himself are indeed metaphysical as Feyerabend has argued\(^4\) and it has never ceased to be what it has always been, it nevertheless was clearer faith in the time of Heraclitus and has become confused faith in the present time of experimental “scientific” sophistication. Then people reasoned. Now, they mainly experiment! That in so doing they think they downgrade their own reasoning (going on before, during and after experimentation) in favor of its wished


\(^4\) P. K. Feyerabend: *Philosophy of Science The Delaware Seminar II*, University of Delaware Press.
for “results” does not in the least alter the situation! No experiment ever substituted Logos; no experiment ever shall do so! The only question is whether or not the hard natural facts themselves rather than our willful elaborate theoretical “interpretation” of them support our metaphysical faith in Logos! Current “science”, based on its “interpretation” of the hard natural facts, using a badly distorted form of Reason (that is only an inseparable part of Logos) chooses to conclude that Logos (the indivisible Whole that also consists of, contains, and gives substance to Reason) does not exist! I argue that the hard natural facts themselves do show the metaphysical Logos on Whom alone they stand! Said another way, however least the modern pseudo-intellectuals basking in the limelight of public attention like it, Logos is the real immaterial substance of the proverbial “branch” on which we have fastened the swing on which we all so very much pleased with ourselves sit, regardless of what we say and do that we always attempt to “explain”, that is to say, to show it is “reasonable”, that it agrees with Logos! Ergo: If we continue to be sane, we may not cut that “branch”! The only think we may, and indeed must, while we still can, cut is the rope, the near end of which we now instead of swing have turned into the noose that strangles us. Will we at last, before we give up the last gasp, cut that rope?

§9. How did we get here? Indeed, by failing to realize the metaphysical and so spiritual but not in the least abstract or uncertain substantive nature of Logos! It takes disciplined reasoning, involving the never ending hard work of self-controlled citizen and society as the Greeks once so well understood, to get to that realization! But that is not alas for the untrained “masses” struggling to put a bite of bread in their mouths! But that was the situation at the turn of the ancient to the new era. You need a fed stomach to supply energy to an agile brain. But not a too well fed stomach, as that turns the energy to fat, poisoning the brain, lulling the Spirit, persuading it to keep on seeking satisfaction in ever more food, corrupting it to seek unendingly ever more material pleasure! Alas, we never found the needed balance! The unlike do not mix well. The Greeks conquered the Medes, but they too, which they have not yet understood, were conquered by them! Yet, East and West never successfully married! The undisciplined “reasoning” of the East spread with Christianity, an almost pure product of the East based on the Old Testament, that only with time acquired a thin skin
of Greek character. The Gospels are mostly spent with feeding the hungry, with alleviating the physical pain, with only the mere rudiments of how hunger and pain can be reduced by unselfish social action. That was all Palestine could then learn, and as matters still go, the lesson has yet to be fully learned and spread. It is on that “understanding” that the Church is still attacked for not doing enough in that direction, as if that were the only objective of the Lord becoming Man. The metaphysical part of the Gospels has been wrapped in “mystery”, the Luminous Holy God has been enveloped in darkness! So, dissenters dismiss it as incredible. The Church, still occupied by the ancient spirit of the Orient has done practically nothing to bring the metaphysical to our conscious understanding: In that regard, the “ask and it shall be given, knock and it shall be opened” has meant nothing to the seeming pious! Two thousand years have passed, but praying that we understand the metaphysical, i.e., nothing other than the Lord God, has yet to begin! The Church has consciously chosen to stand against the Logos, on the stubbornly held wrong, yet supposedly reasonable for its being a religious dogma that the existence of God cannot be proven; in other words, that the Maker did not know how to make Himself unquestionably manifest by His work; in yet other words, that the Lord God Whom the Church teaches as Love takes pleasure in His own inability to prove His Being to His creatures, leading to seeing hapless man struggle with having to choose between belief and unbelief on an equal footing, and callously rewarding those who choose belief when they can just as reasonably choose unbelieving with the rewards of direct chance and the hope of a better afterlife, the chances of which are kept jealously equal to those of the present, the immediate, tangible rewards of which are here for the taking be it even by a hand drenched in blood, that by the mere rules of chance, in view of the immedia-cy as against the mere hope, cannot be said to have been spilt in vain! Not at all has the Church in two thousand years felt the hair raise stiff on her back at the realization that by this tacit teaching of hers, it is she who profanes the Holy God first and foremost!!! Pleadings that she at last change her views on this most funda-mental point have gone unanswered! That is the power of religi-ous tradition wrapped around a stiff oriental wrong dogma that has split God from Logos! Indeed, what can orientals understand of, and be shaken to their foundations by Logos? These people,
having persuaded themselves of their own demigodness, having named their inclination “calling” (in Greek, their κλήσις “κλήσιν”), having spent untold hours before the mirror in order to learn the technique of appearing pleasant and good-natured to all viewers, consider it socially tactful to be overly polite: One can bet that if the Lord reappeared today and once again smashed the tables of the money changers at the Temple, they would turn the other way in extreme embarrassment! It is the only response that “good” social breeding dictates in the face of belief and unbelief! All else is called fanaticism! To be squarely with Logos today is strictly prohibited! Logos also means Holy strict Reasoning and Holy Freedom to express its findings! These are extremely embarrassing! Observe and listen to the “hierarchs” and politicians: What do they not say—always with a broad smile! But a biting Truth in Holy Anger as befits the present times? Never! By word and silence is today the Holy Lord profaned! But the grandest of all questions, that about God and Logos being One, is not broached! On such a matter silence is being preferred, as a forked tongue spelling uncertain words, the preferred language of “authority”, all authorities sense, is far more likely to err! But here, on the ledge over the abyss, the silence must be broken, the prohibition ignored, the tongue mended back to a single honest whole, so that its scream tear the abyss and reach the Heaven: “Holy Father, truly Thy name is Logos”!

§10. Strong words? Definitely! Tactless words? Only as necessary! Impolite words? Hardly! Unpolitic words? Unquestionably! An argument is seen to be this or that according to the impact it produces on a pricked conscience! If words are to be put on paper, for which precious forests are cut, they better deserve their full weight and then some. Bland words are worse than total silence: They disturb the quiet from which alone words worth their weight always spring. In this age of din produced by voluble worthless words coming in from everywhere in the general desperate effort to fill the painfully felt void in our speechless souls, it is unpoltic words that attract attention. But they are only remembered till the next batch of worthless news! When it rarely comes, the deafening Fall of Falsehoods rising above the general din, though unpoltic, is most certainly not worthless! Even if only one, somewhere, listens! After all, words are only for those still having ears! The rest are certain to follow on their preprogram-
med way, as always automatons do! So, these are words only for those, alas now few, still enjoying to carry their precious souls in their own hands, rather than leaving them to the now revealed dubious so-called “care” of others. Only such people listen, and, having listened, weigh the precious value of words, by which they build their informed Spirits. The rest are only parroting! When people such as David Lindley⁵ told us in his End of Physics of the insurmountable predicament of having reached the practical limit of experimentation in fundamental physical research with such tools as, say, the superconducting supercollider, since canceled for its exorbitant cost in the face of certainty that whatever could have been learned with it would only be a tiny fraction of what still lies before us unknown [as it would only register what would happen in the fleeting interval of time during which the tremendous amount of mass and energy involved would be compressed in the tiny volume of collision at the present age of the universe], those still having ears, understanding the “optimism” of S. Weinberg and S. Hawking as resting no longer on what can objectively still be learned but solely on what can subjectively be concocted in keeping with the already set object of such future “studies” that is nothing other than “proving” the world pointless, cannot but conclude that the metaphysical Logos, Whom they feel palpable in their own Spirits, would not have gone to so much trouble for nothing! As a result, they cannot but feel unquestionable the fact that Logos truly has otherwise sought to present the fact of His own presence to all honest seekers! But in this they do not, alas, find the Church and the “theologians” allies; as these insist that the presence of God “cannot” be proven, failing to realize that they only expose their “method” and their “faith”! By which alone, lasting for two thousand years, have we come to our present predicament! And these indeed are strong, not impolite words!

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


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

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

§13. The other says it deals with the world, and how it came about, and whither it is destined. But again, it too does not look deep in the world to find the answers it seeks, but instead confines itself in producing theories! There are professors writing authoritative papers never since graduate school having done an experiment totally on their own! That is “messy” work! Theorizing lifts one up: to the clouds! Wherefrom most of them fall. Without a parachute! Give them a granite-solid analysis of the equally hard facts of Nature and see how they receive it! Contrary to theory? They ask for “verifiable” predictions of what you tell them, which they arbitrarily choose to call a “theory” when it is only a binding, not an argumentative, dimensional analysis of the hard physical fact of such clearly distinct quantities as mass, length, time, force,
momentum, polar moment of inertia of a vibrating spherical shell, energy, action! Why? So that they then commission the messy, very expensive, making-some-rich physical work, for an always dubious theoretical conclusion! So deep in theories do they truly swim that, hard facts and their proper analysis get them on the head like a reef, exactly where according to their theories there only ought to be clear waters! That the universe stands for billions of years on solid Law, not professorial theorizing, for them is not solid enough! The intellectual honesty to admit that the Law out there puts a terminal end to all theorizing, that in turn puts them out of business, is more than they command! The truly cunning ones do not ever commit anything on paper, even if they be bishops, archbishops, professors, presidents of university colleges and scientific societies, or Nobel laureates! Impolite words? Honest true personal observations of more than twenty years!

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

§15. Without faith in that, we may without fear just as well jump off the cliff—with our best and brightest atheist and agnostic scientists, professors, and all the rest of our present “spiritual” leaders watching those others in silence, none other, leading the mad dance down the bottomless abyss!: Because, whether ever expanding or recurring, if the universe is irrational, it is meaningless; and we,
having been the chance products of irrationality that despite appearances could with far greater likelihood not have brought us here than having brought us here, may follow the way of the more likely statistics, for all our “good” luck of appearing into being out of nowhere at all, uncalled for and unsought after! And, in the process, at least show ourselves honest and honorable believers in the correctness of our “scientific” thinking, not just the opposite, be it if only for precious life’s sake! If we, new Jacobs, are prepared and willing to “put God to the wall” as Kitty Ferguson so aptly put it, we must also be ready to show ourselves capable of that too! The arguments cut both ways! Rather than safely watching from the bleachers the struggle of somebody else(whose?), who/that does not concern us, or engaging ourselves gamely in a pointless and indeed sick pseudo-struggle in the mud; in truth, the live-or-die struggle is on the narrow ledge above the abyss! The Loving Rational God truly made the world secure! Only we, by our willful choice of guides, brought ourselves to the edge of the abyss! Still, even as we stand there, God loves us, for it is only there that each one of us shall prove one’s true metal! As we do not show ourselves ready to jump off the cliff, at least as of yet, we cannot shake off the accusation that we knowingly rely on God’s secure loving embrace up there on the ledge to keep on abusing mainly Him, principally with our “theology” and our “science”! We must drop the atheist/agnostic mask, behind which we delude only ourselves; which our “best and brightest” do best than all the rest! There is no honesty, nor honor here! Even the devil himself relies on God’s loving embrace to keep on fighting Him! When at last will we realize that, just as the devil is neither atheist nor agnostic but a dishonorable conscientious anti-Theist, so are we, acting as we do? This is only part of the all-out thoroughness and courage that I had in mind above when I remarked that, tact definitely limits our discussion! Remarks such as “but this is brutal, uncivil, unpoltic, improper in well-behaved society” no longer have a place: We are up there, on that all too precarious ledge fighting God, beckoning to and challenging the abyss! But I agree with all those saying we are still unprepared to face the Truth! I was surprised that they let Kitty Ferguson publish her book! I shall be astounded if they let me, following once again her suggestion that the book I suggested was indeed mine to write! Was it because she was lucky enough to catch them semiconscious, or only because they
judged her discussion safely noncommittal and the object of their labors at casting doubts and aspersions against God quite secure, or was it because after such long slumber they finally realized that events are now overtaking them fast and they must broach the subject? We must give them at least this benefit of doubt!

§16. Still, one cannot help bearing in mind how disparate and jealous of each other the general assembly of university professors really is: Each one absorbed in his own narrow interests, defending one’s own turf against all intruders, using every method at one’s disposal to secure the needed funds from a never sufficient-for-all total sum. They have a choice: either total in-fighting with no holds barred that is certain to demolish the academic structure and bury them all under, or “civilized academic tact” that does not however exclude anything safe from overflowing to the knowledge of the outside world! Guess what they choose! My lifelong search, most intense during the last twenty plus years, to find anywhere at least one academic competent in both Theology and Science has produced no finding! On their side, the “scientists” may perhaps be excused: They have not given an oath of allegiance to help those in imminent peril on the cliffs of knowledge! This most definitely is not the case of “theologians” and Churchmen in particular: The commandment “shepherd my sheep” was not the license understood as “feed on them, take the fat, sell the lard” that is the right of the ordinary shepherd. It was a reminder of the endless caring charged on Peter, and in effect on us all, for every “sheep” lost on the cliffs, hanging perilously over the abyss! God became man in order that He give us just this example of duty! And while on earth, it was as a man, raised by God and himself to being a Man, that He, too, performed that duty! For, otherwise, the Lord God would be asking of us things beyond our capacity—and that would be unbecoming of the Lord God! Yet, to this day, the Church has not taught the nations this basic lesson! The human race hangs on the ledge over the abyss, but the Churchmen mind only what they have all along seen to be their “ordinary” duties: they simply “pray”!: “God, if Thou art there, perform Thy miracle!” [Just God, not Lord, let alone Father! God as a name of rank, like Sergeant, Officer, General! With so many “Eminences”, “Fathers”, “Holy Fathers” and “Most Divine All-Holinesses” (pure Byzantine this one!) around in total disregard of the Lord’s prohibition, just who today calls God Father and means...
Some “faith”! That Faith means action of foot and hand up there on that ledge, is not understood! What’s at peril is not the flesh: that was always meant to be spent like a candle giving off its light to the darkness around, that is to say, converting to light the otherwise heavy soul it houses. What’s at peril is that the light shall be no more, leaving nothing to rise to Heaven! You tell all this tactfully even to high Churchmen. It leaves them unmoved. “The Lord has” is their answer. “Whom, what does He have?”, you ask. The question is regarded tactless, the conversation ends, or the line is cut! Do you not now really think that we, the whole humanity did have more than enough of “tact”, feeding academics and Churchmen, always treating each other with their impeccable “tact”? Up there, at the edge of the abyss you need strong, secure, spiked boots and the grip of steeled, not soft, hands! Papal slippers and high lustre academic boardroom shoes are going to get stepped on in the effort to save those still hardly hanging on! That is pragmatic politeness, which is nothing if not the civil duty of the citizen to save his fellow citizen. Alas, translating from the Greek, we lost the true meaning of politeness [< polites = citizen]! Church and Academia leave us no option but telling it all!

§17. That we still do not with them always tactfully in the lead just jump off Twin Tower style, we may no longer excuse it on our continuing curiosity! If the impasse they want us to believe is true, we have come to the end of our curiosity! Nothing worthwhile can any longer be learned—principally from them! Our curiosity is without meaning and without value! That we still refuse to jump off only shows not just how strongly we are held back by fear, but how strongly we still adhere to Rationality and Meaningfulness, that do stand intact, way beyond our desperate “theological” [not TheoLogical] and “scientific” fulminations!
§18. (a) You simply cannot truly feel what a challenger of established authority is up against until you too ask them face to face to answer the basic questions regarding the source of their authority. The claim of the Holy Apostolic See of Rome is based on a mistranslation of the original Greek “αὐ εἰ Πέτρος καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτην τὴν πέτραν ...” as “thou art Peter and upon this rock ...”! It is one thing to be called Πέτρος and another to mention the πέτρα: The first is masculine, the second feminine! Why so? Why not simply “... and upon thee ...”? Going back even to Homeric usage, the meaning of the masculine and the feminine for rock has different connotations: πέτρος can even be a λίθος a sizable rock you throw by hand; πέτρα can even be an immovable mountain! All Apostles were asked, Peter answered for them all stating, declaring their common faith: Such words as statement, declaration, faith in Greek are all feminine! So, the πέτρα was not Πέτρος, but the solid declaration of common faith on which Christianity was to be built. So, to whom/what was the basilica of St. Peter dedicated? To this one Apostle, or to the solid declaration of common faith? Whatever happened to the one believed to be “the Son of God”? Why was the most magnificent temple of Christendom dedicated to a mere man even if an Apostle, rather than to Christ Himself, the Lord God made Man, or to the metaphysical and so spiritual but not in the least abstract or uncertain substantive God-Logos? The ancient pre-Christian Athenians had already dedicated the Parthenon to “goddess” Athena, i.e., the Ever-Virgin Holy Wisdom; the Byzan-
tines later did the very same in Constantinople! Why did the Romans choose differently?

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

(c) Okay, drop if you will the supposedly! [Let us accept that every word in the Bible, in the position that it exactly appears (and kindly forget the infinite difficulties of translation) was dictated by God; about which whole problem, later.] The first who
made the bold statement of faith in the Lord deserved some, the fair, recognition, even if later, in a state of fear and doubt he denied Him thrice. Why is every other man “who did not even see yet believed” any less worthy of holding the very same keys by which he opens for himself the same Gates? In the New Testament there is no mention of St. Peter ever going to Rome. St. Luke, St. Paul and perhaps even St. Peter himself would not have failed to mention it, had it been true. The discovery much later of the body of a man under the basilica, only lately, by Pope John Paul II said to be that of St. Peter fails to convince. The transfer of the imperial seat to the East “had” to be counterbalanced by those left behind, for purely political reasons, to which the ecclesiastical were attached. The keys not the Cross suffered for the love of God for man, nor the blood of the saints sacrificed in the arena in the Name of the Crucified became the official symbol of the Vatican! In pain do I say this as a Christian! After the schism of the Church of England, deliberately was the cathedral in London dedicated to St. Paul! St. Petersburg was built in Russia as an “Orthodox” counterbalance to “Catholic” Rome! Earlier, in answer to the Roman claim, the Byzantines responded, again without a shred even of mildly convincing evidence, by claiming that the Church of Byzantium was established by St. Andrew, solely for his having been the first-called Apostle! The antagonism about the first honors, in complete disregard of the Lord’s all too clear admonitions, is beyond dispute! To this day, the Christians have not dedicated a fitting Temple to the Lord God Logos Almighty! The barbaric struggle, whether by material or “spiritual” weapons, is about naked power here on earth! Heaven is the mere excuse, Its mention has become a profanity! The split of the Church of Christ to hundreds of splinters contrary to St. Paul’s admonition still goes shamelessly on! I once asked where should an imaginary visitor from another planet send a letter addressed to the Bishop of the Church of the Lord that is on Earth (τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας Κυρίου τῆς οἰκίας ἐπὶ Γῆς), as indeed was the form of address among ancient local Christian Churches, and the priest (a representative of a Patriarch performing services as such within the diocese of an independent national Church and now a bishop of that Church) froze as would a column of salt! I never, in eight years already, heard from him again, though I handed him substantial material, fully within his ken to judge and authoritatively respond to! He has been
seen on television to say “how sweet it is to be called father”, i.e., in complete disdain of the Lord’s prohibition “and call no man your father on earth, for you have one Father who is in heaven; neither be called masters [in Greek, καθηγηταί, as the professors are still called!] for you have one master, the Christ”! The good bishop ignores (?) the mutual corruption of those calling and called fathers! Not just this one bishop, but all the Christian Churches, taught by eminent masters-professors! Just recall what was said above (§16, pp. 24-25).

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

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

§21. None of us, however sincere one may try to be with oneself, can accurately assess the percentage of faith and fear under which one operates. Only the Lord can! When in the nineteenth century under the new wave of knowledge an estimate was made of the span of time implied by the Old Testament narrative, nobody really understood how deep the waters were in which they decided to swim! Taking the Scripture verbatim, the “day” as an ordinary day, and measuring the time by the human lifespan, the age of Creation was set at 4004 B.C.! The development of the natural sciences has since decided matters entirely otherwise. What were/are the faithful to do? Some, clearly pious people, still hold to the verbatim interpretation and speak of the Creation events as miraculously compressed to the span of ordinary days by fiat Divine. Well, an All-powerful God could perform even such miracles. But shouldn’t the pious also ask themselves whether a rational God, the One and only God-Logos would perform such miracles? Obviously, He had all the past time at His own disposal; why would He put off creating the world until 4004 B.C., and then do it all in only six days? Why such a hurry? When the natural sciences, that is to say, the world He created, tell us otherwise, we may not, if we insist on remaining so strictly “pious”, accept the verbatim interpretation otherwise but as a divine attempt to confuse us yet demand of us faith in the Scripture rather than in the evidence of His own Creation, both of them having been put down according to His Will! For myself, a believer
in One All-Holy God-Logos, such behavior of God toward hapless man is entirely out of the question, and any insistence upon it none other than the very height of blasphemy! Even the atheist Einstein, a non believer in a personal God, held fast to the belief that “raffiniert ist der Herrgott, aber boshaft ist er nicht” (the Lord God is refined, but malicious He is not)! No believer in a personal God may believe less! We have no option: We must weigh objectively the weight of Scripture unquestionably set down by the hand of man as the Word of God, against the weight of His Creation as His own Written Word! To deny the evidence of the world even as presented by “science” as wrong is entirely insane: For twenty years already, “science” is being accused of hiding the true undeniable scientific proof of His indisputable being the God-Logos, based on its own very strictest method and findings! The Scriptures were written by pious men, as best they understood then things moral and physical; they were not the mere will-less pens of God! The God-Logos respects even the sinful; He never dictates, only suggests; He never turns men to asses (reversing the story about Balaam’s ass!). Remember St. Paul stating that “... as for knowledge, it will pass away. For our knowledge is imperfect and our prophesy is imperfect; but when the perfect comes, the imperfect will pass away. When I was a child I spoke like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child; when I became a man, I gave up childish ways. For now we see in a mirror dimly, but then face to face. Now I know in part, then I shall understand fully, even as I have been fully understood”. As St. Paul spoke so, how may we believe that people having lived many hundreds of years earlier were wiser knowing so much even less than was known in St. Paul’s time? and how are we permitted to ignore the obligation of learning more of the Truth, by which alone may we come closer to the All-knowing?

§22. Adam is said to have lived for nine hundred and thirty years, and Seth for nine hundred and twelve years. Who did the counting, and by what astronomical measure? Truths revealed by God? But in the story of Babel (unconsciously of us lasting till, and worsening during, these very days with the hundreds of God’s Churches!), God is said to have confused the tongues of men so that they fail to reach Him in Heaven by means of their tower, impliedly because He was afraid of what they would do if left unconfused! This one also another truth revealed by God’s own dictation to the scribes? An Easterner, an ignorant Semite, dares state
that God so confesses. Why should a Greek believing in the Holy God-Logos Who never commits any mistakes and improprieties, and a Christian believing in God’s self-sacrifice on the Cross in order that man may be raised to Heaven believe in such senseless Semitic blasphemies and profanities as Holy Writ? Would it not be much more reasonable to understand that men’s tongue became “confused”, in fact, their languages multiplied perhaps exactly because men attempted to reach Heaven, i.e., speak [as sensibly as they then could, exposing by mouth, as we all still do, the disposition of their soul] about God with such an instrument as the then human language, which though common, was nevertheless still so very very poor for such a task? But which ancient Semite could even begin to comprehend the least of this huge task? What human language is perfect unto itself? The Greek word for light (“that which makes it possible to see”) is φως, which does not also convey the sense of light-weight! Now think: What could run as fast as light if it were not also the lightest thing of all, in other words the fundamental photon, the true Democritean atom? The Greek word θεός (relating to θέω, “I run lightning fast”) means God, which however does not relate to so running (but remember Godspeed)! Now knowing these, do you not get a deeper insight; not, of course, in the sense that God is the fundamental photon, but in the sense that our grandest and least possible conceptions are nevertheless connected? If the Lord Logos did not fail to establish the least of all things we can conceive, each and every of the fundamental quanta, do you really think that He failed to set every detail referring to the world He created using them? Why do you choose to forget those terribly significant words of the Lord saying that “αἱ τρίχαι τῆς κεφαλῆς ἱμῶν ἡρεμημέναι εἰσί”, meaning “the hairs on your heads are not only counted but also numbered, as the words “ἡρεμημέναι εἰσί” mean both, as you cannot count things unless you also number them, giving each of them a number while counting them? But it is not my purpose here to rebut the pragmatic and theological errors in the book of Genesis. To some extent, I have done so elsewhere? 

§23. My purpose in the immediate sequel here is to indicate the fallacy of the strategy and tactics followed, and of some of the arguments presented, by the so-called “Creation Science” camp of well-meaning but clearly misguided believers in God seeming satisfied solely with attempting to show the Genesis story not incompatible with present-day scientific knowledge, yet so visibly feeling embarrassed, for the past teachings, policies and practices of religions and churches, that they do not attempt to unite what ought always to be seen as Theology (not “theology”) and Science (not “science”)! The only reason I can see for their reticence is the failure to appreciate the full weight of the term God-Logos. All believers in One God ought from the beginning, as a matter of a first article of due Faith, regard Him without the least reservation not just as a “Father” (seen with the passage of time, of ever more dubious parenthood) but as Living Person absolutely Logical⁸: otherwise,

⁸ We must at long last mature: Life is not just a characteristic of the flesh, but also of the Spirit! Even the amoeba lives, microbes live, worms live, more advanced animals live, humans live. The nihilists attempt to show that there is absolutely no difference except in what we visibly see as products of blind naked purposeless chance. We must at last mature! Not all such life is the same: The amoeba simply “lives”, but I challenge the nihilists to show us that it also reasons! The more advanced animals clearly show the ability of rudimentary reasoning. Missing links up the
they simply do not regard Him as perfect enough, which must be seen as a shadow that every believer respecting himself must terminally put out of his mind! Unless we act thus, we simply have no future as a race of rational beings! But this is a principle that none of the established religions has yet comprehended! The belief in the separation of “theology” and “science”, so tenaciously adhered to by both sides, is solely due to just this incomprehension.

§24. The first skirmishes between “science” and “theology” appeared in the so-called age of enlightenment. The open attack evolutionary ladder are permitted to be conceived only as more capable of survival than even the links just below them; they simply may not be conceived as extinct! So, I challenge the nihilists to show us that the very next step up from the ape was the creature having the ability of human speech that is just not about survival by food and water but about all the abstractions we have mastered and all the conceptions we have formed from God up there all the way down to the fundamental photon! The search for the still “missing links” that would cover this vast field of intellectual difference is long since the most stupid joke ever played by willful so-called “scientists” [they call themselves, paleontologists is their professional name] attempting by hammer on the hard rock in the sun-burnt desolate deserts of the world to unearth the intellectual and spiritual difference between the howling of an ape on the one hand, and Homer’s epics, Hindu’s Upanishads, Aristarchus’ heliocentricity, Sophocles’ Antigone, Plato’s Republic, Byzantine Vespers, Φίλος Ἰλαρός, Dante’s Divine Comedy, Shakespeare’s Sonnets, Handel’s Messiah, Beethoven’s Ninth, Schubert’s Winterreise, Vaughan Williams’s Lark Ascending, Pythagoras’s Theorem, Newton’s Laws, Kepler’s Laws, da Vinci’s Gioconda, or El Greco’s The Grand Inquisitor on the other. As long as such “search” is permitted to go on in the midst of hunger-stricken peoples in Africa, horsewhip makers ought to be ordered fast back to work! The biochemical differences between ape and man are getting to be so small (less than 2% as of my last hearing), as the functions of their bodies, especially those of tails, hands and tongues, remain so very different that, the latter cannot but be reflected in the remainder of the difference of the former between the two species. The atheists must at long last either produce a convincing link of cause and effect between proteins and amino acids on the one hand, and such as Sonnets, Hymns, Symphonies, Theorems and Universal Laws on the other, or just shut up for good! The stupid farce has been played for far too long! As shame fails, the next word belongs by right to the whip! The truly important part of life is that of the Spirit, not of the rotting flesh! Better than all the rest, the scientists must know this Truth! Einstein was so convinced of the uniqueness of his own brain that he bequeathed it to scientific research. Laboratories all over got a slice! And they all learned absolutely nothing!: Except that it, too, was just another brain!
of the former upon the latter came with the advent of evolutionary theory. When people still believed in the supposed God-ordained superiority of their own nations and races over those they exploited freely, they could not but reject a theory that not only put them all on one level but also called them descendants of the apes, thus at once attacking not only the social order but tacitly even the dogma of the special creation of man by God! When we still do not really understand our nature, the clear uniqueness of man relative to all other animals, commands blind belief in something extraordinarily special about our nature. It is quite clear that the “theologians” still do not accept the duality of our nature, as consisting of the same ordinary “clean” and “dirty” matter as everything material else, and then also of Spirit dwelling within our bodies for as long as we live, that is set free upon death. That was/is much too Greek a conception, for people inclined to accept a whole, inseparable, special nature of man as a result of which he has been destined to be raised whole in Heaven. To this day, the Church (and all monotheistic religions that alone properly are concerned with this matter) refuses to be specific about how matter eventually becomes Spirit, in the face of the understanding that Heaven means nothing other than pure Spirit. Simply because they know nothing substantial about either matter or Spirit, and they have not prayed for understanding! Naturally, the theory of evolution attracted attention both from within the sciences proper and from without. The dust has not completely settled yet. The original evolutionary view was too simplistic to be accepted unexamined, and examination resulted in substantial changes of the theory aiming at fortifying it, though only against formal attack. Even so, all the real questions regarding the pragmatic problems the theory still faces remain unanswered.

§25. (a) Leaving all other details aside, no evidence can be stronger against evolution than that the organisms found in the fossil record are all having organs fully developed! When the basic idea of the theory is the survival of the fittest under an “order” of things developed on mere chance, that “order” cannot be other than that of chaotic disorder! Having worked professionally in ferro-nicheliferous mines, I, too (as all others in the field of mining), never found the most rudimentary utensil made of ferronickel (or such)! Why? Because the “law of oxidation” runs supreme, and overruns the so-called “law of pure chance”! Everybody familiar
with the structure of all kinds of "organs" can only assure you that not one of them is getting in place without a consciously guided hand! Never in all the laboratories of the world has a scientist declared that he found things in order in the morning that he left in disorder in the evening before, absent all human intervention! That the organs of living organisms are all found functioning properly except in case of sickness, and that the fossil record uncovers populations exhibiting healthily functioning life when they were alive demolishes the idea of functioning blind chance. The laws of physics, the laws of chemistry and the laws of biochemistry are all much too exact and austere to have come into being by pure chance, that by its very nature cannot set precedents: That a deck of shuffled cards comes in a particular order does not oblige all the subsequent decks of cards to come out in the exact same order! Science is not the study of such a "principle"!

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

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

§26. There can be no question that the theory of evolution was a genuine product of the time and social circumstances in which it appeared. This is why it was immediately embraced precisely by those who had a worldly interest in casting doubt about the existence of God, whose number since has vastly increased. This of course, as we must be honest, in front of the backdrop of the great and vast in number sins of the Christian Church! It is precisely for those sins that its leaders have wrongly made the matter of God a matter of pure “faith”, totally unguidable by Reason, foreign to Logos! Without in the least realizing that the separation of God and Logos they thus enforce in undisciplined minds as true is precisely the unpardonable sin, that officially through Church sanction renders God at least indifferent to Reason, against Christ’s
plea that we love God “and with all [our] intellect” also! To understand the damage thus caused, we only need consider what abominations so-called “love” is capable of when it is not guided by Reason! This is why the Church still remains mute, willfully totally uncomprehending not only the matter of evolution but also other scientific matters that bear so heavily on our lives and souls. Evolution as a theory of the “survival of the fittest” pardoned all crimes the “fittest” ever committed and continue through the centuries to commit against the thus construed to be “less fit”, among whom are also found the men of scruples! It was thus that the field opened wide to the whims and wiles mainly of the most powerful, who by the fiat of the “law of the fittest” canceled all scruples!

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

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

That of one hundred vehicles is

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

That of one thousand vehicles is

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

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

\[ p_{d1} = 1/(52 \times 51 \times 50 \times \ldots \times 2 \times 1) = (52!)^{-1} = 1.240 \times 10^{-68}. \]  (4)

The probability of that event occurring twice in a row is

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

Now remembering that the whole universe contains the mass equivalent of only about \(10^{80}\) atoms of hydrogen, if you assume it to consist solely of hydrogen atoms, your chances to pick up a particular atom is only \(p_u = 10^{-80}\). Just compare the above numbers and see how the astronomical chances stand in comparison to those of only one thousand vehicles moving one way in a street purely by chance!
(b) The evolutionists must be asked the number of distinct items that are all needed to form a single human body, and to give us the probability that all those items fall in their proper places purely by chance, generation after generation of all humans that ever lived; and then of all species that ever lived! Even professors must be made to feel the shame of deliberate lying to their students from their chairs! And even the most high priests must be made to confess what they have allowed to pass from right under their noses all these centuries! Humility is taught from the top down, not the other way up! These people have shamelessly reversed the teachings of the Lord Christ! Darwin in Galapagos! What did he really see there? The survival of the fittest, or the most fitting accommodation of life to the local conditions? Did he discover there the remnants of all other species that were unfit to the local conditions and only for that reason did they drop dead? We now know life to thrive at great oceanic depths of total darkness. Only yesterday, we thought those conditions far too prohibitive for life! Didn’t the physical conditions preexist the appearance of life? But we find gradual adaptations from species to species, that allow us to conclude evolution in action? Evolution in action based on chance demands the presence of the remnants of untold failed attempts, untold “thalidomide” fossils, for every successful one! Where are they? Doesn’t really the presence of gradual adaptations show the operation of a scheme, indeed of a Grand Design for life that contains the mechanism that adapts its forms to the (changing) conditions? Bearing in mind the numbers given above and those asked that they be given to us by the biologists, what must we really say? That behind it all we only have benevolent yet blind chance, or an all-considering Mind, a Nous, the Logos? Far and wide over this earth have evolutionists traveled in search of support for their theories. Did they discover anywhere a hut, however humble, that got there all by itself, with no maker or craftsman, let alone an architect? There can be no escaping it: Evolution as taught is a naked desperate attempt to avoid confessing the Logos! Shame on you, Professors, and High Priests!

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

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

§29. (a) This is why the theory of evolution does so well indeed! This is why it is being treated with feathered gloves! For indirectly, even those that publicly attack it even in the courts, privately live upon it! Without crime, we need no lawgivers, no policemen, no judges, no jailers, no jail-builders, no executioners, no war industry, no armies, no generals; even no priests to forgive our related sins! Just imagine the unemployment we would have if we ever came to our senses and begun living by the commandments of the Lord engraved solely in our souls! This is why the theory of evolution and all godlessness is not exposed in all its moral nakedness to full public view! Evolutionist “scientists” and all those others going along with them are only the mere and pitiful intellectual mercenaries of the far-flung “philosophy”
of willfully continuing barbarism masquerading under learning, science, culture, civilization; mercenaries hired solely in order to provide what the kept ignorant or colluding masses need as “scientific” foundation, justification and augmentation of our “philosophy” of unending barbarity!

(b) The success of creationists such as Morris and Parker (of the Institute for Creation Research in Santee CA) and others in exposing the fallacies of evolutionary dogma (that remain even after all the twisted sophistication of its present argumentation), will remain modest, elusive, unappreciated and unknown to the general public as long as (a) the social foundation of that dogma as presented above is not fully exposed, and (b) the creationists themselves do not cease to see themselves as appendices of the established religions, having accepted the duty to provide what “scientific” support they can for their Scriptures. In other words, the creationists will do a great disservice to their own cause as long as they continue to see “theology” and “science” as separate compartments of human activity and respective properties solely of “theologians” and “scientists” over which they alone have the first and last word, rather than as a common and united realm of intellectual activity open to all rational thinkers. Belief in a Personal Creator is a total commitment from which absolutely no one and nothing escapes! This is especially true for the Christians, who cannot escape from all consequences of the belief of God having become Man for all and not only for some. It takes a rational, fully committed Christian to see this clearly and conduct accordingly not just his “life”, but his entire vibrant intellect also! Unless he does just that, he has delivered himself to the wild winds of uncontrollable by himself religious sentiment, however well he may try to hide it first from himself (hiding it even under the name of “science”, that as such is nothing other than just another cryptic religion!); yet a sentiment that is masterfully controlled by others using him as a sheep and a pawn! The Good Lord had a far better than this idea for Man! Are at least the Christian creationists, obedient inescapably to God’s idea for Man, prepared to undertake the effort for the complete transformation of society, that as such is a complete, united, moral and intellectual effort, of which Science is but a part? Unless they are prepared for this, their “creation science”, rather than becoming a source of enlightenment and pure joy for all, will remain arid, and an embarrassment mainly of themselves!
(c) Carried away by current practice, many creationists feel it a duty to be careful, and they attempt to separate creation science from theology. But a creationist who feels embarrassed for his own theology is not likely to succeed, however modest a scientific goal he sets for himself; and a Christian who feels embarrassed for his own God is a far far sorrier spectacle than any atheist or other polemical anti-Christ-ian, and indeed becomes their best ally in their well-disguised but no less fervently avowed efforts to see the name of Christ and all its derivatives expunged from the human vocabulary. Even pious people, acting in good faith, think the issues easier to handle if kept separate. They don’t understand that this notion of separation is of a fundamentally atheistic nature; nor that those adopting it provide unconsciously their services to the opposite camp; nor that they only manage to exhibit a faith that still needs time and deeper thought to come to maturity. We miss all this only because we fail to realize how generally successful atheism has already been. That the issues are easier to handle if kept apart is a fundamental mistake, of which the careful unbiased reader will in the end be persuaded. This at any rate is my intent.

(d) God is the source of all Reality, both scientific or other, except of sin! Sin enters Reality solely by our choice of action!: In order to be perfect, Reality must include human freedom; and that involves choices between potentialities! That of sanctity and that of evil! Without freedom sanctity is out of human reach! For sanctity to be within our reach, the potentiality of evil must be there, too! Both sanctity and evil enter as potentialities, not as unavoidable obligations. We must choose, and the Lord must judge! In the Name of Holy Perfection! Only patent fools demand that God had prevented evil from the start! He could have had, but then we would not be free, and Heaven would be out of our reach! They don’t like to be called patent fools? The only remaining legitimate choice of name for them is haters of Heaven! Their choice! Once again: Evil enters as a potentiality, not as an unavoidable obligation; for without it, freedom first and then sanctity, the opposite to evil potentiality as a conscious free choice standing opposite to the potentiality to commit evil, cannot exist! It is by our own free will to choose sanctity that it, too, enters even the present world! It is by our own free will to choose to do evil that it, too, enters and thus becomes real in the world! We cannot hope to resolve any painful issue in the Spirit of Truth, that
involves only painful issues, by which alone it is transformed to Beauty, unless (a) we recognize that it is at the center of all good things, that in order to be such require as potentialities, yet not to be chosen, their opposites; and (b) we finally free ourselves of all atheistic bias cunningly inculcated in our culture either by patent fools or haters of Heaven, as each one of them selects the identity of one’s own choice! Note!: License seekers are Heaven haters!

§30 All atheists and all anti-Christ-ians operating within Christian society deliberately distort the Truth and use and abuse the essentially benign character of it in order cunningly to exploit and subvert it ever more safely for themselves from within. No mistake may the Christians make of this! Take as sufficient example the Church-State separation dogma as understood in the United States. If the Founding Fathers lied in declaring that “all men are created equal”, no faith may be given to any article of the Constitution than is deserving the statements of liars. If so, the American Christian experience is a foredoomed exercise in futility. If the Americans as a nation believe in the opposite, they must also believe that the Founding Fathers also truly believed in the Creator. Yet, hardly is a spectacle in the United States historically sorrier than the misconstrual of this doctrine: Christian tolerance was inserted solely for reasons of human freedom understood to be kept within its God-ordained bounds, not in order to eject God from the social fiber. The misconstrual, initiated for secular gain by seeming, so-called Christians, eventually surrendered society to the hands of active anti-Christ-ians and atheists who hastened to turn the Country de facto atheistic, by giving willing practitioners an essentially free hand, who then converted Religion, Churches and State to servile maids of their particular interests. For this reason only do the churches continue to be tolerated and to be granted the privileges they enjoy: because they deliver servants obedient, pliable and unthinking to a progressively ever less Christian and ever more atheistic State serving such interests. If the proper teaching of Religion, Ethics and TheoLogy must, as it must, be removed from the hands of the “churches”, it is only to be done for their obvious failure [due to the absence of faith of their prelates in God] to defend the Country successfully against this horrid internal subversion. Proof first and sufficient supplies the splintering of the churches, that is anything but benign. The so-called “ecumenical” efforts are laughable, the matter anything
but, the theological immaturity of the prelates evident to all having eyes to see. Quite simply, the churches have simply failed the Nation and are a cause of embarrassment to the remaining believers in God, who are obligated to cut a fresh path, or at least retrace the original path that the churchmen abandoned to the weeds. World leadership has meaning and acquires respect only as it supplies moral leadership also grounded on and guided by a solid faith in God. Economic, military and political power are not their own objectives, but only the means attracting attention to the moral prerogative! The Country does not give evidence of the spiritual agony that accompanies the provision to the world of this worthy example. Relative to it, the highfalutin words the politicians unendingly mouth are infantile blubbery! By what right do I make this charge? By that of a man daring to see what the world could have become but has not after two thousand years of the true, yet still absent, Christian example! Now, the torch has been passed on to the United States! Do we understand the obligation of shedding around the moral light the world now needs, that would oblige the Lord to crack an approving just visible smile at us? What does maturing mean?

§31 If today there are bona fide Christians who still fail to see the totally seamless spectrum of human activity, that we classify variously as cultural, intellectual, moral, philosophical, theological, theoretical as well as practical, this is only a clear proof of how little we have understood of the implications of God and Man. We need to re-examine the entire spectrum of issues and problems implied by Creation, real for believers, still potential for unbelievers. Nothing would be sorrier than to be shown that the so-called “Christians” and “creationists”, too, are just another group of special interest merchandisers determined to meet for monetary profit the particular, psychological if nothing else, need of the “marketplace”! Here, I only attempt to identify the true source of the one Problem of the World and the Universe, and to suggest, as far as I can see it, the vast area to which all intellectuals respecting themselves need to pay attention.
§32 Now, an implacable rationalist cynic may well ask whether without ever confessing it, unconscionably yet truly some have made it their sworn purpose to bring us to the brink, by so designing their teachings as to bring us just there, whether by the one or the other means! Please consider:

(a) Theory Number One: The “unprovability” of God, that most of us have swallowed unchewed, missing the fact that God’s being [the question of His ontology] is being ignored and only His “existence” [the question of His reality, presence or absence] is being “discussed”, by which trick t hidden from view goes the attempt to avoid this difficult yet crucial distinction, and our illicit categorization of Him with about anything else of which we do not discuss the ontology but its mere reality as an ordinary material res, said non-existent when we cannot examine it as the rest! With this teaching, identically coming down by common, agreed on, seemingly learned opinion from both the very highest chairs of “theology” and of “science”, the faith of all (except only the few willing to dig deep in the diamond-hard ontological and existential core of the matter) cannot but be skewed and subverted and nothing can be believed to exist that a hardened hand cannot feel, an untrained myopic, astigmatic eye cannot detect, an untutored mind cannot comprehend, and an undisciplined conscience unaccustomed to the endless pain of minute examination of all received messages cannot fathom! Of course the atheist stands to gain by such
a teaching! But doesn’t the “theologian” understand that, by his own identical teaching, he plays, supposedly on behalf of the Lord he claims to represent, a cruel game of heads or tails at the expense of souls that cannot bear the strain and stress? A “theologian”, especially a churchman, is not an ordinary “intellectual”, nor a professional interested in making a fast deal, but a man sworn to mind the true safety of people’s souls, not the temporary soothing of their psychological anxieties! For these, there are better specialists, medicines, means, and far more pleasant ways of spending one’s time in order to distract oneself! Among the theologians of all three monotheistic religions serving the spiritual needs of half the population of the world and affecting the lives of us all, isn’t there just one man having enough faith to stand up and declare that Holy God cannot have, barred by His own Holiness, so arranged things as to remain undetectable by men’s intellects, allowing that only by our ever doubtful sentiments may we may approach Him? So really little is the faith in God of them all?? And isn’t the “scientist”, if he prides himself as a scientist, a man dedicated to solving difficult problems, to elucidating what seems mysterious, to pushing ever out the curtain of the unknown that prevents our panting lungs from breathing in ever more, ever fresher air to oxygenate the brain spending itself right at the front of that curtain? Why then does he reject the true and worthy pride for solving that greatest of all problems and feels satisfied with the always doubtful pride of a Nobel prize that tomorrow may prove to have been wrongfully awarded, which only by collusion is never confessed?

(b) Theory Number Two: The theory of evolution both as originally conceived and as developed to date denies all rationality acting under what it insists has been a totally fortuitous and undesign “scheme” of selection! Unquestionably, it was the first of the modern “scientific” theories that held high the banner of rebellion against all underlying rationality! It was behind which there later gathered all the “hard” sciences led by atheists and “agnostics”! It was easily more than sixty years after its appearance that physics under its own banners of relativity and quantum mechanics could at all with any semblance of “good” conscience arrive at the “conclusion” of meaninglessness! It first showed the way to that “conclusion”, now openly proclaimed by “all authorities and all serious scientists”, humbly proclaiming first themselves and
all their sayings meaningless! But even as the theory still restricts itself to biology, no one can deny the underlying physics on which it, too, operates and by which it is inexorably carried to wherever the underlying physics leads! Why, then, do “all authorities and all serious scientists” not regard themselves duty and honor bound to spread it [the theory of evolution] out to make it a general theory of evolution underlying all “hard” sciences, all the way back to the Big Bang? Surely, an implacable rationalist cynic will say that there must be some reason even for that! Could it be that it hits much too close to home? A general theory of evolution cannot start from the amoeba! It must start from the Democritean atom! The amoeba subdivides, the Democritean atom does not! If anything subdivided at the moment of the Big Bang it was the whole universe. But then it is arbitrary, gross to say that it subdivided to just atoms of hydrogen! They, too, are composed of sub particles! Why then universally to just atoms of hydrogen? What totally fortuitous and undesigned “scheme” of selection brought that subdivision about? Why don’t “all authorities and all serious scientists” regard it a duty to give us the mathematical probability of that subdivision? Surely, the numbers cited earlier give them some idea about the procedure, even if things at the moment of the Big Bang worked in the reverse. But then, Friends, remember: Gauss stands on the side watching over the probabilities! Does he conclude lawless chance or Law at work?

(c) Theory Number Three: Relativity: the theory that attempts to make the point, as much as Einstein could make the point stick, that, above all, underneath all, controlling all, in the place of the old Absolute Designer-Intelligence God, there instead stands a new Absolute Principle-Goddess. The difference? The old God was believed to have established a well-behaved scheme based on Law determining all relationships, including the physical, that could in brief be called relativistic Determinism. Einstein definitely wanted this arrangement canceled and this way of thinking foreclosed! So he reversed the nominative and the adjective! He made a new substantive out of the old adjective, and demoted the old substantive to the adjectival position of a mere characteristic! He called the new Goddess “Absolute All-determining Relativity”! The difference? Where the stiff Law stood, there now stands the view of the observer, in the “science” of this new “physics” called the “observer’s system of coordinates”! In plain language? What anybody
says passes! Down goes the old God! Now, up stand all and every-thing as co-equal “gods”? Accounting, reporting, apology? No longer there! The “gods” do not report to anyone! Total release from responsibility! All pangs of conscience gone! Freedom at last! Or is it absolute license? For, of course, as always, who has the upper hand wins! Only now, the upper hand no longer belongs to Reason and the Holy Logos, but to brute physical force! Don’t be impressed by the ostensibly austere looking mathematical formalism of the theory! That is a mere dress to impress the ignoramuses! Underneath it all the king stands naked. But the cognoscenti do not mind: first comes the business! And to do that well you need good psychology! Already with his paper of 1916, Einstein was sincere: he did not intend “a system ...as simple and logical as possible, ...but that the reader ... feel ... the path ... psychologically ... natural ...!”! Without these explanations, the difference between relativistic Determinism and deterministic Relativity appears subtle; with these explanations, the difference is shown to be fundamental! Without these explanations, all seems theorizing, beyond the reach of the uninformed reader; with these explanations, everyone can indeed understand how the initial conditions determine the outcome: how wide, worlds apart, stand the old and the new visions of the World!: True: Einstein insisted but solely on his sort of “absolute rationality”, operating so as to make Relativi-ty Goddess Maxima! To whom he knowingly sacrificed even the possi-bility of making such definitive fundamental distinctions as those of here/there and before/after, that are essential even to any God-dess Maxima honor bound to respect her good name! Because it was only for the sake of Relativity of the psychologically affected ob-server that he insisted that there be nothing other than the physical universe understood in his own way, that essentially undercut even this his only “Goddess”, by knowingly denying her all possibility of spatial and temporal self-knowledge! What this makes even of his “absolute rationality” based on such all too dubious ontology as so compromisedly conceived by him is now obvious!

(d) Theory Number Four: The now accepted Quantum Mech-anics. Equally obvious is the fact that, even as Einstein thus played with fire drawing the above not at all “subtle” distinction, but not eliminating the idea of the Absolute though now reserved for his Relativity, under the banner of the theory of quantum mechanics, his “scientific” opponents have wanted to remove all men-
tion of the Absolute! Curiously essential to the edifice Einstein built was indeed the door of the Absolute! But Einstein designed that door both as a terminal shrine to his Relativity and forever closed to the all-out uncompromising Rational Absolutism of Intelligence! Even more curiously, his opponents, too, have wanted this door both kept and walled in! They do want to have full access to it and use it for their purposes, but they also want all “illicit” connotations coming with it left unmentioned! Thus must we see their insistence on the superiornity of quantum mechanics, to which they adhere with an even greater, and worse than medieval, religious fervor and awe; refusing, as no believer ever refused to question his God, to question its all too obvious irrationality, that must remain unmentioned in order that all outsiders never learn the proceedings, developed and written by the initiated solely for themselves! A mathematical theory replete with infinities! All magically expelled, in officialese “re-normalized out”! To the body of the theory we shall return later when the time for it comes. Our present intention is other: to expose the moving impulse, that also is the intended objective; which is none other than the banning of the Absolute. The means is called “Indeterminacy, or Uncertainty Principle”. A mere principle [based as we shall see on a misreading of physical Reality]! On the basis of which, Heisenberg was adamant: that we not see under even the name “electron” anything physical, but only the mathematical expressions!: Now even five year olds carry along their cellular phones, on which they can download even what is best left unmentioned. [Back in 1990, I recall, I had commented to my lawyer and then also a judge that half the proceeds from nocturnal telephone calls of lascivious nature were ending up in the coffers of the telephone company paying for high-end research and the Nobel laureates in its staff. Even he did not like the comment!] Imagine how the high priesthood of “science” like the mention of their dubious practices, just as also any suggestion of the existence of “hidden variables” operating in subatomic levels. Which, however, does not preclude their empty theorizing about quarks, chords and the like! But variables suggest all too clearly stiff laws operating directly in that level of nature, which not only blows up the uncertainty principle, but even opens the door to admit the Intelligence having laid down those stiff laws, that they want kept out with the tool of the uncertainty principle! In obedience to which, we are asked to submit no questions embar-
rassing the professors! So it is that our professors want us all of all ages down to babes to gasp in amazement as if in a circus. Pigeons out of hats? Wonder! A miracle! Priests, professors, jugglers, astrologers, fortune tellers? All “humble” servants of the Unknown Unknowable, that likes particularly the fat sacrifices! Intelligence? Unless it refers to that of professors, Its mention is insolence! Unfaithful, you shall never get a degree!

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

§34 In her “Fire in the Equations” Kitty Ferguson (loc. cit.) has made a study of the of S. Hawking’s sayings, whom she admires and respects for his courage “in the face of overwhelming adversity”. It takes a deep believer in God to admire and respect even “an avowed agnostic” for his virtues. But, I submit, it is high time for us all, adversity-stricken avowed agnostics by right of obligation included before us all, to ask even about the source of their admirable virtues! How does a meaningless purely physical universe produce such generally recognized admirable virtues, that are nothing at all if not spiritual products? Values can be found even in an untreated refuse dump site: Poor people collect all salvageable values, and birds feed. So, I submit, this is not a good enough approximation of total meaninglessness. That can only be approximated by refuse so thoroughly mixed as to make it forever impossible to collect anything valuable from the homogenized heap! How do you extract admirable spiritual values from there? An “avowed agnostic” is honor bound to ask and satisfactorily answer this question before all other ones! If he succeeds in doing that, he must then ask himself whether he may still call himself an agnostic! Ferguson states: “[t]o say that Hawking or any other theorist has shown us there is no God is premature to say the least”, I must ask: How does a theorist show us the existence or nonexistence of anything? Does it not
take an archeologist or a paleontologist, i.e., practical men willing to get dirty digging deep and examining minutely a site to state the existence or nonexistence of findings in it? A theorist can only present us his theory and his assumptions; nothing more. Then it is up to practical men to investigate the hard facts and determine the compatibility of the theory with them! Particularly in the case of Hawking, the hard facts are his evident virtues! Does his theory explain at least them? If not, where indeed is the value of “avowed agnosticism”? One who doesn’t understand the complexity of today’s advanced scientific theories, the core of which is accessible only by the few, nor the whole package of side issues in which these theories are ever so carefully wrapped, cannot evaluate the caveats and takes the mere statements of the theorists before even they are put to the test as a proven truth! Laicization of science is useful, but only when every word is put down and taken with infinite care; otherwise it is bound to mislead! When, as Ferguson puts it, we dare “put God to the wall”, why shouldn’t our cynic question how Hawking from his wheelchair dares ask “what place for a Creator?” After all, even a “complete” man-invented “theory of everything” cannot be more than an exercise on paper! Is it possible that Hawking is ignorant of what it would take to translate our scribblings into Reality, that it took our entire civilization to date to put a man on the Moon for just a couple of days? Will Hawking’s “theory of everything” also explain how his scribblings, “written” on no paper at all, made this real Universe? As his effort is to avoid the initial singularity, for his proposed theory to be correct, it must prove the impossibility of any law already discovered or to be discovered in the future explicitly expressing universal physical operations in terms of a definite age of the universe, as that automatically introduces the notion of Beginning, that the “experts” attempt so clumsily to hide behind the term “singularity”, adopted only in order to confuse the uninitiated! For, obviously, you cannot ever have more than just one singularity, as the two terms cannot but remain synonymous! Our incorrigible cynic will insist: if Hawking is such a good theorist and “avowed agnostic”, rather than remaining only an one-side advocate, why doesn’t he first also spend an equal time on theorizing on and examining the alternative possibility that the true fire suggested by the equations is none other than the creative intellectual and practical power of God by which He called the world into being, so that he, Hawking, can then compare the two
alternatives and present to us the results of that comparison also? Now that would be something before which any cynic would take a pause!

§35 Alas, our best our brightest cannot escape the grip of the cynic! Kitty Ferguson obviously concurs with Hoyle whom she quotes saying that “I have always thought it curious that, while most scientists claim to eschew religion, it actually dominates their thoughts more than it does the clergy”! Our cynic will reply: “But this is not curious! There is an obvious reason for that: Both camps deal with the problem of Reality. But they arbitrarily cut it down the middle, into an emotional and a logical part. The clergy take only the former, the scientists only the latter. The clergy regard God as an unfathomable Person, but not also as the Supreme Logician, Scientist and Engineer whose material product is the world they too touch; which if we carefully study, we all can arrive at understanding more than just that aspect of God’s nature that is thus accessible to us! The scientists, on the other hand, correctly regard the clergy’s half God a figment of the human imagination, but wrongly reject even the possibility of God being the Complete Supreme Person! Wrongly the clergy stand unconcerned about the hard fact that the world is a logical product of God, that thus connects all to the world of the Spirit; and wrongly do they abandon the world’s fate entirely in the hands of the Lord, instead of correctly insisting that we all give a hand steering it by our best Reason; nevertheless they believe and do not contest God! Emotionally exhausted, they can sleep! The scientists, however, trying to understand the world, are constantly faced with the dilemma either (a) to accept it itself as God; in which case, as they examine it functioning, they act as anatomists of the living physical God, who however does not respond as he should to the proddings; or (b) for their also being most puzzled by the obvious absence of a physical source of the logical structure of the world, to admit, as a consequence, the clergy’s proposal that the world is truly a product of an otherworldly God’s creative action, which they hate to do! Not that they have determined that structure and there only remains to discover its source; but that even before discovering it, they are persuaded of its logicality, that alone justifies their own labors in the lab, that would be pointless if the structure of the world were not logical! At rock bottom, for all their false sayings to the contrary, the scientists do very much believe in God as the Supreme Logician, Scientist and Engineer, while they re-
fuse to accept Him as the Supreme Spiritual Person, He above all else is! Thus their logic is split down its middle: Palpably in all they do, feel they only His Presence, that would be impossible were He not there! They are puzzled by His unresponsiveness to their physical-anatomical proddings, only because they choose to regard Him as physical! In desperation, instead of confessing the world different from a living man stretched on an anatomical bed [in whom alone body and Spirit react and produce a living reaction] and separate from God [unresponsive solely for that reason to physical-anatomical proddings], because they hold only the body, they consider it logical to declare the Spirit of God nonexistent! This, while they are awake. For soon after Morpheus takes over and the Spirit in them relaxes, the nightmares begin: Fully as Diotima [what for a woman magnificent name: “the God-honoring”!] Just please attempt to compare that to what we here describe! Alas, there still are plentiful pitiful patent fools who dare call the Hellenes idolaters! Those who, far beyond mere marbles, sculpted immortal even more the holy words! explained, their Spirit’s one half seeks to unite with its other, the one they rejected while still awake! Man asleep with his God unites! Cold sweat wakes them up! What awake they hate the most is their far better half with which they unite upon falling asleep! Regarding themselves men of cold Reason, they reject the divine emotion of feeling complete! And in fury, they deliver themselves to the never confessed raw ugly emotion of hating all that is Heavenly! So much having in mind, of course fall asleep they cannot! You can now imagine the mood they are in, by which occupied they return to the insane “sanity” of their zombie-like fully waking life!”

§36 Here indeed are three examples of how they try to cope:

(i) Since we first learned of imaginary numbers, we also learned they are inseparably associated with negative numbers, which in turn owe their existence to our arbitrary setting of the zero at some definite point of our choosing in mathematical and perhaps now even in geometrical “space”, without showing nonexistent the space to the left of said point. All negative numbers and all negative physical quantities owe their “presence” in our science to some such convention; they are not real! Hawking uses imaginary numbers (i.e., second-class unreal “things” hanging on the convention of first-class unreal, negative, “things”) in order to circumvent first, the singularity not just of a conventional mathematical but of the
physical zero, and second, the inexorable logical necessity of having a Logical Creator that alone can bring into being the logical physical reality science investigates out of the physical nonexistence the physical zero represents! Our recalcitrant cynic will insist that this second one has been Hawking’s real objective all along!

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

established dogma as general relativity was back then be allowed today to appear in the scientific press, if it made such representations? Would you say that the theory has since been verified; post hoc ergo propter hoc? Lindley states (loc. cit., p. 87) that “[t]he true accuracy of Eddington’s test has been debated by historians ... Since then other tests of general relativity have been devised and performed; nevertheless, because directly measurable effects within the confines of the Solar System are so tiny, general relativity remains a theory whose wide acceptance owes at least as much to its overwhelming conceptual power as to any empirical support. The theory, fully grasped, strikes most students of physics as something that has to be right because it seems so right” [all emphases added]! Lindley proceeds (on p. 88-90) to discuss what must be the very best “evidence” today in favor of general relativity: the Hulse-Taylor pulsar. After admitting the long-standing failure to discover gravitational waves, even in the case of this (“true or believed”? our cynic will again wonder!) binary, he states that the observed gradual decay of the orbit of the binary “was enough to persuade most physicists that the strange distortions of spacetime, so fiercely debated ..., so contrary to the common sense ..., were real physical phenomena”. But this is pure post hoc ergo propter hoc reasoning, based moreover on a substantial number of ad hoc assumptions Lindley was much too loyal to mention superadded to those used to build relativity! In addition, the “proof” makes no allowance for, and Lindley mentions none of, such unobservable phenomena certain to exist in such a close binary, as are tremendous tides and possible transfer of matter, that drain gravitational energy, but remain impossible even to calculate except on a large number of entirely dubious assumptions! Our cynic cannot be persuaded that the theory of relativity has at all been proven, especially as Lindley himself admits that “[o]f all the great theoretical constructions of physics, general relativity is the least demonstrated”! This brings us back to the beginning: What were the real psychological reasons that pushed Einstein to devise his theory, that since 1905 (or 1916, if you will) even the most strenuous scientific effort the world has yet not managed to prove? Looking back over his own life, every true genius will admit the fact that at the ages of 26 and 37 (respectively, Einstein’s in 1905 and 1916) he had no substantial body of personal experience and wisdom in the ways of science or the world permitting him to speak with authority on its fate! What Einstein did have in abundance were his
self-confessed rebelliousness against authority, forcing him to deny even the personhood of the God of Israel, and certainly, the wounds he carried as a Jew in the Christian milieu, that made him so greatly desire a scientific scheme that would permit him both to deny reference to ultimate absolute authority and to claim the correctness of all points of view! Without doubt, that was the psychological force majeure behind his lifelong scientific efforts!

(iii) In the section labeled “Newton’s Theory as a First Approximation” of Einstein’s 1916 paper, there exist at least five unevauluated assumptions without which the title point couldn’t and still can’t be “shown”, assumptions superadded to those made before! But if any one assumption be given an equal probability of being right as of being wrong, for five of them to be all right, the probability is 1 in 32, or just over 3%! Neither Einstein nor anybody else has offered any, let alone solid, arguments that even only those five assumptions indeed have very high probabilities! On “average”, each of them must be right by at least 87% in order that they all together just have a 50% chance of being right! The great significance even of the number of assumptions used in building scientific theories has not concerned the scientists! With such surfeit of geniuses around, can it be that they all have failed to notice the significance of these statistics? Or are they so confident that nobody will notice it and call their bluff, that it is upon such poor chances that they play their game of world poker—with God, none other? [In view of the clear experimental end of physics, may I humbly suggest that some honest mathematical physicists consider forming a society having as object the identification, enumeration and evaluation of all assumptions underlying each now separately yet reverently standing and each proposed theory, and all these theories put together, vis-à-vis the integral problem of the world, a project that certainly surpasses the ability or avocational time expenditure of any one individual scientist? I am certain that the scientific world, not to mention the laymen, will be astounded! Even if none of them rises to the challenge, our cynic’s conclusion regarding affairs in the state of “Denmark” will be crushing!]
§37 At this point, our now so familiar cynic shall not be able to repress interjecting that there has really been a very great deal of willfulness and wishful thinking in the making of our most revered scientific theories! And we cannot ignore the thrust of his remark, even if spitefully made! On reading Kitty Ferguson’s book, one is left with the impression that “the scientists would not object to accepting God, if he were not a person”! I consider this idea crucial for the arguments that must now be made. She quotes Joseph Ford saying that, “[m]ore than most [scientists] are content to live with unanswered questions”. I don’t think that anyone can deny that far more important than deciding whether there is some “God” is whether there is the Personal God! After all, when people ask the question, it is a personal God they have in mind! She closes her book with: “Religion is far more optimistic than science that in some manner beyond our present concept of human reason, we can know ‘everything important’. Perhaps the most significant difference between science and religion is that science thinks that on this quest we are entirely on our own. Religion tells us that although we who seek the truth may ride imaginary horses, Truth also seeks us”! But if she does, then she is not just a concept in our mind! Eggs in pigeon nests do not exist before nests, and they do not exist before pigeons! Pigeons can be out feeding, but they are there! God stands in the place of the unseen pigeon. We are the eggs. The world is the nest. The single most important difference between religion and science, surprising as it may appear, is in the fact that religion is closer than science to the ground point of Logic: the question of
the Personhood of God! That is the bone of contention, and religion wins! Any “religion” that dismisses this point or yields to the hyenas is not a Religion, and unworthy its salt! Because, “truth” is not Truth unless it affirmatively answers, as it shall here be shown, this ground question! And “science” is not Science if it thinks that we are on our own in the quest of ‘importance’, when we must be guided by It in questing the Truth by Knowledge (that is the other name of Science)! Do the “scientists” really yield on importance, do they admit that “science”, their science is not (quite) “important”? That truly is News!

§38 With regard to either religion or science, we are equally on our own, no more alone and no more “together”! With regard to them both, and a point they both miss, we are who we are, whole and indivisible! Since at the very end of her book Kitty Ferguson capitalized Truth, I might be excused if I stated my personal sense of it: When, in 1964 (then aged 30 and a graduate student at Imperial College, London) at a time of intense concentration and agony I first realized the sheer magnitude of all-including Truth I, too, was seeking, its total penetrating power, its scope over everything seen and unseen, I felt my hair stand on end as I then sensed the Close, Warm, Personal, Severe, Loving, Peace-giving, Joy-radiating, Safety-producing He-Presence, talking to me both from inside me and outside me from a distance of about two-to-three meters from beyond the wall yet inside the room, asking me whether I truly meant it that I desired to know the Truth!: Truth and God is a real He! Since then, I have found the doubts beginning to drop out of my thoughts and statements on matters of Religion and Science, and I acquired the sense of total conviction given only by Absolute Logic, the Holy Logos! No! I am not saying that all I say is Absolute Logic! What I am saying is that where I am wrong, I am wrong only because I have yet to unite still more perfectly the unity of Logic (of which Science is but a part) and Faith in God (for which the ordinary “religion” dispensed by Churches is but a poor substitute)! If, remembering Lyttleton, faithlessness is on the left and Faith on the right of what I say, then the way to Truth is not on the left, but the right! It is in this Spirit that I can say that whoever has not sought Truth at least as strongly as to feel and sense it as I did back then, he/she has not known either the separate meaning of Science and Religion, or their indivisible unity, and cannot speak with any authority from personal conviction! It is with such conviction that I
state that both our Religions and our Science have been much the poorer for our failure to see their intrinsic unity! Please, don’t misunderstand: I don’t blame the Bible for not being scientific enough in the way scientists would like it to be, or science for not producing in us mystical ecstasy in the way the religious people would appreciate! Each has its audience, and each its language. And the language of either, to be written down at all, must first be understood by those hearing it in themselves and writing it down! Then, as religion addresses all people, it must be stated in words understood by all people! Of such a language, we may not expect ultimate accuracy or precision of expression, as we do of the language of science, for the sufficient reason that not all people speak such a language! But we may and indeed must expect from all religions respecting themselves to preach and live by the very highest standards when referring to the Ultimate Reality, that cannot be Ultimate unless it is also Personal, free of all blemish! If ever comes a day when all people become capable of such a language as to persuade them of this Ultimate Hard Fact, then indeed Truth shall inform them of Her Ultimate Unity! Before that time, all less is big juvenile talk, be it even based on current theory! Again, not all recognition of Truth will come to us all in a flash. We must grow, arduously, into Truth! Both religion and science are as much personal as they are communal affairs! As a result, they require the gradual development of the language tools needed for their expression and dissemination. But before we produce those tools, we need an inner understanding of what it is that must be expressed. In that, not even our present science has succeeded! Because, it has not thought through either what it is that needs to be expressed, or even the significance of what it itself has said so far! The union of Religion and Science into unity will indeed take the whole of our education and of our culture! It cannot come without a radical reformation, obviously for the much, much better, of our entire civilization! If that is “the ultimate cultural imperialism”, so be it! God is indeed the Ultimate Imperialist, though with a vast difference! After all, isn’t the Kingdom His? Only anarchists may object! If our “best and brightest” object to Him for being who He is, why do they not also object to all those far lesser pseudo-imperialists who as from high above teach the world obvious falsehoods? Why do they not object to their own cultural imperialism, that, as I proved above, has grown far, far worse than it was back
in 1905 and 1916? For not doing that, their rejection of God is suspect! If they feel strong on their own convictions, I will tell them that they have defeated no God, if they have not defeated the Ultimate Personal God and His Science! I will also tell them that they have done no science, if they have not done His Science! I will also tell them that, by the method of their maniacally concocted and desperately convoluted theories, no whole science worth its salt can come about; but only by the only truly scientific method that His Personhood requires! In the spirit taught by Plato in the Timaeus, I will tell them that, only after they advance the better argument regarding Faith and Science may the wreath become theirs! I will challenge anyone speaking of God to deny that when the idea of God first comes to his/her mind, he/she is not automatically thinking of God as a He-Person! If we force ourselves to speak of Him otherwise, that is oppression! No! That is not due to social conditioning! It is due to our innate sense of what is the most logical! It is not just mystical or cultural that all people speak of God in He-Personal terms! It also is Logical! No people who ever lived was freer than the Hellenes! Their theogony speaks volumes to those who understand its deeply philosophical-logical steps of development. In the end, they installed Zeus, the most solid He-Person ever conceived by human intelligence! Socrates and Plato were not mystics! To the degree allowed by their age, and ours, they were Logicians! Our own problem is that we since have developed a very skewed idea of the “person”! When we speak or write to someone, we do not address ears, eyes, or brain! We address only the mind and spirit! That is the (essential) person! Those others are only its mask! The Ultimate God cannot Logically lack what we all consider our essential person! On the contrary, His being Ultimate, requires that He be the ultimate Person! Nothing can be, and thus nothing is higher than the person, and ultimately the He-Person! All else is paying toll to Cerberus, who only guards the entrance to Hades, not Heaven!
§39 Once we accept God as the Ultimate Living Mind Spirit Person, things get greatly simplified:
First: He does not hide; He is not afraid of anybody! Our failure to see Him is only ours! We simply do not know how to look for God!
Second: He did what He did with a purpose in Mind! That purpose is the last cause! That is how the last cause becomes also the first cause! Accepting as logically inviolable that there first be a first cause that desires a purpose and wills the means of its achievement, we avoid the temporal and logical impossibility of an uncaused last cause coming from the future to justify what has already become! [That solves the most nagging problem of the so-called “anthropic principle”!]
Third: He did what He did with ultimate economy conducive to His purpose! In other words, it is not obligatory that everything be arranged from the beginning, unless this is how it is most economical for the objective-purpose to be achieved! This allows for “miracles”!
Consider: No scientist creates a fully functional laboratory and locks it behind him, forever forbidding himself to intervene in the proceedings within! His next appearance in there is not a miracle, but part of the logical course of events! What he does not do as a matter of pure logic, he may not demand that God must do as an inviolable part of His own laws while he does not know either what God’s purpose is, or which is the most economical means of its achievement!
Fourth: Considering the analogy of a painting, we distinguish, and are not mistaken in so doing, between the pigments spread on the canvas from the “way” (including the manner of brushstroke, overall technique and the overall design and scope) in which they are spread! The same quantity of the very same pigments can be spread in innumerable ways, either by many creators or by the same one creator! What in our present case does the “way” of the creator represent? Succinctly, the law imposed on the pigments! We thus see clearly how material things are one thing and the laws of their operation are another; how the two do not mix but are matched and made to cooperate towards the perceived purpose! Why then must we assume that God did not act similarly and did not impose laws upon matter? Where indeed did we find that the laws are intrinsic properties of matter and are not imposed on it?

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

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

We could go on, but I think these will suffice as to how we Logically must think of God in the context of science. Alas, we no longer
examine the evidence of Nature as the witness of God, we only spend our precious little time and the energy of our geniuses in producing theories, and expending for nothing the real wealth of others in our fatuous effort to “verify” them, as all along we know that they cannot truly be verified! Science is not license, nor of course is religion. God’s economy forbids all kinds of licentiousness: Truly, because the Lord stood against it, was He finally crucified! Doing “science” as another way of doing or boosting business is dirty “business”? And so is “religion”, that does not hesitate to exploit even bereavement, the dead and the naked fear of souls; selling “hope” as if it were a material product, along with incense!

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

§41 Now, how according to the Bible are we capitally called to think of God? “In the beginning God made the heaven and the earth”. “In the beginning was the Logos”, not just the mere “Word”! Which of these two was then the earlier beginning? Were heaven and earth created first, without Logos? Could God be without Logos when He created the world? No! The Ultimate God could not make anything without applying His total indivisible Being! Was ever God without Logos? No! The complete Logos, namely the ability of all three: to think Logically, and to express Himself Logically, and to be infused by a Logical Spirit, is intrinsic to His nature, and He cannot be other than what He is by His own Nature! These negations do not indicate incapacity, nor yielding to some extraneous superior
necessity; it is an inseparable “part” (in limited human language) of the one indivisible whole that is God. We, therefore, go much too far when we, following mundane philosophy, “see” divisions in Ultimate Reality where none such exists! We are much too conscious of our human incapacity, and much too wrong in letting it dictate the terms even of our understanding of ourselves, as when we think of the products even of our own mind (not of our hands) as something extraneous of it! I am referring especially to Mathematical and Logical Consistency. This is not external, but part of the mind.

As we grow, our mind deepens, and in its depth do we find even the mathematical and logical consistency, but more as a shadow of the real thing than the real thing itself! This is why we do not know fully what exactly the famous Mathematical and Logical Consistency is! This is why we in fact theorize about it also when we say it must be this or that! But what is of any our theory is of our own mind! In the world out there, we may or may not find something looking like what is in our theory. What looks like does not verify any theory! If we truly care to find how the world was made (by whomever, to take the agnostic view), we must abandon the theories and look hard at the evidence/witness after we learn to separate what is truly out there from what is only part of our theories. Thus, what Kitty Ferguson capitalizes calling it Mathematical and Logical Consistency also is the product of a Mind out there, as it too cannot exist outside any mind at all; and it certainly is not in our own mind, as we have no idea about what exactly it is! Once for all, we must understand that Mathematical and Logical Consistency is integral, not differential! It contains exactly all that is and excludes all that is not! As against that, we only produce differential theories; the real value of which remains, moreover, unknown; theories that for being differential cannot fail to “predict” (nearly) everything, and thus truly predict nothing! Our theories are much too “soft”; yet, it is by them that we dare, pedantically test the far harder than diamond Reality out there! We must swallow hard and at long last admit that, if we find Mathematical and Logical Consistency to be the sine qua non of the world, what in fact we shall admit as sine qua non is the very Mind within which alone Mathematical and Logical Consistency can at all exist! In this context, we must also admit that, if I happen to hit perfectly on something existing out there with my mind, that something does not become a thing only of my mind and cease to exist out there! This is the other
side of what we argued just above to the effect that what is in my mind does not get out of it to exist out there independently of it! However, when between what is in our mind and what is out there that is also part of a mind we find that there is perfect or seeming perfect agreement, we must exercise good judgment! At first sight, we cannot admit that perfect or seeming perfect agreement as much more than the similarity of two perfect or seeming perfect twins, who may or may not have the exact same idea about something! What we see at first sight are only the envelope-ideas (of the second kind described just below) enclosing the important content-ideas (of the first kind). The contents of the envelopes are separate from their envelopes, and it remains to be seen whether the contents also are identical! This is why people declare they agree when in fact they do not agree at all!: They agree, or almost, on the rough shape of the envelopes, when they have yet to agree on what to put inside! Consider: That one plus one equals two is an idea that I have, that you also have. But this fact is the kernel or objective ontological body of the idea of the first kind contained in the corresponding envelope-idea forming in our minds to contain this objective fact. When asked about something we answer “I have no idea”, it is usually this idea of the second kind we do not have in mind, and thus lack the context, pigeon-hole, envelop in which it is proper to enclose the kernel of the question. When asked about something we answer that “I do not understand what you mean”, it is the kernel-idea of the objective facts that we do not understand! Clearly, by using either expression, we do not deny the existence of the objective ontological body of the kernel-idea. Equally clearly, we need knowledge of both the envelope-idea and the kernel-idea in order to process satisfactorily all the facts. Even as we have or have not, may or may not form, in our minds the kernel-idea of the objective fact, the latter does not therefore cease to be having its own ontological body, if not in our minds, then in some other mind, even the one “hiding” behind the objective facts of Nature! My (envelope-)idea and your (envelope-)idea themselves of the self-same ontological body remain separate and intact in themselves, as separate and intact remain our two minds, whether they are thinking of the same idea or of something else. But the kernel idea, even as it is housed in those envelopes, remains nevertheless independent of them: Clearly, even as it is housed in “here” and is a part of our minds, it is no less a part of the Reality out there!
So too, if out there we find what we call Mathematical and Logical Consistency, that “lady” necessarily belongs first in a Mind out there, even as by recognizing her we also make her a part of our own minds: One ontological body thought by two, or more, minds simultaneously! The Mind out there is no other than the Mind of God! We must not commit the great mistake of thinking of God separate from all that belongs intrinsically to His own Nature that also includes the Mathematical and Logical Consistency! Because we think this consistency as a product solely of our scientific minds, and because this consistency has not been considered by traditional “theologians”, this consistency is no less a wholesome inseparable “part” of the Mind of God! The ancient Greeks thought first of “God”, then of Nous or Mind, and only then of Logos: They found “God” to be unworthy of their respect if he did not have a mind at least equal to their own! Then, as they realized that having a mind does not protect from acting illogically, they recognized logos to be the true essence of mind! Thus they went back and revised their idea of “God”, and decided that, only if he had an absolute command not just of logos at their own fallible level but of Logos at the Ultimate Infallible level, would he become He and worthy of their total respect; in which case alone, thus by right, the “he” becomes He, and the quotation marks drop from around “God”; who thus becomes the pure Ultimate He-God! The human mind conceived Logos to be the highest possible category of Being, and I need not spend more time showing the Mathematical and Logical Consistency to be only a “part” of Logos! It is thus that we cannot conceive of a yet higher category! It is thus that we only regress, and no longer progress, the moment we deviate from this basic principle! It is thus that we cannot think straight about the Reality out there, unless we first put all these things in their proper order; in which effort we spent the time so far, I putting down on paper all that lies above and you, Reader, reading it, with interest, I trust! And if you, Friend, can put all this in fewer words, yet clearer still, yours is the wreath!
§42 And it is thus that, faced with the inescapable idea of the highest possible perfection that we cannot but associate naturally with God, we, starting carefully and impartially, also cannot but admit of only two possibilities: Namely, either that this God is none other that the physical universe itself, which constitutes the essence of classical philosophical materialism; in which case, all the highest attributes (including that of self-knowledge, and that of self-control by means of physical laws) that we above associated with the Ultimate God must be discovered to be of, not just in, the physical universe; or failing that discovery and in view of the fact, if it is a true fact, that the universe is controlled by Laws of other than its own devising, that those attributes belong to an entirely other, now no less but even more real, immaterial (and so) spiritual (not idealistic, as opposed to the philosophical materialistic, nor of course “spiritualistic”) category of being, and characterize a Being having the power not only simply to think of this world, but also to reason, and reasoning to bring it into being, and set it to function under those Laws.

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

§44 And finally, it is thus that, beyond the troubling statistics
mentioned above and the other problems already discussed, we find
additional most powerful physical arguments to be made regarding
God and the world from within science itself! The era of modern
science started in 1888 with the Michelson-Morley experiment.
Before that, three were the important stations of classical science:
Newton’s dynamics, with his law of gravitation appended; the
concept of energy and its conservation, come into our conscious-
ness gradually during the middle of the nineteenth century; and
Darwin’s theory of natural selection. As for light, we still
are left
with Newton’s “corpuscles”, and Young’s “waves”; our know-
ledge of its true nature has not advanced! Without that knowledge
did we agree to move on to other discussions, including relativity
and quantum mechanics! The arguments, strictly reasoned, refer
all these.
§45 With the theory of evolution having been the first to stir the stale waters, let us begin with its subject matter. Before the idea of evolution was introduced, there was no view other than the traditional, having all living organisms created separately by specie. Still faithful to this view, creationists such as Morris and Parker draw a sharp distinction even between what they call “theistic evolution” and the traditional view of creation, grouping the former with atheistic evolution, for considering the two indistinguishable except for the question of whether or not God enacted the natural processes, frameworks, mechanisms examined and discussed by science and believing that creation by specie can still be successfully juxtaposed to, and win, evolution both theistic and atheistic. Faithful to the old view, they continue to hold that the entire issue must be judged on the basis not of scientific but theological criteria, yet avoid to state how this can be done to the satisfaction of all thinking people.

11 Which, alas, demonstrates the old common fallacy of having the “theologians” uniquely qualified and empowered to decide all that falls within the theological purview! A fallacy based on forgetting that all “holy scriptures” are works of men. Enlightened? Only to the extent they could bear, under the lights of their time and the understanding it could provide of the Divine! No so-called “holy scripture” is a work truly of God, only of man! The only true God’s Scripture is none other than the world He created, which the “theologians” belittle cunningly in favor of their own word, which they have passed to the “masses” as having come ex-
§46  (a) For indeed, unless we be willing to charge God with Logical arbitrariness and malice [this, doubtless, in order to confuse us!], which is unpardonable profanity, especially when coming from “theists”, we must admit that, even if He took only “six days” to create the world, those six days do indeed imply some kind of “evolution”, if only of the conditions needed to be established on each “day” that would be conducive to the success and survival of the creative work He had planned for the following “days” of Creation. God did not divide His creative work into (six or other) segments for nothing, but for a reason! As this must also be juxtaposed to the immediate, in zero time and of zero duration, creation of the world, remaining ever since totally unchanged as He created it and exactly as we find and know it, that must also be considered within the power of an all-powerful Being. The special Creation which the creationists advocate, would only be fully-truly special if it were carried out in such zero span of time and involved, if it demonstrably involved, only materials so different and disparate from each other, yet so unique to each species, inorganic and organic, as alone would demonstrate as a scientific fact this kind of Creation! But this would be seen at once as many, simultaneous, parallel and independent of each other creations, a mix of foreign and unrelated and inert to each other worlds thrown for no discernible purpose together, that by no stretch of imagination or goodwill could be conceived as one Cosmos or Universe created by an all-powerful-and-wise Creator! (And I need not discuss, only just mention the question of what would serve as food for living species in such a world!)

(b) On the contrary, a one and only Creation is recognized as such and as product of Divine Wisdom only when it is organized all the way from the designing to executing to functioning under act to the letter and the last iota and comma from Heaven! Of all that is or is not true Holy Scripture, only the Logos shall decide and tell, which cannot by the nature of the Divine ever conflict the Truth, the Righteousness, the Justice, and all that is “written” in Nature, clearly not by the hand of man, “scientist” or “theologian”, but by the Logos of the Creator! The “theologians” cannot decipher Nature’s language! Which the atheist “scientists” constantly struggle to contort, to say what they want to be said! But as the sequel will show, of all them the time has passed; as for years twenty plus by now, falsehoods knowingly do they continue to teach, under cover of Churchmen, no less!
Law and Order, with all its parts harmoniously fitted to each other through space and time, as one indivisible and meaningful whole aiming at a purpose!

(c) I may not at this point avoid mentioning that even Morris and Parker (in their “What is Creation Science”, p. 264) admit of a ”creation period” and a catastrophic even if brief, lasting only for a few days, deposition of sediments (obviously, Noah’s cataclysm), which is clearly an evolutionary process! So, the above sort of instantaneous creation is not what creationists have in mind; and they certainly would not blaspheme God by calling Him illogical, arbitrary (i.e., unaccountable even to Himself) or malicious! In light of which, they too must submit to the logical dictates of an at least rudimentary “theistic evolutionary”, to the extent demonstrated in Nature, creation of the natural world by God; since all of it is composed of (let us briefly say) light, protons and electrons (the true nature of which still remains to be learned), i.e., materials clearly common to all higher species, which demolishes right from its physical foundations the idea of a creation by specie of the living organisms! Further evidence that creationists too subscribe to the general view is that Morris and Parker (loc. cit., p. 228), unawares of its significance, state “the testimony of the true facts of science is thus in full support of the Creation Model. That is, at some point of time, say T₀...” ascribing to the first moment of Creation an unspecified time T₀, rather than an unequivocally zero time T₀ = 0!

[Statements such as “true facts” and “some” point of time, pointing to yet another and substantial common confusion due to inadequate understanding of the true facts, are taken straight out of atheistic “science”, along with the statement “... the Space/Mass/Time cosmos was simply created, brought into existence in fully developed and functioning form right from the beginning” immediately following the above. At best, this language is imprecise for it leaves just as unclear what happened at T₀ as it does the standard atheistic science. If T₀ were only some point in time and not the zero time, the act of Creation is left undefended and can be interpreted narrowly, as a simple act of organizing the previously unorganized elements of Space, Mass and Time, i.e., as a limited act excluding the creation of these three, that must also be included for creation be the complete Creation of the Natural world!]
In the first place, this leaves the door open to the co-eternity of God, Space, Mass and Time, thus removing the absolute uniqueness of God as alone being eternal! This is an unintended offering to the atheists, who freely admit that at the moment of the Big Bang [the atheistic code-word that succeeds in talking of Creation while hiding from direct view the Creator!], on physical evidence, all three came into existence, their “possible” pre-existence being purely speculative, thrown in solely in order to save the atheists from having to confess the Creator as the direct Cause of the Big Bang, and left totally in the dark in order to avoid telling how they too came about!

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

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

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

(b) There is a reason why I so insist on detail: The strength of all beliefs and all theories, theological, scientific or other, is judged by the number, simplicity, cogency and (not just seeming) veracity of the principles and a priori and ad hoc hypotheses on which they are built, not on the number of followers or their polemical power. The fewer the principles and the hypotheses a priori, and the total absence of those made ad hoc, the better the theory, or belief. Moreover, even beliefs are not just of statements that are impossible to prove to the satisfaction of Reason! You cannot just believe that a dog once barked, and, lo! the universe showed up! You are in need of a house. You pray: God, give me a house! Do-
es a house just come to you? Not even just any house, but the house we call universe? Doesn’t somebody have to design it, to find a place to put it in, to build it, to furnish it? It is getting dark and you need light. Now, you may just turn on the switch, and there is light. But light just does not come on from just nowhere! When there were no light bulbs, no cables, no electricity, no power company, no engineers, no mines, no, earth, not even the universe, still light once came; but in no sense could this ever eliminate the real substance of the light that came, nor Him who sent it on, nor Him who thought through of it, nor Him who desired it! That the dog barked just doesn’t wash! He knows that day also means light, and night means also the absence of it. But the dog has no conception of the substance of light, and to speak true, for all our “science”, still neither do we! Yet, we dare, in the name of just that our “science” say that those three other ones are not needed! That is just another belief, as believable as that about the dog that barked and brought the light! Ultimately, even behind beliefs there is a concrete doer, or else the belief cannot stand! And he better be reasonable, or else, the belief is just for the dogs! Beliefs send directly to the Doer! While the theories are constructed to give answers to questions about the steps leading up to the Doer. The more cogent the answers, the more seamless the connection of steps, the better the theory. But as Plato showed in “Parmenides”, giving answers is still not quite good enough!: For we must also think through all the consequences of the answers we offer! Note this: we shall need it later.

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

12 Based on the volumes of the four great oceans, if the entire Earth were covered by water, its average depth would be somewhat more than 2870 meters. If the Flood occurred from an atmosphere at 50°C and 95% relative humidity, the water level would rise by only about 1.20 meters; and if the entire atmospheric pressure were due to moisture, on total precipitation the water level would rise by only 10.33 meters. If the
reduce, for the absence of altitude and inclination, the hydraulic effect: The water and the mud would flow from a much lower altitude at a much lower speed! But even so, how long did it take, before the Flood, for the ground to erode, in preparation for the catastrophe that carried the sand and silt to the oceans? The catastrophic deposition of sediments you imply requires not only highly turbulent conditions (now seen not to have existed on account of the very much lower altitudes crossed), but also washing off (perhaps down to the solid rock below), stirring, mixing and burying at sea all fertile soil along with all the seeds in it, thereby destroying all land vegetation! In scheme of events, there simply was no time to restore all this destruction! Moreover, this “explanation” of the Flood because of the concomitant burial at sea of all that highly mixed burden is most definitely not supported by the observed purity of the sediments, requiring unstirred conditions and a slow chemical, not mechanical process! Then again, the deposits of coal layers are incompatible with this scheme of the Flood: Logs, being lighter than mud and silt, simply cannot be buried under; at least not before they rot in the absence of air, which cannot happen in just a few days; just as forests do not grow almost overnight, tree rings being sufficient witnesses! Moreover, a more even terrain over the entire Earth at the time of the Flood can only mean that the ruggedness of the ground we now observe developed later. But then, earthquakes and tsunamis of an unimaginable magnitude must have occurred following the Flood, of which however not a word is included in the Scriptures, “remembering” the earlier event but “forgetting” the more recent ones, that inescapably ought to be described too as due to the rekindled wrath of God! As a mining engineer, I have directed underground operations in a lignite mine, the deposit being of the Miocene or Pleiocene period: Compressed tree trunks and leaves were beautifully preserved until exposed to air. The entire coal deposit of two to five feet in thickness was composed of lignite average height of Antarctica is taken to be the average height of its 50 highest mountain peaks, and one half of its volume above sea level is taken to be water, on melting and level spreading over the entire Earth, the water level would rise by only about 84 meters. These numbers show that there could never have been a world wide Flood. Local floods thought to be world wide in coverage are a totally other matter!
only, totally unmixed with silt and debris (that one would expect from a mud slide), as if the entire forest had been felled in situ covered by its own foliage and protected from penetrating silt. The next layer up was pure gray clay! The lignite deposit had a low ash content, just as all good quality hard coal, sufficient evidence of the absence of conditions expected from such a creationist Flood episode! These hard facts cannot be accommodated by additional ad hoc hypotheses! So, the choice being unavoidable between the “Creation Model” based on the narrative of the Scriptures (written, I repeat, by men trying hard, given their own unknown even to themselves ignorance of the hard facts, to keep on the moral line an uneducated, undisciplined and blasphemous people, and passing down the generations their writings as the verbatim hard Word of God) and the objective evidence of Nature operating directly under the Logical Law of God, and offering us even our food, rather than tithing us as do the “men of God”, it seems to me, and doubtless to all people of good will, that we have no option; or else, God-respecting scientists are not serious and do not honor their academic titles! They may not be, nor appear to be, as, or more, illogical as the atheists; or else, their well intentioned efforts are far more likely to be counterproductive.

(b) Thus creationists cannot avoid being much closer to what they call theistic evolution than they care to admit or indeed realize. But thus also, the difference between theistic and atheistic evolution is not merely in whether or not God is behind the very same evolutionary processes, but in whether the so far presumed as natural evolutionary processes were those adopted by the Creator. Atheistic evolution seeks to do away with God. But it can do so not merely by adopting each and every unqualified element of the triad of “time, chance and the intrinsic properties of matter” that Morris and Parker identified as the physical foundation of atheistic evolution, but by adopting (a) time as forever from all eternity; (b) the intrinsic properties of matter as intrinsic to it from all eternity, for only thus may its creation be denied altogether; and (c) chance as the sole creative force, for its alone being the only alternative to Divine Wisdom and Its power to effect Creation in a fully Logical and controlled manner. We may not ignore, that God is positively profaned when depicted as “throwing dice” [that He did not even create consciously as dice] and awaiting something good to happen by such a random process that in fact
excludes the existence even of well formed, that is to say, designed dice [without which even the mathematical study of probabilities is altogether impossible!], as if He could or would no better! [Even Einstein, a self-confessed unbeliever in a Personal God, rejected vehemently the notion of “God” playing dice! Just imagine how atheist indeed are those in the far “left” of the atheistic camp who oppose(d) him, presumably on the grounds of quantum theory, that they nevertheless still attempt, unsuccessfully, to reconcile with relativity!] On the one hand, the cunning atheistic evolutionists do not rely on the basic evolutionary element of pure chance when it comes to designing and conducting their own well-controlled experiments [thus assessing to themselves greater wisdom than either to a personal God, or in His absence to the Pantheistic Nature, which they thus also deprive of built-in wisdom even as they claim to be seeking the Universal Law under which Nature operates; thus also mutely declaring themselves, pure products as they claim of blind chance, as the sole worthy of note “correctly” thinking and “wise” elements in the whole of Nature, even as they ignore the inescapable fact that, were such a Law found, it would only prove the Presence of a complete Process capable of establishing such a Law, or else they would have to start an altogether new game of picking literally out of where(???) that Law! And on the other hand, the stupid churches, not realizing what they are doing, give divine sanction to chance by themselves exploiting the human weakness for gambling, that they thus aggravate, with all sorts of unholy “games” of chance such as bingo, lotteries, raffles etc., as they, finding themselves unable to inspire their congregations with Faith, reduce themselves to the ways of the Mammon! The enemy believers try to defeat is already let inside, and presiding over the multifarious church functions that have nothing to do with the Spirit! How can we, outside the clerical and professorial classes, seeing the follies on either side, more saddened than bemused, hope to succeed, unless we stay well clear of all unreasonableness?

(c) The distinction between theistic and atheistic evolution lies exactly in these: (i) that time as we know it in life and science is (was) not there from all eternity, but was itself created (as Plato already knew, see his “Timaeus”); (ii) the intrinsic properties of matter were not from all eternity but inscribed to it according to Law when matter was created; and (iii) Law, not chance, fully
deterministic God-given Natural Law is the fundamental and sole worthwhile feature in God’s Creation of Nature, without which, “Space, Matter and Time” are totally blank and useless. “Theistic evolution” uses, is indeed obligated to use, these elements as described here. But as described here, these elements are entirely foreign to atheistic usage, because only in this way do they give flesh and bones to God’s creative Design and its product, that was the World.

(d) I cannot overemphasize the importance of Law in God’s Design: it must be comprehensive, deterministic, non-redundant, least yet complete, and non-self-conflicting. Blank matter was ordered (in both senses of “organized”-“set in order” and “made to obey”) by God, i.e., God inscribed to it properties according to such Law, and only thus were the properties of matter recognized as such. And time (the age of the Universe) since Creation was established as the fundamental physical variable by means of which the Natural Law could take effect and function in Nature. Atheistic evolution accepts “time, chance and the intrinsic properties of matter” as cabalistic mysteries not to be further investigated, as intrinsic to the nature of the pantheistic god, or as absolute a priori non-investigable elements of Reality. It is now clear that there is an abyss between what Morris and Parker call theistic and atheistic evolutions. The two are more clearly distinguishable than day and night, and as such, they cannot fail to be even more distinguishable by pure, correct scientific means as well, as in the sequel shall be shown.
§49 Following the widespread current philosophical beliefs, and believing they can protect their opinions from attack, Morris and Parker state that their version of creationism is to be considered as an alternative aprioristic model of origins, in itself incapable of being confirmed or falsified, just as atheistic evolution! While the method of falsification of atheistic beliefs including evolution remains to be presented, in view of the discussion already presented so far and especially that of the previous chapter, I submit that, no conscientious reader can any longer agree with the Morris and Parker contention regarding their explanation of biblical creationism! This is an important subject on which I feel I may not munch or at all contort my words in order to avoid hurting sensitive hearts; I must tell things as clearly as I see them:

(i) Even today, there are damn few people who dare to advance their TheoLogical reasoning beyond the level of their revered ecclesiastical authorities. (ii) Those, daily preoccupied mainly with the always pressing yet ordinary affairs of their empires, and so having little time even to defend even the part of their histories they can even from fair attack [I insist on this triple even!], simply do not have the ample time needed to meditate on the true substance of their beliefs. (iii) So, if they are not simply annoyed in their serenity even by the mention of things like that, to the extent that they do not even acknowledge receipt of suggestions through some fourth-level secretary, they rely on external intel-
lectuals and bona fide philosophers [and most usually on those with whom they are in good social terms, that exclude discussions of “sensitive” matters!], who usually however deal with ideas trickling down to them from the high Halls of Science, where the focus is not on the philosophy even of science, but on how to reach first to a finding that will secure the next Nobel prize! (iv) Philosophers learn of science second hand; scientists learn of philosophy second hand; ecclesiastical authorities learn of the fundamental philosophical-scientific developments third hand, and are thus practically incapable of judging their significance; which is why the latter choose to fall back on their familiar ecclesiastical traditions, which they believe safe, especially if they name them “unfalsifiable”! (v) Even pious laymen thus come mixed fourth hand to ideas that need a deep balanced knowledge of all four Logic, Philosophy, Science and TheoLogy, and naturally they cannot easily judge after the daily drudge! (vi) Ordinary laymen, simply depending on ordinary laymen’s hearsay, “believe”! Today, everybody “believes”, Where each one falls is solely for oneself to determine! I fear it is all too easy for untrained and/or undisciplined minds to fall victim of the widespread yet blatantly false belief and so-called “principle”, that dear of people lacking

13 A well-known priest-professor of “theology” stated on public TV that he has an “unlimited respect for Einstein”: What relativity does to TheoLogy was definitely beyond his conception! Even in the principal “first world” countries, the spread of centers of intellectual and practical substantial activities, and the splintering of interests is so wide and deep that only rarely and briefly if at all people personally active at the fronts of Logic, Philosophy, Science and TheoLogy ever meet. One can only dimly imagine what happens in countries where those fronts are heard of in the news from abroad! Today’s Athenian, e.g., does not even think that the Theseum, the Temple of Hephaestus in the center of Athens, is more ancient than the Parthenon, the Temple of God’s Wisdom; and that the former, a beloved God, was lame due to a hammer that fell on his foot while working furiously at the anvil! The point? Ancient Athens was a concentrated place where inactivity was shameful; all activities were in quarters placed closely together; Logic, Philosophy, Science and TheoLogy were in constant close interaction; and it was considered a greater honor even for a God to be lambed at work than to be a recluse withdrawn to his “other” world! The Hellenic conception of God is of a complete Person involved both in contemplation and activity, and as such perfect in all that is honorable, with no shades or shadows about Him. The myste-
in logical arguments, catch-all-winds politicians, souls so insecure that they play it ever “correctly”, particularly when they aspire to and hold the highest positions in the world, who in order to escape from the terrible clutches of Reason, with the sweetest of smiles and an overall bearing putting saints to shame, state that “the existence or nonexistence of God cannot be proven”! Thus keeping themselves pleasant to all, amicable to all passersby! Shameful, I say! But this is where professional “theology” [as empire, as a market trade for profit, or at least for just earning a living, not daring oppose every “customer who is always right”] leads! These people forget that the matter of God is not a matter of ordinary supposedly “respected” opinion! Today, we respect the opinion, not the person expressing it! We kill the person, but respect his opinion, even if it be trash! That’s why we have killed God but continue to speak about Him—as of course we do! God IS the matter par excellence: it pertains not just to the physical world but to the whole ‘Αληθεία Ἰππούμα, the Everbeing Everlasting Spirit and Logos [that is more than mere Reason], and to the Moral Essence of God and Man, and to the ultimate salvation of Man’s soul. These are not matters of “easy”, social conversation, but of the deepest agonizing contemplation! Let me put it flatly: A God who is not a person, nay, the Person, is less than a person, and as such is not worthy of the adulation and worship of persons! A person who believes in such a God is not worthy of respect! A God who has designed the world in a way His presence cannot be obvious to all honest and well-formed minds is unworthy even of the least possible respect!!! That the churches advertise such a God and prosper hiding behind Him is the measure of their shameless blasphemy, than which there can be no greater!!! For they prosper behind a God-Casino where the salvation of the souls of men de-
pends on the choice of heads or tails at the throw of a perfect coin! And a man who so gambles his soul not only does he not know what his soul is, but is also unworthy of salvation regardless of the outcome of the throw!

§50  (a) God’s existence and His non existence:
(i) Are they really propositions equally unfalsifiable, or are they indeed propositions that are both falsifiable? The difference? In the first case, you can believe either or both, without any anywhere support, not even in Logic: hence the “or both”. In the second case, when the one stands, the other definitely falls! Questions: Are we so bereft of all confidence even in ourselves that we cannot depend even on what we call “sense”, if not “logic”? And this in the name of both religion and science? Are they really both these abandoned in the hands of such people? Are churches and universities and research institutions truly insane asylums?
(ii) But are they not also logically opposite propositions, the one of which flatly denies the other? If Logic truly cannot tell them apart even as regards the unfalsifiability of logical opposites, what indeed becomes of Logic and all that is based on it??? Is truly Logic a mere figment??? On the basis of what would you answer this question affirmatively, and expect that we all do so?
(iii) And are they not also questions pertaining to the Ultimate Truth and the Ultimate Falsehood? Are these also equally unfalsifiable? If even these are placed on a co-equal footing, how indeed are we to distinguish between lesser lies and truths? Does this not demolish the entire edifice of ethics and morality civilized man has so painfully tried to erect throughout his History? Or is this the well hidden intent? Have we today become so thick, so impregnable by all light, so ignorant of secure past learning, that we have lost even this so far thought secure compass seeing us through the starless abyss? And for the sake indeed of what? In the name of what higher value? Is this Philosophy? Or is it Theology? Or is it perhaps Science? Or, rather, it only can be sheer unadulterated madness, that sees everything in reverse?
(b) One shudders to assess these even to the followers of other religions based on the words of mere men! But how indeed can one expect this of Christians, and high priests among them, too? These are supposed to believe in and serve not just some God they concocted, but the Incarnate God! Can a God who cannot be told whether He truly exists get believed as being able to incar-
nate Himself? And for what? If unbelief becomes rampant on the grounds of unfalsifiability, is the faith of Christians to be kept just for decorum, in order to have a priesthood that fundamentally doubts it believes and teaches such trash, but insists on living at our expense by singing this trash as “learned faith” in Him? Does their shamelessness indeed know no end? Only by such “leaders” led may we declare the choice between these supposedly co-equal unfalsifiables a matter of taste! They dare to call this taste!

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

§52 Only for the immaturity of their personal “faith”, at least today’s “men of the cloth” could not resist the insistence of atheists that the existence of God cannot be proven! When Christ has told us that even by a grain of faith we can command mountains into the sea and see them obey, our inability to demonstrate God’s existence, on Whose service alone mountains move, the fault is purely ours! Cunningly the atheists capitalize on this! And the “believers” concede as true the untrue: that the existence of God objectively is unprovable! Thus were the gates opened wide to faithlessness and to sin, by the influence of such company on the “believers’ soft faith, who were unable to realize that the doctrine of unfalsifiability of the enemy’s position and of the co-equality of Truth and Falsehood was atheistically inspired and inculcated! Remove Logos, and the Gates of the Abyss are opened wide!
§53 By adopting this false doctrine as a matter of faith, in effect we strengthen the general faithlessness and deny God the possibility to prove His existence through our faith in Him! But by adopting this doctrine as a matter of science, we do something even worse: we also deny God His inalienable right to prove His existence through the Logic He built in His own Creation, the objective physical world out there! It is an atheistically inculcated doctrine that the objective physical world and science cannot prove God’s existence!: The atheists had a vital interest in advancing it. The “believers” adopted it only for their diminished faith and undisciplined reasoning! The proud “men of the cloth”, being un-Christian in direct proportion to their pride, because of it would not and could not recognize that there is more to faith in God than they had said ostensibly “theologically”! And the proud “people of science” who learned their lessons, even the lessons in pride, at the knees of the “men of the cloth”, also for their pride, in turn, could not and would not recognize that there is more to science than presumably “scientifically” they themselves had had to say! In this, the “scientists” were joined by the atheists operating under the clothing of “science”. Together did they develop “science” as counterpoint and negation of religion, failing to realize and unable to confess that, they too did all this on a foundation of faith equally religious and equally faulty to that of the other sort that passed as the Faith in God, which they rejected! Thus was it that the ostensibly abyssal separation of Science from Religion was conceived from the pride of men and their little faith in both God and Logos that are not two but one, which now engulfs all our lives. And so is it that, if, early on, the “faithful”, for their basic honesty, had to concede that, God’s existence “was perhaps objectively unprovable on the evidence then had”, now that the atheists rule the waves, where they too find themselves in the same predicament regarding their position, it is a strategic blunder on the side of God’s honest people to believe them as retaining any scruples of basic honesty! Atheism, from its inception, is a system consciously sworn to dishonesty, and the atheists will never grant naïve people the co-equality they seek to obtain from them!

§54 Creationism, as the firm belief that it took indeed the Creator for the world to exist, not as a worthless counter unprovable belief, must revise its strategy if it truly wants to win. Because God’s existence can truly be proven! But in order for this to be confessed, a lot on both sides must first be done! On the side of Faith, the faith
on Scriptural man’s every iota and dot must be dropped. I am not suggesting stopping respecting the Scriptures! I am suggesting starting to study them carefully, in order to take from them all that truly and correctly pertains to the Holy God as HE truly IS, not as men of the dim ignorant past conceived Him to be! More specifically does his apply to the Old Testament, being a hard mix of tale, myth, biased national Jewish history, and holy Jewish men’s insights into the Holy. But it also applies to the New Testament, also by Jews written, not yet freed from the old Jewish so mixed mode of thinking! We must understand that God IS! [I refer to the ontological sense of the verb “to be”; not to the predicative (as in grammar) sense of the verb “to be”—this or that.] As also that, man’s understanding of Him is a totally other matter! The Theology pertains to the Lord as He IS! Whereas the “theology” is at best only a collection of men’s opinions about the Lord! I fear that, the vast amount of men’s sayings about the Lord is solely about opinions! And it is a waste of time trying to justify them all! If we men, mainly by what we do (including writing!) expose ourselves, beyond even our conscious comprehension, we do so Logically inescapably: We give egress and venue to part of what transpires inside us. In proper Greek, Λέγωμεν τι ἐκ τοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν Λόγου. This Logical inescapability applies to God also, who, however, is fully conscious of all that He says about Himself through His Work! If the world is His Creation [I say this “if” as a scientific question yet to be answered], the world as it stands is an expression of some part of God’s Mind: Just as a building is an expression of its architect’s mind and its details and functioning expose his care, so it is with the world! We only have to look not just at it, but in it, to turn every stone upside down, inside out, and surely there, we shall find the sufficient evidence we seek! Actually, the work is not as laborious as the words here make it out to be—only in order to show that absolutely nothing has escaped the Lord’s attention: God, even the atheist Einstein admitted, is not malicious! So, He has not made it impossible for us to find Ariadne’s thread, that safely leads out of what we consider to be Minotaur’s Labyrinth! What we seek is the Plan; and the Plan at its center contains the Law of construction around which every detail was spelled. If the Law is found and shown that it can be instituted (legislated, executed, controlled, overseen) by none other than the inanimate matter that makes up the physical universe, that also
contains all the properly functioning mechanisms necessary to this institutionalization (also containing, never forget it, everything that applies even to our intellectual and psychological makeup, including, lo, the religious!), analogous to the social mechanisms we institute for the proper application of man-made laws, then indeed the atheists carry away the wreath and inanimate Nature is the God. If the Law is found but shown that it cannot be so instituted, and that the universe does not contain all those needed mechanisms, then indeed the Law, by its incontestable presence in the absence of the necessary physical support, shall have incontestably shown its extra-worldly origin, and the theists shall have conquered the field! The proof that God indeed IS and is not malicious is sufficiently provided by the presence of just that Law, right under our own yet unable to smell it out noses, for more than three hundred years already! In fact, the Law has indeed been in place since $T_0 = 0$. Three hundred years ago, it was only “discovered”! It took another three hundred years for its full consequences to be realized! It has taken another twenty years so far during which, now only for their indefensible pride, spite, profanity, the intellectual powers, both “theological” and “scientific” that torture us have yet to acknowledge it publicly! All that has happened during the last twenty years of evil is in direct conscious, on the side of those powers, disdain of the Sitting Judge!

§55 Such a proof has an additional advantage: If today I commanded a mountain into the sea, it would immediately be discounted as an act of magic. The atheists would still not be persuaded, as they were “not” even as they were by the countless and no less impressive Miracles Christ performed in person in their midst, as also have never been all committed anti-Christians of all ages. Just as they then said “this is no Miracle, even as we cannot explain why it is not a Miracle”, or else they would have to believe in Him, so today they would still say the very same thing; and I do not think that I say this merely to cover my lack of faith to command the mountain, though I am quite aware of this my shortcoming! No Miracle I could ever perform would persuade the atheists, who chose not to believe God in person! But if I prove God’s existence in the way the atheists themselves demand that the proof be produced, by Reason and Science, them indeed they shall be caught in their own snares, and they will have no rebuttal, no Logical escape, Logic being what they say
they prize above all else! I do not think this is a way much inferi-
or to producing a direct Miracle. For, by disclaiming it as miracu-
lous from the start, the method I suggest does in fact reveal in all
its glory the First Miracle Christ performed, that was no other than
the Creation of the entire World! It is that unique Miracle that the
atheists shall thus have to explain, that, as it involves the entire
World, hits at the heart of what they regard themselves expert on!

§56 (a) Now, you will perhaps say that this is a very tall or-
der indeed. Well, if you think about it, it is not really that tall! And
the reason is that if God had made it that tall, He would have made
it that much harder for us to prove His existence. This was not
His intention, for we then, by our weakness, would have defeated His
purpose! His intention, rather, was to make His presence plainly
evident to those who would be willing to look systematically at the full
significance of the terms they use and the natural record before
them, totally unencumbered by false human preconceptions! God
cannot be proven that He exists, unless He be assumed perfect in
everything He is and does! Those unwilling to see Him so will nev-
er “see” Him at all. For only thus can He both be present and seen
to be present by those who believe in Him, and at the same time
appear “non-existent” and “unseen” by those whose wounded ar-
rogance does not permit them to see Him in His absolute perfec-
tion that stands so very much higher than they think about them-
seves. For only thus can He avoid exhibiting His presence, that
would be unbearable beyond all imagining to those who do not want
freely to believe in Him, who then would be forced to believe in
Him; in which case, first He and then they would discount the value
of free belief, that retains its full value only if it remain totally
free and be not forced! It is alone out of His love for us that He so
tries to “hide” Himself! And it is for this reason that we cannot
hope to do correct Science unless we also do some correct Philosophy
and Theology, all three together!

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

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

§57 Here is a good example of what I mean saying that we must look at the record free of misconceptions: Morris and Parker (loc. cit.) state that the first two laws of thermodynamics are compatible with, and indeed implied by their Creation Model. This is not obvious: The “unwinding” (if one chooses correctly to call it so) implied by the Second Law, namely, the fact that energy becomes progressively unavailable for the production of useful work, as far as we can tell is a fact, but nothing so far shows that it did not start either way back in all eternity, thereby making the physical world co-eternal with God; or following some kind of automatic earlier “winding”, thereby making the world independent of God’s intervention. Only if these two propositions are both untrue is it correct to say that somebody did the “winding” of the world, that thus started up at some definite, not infinite past time. However, this becomes a crushing argument only after it is shown that the world did indeed get started, but not on its own, at some stated definite past. When Morris and Parker state (p. 227) that “the First Law testifies that the Universe could not have created itself”, one fails to see why this must be true. If the Universe has always existed, the First law becomes a tautology and proves nothing! The issue becomes important after it is shown that the universe had a definite beginning, due to an outside agency, which however cannot be shown from within thermodynamics! Then, again, what Logic does the Creator exhibit by creating energy (presumably along with the physical universe) and henceforth holding it constant
according to the First Law, but making it constantly unavailable according to the Second? If an excellent reason for things to be so ordered cannot be demonstrated, the “logic” of such creation, suggesting an inexcusably whimsical behavior, becomes suspect! And Divine Whim is *not* a way conducive to universal human faith, let alone to faith based on proof! Where, in which particles of matter does God choose to hide the unavailable energy? Remove the word “God” and ask: “with the total energy constant, where is the unavailable energy hidden?”, to which not just the creationists but all scientists ought to have devoted a far greater interest than indeed they have, which is *none*! The question has *never* come to the fore! Besides, despite the so-called “experimental verification” (of which in a moment) of the two laws, there is a huge logical conflict between them, that has *not* been recognized, nor faced: What indeed is energy if it can both be present and unavailable? The “thermal death” notion is conceived of closed systems that *remain at equilibrium, after they have reached it*. As such, it is a logical notion, but *nobody* has truly observed such systems with proper instruments, sufficiently diligently and for long enough as *indeed is needed* as to establish the eventual “thermal death” as a *fact of cosmological significance*!!! We may *not* forget that thermodynamics and the associated notions were developed *long* before it was learned that the universe expands. Thermodynamics and Cosmology have yet to be united! *The full true significance of universal expansion has yet to sink in!!!* So taken in are we by the so-called experimental verification in close quarters! We both demand it when it suits us, and forget it when it does not! The scientists and not only the creationists so far choose to ignore the entire set of these and related issues!

§58 Indeed, what *is* energy and what *is* matter, and *why* are they told to be the same, as “science” believes following Einstein, when dimensionally they are *not* the same at all (energy having the dimensions of $[ML^2T^{-2}]$, and mass of $[M]$)? “Science” has offered the most superficial reasons for this claimed “sameness” (see §63, p. 99), but *only in order to give all the legitimacy it could, that was definitely lacking*, to that other atheistic attempt, presented as a true fact, of equating the man-made “laws of physics” to the *true hard-fact* Laws of Nature operating out there, of which attempt we shall say more later (see §62, p. 97-8). When scientists are taken to task on this “sameness” and on the naked irrespon-
sibility of their answers that touches on frivolity given the huge dimensional difference, they again exhibit the impenetrability and imperturbability of the Sphinx: they almost have as much to say! So, what indeed makes us think that the answers human “science” gives are the answers God would have given, and has indeed given?

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

§60 Even the so-called “Law” of mass conservation is not much better established! Here, we must not forget that we do not even have mass meters but balances weighing forces (having physical dimensions of [MLT^{-2}]) acting on masses, so much so that the confusion of a gram of weight and a gram of mass is not entirely unjustified until the vast difference finally sinks in! In weightless conditions only the weight vanishes, that is to say, the gravitational force acting on the mass; but how much is truly the mass and how do we determine that it truly conserves? Had we been born and aged under truly weightless conditions, would we have a correct
sense of the true quality and quantity of mass? As for its quality, the mere presence of mass in a spaceship in deep space supplies some least measure of it, but its quantity cannot be directly determined as on the Earth, nor can its density! In deep space, a liter of lead and a feather stand in mid air side by side! We sense that there is so much more mass in the former only by the effort we make to move it around. But effort means force! In other words, we truly do not have a direct means for measuring the quantity of mass in any body, though we do not doubt for a moment its presence! Under gravity, microbalances do the required detailed work; but since high school, in three universities, two postdoctoral appointments (one in a fourth university, the other in a most prestigious national research laboratory) and many many years in the field of basic and applied research, I never heard of chemists, or others for that matter, correcting when using microbalances for the positions of the Sun and the Moon, though their gravities in the surface of the Earth relative to that of the Earth stand respectively in the ratios of 0.0006049 and 0.0000035 and vary twice that much daily! I myself have used microbalances extensively and never seen in their instruction manuals the solar and lunar effects discussed, or how the measurements are to be corrected for more precise work!!! So, even the “Law” of conservation of mass is in reality also axiomatic, not factual as it now stands. Until, that is, we contemplate the issue of the true physical unit of mass, that cannot be other than what was once called the Democritean atom

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

14 In this regard, mass is not unlike time: We do not doubt its presence either (despite the efforts of some to denude it of its physical existence and dress it up in “psychological” garments); but we need a mechanism such as a clock, whether in the universe (where we “see” the daily motion of stars) or on our wrists in order to make time (through its inexorable passing) solid enough for our more satisfactory understanding! The difference between mass and time is that whereas mass comes in chunks called Democritean atoms that together constitute all the univer-
giving rise to the different macroscopically seen kinds of seemingly different materials! For otherwise, the universal Law applicable to all masses cannot be the simplest possible, for it would also have to consider the different qualities of the Democritean atoms, if these be unique per kind of material! Our present understanding of electrons and nucleons on down suggests mutely just this one only kind of Democritean atom!], so much later confused with the chemical atom! If mass (that is to say, each and every Democritean atom) do not conserve, not only does the number of Democritean atoms not conserve, as some of them inevitably vanish—or are created, but they also dissolve in different kinds, on which the simplest universal Law cannot possibly apply! If each and every Democritean atom do not conserve, the universe is inevitably involved in this kind of constant creation-vanishing play, that is either uncontrolled or requires additional Laws added to those known (or thought to be known!) in order to be fully and correctly controlled by the entire set of Laws! Creationists and all kinds of “scientists” must come out clearly on what they, whether by mere belief or or else solid proof, consider to be the case! Otherwise, none at least of those that choose to remain silent can be taken as serious!

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

§62 What the creationist must deny is what the atheist asserts to be the identity of man-made and Natural Law; which the latter deliberately disguises under the supposedly neutral term of “physical” law” or “law of physics”, exactly in order to avoid the otherwise due distinction between human invention and hard Natural Fact! Such Fact is either Nature’s own (Pantheism); or established on her supernaturally by God, in which case it constitutes the correct refutation of atheism! In either case, it is the refutation of human “science”, that is reduced, except by mere serendipity, to being “castles in the air”! This juxtaposition frees us of the obligation to accept as correct theories of intrinsic doubt. Whatever the degree of “experimental” corroborations or “general acceptance by scientists”, theories of intrinsic doubt, as are the theory of evolution, the theory of relativity, the current quantum theory, these three “scientific” pillars on which atheism today stands, cannot be correct theories of Nature! Every engineer worth his salt knows that he cannot do anything right, unless he knows full well what he is doing. How much more applicable must this be either for Nature-god; or for God Himself, Who could not but have preconceived perfectly in His Mind everything He later proceeded to create, beyond every humanly conceived measure! But the atheist does not want to admit even the minimal moral consequences that are introduced pantheistically! This is why he insists on debasing even Nature with his concoction of chance as the ultimate ruler of the world. The “pantheist” (in truth, atheist) Einstein was still enough of a determinist to object to the quantum-mechanically introduced uncertainty, but he totally failed to
see anything wrong with the relativistically introduced spatial and temporal uncertainty that he himself introduced; thus at any rate atheistically making a total fool even of his own pantheistic god, for not knowing and being unable to know (H)imself, even in principle! All this is, of course, well known to the “pantheon” of atheistic “high science”, as these people are not fools; which is why they never discuss in some serious depth, nor permit, these matters in public; which would soon debunk their false pretensions. And it is pitiful to see how they discuss them in private, how childish, totally flustered their reasoning reveals itself! The creationist must know his enemy very well indeed before he can entertain hopes of victory. God’s creation of the world can only be subject to a fully deterministic, non-redundant, non-self-conflicting Least Set of fundamental Laws permitting in their structure and application no uncertainty whatever! Otherwise the operation of Physical Nature would be fumbled, tangled, bungled! No human theory is, can be, correct, but is flatly false, unless it is compatible with this Least Set. This much must already be asserted as the basic Logical requirement, or else, Science is a total fake! This means that not only must thermodynamics be made compatible with the least Set of Laws, but also that the theories of evolution, relativity, and the current quantum mechanics are out as not fully deterministic, and thus as incompatible with the Ultimate Engineer’s [be He Nature, already rejected as we have seen (on §54, p. 88-9) for her complete inability to institute and administer the Natural law entirely on her own, or God] grand plan of creation!
§63 Energy, one of the most important concepts of modern science, was debated extensively in the mid nineteenth century, when first it was stated to conserve. It comes in many forms, among which it transforms with various degrees of efficiency. Light is regarded as the most refined form of energy; heat as the crudest; low-grade heat as an almost total waste. [True, we can extract heat from a relatively cold outside to warm up a room by reversing the process of ordinary cooling an air conditioner performs, but what is the total universal balance? On aggregate, we do not really save energy, we only spend more of it!: The second law of thermodynamics is not defeated!] Except for gravitational, atomic and nuclear, all other forms of energy on earth derive their existence from the light of the sun. Most of the solar light impacting the earth transforms to heat, stored in bodies in the form of vibration of its atoms. Both light and radiant heat are recognized as forms of electromagnetic energy. The other forms of energy stand between those two, but are not regarded as electromagnetic. The thermal energy of ordinary bodies is attributed to the internal vibrations of their atoms. Chemical energy is a form of energy stored internally in atoms and molecules of reduced and oxidizing matter (and in the case of plants generated by the action of light energy during photosynthesis), whence it is released upon combustion. The effort to unite the forces recognized as acting in nature is also an effort to see all forms of energy as essentially one. Energy in all its forms is expressed in terms of \( (\text{mass}) \times (\text{velocity})^2 \), having as already stated (in §58, p. 93) the physical dimen-
sions of $|MLT^2|$. Newton believed light to come in material "corpuscles". Young, by analogy of observations in water and air, "found" it to be "waves" of what he thought was a material continuum called "ether". In 1888, the Michelson-Morley experiment proved the "ether" nonexistent. but we still continue to regard light as vibrations of a continuum! The situation was not "saved" by the relativity theory: "Spacetime", the new continuum, what “physical” (how indeed physical?) still remains when all matter (all mass and with it also all energy, given its physical dimensions) is totally absent, has no material substance, and therefore it cannot, vibrating, carry energy nor cause a gravitational field 15 (both understood only in terms of mass, velocity, acceleration and distance).

15 The gravitational field is a conception associated with the gravitational force (namely, the attraction) every mass exerts upon another mass at a distance in the absence of any medium (such as a pulling rope) transferring the pulling effect. A force understood as the product of (mass) x (acceleration) has the physical dimensions of $|MLT^2|$ (see §60, p. 94). The gravitational field due to a particular mass $M_1$ at a distance $r$ from it is the product $\nabla = GM_1/r^2$ (where $G$ is Newton's universal gravitational constant). The product $gM_2$ is the force of gravity acting between the two masses. In §14 of his 1916 general relativity paper (as reported on p.143 of the work mentioned in F/n. 10 on p. 56 of this work), Einstein stated “[w]e make a distinction hereafter between ‘gravitational field’ and ‘matter’ in this way, that we denote everything but the gravitational field as ‘matter’. Our use of the word therefore includes not only matter in the ordinary sense, but the electromagnetic field as well. Our next task is to find the field equations of gravitation in the absence of matter” Yet, in §2 of his same work (p. 112-3 of the work mentioned in F/n. 10 on p. 56 of this work), Einstein saw it fit to state that “[n]o answer can be admitted as epistemologically satisfactory,” unless the reason given is an observable fact of experience. The law of causality has not the significance of a statement as to the world of experience, except when observable facts appear as causes and effects” [emphases in the original], and by the asterisk he referred to a footnote stating “of course, an answer may be satisfactory from the point of view of epistemology, yet be unsound physically, if it is in conflict with other experiences”.

It is thus quite remarkable and totally inexplicable how in spite of these his all too clear statements in his §2, he still saw it proper to make the above cited statement in his §14, by which he permitted himself to speak of “the field equations of gravitation in the absence of matter”, i.e., contrary to all three: his own stated epistemological precepts, the observable facts of experience and the physical unsoundness of attributing an effect (the gravitational field) to no cause at all (in face of the total absence of both matter and the electromagnetic field, in reference to which alone
between material bodies) to exist in totally empty space! When in his “The Field Equations of Gravitation in the Absence of Matter” section of his 1916 paper, Einstein explicitly specified the word “matter” to include “not only matter in the ordinary sense, but the electromagnetic field as well”, it is a non sequitur that the gravitational field, requiring mass (es and the distances between them and the measured universal gravitational constant) in order to exist and to be expressed mathematically, is taken by the theory to exist even in the absence of all these! It becomes a double non sequitur that light, a form of electromagnetic energy thus excluded by Einstein from the concept of “spacetime”, is nevertheless taken to be “undulations of spacetime”! It gets to be a triple non sequitur that light, appearing in experiments now as particles (photons) and now as waves, and being unquestionably energy (that Einstein himself wrote as mc²), is believed to be massless! It is a quadruple non sequitur that as a result of the theory of relativity the classical concept of conservation of energy has surreptitiously yet definitely lost its sheen!: Because, the heretofore conserved total amount of energy (expressed under relativity as Mc², where M is the total mass in the universe and c the presumed constant velocity of light) necessarily sums up all forms of energy! But how is the summing up done physically? This has never been explained!: With all other forms of energy remaining the same, the kinetic energy depends on where you measure it from! Two observers in motion relative to each other will generally not agree on the kinetic energy of bodies! And so, neither will they on the total energy of the universe! E.g., the earth as seen from the sun (one revolution of a relatively tiny planet per year) and the sun as seen from the earth (one revolution of a relatively huge “planet” per day!) do not possess equal amounts of kinetic energy, though the potential energy of the sun-earth system works out the same whether from the sun or the earth due to their mutual gravitational attraction as per Newton, a concept to which even Einstein saw it necessary to adapt his general relativity theory, though claiming Newton’s gravitation to be a “first approximation” to his own theory in the §21 section of his general relativity pa-

could one at that time speak of field equations)! No longer so: We since have “advanced”: Following this his example, “scientists” now, more than he ever did, proceed to speak of all sorts of mostly imagined effects without the slightest rational hesitation of mentioning their causes!
per! However little liked and even less discussed, this nevertheless is the state of “understanding” permitted by the bulk of modern theories [to which we still attempt to marry the current quantum mechanics (of which a great deal more later), failing to comprehend that the continuum and the conceived quanta even conceptually simply negate each other, and any seeming marriage will only be yet another “scientific” hat trick!] with which we attempt to investigate even conceptually the state of the world and determine the “Equation of Everything”! But there is more!

§64 The science of motion we nonchalantly have invented permits us to conceive “operations” running backwards in time. Though we have never seen a natural clock running backwards (and even if we saw the sun to reverse course we would not develop a sense of time running backwards!), we nonetheless feel ourselves free to play even “scientifically” with the idea; aided “scientifically” by the theory of relativity! And based on current “knowledge” (i.e., without true knowledge of how fundamentally universal time affects universal operations), we have the temerity to run the history of the universe in reverse, and to believe operations to have taken place in the normal course of time, without taking due account of all the assumptions we make tacitly in the process! So, we believe there was once a time (“epoch of decoupling”) before which, the entire mass of the universe was hydrogen so hot as to be ionized thermally and the universe was optically opaque due to the very strong interaction of light with protons and electrons. Much further back we must also believe based on theory, though theory runs very thin as regards what happened back then, there was an era of much higher temperatures when all matter and energy, compressed unimaginably, were nevertheless present in the form of pure massless radiation; as a result of which, the universe must have then been transparent! Ordinary matter other than hydrogen is believed to have formed in stars following the age of decoupling; when, due to gravitational instabilities of unknown origin in the gas, masses of it coagulated locally, compressed themselves under high temperatures into stars, in the interiors of which were formed the other elements of ordinary matter. Totally ignored remains the fact that, as the original transparent pure-radiation universe cooled, there necessarily was a first time when the temperature and pressure was as high as hypothesized to have existed in the interiors of stars following the age of decoupling!
Why ordinary matter did not form then (as it ought to have done, since thermodynamically it matters not how the conditions are arrived at but that they apply and result in their effects), but all matter passed on to form hydrogen that only later was recompressed according to standing theory, this basic inconsistency modern science has not bothered to explain! Nor was it ever explained how or why hydrogen, constituted as “understood”, was picked to play this pivotal role! But take a present-day scientist accepting, as he does with fervor, our present-day scientific knowledge of fundamentals to be eternally true, transform him into a non-physical observer and send him back to the era of pure radiation with orders to conduct measurements on energy and the universe. With mass yet to come into being, he would be at a total loss to say ought about the universe or the energy, that he would not even be able to see at all due to their total transparency! With these in mind, we are logically bound to make theories claiming resolution of our questions about the universe, when, based on them, we conceive of epochs during which under identical conditions the same particular result now did not obtain and now it did, while our most fundamental supposedly eternal concepts would not be able to find their due correspondence with the then observed facts! How little the situation then in effect is understood is further shown by the accepted “explanation” of the so-called “background radiation”; believed to be a direct, unaltered, and the same everywhere remnant of the original “fireball”, rather than the local background radiation field in which we are immersed, as it is presently formed by all universal processes to date!

§65 The problem of energy shows up even in nuclear particle research: When particles are accelerated, they are assumed to consist of only the mass they had before the acceleration. When highly accelerated nuclear particles are smashed in collisions, fragments are found heavier than the particles from which they are supposed to be coming, in which they are said to have been contained, the extra mass believed even gravitationally unseen, before the collisions! Black holes, the supposed not quite perfect (according to Hawking) holders of unseen matter, do nonetheless betray the presence of their contents by their gravitational effects on the surrounding world. Not so with the nuclear particles, even as they are not black holes! Totally unabashed by these horren-
dous logical conflicts, we proceed to make theories about nuclear and subnuclear (so-called “elementary”) particles, and to build hugely expensive machines intended to test these our theories, that hardly ever fail to be “verified”! Thus emboldened, our theories (that is, we) continue to ignore all such conflicts; and so far at least, we continued to build ever bigger particle-smashers! Early in the twentieth century, we thought we had come to the end of the particles line: The world with just the electron, the proton and the neutron seemed simple enough. The neutron did not present us with the above conflict: its mass exceeds the combined mass of the proton and electron to which it disintegrates when left in free state. The conflict arose when, after great acceleration, the nuclear particles were forcibly smashed. And we then never stopped “finding” ever more, ever heavier and ever more mysterious particles hiding inside those early three! In fact, if all this activity is on the right track, those three represent a sort of a bottleneck in nature!: the “elementary” particles, perhaps hundreds in number, all hide inside those three, through which (when smashed) alone they make their presence known to the world above, that also consists of a very large number of atomic and molecular particles! As the “elementary” particles proliferated, it became obvious that, for their sheer number alone, they could not all (if any of them) be truly elementary! Back to the theory-drawing-board: other theories were drawn up to take care of this situation, and “particles” like quarks made their appearance (these surely only on paper, since they are supposed to dwell even deeper inside those other ones and can never be examined in vero corpo), that again began to proliferate much like the previous generation! In truth, all subnuclear particles are never observed in vero corpo: only traces of condensed vapors of ordinary molecules in cloud chambers are observed, and these traces are interpreted as paths of the sought after fast-moving particles, based on heavily-assumption-laden theories! Question: If we insist that the world is rational, on which basis alone we continue to do science, may we also continue to uphold theories about particles that make the world look progressively irrational as a result of all those particles supposedly “found” in nature? How short, as a minimum, must the life of a particle be in order that we may decide that we deal with a real particle, rather than with a forced coagulation of mass-energy that proceeds to “disintegrate” (can this be the right word in this case, or is it per-
haps better to use relax?) the moment the mass-energy concentration-pressure falls below the corresponding certain level? Utilitarian nuclear fission and fusion work can proceed without recourse to results of work based on such “advanced” theories of nuclear “structure”. What then is the real value of such theoretical work, conducted moreover without any parallel effort to resolve the all too real physical-philosophical issues raised by it? Whatever the results of such work, not all reasonable people, if experience to date can guide, shall be satisfied with their interpretation! Even if Nobel prizes are dispensed! Even people moderately versed in the structure of “science” and society will understand the shock, cultural and social, of the admission of these facts and their consequences: A very great deal of current science and science-supported philosophy must be abandoned! And all those currently employed in the multi-billion-dollar industry built around the efforts of “verification” of the theories involved must find other, meaningful, employment! It does not take brains to understand that the shock shall be all the greater the simpler is the correct solution of this problem, that indeed is simple! No amount of tact can lessen the impact, while any effort to be tactful about all these interrelated matters may perhaps be taken as a double insult! Factual language is the better part of valor and tact!
§66 As it now stands, the theory of evolution insults our intelligence *not* as a theory of evolution per se, but for insisting along with all atheism of which it *has* become a part, that *all* we value is the product of *meaningless and purposeless chance*, which it substitutes for Purpose, Logic and Will, in a single word for *Logos* (clearly of God, in the face of the hard fact that the material universe *has* been proven, as the sequel shall clearly show, to be without such on its own); which is the antithesis of the *Principle of Engineering*, i.e., of *consciously making* (note the significance of this term vs. that of “*just happening*”) anything at all for a freely conceived and pursued clearly seen objective, that cannot be gotten except through disciplined and well organized effort. The moment it is realized that the creation of the world could *not* have have come about by chance, but was subject to Law (necessarily conceived in a *Mind* capable of conceiving its own objective and all the means needed for its attainment), evolution loses its stigma!

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

§68 It is a fundamental mistake to ignore all this, and attempt instead to uphold and prove Creation by the methods of the nineteenth century, concentrating our attention to what are now seen to be clearly unimportant structural, biological and biochemical differences and similarities [except when the complete structures are seen to be perfectly suited to the life of each specie!] between man and monkey, as if that alone were the principal
ground for comparison! It is as though in the age of the hydrogen bomb, some still insist on conducting the battle as in Waterloo, with the lead soldiers supplied by atheistic materialism! It is depressing to see the creationists content to play this now clearly seen to be a silly game with the atheists. For if materialism were honest and true to itself, it would first ask for an exact explanation of the very same questions the more thoughtful theists pose!

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

§69 Returning to the theme of §60 (pp. 94-6) solid arguments can be made that the true fundamental particle of matter is of the order of $10^{-65}$ g. This places it some 39 orders of magnitude below the electron! Even the electron is a veritable universe composed of some $10^{39}$ fundamental particles! How the electron and the proton behave is thus coded deep inside them. So, to make the greatest leap in complexity, when we are born and when we die a natural death as physical units is indeed coded deep inside us! Is such a hugely complex code truly the blind result of chance in Nature, or is it, far more likely, the outcome of the conscious effort of God so to organize matter as it to act as He determined, so that in turn we give meaning to our life, rather than surrendering to the consciousness (cunningly, viperously, inculcated in us by the very professors supposed to be studying these matters in order that they, on our behalf, at our expense, extract from them all the lessons of Order) of meaninglessness? If obedient to the code inscribed on it by God, matter at the appointed universal times transformed some species and without error produced new kinds of living species, were such acts any less than special, or were they rather real proof absolute of His Wisdom and total control over Nature? When creationists deny theistic evolution as the handiwork of God, in favor of an uneconomical process of what they call “special creation”, they deny themselves the ultimate weapon that guarantees them complete victory: The atheists adopted evolution solely because it offered itself, so they thought, as a tool and argument against God’s existence. Little did they expect that their own weapon would in the proper time turn against them! They wanted evolution at the level of the nineteenth century thinking? At the dawn of the twenty-first, the time has come to update the argument and the science! Let them have evolution! To embarrass them completely, “theistic evolution” does not have to prove that such (by definition the most complex) phenomena of science as the sudden transformation of one species to another are fully beyond the ability of blind chance and of, if that be true, undisciplined Nature to bring them about entirely on her/their own without an inscribed, fully detailed code; though the very formulation, as here attempted, of the question almost makes the proof. It more than suffices to show that far simpler, and
indeed the simplest by definition, Laws of Nature are totally beyond her capabilities to institute upon herself on her own accord! As also to produce the altogether crushing statistics against the order of the world to have been won and, without a single miss, to keep on being won by every single “Planck time interval”! Which both shall later be shown!!!
§70. Both the development and traditional discussion of the theory of evolution have taken place independently of, and one is tempted to say, in spite of, the substantial underlying issues of chemistry and physics! In this, this theory too indeed resembles all great scientific theories that so far have developed in isolation from the surrounding great balance of physical and logical constraints that naturally bear upon them! It is only later that the theories are “adjusted”, or rather manhandled, to “fit” the requirements of the real world! So it has been with the theories of the continuum, ignoring the hard fact that real things (all “real” things except time, despite the illusion provided by clocks!) can be, and are being, cut up. So too it has been with the theories of the quanta, built ignoring the hard fact that there can only be a definite natural limit to the process of division for all things dividable, as is sufficiently shown by those other hard facts (a) that cutting endlessly by half finally ends up to the size of \((1/2)^\infty = 0\), and (b) that the sum even of an infinite number of zeros is just zero, and nothing tangible! So it has been with the theories of atomic matter, built ignoring the hard fact that there is indeed a uni-verse out there to the laws of which they too must comply! The theory of evolution has distinguished itself by ignoring more problems than any other theory! The uni-verse and its parts has yet to be seen as a whole that ignores no fact and no “detail”! For us to continue along that “time-honored” venue would be patently irresponsible! Rather, we must first try to see what has truly transpired around that
theory and then return to see the development of the living species as a part of the whole physical problem! By having reached so far in this discussion, this much is already clear to us: Once the underlying physical world proves the existence of God, opining that the theory of natural selection can still dispel the need for God is as responsible as opining that an 80eth-floor penthouse can on its own dispel the need of the structure below on which it is built!

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

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

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

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

(c) For yet another thing, we must consider how people divide over this important issue: When the theory of evolution appeared, on the side of religious belief stood only the option of belief according to the Scriptural description of special creation by specie; while on the side of irreligious belief stood the only other option then or since till now thought possible, namely, that of “creation” by pure chance; “chance” being the only kind of “creative” agent that is possible to imagine at all in the absence of God! As a result, on the irreligious and supposedly “scientific” side, stood people who objected to the belief in God for whatever other reason, as did also otherwise bona fide reasonable people who thought opposition to the Biblical belief their “only logical” option, without in the least comprehending the tremendous logical problems this option introduces, problems revealed only when this option is examined closely! While on the religious and supposedly “obscurantist” side, there stood people believing themselves bona fide faithful Christians in thinking of the traditional special creation by specie as their only con Deo option without in the least compre-
hending the grave compromises this makes to their belief as Christians in an All-wise God; while with them also stood all remaining people, who though not consciously religious, nevertheless found it both intellectually and morally abhorrent to believe in the possibility even of creation by pure chance! This division of both issues and people has been yet another source of confusion.

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

§74. What Dawkins overlooks, making it particularly painful and sorrowful to watch a supposedly disciplined scientist doing it, is his intellectual dishonesty he himself exposes! What he argues for in effect is the theory within the theory, of “punctuated equilibrium” within the theoretical scheme of evolution by natural selection. The first problem is that neither he nor anyone else has managed to produce a reasonable physical cause for the supposed “fact” that evolution advances by locking in on the next higher organism it produces at a time through pure purposeless chance. The evolutionists ignore the cause! They begin in mid-air with the process! And with it, they attempt to produce the effect! The only evolutionary “process” or “mechanism” all evolutionists accept without demur is that of blind and purposeless mutation. Note
it: mutation is only a process, not the cause! Here immediately come the questions:

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

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

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

(d) Faced with that absence, are they finally ready to admit that the process of evolution is not blind and purposeless? Then somebody sees through it all and consciously purposes! Will the evolutionists at last realize that it is far more likely to observe whole cities of perfect buildings standing in place, yet produced purposelessly by inanimate nature, than to have through the ages the healthy populations of animals we observe either living or as fossils?
(e) Are the evolutionists ready to admit a *preferred* direction and ordering of structures? *Preferred* implies him who prefers; *ordering* him who orders! In other words, the cause? Can they show us *who* he is, or will they continue so to abuse the language we all use and its meanings and implications?

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

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

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

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

(j) Will the evolutionists finally comprehend that in a blind and purposeless so-called “universe”, *no kind* of obvious or hidden purposive item, instrument, mechanism or process are allowed
at all? That any motion in such a “system” must of necessity be chaotic, not organizing, nor self-organizing? That in such a “system”, not even “needs” exist, let alone needs? That “needs” said to exist in such a “system” are only thought by people such as themselves [do they know what the word system truly means?] comfortably ensconced in a system perfectly thought out, in which they act as freeloaders refusing to take up the full-blown intellectual, ethical and moral responsibilities of a rightful member?

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

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

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

(a) Do they not describe evolution as the purposeless and unselfconscious nature’s undesigned selection of individuals and species struggling for survival by way of chanced mutations? And do they not call the survivors the fittest, just for having survived? Shall we all finally realize that every selection is the process by which the processor (here, nature) chooses based on some criteria? Shall we all finally realize that criteria are established for the attainment of some specific objective? Shall we call survival as the objective? One can understand, say, Nirvana as the objective, for its being the final state to eternity! But survival is only for a short time, leading to nothing, according to evolutionists! How then can it be called the objective? How indeed do these “scientists” understand all this so real trouble of this entire peregrination from nothing to nothing? Shall we all thus finally comprehend that without objective there can be no criteria, and that with no criteria there can be no selection? Do we now finally thus comprehend that the theory of evolution asserts that nature has followed a sequence of events
that cannot even get started if she truly is purposeless and unselfconscious? And do we now finally comprehend that if we ever so slightly admit these two as characteristics of nature, we admit her as god, yet a god far inferior to that advocated by any decent religion, in direct proportion of the inferiority we allow of those two characteristics of nature relative to the perfection of God? For not giving all the needed attention to the ontological significance of the terms they use, the evolutionists in fact advocate belief in a vastly inferior god, and this in the name of “science”!

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

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

(d) Now first, mutation (i.e., an error in gene replication) proceeds according to theory by chance and at a low rate (typically one in a hundred million per base replication\(^{16}\)) that either is least or optimum. The argument for the least rate is that the vast majority of mutations is harmful, and an individual with a high mutation rate will soon make its lineage extinct; whereas an individual with a low mutation rate will leave more, though less evolved offspring. The argument for the optimum rate is that it somehow yet purposelessly balances the effects of the vast number of harmful mutations by the advantages of the much smaller number of beneficial mutations that carry the evolutionary adaptation forward!

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

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

(f) Because rationally, the appearance in sufficient numbers such as to give notice of themselves as a distinct specie of individuals resulting from a practically simultaneous chance occurrence in them of vastly less likely identical beneficial mutations in comparison to the already high probability of harmful mutations truly stretches belief in sheer “good luck”! [In the spirit of all this dis-
cussion, this question, too, must be answered: Have gene mutations truly been observed and isolated and those that produce the evolutionary novelty and carry the evolution by natural selection forward proven to be beneficial, or are they simply an elaborate mental construct, a mere hypothesis, supporting the larger hypothesis, the theory of evolution by natural selection as it now stands, in the absence of an alternative thought acceptable to academia? The self-admitted “enough of a Popperian” J. M. Smith seems to admit as much, though he does not expect that he may have to stop being “an unrepentant neo-Darwinist” any time soon. Regarding an alternative thought, more later!]

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

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

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

(j) Shall we all finally realize that “struggle” is also a process requiring a conscious effort involving bodily, psychical and intellectual energy, and this makes the word unsuitable for unconscious
nature? That we transfer our way of reasoning to things, genes and their mutations, that cannot reason?

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

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

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

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

(o) Then again, a less than perfect and not by its purpose spirited organism, mutating, cannot be trusted to carry the process to its “objective”, that unless it is objective, the process would never be known as evolution, but rather as total mess and chaos, that could never have brought us here whether as individuals or society capable of debating it! A less than perfect mutant to see the process through? Would you mount an untrained workhorse to see you through the Olympic equestrian course? Are the evolutionists so blind that they do not see what happens around? Or is it that they do see, all right, but they do not understand what they see? Or rather, it is far more likely that they dutifully serve what we may call the religion of ultimate purposelessness, in a universe they choose to portray as having produced accidentally the intelligence we see, that in turn has as its only objective its immoral immediate material gain, however we otherwise timidly call it in progressively ever more meaningless language?
There is simply no end of reasonable questions, bearing upon the essence itself of ratiocination, that the theory of evolution fails to answer! If faced with this large number of questions on the one side and the deafening silence on the other, our cynic remarks that there is no science here, but only a lower form of religion dressed as “science”, what will the evolutionists say to him? What will it take for them to realize that even the term “evolution” is a misnomer for a blind and purposeless process?

§76. Despite all the above, we cannot understand the problem posed by the theory of evolution until we understand the cultural milieu in which it appeared. Even our present culture, far from being a systematic whole, remains stubbornly an unorganized collection of disciplines having started independently of each other and coexisting not on an inner functioning network that unites them to a meaningful collaboration, but only for the (on occasion, just merely bearable) social interdependence of their carriers that are us. Our modern social troubles are due to our ossifying around our ideas that we accept as forevermore fixed and non-negotiable as already developed, for which we are prepared to rend to shreds even the society that holds us together. The ordinary man cannot perceive the gravity of the problem. The intellectual elites are exactly the ones that lead the rending. The universities are only institutions housing together disparate disciplinarians determined to remain ensconced in their separate ivory towers, feeding upon the rest of society, unconscious of the need that universities finally see all knowledge as a uni-verse rather than as a haphazard collection of strangely cohabiting ideas each seeking to form a closed independent association with its likes. The cultural milieu in the mid nineteenth century, having shed the remnants of medieval shackles, had embarked on a wide expedition to discover, describe and classify the secrets of the still widely unexplored expanses of the earth. Darwin’s expedition to the Galapagos was one such. The discipline got its start, and only gradually did it begin to face its own internal difficulties, sticking stubbornly, however, to the no longer viable original line of thought that it considered non-negotiable. Evolutionists still try to explain what they consider to remain the core of the discipline, namely, the phylogenesis of the various species based on spurious chance accidents occurring during the development of organs on passing from one generation to the next. How the stable forms (morphogenesis) of both the species (as a second step) and the in-
dividuals (as the necessary first step leading up to the second) that make them up takes place as a result solely of accidents is still handled in an unconvincing way. Accidents and errors do not result in order. [Conscientious examiners do not grade examination papers solely on the correctness of the final answer, but on the reasoning; as, say, two errors can cancel each other out, but do not justify the correctness of the final answer!] The individuals within a specie exhibit sufficient order to vitiate completely the idea of accidents. Expressions such as “only phenomenal order” hiding the underlying accidents, and “apparent, not real, purpose” as a mere illusion in a world dominated by accidents simply cannot convince. The species show sufficient uniqueness to be recognized as separate species. This is non-negotiable thematism that, even if temporary in the long run of aeons, cannot but prove the workings of a scheme designed to bring them about even if for only some time. These can only be understood as designed way stations to a final destination: Evolution is progress only if it is a progression toward something definite. Absent that, the process would only be going haphazardly around, and this would have become obvious. It has not! Man stands out for having a unique intellectual capacity of very high order: We have spread our sight from the Democritean atom to the whole of the universe; from the first moment of the world (“Big Bang”) to what we investigate must be fitting to be its termination; there is nothing material our tactile empiricism has ignored. We have gone beyond our tactile empiricism, and touched the ethereal worlds of Ideas, of Beauty, of Duty, of Justice, of Sanctity, of Absolute Holiness. Those who deny the existence of all these, have set as a program of their lives to investigate the “pleasures” of the “easy way” and to reach destinations that I better not mention! With all these within our reach, it seems that the process of evolution has indeed come to its end: there is nothing remaining to be done by some next more evolved and involved specie. Indeed, we seem to be hitting our heads on an invisible wall we have erected, that we may call involution as we have already begun to consume with “substances” our own intestines, and revolution as we have begun to demolish what still exists in us of the Spirit! Our professors lead us to purposelessness and meaninglessness! Indeed, only so far do they see with all their “science”! We may not be surprised at anything we see that occurs having such teachers as guides!
§77. The Uni-verse cries out to be understood. We have cut it to pieces: Here goes our geology, there our astronomy, this way the physics, that way the chemistry, inorganic and organic apart, there goes observational biology, that way genetics, all over behaviorism! Stubborn, our professors of evolution refuse to broaden the discipline and place the entire Uni-verse underneath. Uni-verse means purpose under a unifying theme: Physics has from the beginning worked under Law, not the one now taught, but still under Law. Under that Law have the elements been built and set in a row. As a result of that Law do the elements make up molecules. Under that same Law does carbon appear now as worthless graphite soft opaque and black, and then as priceless diamond hard diaphanous sparkling. Under that same Law here comes gaseous hydrogen, and with carbon united goes as methane. Under that same Law does the “inorganic” turn into “organic”. Under that same Law does the “organic” form the “biological”. Without an all-unifying Law there is no Uni-verse! Will the professors ever understand that, and begin to behave at last as indeed they must? Thank the Lord, I am not alone in calling for sanity! It is worth reading E. W. F. Tomlin 17 who has seen it fit

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

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

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

§78. Now, apply the Principle of Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity to the theory of evolution, once as it stands now and then as it is proposed that it be broadened. That as it stands now it possesses no concrete physico-mathematical body does not make it immune to the test of this Principle! After all, even mathematics is part of Logic! On top of a long sheet of pa-
per leave some room for the heading. Below, draw a vertical line dividing the paper into two columns. On the left column write the list of all questions as the above in §§74-5 (p. 114-23). In the place of the heading write the one self-consistent mechanism, process or idea that, you think, resolves all the questions you have written already. In the second column and against each question in the first column, write down how the item at the top best answers the question. Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity has the unique advantage that it answers all questions with absolute clarity and confidence! Against that measure, now judge the results! If all other items, one at a time, that you try on the top fail, you are not an objective scientist if you do not then write on top the name of God! He is the only carrier of the Logic the evolutionary process [embedded within the whole universal process about which we have a great deal more to say] needs in order to succeed! But the evolutionists are trying to use the evolutionary process they propose as a weapon against God, as the substitute for and superior to Him, who alone stands behind all processes in the Universe and alone assures their success! Now, the boomerang called "evolution" the atheists thrust out returns home!

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

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

(b) Dawkins, confessing the overwhelmingly negligible probability of all this huge variety of life to have come about solely by chance, nevertheless (on p. 49) berates “experts in [other] fields” for failing to understand that “chance – ‘single-step selection’ – alone ... is a minor ingredient in the Darwinian recipe [because] the most important ingredient is cumulative selection which is quintessentially non-random”, which makes the “belief that Darwinian selection is ‘random’ ...not merely false ... but the exact opposite of the truth”. Now, “quintessential” does not only refer to the ancient philosophical conception of the “fifth essence” that added to air, water, earth and fire completes the ingredients making up the world of physical reality; but it also has a still weightier, purely Platonic significance in the strenuous effort of acquiring knowledge based on names (for representing things definite and concrete), descriptions (for the fact that with them we present the real objects in logos, and so we make concrete sense of them), forms (for confining within definite spatial configurations and limits the real objects having them), wider concepts (for alone encompassing additional universal properties and characteristics of the real objects, that cannot be seen from the separate consideration of names, descriptions, and forms), that all together lead to the final fifth and only truly important acquisition that is no other than the Ultimate Knowledge of the All-inclusive Reality. This being the double meaning of the term “quintessence”, brimming with the purposiveness of perfection,
it is incomprehensible that it should be used by a modern profes-
sor in his effort to support the present-day message of general
ultimate meaninglessness, to which these days so-called “intel-
lectuals” desire to lead the world—unless they truly recognize
absolutely no limits in their self-given license to prostitute ev-
erything once held sacred and indeed holy!

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

(i) That state, some about 150 years after the theory was first pre-
sented to the world and cannot since be said to have changed at
all except for its wordy elaboration, has been given by Roy J. Brit-
ten (Senior Research Associate at the California Institute of Tech-
nology, Staff Member of the Carnegie Institution of Washington,
and Member of the U. S. Academy of Sciences) in an article titled
“The Sources of Variation in Evolution” published in 1977-8 19
starting with: “A brief catalogue of ignorance or a list of questions about
the mechanism of evolution makes a good starting point. Many of these
questions may seem foolish or unanswerable when we understand the
process of evolution. [Ergo, we still do not understand that process!] However, I feel they are appropriate from a molecular biologist’s point
of view. The nature if living organisms is so intimately intertwined
with their evolution that most areas of biological ignorance should be listed
but are not. ... I use incautious and non-professional language in order
to raise questions which cannot yet be properly formulated”. [Ergo,
cautious professional language cannot even formulate questions on the precise degree of present ignorance of the matter! Bold
characters were used here in order to draw all the reader’s atten-
tion.] He proceeds with “Population genetics explores the role of pop-

19 Roy J. Britten: The Sources of Variation in Evolution THE ENCYCLO-
ulations in evolution and the way in which natural evolution operates on individuals”, which is yet another example of how from the effect (here, the population) we attempt to divine the “cause” we have hastened to label “evolution” that we still try to prove by concluding preposterously that it “must” act on the individuals, that only if viable to maturity form the population! All this while we keep on ignoring the deep cause acting on the “cause”, since within the confines of evolutionary theory no effort is made to understand either the working molecular chemistry or the underlying physics of atoms, that through the precise electronic nature of atomic bonds both within and between the molecules dispose all these structures in three-dimensional space to form the mostly flexible living tissues! Britten continues to say that “it [the theory] is a field with a large mathematical structure, many specific problems and questions but no overall solutions”, and then that “[f]or myself the question of questions is what I term the immediacy of natural selection. Does it operate through the score of reproduction of adapted offspring that in turn reproduce?”, thus questioning despite the theory’s “large mathematical structure” (obviously totally unrelated to the still unknown precise underlying controlling physics of the atomic chemical bonds, or else we already would have had a full understanding of the overall process!) even the “way” by which Darwinism has always insisted that evolution proceeds! And then, he says “[w]e are nearly totally ignorant of the way ‘external’ events such as environment or population [remember here the earlier reference to population genetics!] affect evolution. Obviously, we are not much better off in regard to the ‘internal’ events. I divide internal and external domains arbitrarily at the skin of the animal. ... thinking of these domains separately has value. Most internal events are decided molecularly and the basis is DNA. [Not the original building blocks that are the atoms themselves.] There follows a brief review of the current dogma. [Emphasis added] The DNA of each cell of an individual is the same and carries the genome of the species. The sub-set of these genes that are expressed determines each cell type and state. For simplicity, I assume [another way of avoiding to confess the also near total ignorance of ‘internal’ events!] that the process by which these genes are expressed is understood. The DNA codes for a protein sequence. The sequence is transcribed into messenger RNA and the message is translated on ribosomes into the protein molecule. [Here the fact that the living organisms hydrolyze the proteins and incorporate directly the amino acids of which the proteins are composed to the
double helical structure of the DNA\textsuperscript{20} seems to be forgotten] The amino acid sequence determines the three-dimensional structure of the protein with appropriate consideration of the influence of other molecules and structures in the cell. ... If all of the appropriate gene products are produced without error and in the right quantities the result is a cell, differentiated for its role. If all the appropriate cells are present in the right places we get a living organism with all of its complex structure and behavior. For the time being I am willing to by-pass the question of the validity of this model and ask if we can use it with appropriate subtlety to go after the mechanism of evolution”. But what we truly lack is not the “appropriate subtlety” to use mere words, but the precise knowledge of the natural mechanism that based all the way on underlying Law permits the quantum-mechanical solution of each cell type and state! It is not science that based on “dogma” and a wordy model starts out from the already advanced state of the gene that may or may not fall in the right place at the right time! As unquestionably, underneath it all operates the Law that puts all atoms in place within the smaller molecules, it is not science to state that at that level physics and chemistry stops and chance now begins! Even if for a time, even if for just only once and then everything settles down again! This settling down means return under the operation of natural Law, not in obedience to human dogma! When sixes come up time after time after time ..., then the dice are fixed and this means law, the law of fixing, even as the fixing of dice goes against State Law! Let us all understand that where there is Law there is no chance! It is not science to excuse on chance our neglect or total ignorance of the Law! Britten concludes his article with: “In conclusion I wish to emphasize that while ingenious speculations can be made about the gene regulation system and its relationship to the source of variation in evolution our ignorance of the actual sources of variation is just as abysmal as our ignorance of the formal properties of the regulatory system that is evolving”. Yet, in preparation for this conclusion, Britten does not hesitate also to state in an obvious effort to stay within the limits of “the current dogma” that “[w]e know that evolution [implied as dependent on the outcome of chance mutations!] works! However we know almost nothing of how it works ...”! [The reader both here

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

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

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

METHINKS IT IS LIKE A WEASEL,
consisting of 28 letters and blank spaces, which a monkey typing endlessly away on a simplified typewriter having keys for the 26 capital letters and 1 blank space will on average get it right in only 1 out of $27^{28} = 1.20 \times 10^{40}$ tries. Dawkins claims that "cumulative selection" can accomplish this feat in only something like 41 to
The program executed the First Run starting out with the chanced first phrase noted as Gen. 0, which, however, consists of only 27 letters and blank spaces (unless the blank in Place 28 is counted as correct). But as the odds of going from Gen. 0 to Gen. 1 are truly negligible, in view of the fact that in the latter only T is added in Place 04 and the blank on Place 28 is eliminated, while all characters in between are moved one place to the right, it is reasonable to conclude that a mistyping, gone through undetected, occurred in the process of generating Dawkins’ initial manuscript, and that the most favorable correct initial sequence is the one noted as Gen. 0(corr.) that moves over the M noted and all following letters and blank spaces one position to the right. Then, the “improvement” of going from Gen. 0(corr.) to Gen. 1 is due only to the substitution of T for the blank space in Place 04, and of S for K in Place 14. The Reader will also note that all characters that happen by chance to fall correctly in place, as it happened from the beginning with N in Place 06 and T in Place 11, are never subsequently allowed to suffer expulsion from that correct placement. Obviously, this is exactly what Dawkins calls “cumulative selection” but does not tell us how it can at all take place in a blind and purposeless process guided through by pure chance alone! While Dawkins spent time telling us about the time the program spent on producing the “feat” in 43 “generations”, which information is in effect useless, he avoided telling us the number of trials his monkey computer happened to need in order to produce the sequences reported as Gen, 1, 10, 20, etc. This reporting would have been most valuable in estimating the real-life generations that an organism would need in order even thus to obtain the 43 thus implied gene “generations” in which this cumulative “feat” was accomplished. This information is particularly valuable in face of the facts discussed in §140b (p. 282-3), according to which 12 separate flasks of bacterial colonies showed” surprising” identical development after more than 30000 real-life generations proving that this repeatability is not at all based on chance, and so, therefore, it is based only on Law!

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

FIRST RUN

Gen. 0 (corr.) W D L M N L T D T J B K W I R Z R E Z L M Q C O P
Gen. 20: M E L D I N L S I T I S W P R K E Z W E C S E L
Gen. 30: M E T H I N K S I T I S L I K E I W E A S E L
Gen. 40: M E T H I N K S I T I S L I K E A W E A S E L
Gen. 43: M E T H I N K S I T I S L I K E A W E A S E L

SECOND RUN

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

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

It also reveals how easy it is for mistyping (whether in writing the computer program or in preparing the book for printing remaining unknown) to interfere: one in Gen. 0 of the first run, which transposed all characters from column 4 by one place toward the right; and another in Gen. 0 of the second run, which in effect allowed 29 columns to appear in the beginning as present!
be programmed, if the aim-phrase or other information equivalent to it had never been fed into it; what then the significance of “generations” would have been; how many of them would have been needed; and how many trials the computer would have had to go through in order to produce the aimed at phrase, if it had remained only on paper!

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

(d) There is an additional consideration we need to bear in mind: Strictly speaking, a mutation must be conceived as representing the generation of a new specie, not the development of the same one. Otherwise, we need to have some fair idea about the number of mutations needed to bring about the appearance of a new specie. The theory of evolution does not seem to be fully if at all cognizant of this substantial distinction, and Dawkins’ “generations” cannot be said to represent this or that in true life: forty three different species or forty three way stations, say, of monkey before evolving to homo. If 12 distinct sets of originally identical bacterial populations, have each gone through more than 30000 generations, yet show development substantially identical, we are very hard pressed to conclude that they all represent the same exact specie developing but not differentiating to a new specie; and, therefore, that they constitute a most remarkable case substantially disproving the theory! In the case of homo, 30000 generations represent at least some 70000 years of a developing yet
fixed specie! If all these generations represent what at least some evolutionists call “punctuated equilibrium states”, and we know only the first and the last of them, all in between states cannot exactly be called “missing links”, i.e., states carrying the process forward from one specie to the chanced next down the line! And, as a result, the geological time thought to be available for the sort of evolution propounded by atheist evolutionists may well not be long enough to accommodate all species representing the direct line! The things are entirely different if evolution is not chanced at all but subject to Law: then it proceeds when the conditions the Law allows are met! Which introduces the question of the origin of the Law!

§81. (a) The claimed “success” of Dawkins’ computer experiment was unquestionably forced by the way it was carried out:
— He told the computer from the beginning the number of letters and spaces, thus drastically guiding the computer to follow a particular mode of action: in real life, the way Dawkins wants us to understand it, no particular mode of action is set: in other words, Dawkins ought not to have told the computer how many members the sequences ought to have; he ought to have left it up to the computer randomly to find that number too!
— He locked in the “hits”, ignoring and hiding from his reader [I wonder: did he also hide it from his students?] the fact that in real life “locking in” is called natural Law; which introduces the need to search for the Lawgiver, or else the need for a rational explanation of how (must I say, totally unguided?) randomness establishes Law!
— He did not allow that the “hits”, too, just as all parts of every generated sentence be subject to variation given the real-life randomness of a true chance process [Chance never locks in a particular hit: if in a game of cards one could lock in for himself the aces in the way Dawkins locked in his “hits”, there would be no poker!]
— He did not allow for the real-life hard fact that the vast majority of mutations is indeed harmful, which in the computer simulation ought to be represented by a corresponding vast number of errors exactly in the places where in Dawkins’ computer simulation the letters and spaces were locked in!
— With all these reservations and objections, he proved absolutely nothing of what he thought he proved!: His simulation was “doctor-ed”!“: It could not but in time produce any preordained result!: And so, it proved just the reverse: that in nature, the Law is the
King! And Dawkins’ method was by no stretch of any rational imagination a method for demonstrating the random establishment of a natural Law!

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

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

Not quite, Professor! For, first, we are faced with the factual origin of the universe! So, life by way of the DNA/protein machine was not always there! Then, we have to calculate the odds all the way from the Planck levels on up for intelligence to develop even to this professor’s level! Who does not understand that he simply may not ask questions pertinent for natural beings about beings himself calls supernatural, about which anterior lineage has not been found to be indispensable! As a result, his asking for an explanation of the origin of the supernatural Designer very much along natural lines is logically illegitimate! Then, if we agree that either the universe without a Creator’s prior action suddenly showed up out of nowhere at the very first moment of the Big Bang and from the Planck levels of total anarchy, as they too are subject to universal expansion, proceeded fully on its own to develop such Universal Laws (that clearly require a super-universal Intelligence to conceive the Whole over which they act) as indeed we find, or that alternatively, all this came into being by supernatural fiat, it becomes crystal clear that we must make a choice as to which of the two is both simpler and more logical! Choosing the former requires proving the odds of its happening greater than those of the latter! OK, we don’t know how to calculate the odds of the latter! But as regards those of the former, the professors claim to be expert. So clearly, it does not speak well of them that start from arbitrary odds involving only unknown numbers of planets, rather than the entire gamut just indicated! If, as Dawkins admits, the odds of haemoglobin (all four chains of it) coming about by a single step selection is $1 \times 2^{146}$, the odds of the universe coming about at a single moment, involving necessarily the ultimate single step selection of everything needed and only thus being fully equipped to develop in due time even the molecule of haemoglobin, quite clearly cannot but be very very very much smaller still! We all, Dawkins included, agree that life cannot but precede intelligence! As especially today there are many who “argue” for the existence of other forms of life, why must we confine ourselves to demanding that all those forms barring none “must” have a material basis very much such as ours? The “argument” that matter-based intelligence has always been there (and so, that “DNA was always there”) collapses upon the realization that the material universe has not, in clear view of the Big Bang, always been there! It
thus becomes very much clearer that as the Universal Laws require an intelligence superior than themselves on the whole in order that they be conceived in their totality, and as life must precede intelligence, we may not but with Logic conclude that the supernatural Intelligence that conceived the Universal Laws does in fact require Life at Its own Level, not at ours! In other words, in the contest, between on the one hand, of the Big Bang and the odds as above indicated, and on the other, of Life, Intelligence and the Perfection of Laws from the beginning governing the world (and this in clear view of the fact that it took the universe some twelve billion years to develop professors of this level, being still nowhere close to coming up with the ultimate answer), the latter contestant wins hands down! In the very least (that is, ignoring the question of the appearance of the universe out of nowhere at all), the professors are honor bound to content with the odds of taming the Planck anarchy! As for the origin of the Designer, Dawkins, and not only he, truly needs a crash course in Aristotelian Logic that forbids an infinite regress of intelligent causes of intelligent causes, especially of naturally intelligible intelligent causes of supernatural Intelligent Causes! One supernatural Intelligent Cause is all that is needed, and exactly There does all this search Logically end! It follows that, all those who truly argue for life may not but also argue for Life that has indeed the Intelligence to encompass the Whole! It obviously takes much wider minds to consider the Whole and escape the parochial confines of this limited planet (with its unlimited blinding hateful passion against Life, Intelligence, Perfection and Holiness), to which only raw incorrigible peasants are professorially still allowed to confine themselves and thus limit the field of their intellectual vision to a horizon so far short of the Whole! All else is neither Science, nor Philosophy, nor Theology, but pure unadulterated nonsense, totally unbecoming of grownups and especially of professors building sand castles in the sun-bleached shores of the still unexplored ocean called the Whole! [As I am dealing with theories much in the order of their appearance, the Reader may find that, above, I use terms and ideas not yet presented. I request that he be patient till the end. Then having considered this whole, he may want to return to reconsider the parts. I know of no other way to make a well argued and meaningful presentation of the matter before us!]
§83. When in about the middle of the nineteenth century the principle of conservation of energy was first proposed, there was significant opposition to it. Neither the engineering limitations of measurement nor the philosophical implications of the principle escaped the careful thinkers. Denying God by asserting the principle, on the belief that “science” and Laplacian determinism sufficed, seemed at the time (but only for a time) to guarantee the “triumph” of materialism. Matter as always from all eternity having been here [and we must not forget that the universe was then also believed to be infinite] could more easily be henceforth asserted. Neither science nor philosophy had yet advanced to the point of asking the crucial detailed questions about the significance of Law on the very constitution of matter: with the Law thought to be of the nature itself of matter, materialism could thus foolishly assert that matter stood alone. Even today, the full significance of Law has yet to sink in and be fully appreciated by philosophers, while the materialist scientists, who have had ample opportunity to dwell on it, deliberately avoided and indeed still prevent public discussion of the issue, that cannot but only point to the basic weakness of materialism: Its failure to face squarely the Question of Law in Nature. The essentially parallel and only supposedly “independent” (for being a concurrent and no secret) advent of the theory of evolution was, of course, a boon to the materialists. But the polemical atheists of the second half of the nineteenth century could still not sleep quiet: The unity of Nature that even
the materialists could not and still cannot ignore led to the realization that, if materialism were to be true, it ought to be true down to the core of matter, including the chemical and physical processes and the principles underlying all physical reality, and thus also underlying the domain of biological evolution. The principles of the conservation of mass and energy were not yet sufficient grounds, they recognized, for the secure triumph of materialism: Nothing had yet been found that established clearly the non-creation of the world, or prevented the institution of principles by a supernatural Creating Agency. On the other hand, the weaknesses of the theory of evolution were being made painfully obvious to the evolutionists, even as they publicly vehemently denied, as they still do, any weaknesses.

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

§85. The strengthening of the atheist argument appeared again as the “independent” theory of relativity. The supposedly impeccable “scientific” credentials were again denied, but the “success” of the theory, especially demonstrated later in the successful explosion of the atomic bomb, was much too “obvious” to be refuted. Still, one cannot fail to be struck by Einstein’s state-
ment referred to already (see §36 p.56). In addition to the remarks there made, the following also seem very pertinent:

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

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

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

§86. Alas, the justification of all we presented above as the motive of atheistic science is supplied, as here proven, by these stark words of Einstein himself! Eventually, the “philosophy”, that the so-called “uncomprehending masses” do in fact comprehend better than the modern professional philosophers who lack the courage to express themselves honestly and clearly, caught up with the “science”: The principle that “all is relative” is the unavoidable philosophical lemma of the theory [the principle] of relativity, the full atheistic consequences of which we have begun to “enjoy”, to our horror and despair, only gradually but ever more acceleratingly and unstoppably already during the past one hundred years. The relativists, as it should have been expected, are vehement in their public denials of the connection between the “scientific” and the “philosophical” principles: They refuse to see that, if all physical ultimately refer to the “field”, and if there be nothing other than what they call physical, then inexorably, there are no absolutes and all is relative! The more the “scientific” aspect of Nature is stressed [which the atheists foolishly think
works to their advantage if presented as identical with such pseudo-scientific theories], the more prominent the contradistinction between “science” and the secure belief [not religion] in a Logical God becomes. But when the morality included in the latter is seen as an impediment to the so-called “progress” [certainly toward the always unstated abyss!], all the more do these relativities (the “scientific” and the “philosophical”) get confused! The many tales about Einstein, told by his admirers, have him on one occasion feeling sorry for the “good Lord”, should He be shown to have failed to see the “logical inevitability” of his relativity as underlying truth, and to have constructed the world on some other principle; and on another denying the existence of any philosophical and theological implications ineluctably included in his theory! The Lord certainly foresaw all that Einstein led to, including the built-in profanities; which is why He chose otherwise to construct the World! Einstein in all his “wisdom” and because of it, simply could not see beyond it! Eddington 21 has without equivocation stigmatized the glaring fallacy of holding relativity innocent of profound religious implications. Have the admiring propagators themselves of these myths been so totally confused, or do they spread them on purpose for all the evil they can produce while drawing the admiration of the uncomprehending? For their other intelligence, we cannot but opt for their conscious intent! As for the real value of the admiration of the uncomprehending, how indeed can it be other than squarely nil? Still, the monetary value for some of the admiration of relativity as the new popular religion, by far the worst ever opium of the masses, is inestimable! Which is why some, and especially those in very high places, choose to play on both boards, knowingly profaning the Holy God!

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

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

§88 By not discussing openly and thoroughly the whole issue of determinism vs. relativism, the atheists have succeeded in fooling a far wider following of fellow-travelers who have bought the theory of relativity without still realizing what in fact they have bought. Back in the pre-relativistic times, Laplacian determinism was recognized, even by the atheists, as a double-
edged sword with which they could cut as well as be cut. Under determinism, the World could far more easily be seen as the work of a Creator rather than as the outcome of a blind process of evolution based on chance. So, while the atheists publicly upheld Laplacian determinism as the pillar of materialism, privately they worked to subvert it themselves and, in keeping with the implications of chance masquerading as evolution, to cut off with it the clear possibility that Laplacian determinism could still point to Design.
§89 Despite all remonstrations, materialism, the belief in matter alone, is the “philosophy” the world holds today supreme. Under its sway, matter is the subject of all our sciences, not just only the physical! Yet, our scientific ideas about matter and energy [and thus with them even the materialistic underpinnings of materialism] have not, because we have not dared to face them, been placed under the full power of the microscope of rational examination, that we so far have called “Logical and Mathematical Simplicity Principle” (or, L&MSP). The time now compels us to consider the hard facts:

(a) We cut up material bodies. We even smash atoms. How far can we continue the process of cutting up? It has been a direct finding of that process that, in order to proceed further we need to accelerate the colliding particles to very high velocities, but then we find a collection of particles having a total amount of matter greater than that contained in the particles we accelerated! What gives? The process of cutting up ought to refer only to the reduction in size, or so we thought. Now, given our limitations in optical analysis, instead of measuring geometrical size, we in effect weigh masses! Smashing atoms ought to result in smaller particles continuing to have the total mass of the original particles, not more as we indeed find! The suspicion is strong that if we could continue the process, even heavier particles would result! But instead of thinking rationally, some scientists have as a result spoken of “hidden” mass residing in the particles so far
recognized, passing gravitationally undetectable under normal conditions [while others simply take it as “mystery” and continue with their work]! But that is contrary to L&MSP, and must therefore be rejected. What is the alternative? That we finally face the hard fact that part of the energy we spend in accelerating the particles, the part that shows up as increased kinetic energy of the accelerated particles attaches to, is absorbed in, and shows up in them as mass, for no magical or relativistic reason at all, but only because the energy is not massless, despite all current belief, for the reason that photons are indeed massive particles\(^{22}\). In other words, under L&MSP, the creation of the world involved only the creation of light in the form of the fundamental photons, that are no other than the Democritean atoms! It was with these considerations in mind that above we made all those remarks on pp. 34 (§22), 41

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

\[
f = \frac{dp}{dt} = \frac{d(mv)}{dt}, \quad (22/1)
\]

\[
dx = f dx = \frac{(dx/dt) d(mv)}{dt} = v(dm) = v^2 dm + mv dv, \quad (22/2)
\]

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

\[
dx = v^2 dm + mv dv = c^2 dm + 2m c dv. \quad (22/3)
\]

Setting \(v = \gamma c\) and \(dv = c\gamma dc\), we obtain

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

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

\[
m = m_o/(1 - \gamma^2)^{1/2}; \quad (22/5)
\]

which is thus shown to have absolutely nothing to do with the theory of relativity, but is solely due to the physical hard fact that the photons possess mass, and every mass is the grand sum of the masses of the photons of which it is composed, in full agreement with the L&MSP.
(F/n. 9), 49 (§32b), 77 (§47b), and 124 (§76) about the Democritean atoms and the substance of light; on pp. 20 (§10) and 103 (§65) about the tiny volume in which high energies are concentrated upon collision in supercolliders; and on pp. 93 (§58), 99 (§63), 154 (§93), 100 (F/n. 15) and 170 (§104b) about the confusion and irrationality of talking of the identity of matter and energy and the presence of gravitational field in the absence of matter.

(i) Solution of all these problems requires that we face the hard fact that the fundamental photons have true, not "virtual", mass corresponding to their energy \( (\varepsilon_0 = m_0 c^2) \), and that the grand sum of all their energies and masses produces the expression \( E = Mc^2 \). Accordingly, no theory is required to produce this simple equation; it is necessitated only by the requirement that true mass correspond to energy as per the dimensional definition of energy, from the true elementary particle on up! The increase of mass with velocity predicted by special relativity was first received with great skepticism. This was converted to shock, acceptance of, belief in the theory when particle accelerators “verified the predicted” effect. But when mass is admitted to be delivered to particles on acceleration, according to the above specification, the mass of the accelerated particles comes out naturally exactly as “predicted” by special relativity, yet, without need of the theory! Automatically as it now becomes obvious, the quandary of “over-massive particles hiding in the nucleons but not reporting in the ordinary course of events, except on smashing”, vanishes! All excess mass is seen for what it truly is: added on acceleration, not preexisting in there! But what does this make of all our currently precious theories, and of our “best and brightest”?

(ii) Let us see: With the photon massive, we are talking of a totally New Science! The expansion or contraction of the universe would not remain, as it shockingly is, totally silent on the fate of all photons out there! Light, every single fundamental photon, must be accounted for in any self-respecting theory of the universe! Remember the general relativistic theories of the re-collapsing or recurring universe: Do they say anything at all (based on general relativity that brought them to the fore, or on anything else) about how light is to be retarded to a dead stop and re-accelerated backwards? No! Can they be serious? No! Remember all the (now seen to be only fatuous) talk about the “missing mass” out there! Remember the deflection of light and the retardation of signals pas-
sing close to massive bodies “predicted” by general relativity!: The massive photon, attracted naturally by massive bodies, follows not a straight but a curved path (upon which travel takes longer), different from that calculated on the basis of Newtonian mechanics: The deflection comes out exactly as observed and “predicted” by relativity! Remember that with a massive photon, even the velocity of light suffers cosmological retardation! Its velocity, therefore, cannot remain constant as current theory requires! In truth, it is amazing how diligently current theory avoids discussing how light and the whole universe escaped the original “singularity” (of infinite gravitational force) with a maximum velocity of expansion limited to the present (if constant) velocity of light! With the present velocity of light, the universe could not have come out of the initial singularity! On the other hand, inflationary theories are silly! Because the total velocity of separation of bodies includes all effects; and it is the total velocity of bodies separating that is limited by the velocity of light! A non-physical observer watching events then, as now, would have to conclude that the total velocity of separation could not have exceeded the velocity of light! But if you think that here we have a true quandary, please read on!

(iii) In (a) above we just touched on the problem of cutting up material bodies. That problem was first faced by Democritus who correctly decided that there must be a limit to that process. In modern language, this is simply expressed and proven by the expressions \( \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^\infty = 0 \), and \( \sum \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^n = 0 \). But today we find that light is behaving now as a particle and now again as a wave, while it has been proven that high frequency shorter wavelength light is more energetic than low frequency longer wavelength light. Which, under L&MSP, clearly compels us to conclude that the weakest possible light in the universe is that having the longest possible wavelength, that cannot but equal the diameter of the universe! Nor indeed can it be doubted that as the universe expands [for the proof of that, please wait until §119a, p. 217], the first light produced is that always henceforth present in the always advancing front of the expanding universe. The conclusion? That the Democritean atom, the fundamental photon, has a size equal to that of the entire universe! The universe expands as it dissolves to ever weaker light! In the beginning, at the moment of its creation, the entire universe was concentrated in a point of zero vo-
lume, its total mass has since been constant as the grand sum of all its photons, its energy was \( E = Mc^2 \), but light then had the shortest possible (i.e., zero) wavelength and the greatest possible (i.e., infinite) velocity \( c = \left( \frac{4\pi GM}{T^2} \right)^{1/3} \), where \( T \) is the age of the universe, in the beginning having the value of zero, the only value with which expansion could defeat the also infinite initial gravity of the universe concentrated in zero volume! While for these you must wait until later, you may, in the above expression for the velocity of light, try its present value \( c = 2.99 \times 10^{10} \text{ cm/sec} \), together with the value of \( G = 6.672 \times 10^{-8} \text{ g cm}^3\text{sec}^{-2} \) and \( T = 3.786 \times 10^{17} \text{ sec} \) (= 12 billion years), that give \( M = 1.15 \times 10^{56} \text{ g} \), easily within one order of magnitude of the total mass of the universe. All these being fully compatible with Newton’s law of gravitation! Now, you may reflect on whether or not that Law had at all been comprehended in all its universal significance, and whether some other theory or consideration of the universe produced anything as simple as all this and fully compatible with L&MSP! There is more to this story, of course. We have already referred to the mass of the fundamental photon being of the order of \( 1.947 \times 10^{65} \), while the mass of the electron is \( 9.109 \times 10^{-28} \text{ g} \), or some \( 4.68 \times 10^{37} \) times larger. This means that the electron is made up of an equal number of Democritean atoms, obviously held together under a universal (in view of the L&MSP) quantum-mechanical Law (certainly other than the one now in fashion) that holds them together within the confines of the electron, the basic quantum of mass, energy and action being no other than the Democritean atom itself, naturally embodying in itself all these three. As action is the product (energy)(time), it is obvious that it is proportional to \( T^{1/3} \); the initial values of action for both the Democritean atom and the entire universe having been zero, and having since been increasing with the universal age. It is also entirely clear that it is the present action of the Democritean atom that is having the present value of the Heisenberg so-called “constant” \( h \). If \( h \) were a true constant, it also is obvious that there ought to be, very early on, a period of time during which the entire universe would produce no action at all, its total action then being less than \( h \), though the universe did clearly produce action as it was already expanding and thus acting, even during that very early period! An obvious contradiction, not allowed under L&MSP.
§90 What problems? Is there a problem? But isn’t there a huge problem? Nature and the L&MSP impose the hard fact that any one thing moving in space possesses an objective total velocity vector that though unknown to us may not be ignored, especially in an experiment such as this! This hard fact was not considered either by Michelson and Morley, or by FitzGerald, or by the relativists who searched for, found, and adopted such transformation of coordinates as to “justify” theoretically the wrong, in the absence of the proper consideration of this hard fact, FitzGerald contraction! So it has been that the Michelson-Morley experiment has wrongly been taken to support the special relativity theory. All this is due to overlooking the major triple blunder of tacitly equating as at all times correct the direction of the total velocity of the interferometer in space to the direction of its principal axis! But this constitutes a hidden assumption, that only rarely, through serendipity if ever comes out true. The correct analysis must at all times involve the projections of the total velocity vector on the axes of the interferometer!

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

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

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

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

where $\gamma = v_{\text{total}} / c$, which shows that only for $\alpha = 0^\circ$, $\beta = \gamma = 90^\circ$ is it true that only the principal axis contracts relative to the other two, as has been the conclusion known as the FitzGerald
contraction, based on the faulty Michelson and Morley analysis! Naturally, in a situation such as that of the Michelson and Morley experiment, the above differentiated lengths become the instantaneous lengths of the three axes. In other words, had this correct analysis been carried out even as late as 1905, the theory of relativity would not have come into being; and even if it had, the experiment would already have shown its lie!

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

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

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

§94 There is one more related problem that must here be mentioned. Unquestionably, light is part of the natural world, and as such is subject to all the laws ruling the world, as well as to the laws specifically applicable to it. It follows that if for the velocities of two other bodies it is legitimate to write such sums as \((v_a \pm v_b)\), under the universality of Laws and the L&MSP, it is legitimate to write them even when \(v_a = c\) also, as was in fact done by Michelson and Morley, who proceeded to conduct their experiment and produce its findings on the basis of just such sums, against which nobody has since ever complained! Though the velocity of light in
space is subject to the laws applying to it, sums such as $(c \pm v_s)$, where $v_s$ is the velocity of its source, or of some other body do not become meaningless. If that were the case, the Michelson-Morley experiment ought never to have been conducted, as nothing other than a null result could possibly be expected! If I, traveling with speed $c/2$ send forward light, the difference in our velocities truly is $c/2$ and not $c$, as relativity theory states: The velocity of light in space remains $c$, but this does not affect my own speed that also remains at $c/2$. The reason is that the universe as a whole constitutes a universal reference frame, and all velocities ultimately refer only to it, regardless of the opinions (and the frames of reference) of observers in it. It is not relative to any observer that light obeys the universal Law establishing (regulating) its velocity. If the velocity of light were constant relative to all observers, independent of the velocity of its source, and without reference to the one-only absolute universe-frame, as per current belief, the sums $(c \pm v)$ as used by Michelson and Morley would be illegitimate! But then, relativity itself would remove the carpet upon which it flies! The use of the Michelson-Morley experiment in support of relativity is a tacit admission of the existence of the universe-frame. The theory cannot thus deny that upon which it has built itself! But making this admission is equivalent to writing its own obituary! All the rest are at best mere illusions, at worst fatuous self-delusions!

§95 It is incredible that with so many problems relating to our most famous theories still outstanding, our “best and brightest” continue to build on them rather than reexamining their premises ab initio! Continue, that is, even after 1985, when all these issues were presented to them in full, and they decided in full knowledge of the facts to suppress the findings and pretend that nothing had changed! It does not require much expertise to understand what the Michelson-Morley experiment says about ordinary bodies, truly and instantaneously contracting as they turn relative to their direction of total motion! But when one considers that they all are made of fundamental photons, their behavior can no longer surprise! So, this discussion finally demonstrates what so far has remained a carefully guarded secret, namely that relativity, built on the blunders committed in the execution and interpretation of the Michelson-Morley experiment, was not both philosophically and theologically innocent when introduced and accepted, despite the vehement denials of the atheists. If it were, and if the atheists as scientists were
men of honor, they should have no difficulty discussing dispassionately these and all related issues; instead they attempt to bury them, thus themselves demonstrating their own dishonesty. It should, therefore, come as no surprise that in this Age of the Great Deception, even, and principally, professors would not hesitate, nor be shamed, to teach as truths what they now know, at least for twenty years already, to be absolute falsehoods!
§96 According to Einstein, what caused him to develop general relativity was the “inaccuracy” of Newton’s law. But does it not strike as most odd that we have been much too quick to dismiss Newton’s law as “highly accurate but not exactly accurate”, when we have not spent all necessary effort in determining the causes of its purported inaccuracy? Let’s review the situation: If we look carefully at what we call “laws of nature”, we will be struck by the fact that, among them all, Newton’s is the only one that is free of obvious assumptions! Mass, separation, force are all objective physical quantities! Nothing more seems to be involved in Newton’s Law! The so-called gravitational constant is nothing more but a proportionality constant, the introduction and use of which involved no ad hoc assumptions! [Compared to this Law, all other so-called laws are contingent on difficult and not well understood concepts and unverified assumptions, such as the pure claim that the velocity of light is constant, or the equally pure claim that the photon is massless. The latter of these claims has already been shown above, on material already before us at the time of the Michelson-Morley experiment (yet, material then and now misunderstood), to have been entirely baseless!] We have verified evidence, indeed unshakable proof, that the solar system is held together by gravitation as defined by Newton’s Law! Kepler’s Laws relate inextricably to Newton’s Law! On account of these sufficient hard facts, we ought to have redoubled our efforts to discover the purported failure of Newton’s law to
account for the precession of planetary orbits! Which, however, we did not do, either before 1916, or after Einstein added at least five more to his other assumptions in his effort to “streamline” his general relativity to Newton’s Law, in order that he may then come back to claim the latter as a case of the former to a “first approximation”! Moreover, after the discovery of universal expansion, leading directly to the initial singularity and its infinite field of gravitation, we have every reason to think that by no finite initial velocity could the universe have been set upon its subsequent expansion! Thus, the fact that the universe is still as observed and has not already scattered to infinity cannot have been due to some cause other than gravitation delaying its expansion right from the start! This, in face of the fact that Hawking and Company admit the breakdown of relativity during the earliest period in the life of the universe, during which Newton’s Law does not break down, as it already allows for the infinite force of gravity at zero separation! Which all is all the more sufficient reason for us to redouble our effort to understand all that lies hidden in Newton’s Law! Which unquestionably is indeed plenty!

§97 First off, we see at once that what we call Mathematical and Logical Consistency could not have failed to leave out of consideration something as universal as Newton’s physical-natural Law [physical, as part of physics, the science; natural, as part of Nature, the Greek physis; on account of which, the hyphenated term is naturally given in Greek by the sufficient term physical!] When from a tiny bit of tissue, as we now find, we can reconstruct a whole living organism, surely from a Law within the Consistent Mathematical and Logical System, we ought to be able to learn plenty! And what we learn right off is that even this old as the universe Law has been misunderstood for three-hundred years already! Whereas we have a good intuitive feeling of what a physical force is (as we all have felt physical forces), and what a physical mass is (as we all have held physical masses in our hands), and we know that there are objective quantities out there corresponding to forces and masses, the intuitive feeling we have of physical separations does not automatically lead to being a Law of nature that the separation used in Newton’s Law must be measured along a Euclidean straight line! In other words, what the exact physical separation of bodies as used in Newton’s Law is can only be defined by another physical Law, and we may not assume without testing that
that Law dictates the Euclidean straight-line separation! What separation that other Law dictates is a matter for a separate detailed investigation! We have been wrong for three hundred years, and we still are, to subsume without testing Euclidean straight-line distances operating under Newton’s Law! For that matter, in a dynamic system in continuous motion, and the universe is the ultimate such system, how is that Law to define distance, statically or dynamically? A static definition could require that at a frozen moment, perhaps, the best option is of the frozen Euclidean straight-line distance. At the next frozen moment the then frozen Euclidean straight-line distance, and so on. But how do we know what those frozen distances are when we may only judge distances by light, i.e., massive photons traveling in real time, and along curved paths due to gravity? Let me try to be as precise as I can: In a dynamic system, the frozen distance is a constantly fleeting conception, requiring for its complete grasping not only the distance itself, constantly, cosmologically, in real time, developing between the two bodies, but also the constantly, cosmologically, in real time, developing path along which we observe what we take to be that distance, along which the photon travels under its constantly, cosmologically, in real time developing velocity! A dynamic definition could require that at a frozen moment, perhaps, the best option is of the distance along the actual physical path a photon would travel under the field of gravity of the entire frozen rest of the universe (i.e., of the universe minus that photon) applying to each point along that path! A variation, perhaps already involved automatically in this definition, is the requirement that the light path between two bodies be the least path traveled in the least time! Perhaps, other static or dynamic definitions may be imagined. What we call Mathematical and Logical Consistency cannot have failed, among all the various options open in this regard, to pick the one most parsimonious of means (including the ideas of least path, time, energy, action) and most economical relative to the overall objective; without which considerations, the term “Consistency” totally loses its meaning! There is no question that, between any two points, light travels in the particular path that is the most “economical” relative to something! In other words, there is no question that the Mathematical and Logical Consistency is already at work having resolved all the issues involved! The problem is we do not know which that something is and how Mathematical and Logical Consistency has gone
about resolving the issues involved! Besides, there is yet another
issue to be decided: Traditionally, we write Newton’s Law as
\[ F = G \frac{m_1 m_2}{r^2}. \] (7)
But in the face of the universality of this Law, “Consistency” re-
quires that both views of the universe, i.e., as seen about each of
the two mutually attracting masses be considered. E.g., a test par-
ticle moving from the Sun to the Earth, and another moving at the
same time in the opposite direction will not follow the same path,
as the universe is not arranged exactly the same as regards both
bodies acting as gravitational centers on all other masses! This
means that the correct writing of the Law should be
\[ F = G \frac{m_1}{r_1} \frac{m_2}{r_2}. \] (8)
How naïve, if not irresponsible in light of this discussion, a not too
austere critic might regard the current theories is seen by the fact
that nowhere in them are these issues at all hinted at! That general rel-
ativity ignores them does not make them unimportant, only it much
too crude! Now, we all can have a better measure of how complete
the abandon is with which our “best and brightest” keep on erect-
ing their impressive-looking mathematical edifices—on unsec-
cur ed ground! [See also F/notes: 15, p. 100; 22, p. 147; and 25, p. 165.]
§98 How then is the problem of planetary orbital precession
resolved? A planetary Keplerian orbit remains fixed in space on-
ly as long as the separation entering Newton’s law is exactly the
least and constant distance of the Euclidean straight line! Any longer
distance entering Newton’s law will automatically cause planeta-
ry precession! Unquestionably, the universal expansion itself, ap-
plying to planetary orbits also, causes them to be not closed but expand-
ing ellipses, precessing forward as they are spiraling outward! In light
of this discussion, if all ordinary effects on a planetary orbit are pro-
perly accounted for, but the orbital precession is not thereby fully
accounted for, then there can be no question that the separation
used in Newton’s Law must include the total acting effect of the
universal expansion; and if the orbital precession is still not account-
ed for fully, there then shall be no avoiding the acting hard fact of
the path of separation being longer than the Euclidean straight
line path! A least test particle traveling from one celestial body to
another cannot but feel the effect of the entire rest of the universe,
meaning the effects as they reach it of all other celestial bodies from the
minutest to the largest as they are distributed in space around the tra-
veling test particle! Unquestionably, the path of separation as deter-
mined by its own independent defining Law, that alone is used in Nature’s Newton’s Law remains to be determined! It is naïve to believe that general relativity automatically accounts correctly for planetary precession, when it has ignored and not addressed in an explicit and compelling way all these issues, that under no circumstances can be made to go away! [In his 1916 general relativity paper (loc. cit. p. 164), Einstein referred to two earlier (and may we judge independent of general relativistic considerations?) papers by himself of 1915, and by K. Schwarzschild of 1916, bearing on planetary precession. Having not seen those papers, I cannot comment on the assumptions made in them. But this is clear: When in the late twenties, faced with Hubble’s proof of universal expansion against which he had till then fought so strenuously, he finally admitted “the greatest blunder of his life”, it must be regarded as an extraordinarily serendipitous pure coincidence that as early as 1915 he had been able to account correctly for the precession, i.e., without, at least, considering the effect of universal expansion—to say nothing about the accuracy of Le Verrier’s calculations of residual Mercurial precession in the mid nineteenth century!]
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§99. Our entire discussion so far demonstrates, if anything, how intimately intertwined philosophy, religion and science truly are, and why it is a fundamental mistake to believe we can do correct science in the absence of a correct general consideration of all philosophical and “religious” matters also, relating directly to the physical world. It was not a result of loose concentration that every now and then we allowed ourselves to veer off to matters considered foreign to the subject of some particular main discussion, but for the fact that we never let go out of our attention that matters traditionally appearing under phenomenally foreign headings were not in fact foreign. Nothing brings that into yet sharper focus than a so-called “scientific” theory that calls itself “General Theory of Relativity”, that purports to unite everything under the consideration of a single indivisible field (of which all things we see are mere local concentrations); of which theory the disciples, subsequently faced with a philosophically opposite theory, that of “quanta” (namely, quantities distinct ontologically from each other yet said to be making up all we see), have embarked, so far without success, on an effort to develop a truly “General Theory of Everything”. These latter people, presently headed by Stephen Hawking, make no bones about their religious beliefs, regarding themselves atheists, yet without realizing that in exactly this their effort they do not in fact eliminate religious considerations, but only substitute those of the past with the one they hope they will one
day invent. [Nor is the blame wholly theirs: Just imagine the world still holding the once current “scientific” beliefs of the Chaldeans, or of Claudius Ptolemy! We are lucky that science has advanced. That traditional religion, blindly if not calculatingly, claims for itself to be Revelation is only partly correct! All its overstructure is man’s invention! And we are unlucky that religion, self-shielded behind what she calls Revelation, has not advanced, has not seen it fit to improve, as science has done with hers, her overstructure that continues to be man’s invention, and so ever more continues to be a profanity!] I use the “invent” in full consciousness of what they are doing [and those others have done]: The developing of a theory is a process of invention, not of discovery! You discover what though unbeknownst to us yet already existed. You invent what has never existed before. The effort of these people is therefore to invent, not discover, a theory. As a theory is a complex construct living in at least one mind, these people deny that there is or ever has been a mind that has taken in its purview everything there is. They thus attempt to establish themselves not just as mere inventors but as in effect Gods after the fact, inventors of a so-called “Theory of Everything”, after all that exists has already been in existence and declared by these same people as meaningless! So, these people are not thus acting as cats, chasing gracefully as cats only can their tales, visibly attempting to catch them as it were by surprise, but are in fact the tails attempting to arrest the heads that always go in front! This is not comical! It is the natural development of man’s mad effort to substitute himself as God ruling over what he calls a meaningless world; an effort that proves how much these people truly hunger for the existence of the Person they deny, Whom, faced by their own denial of Him, they are forced to attempt to replace by themselves! Would you call it “crazy” or “insane”? This is exactly what Karl Stern had in mind, as we have already referred (§77, p. 126). Yet, it is no less a religion, unconscious though it is of itself being one such, in the pangs of being born, even as it is going to be born still! We therefore shall be remiss if we here fail to examine in at least some depth the theory that was the mother of all such ostensibly “scientific” efforts to resolve the “mysteries” of the world that were not.

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

§101. How did general relativity succeed? As A. Lynch has shown, by cunningly imitating Nature where it can be checked against her, and by “predicting” essentially everything where it cannot! “The “verifications” of general relativity are not beyond question. Even its handling of the precession of the perihelia has totally ignored the effects of the planets (and, of course, the problems discussed in the previous chapter of the present work. The theory wondrously predicts the correct result of precession without any mention of the planets! The classically (i.e., according to Newtonian mechanics) “unexplained” residue of precession is net of the effects of the planets; i.e., determined after those effects have been calculated and subtracted. But those effects were calculated on the basis of Newton’s law as it was then “understood” that it ought to apply. If those calculations as then carried out were incorrect by reason of improper consideration of all matters concerned, yet without the law of gravity itself being at all wrong, then the residue would not be free of error! General relativity can only
justify its prediction of the residue by assuming, not proving that the residue so calculated is free of error! But this inevitably though tacitly thus also assumes correct the whole of "Newtonian" mechanics as classically understood and applied to those calculations!!! In other words, relativity tacitly uses the assumed correctness of Newtonian gravitation in order, later, in the end, to deny the truthfulness of Newton’s law!!! Again, Sciama has all but openly admitted the total uselessness of the so-called “soft” theories, (including those based on differential calculus) that do not make unique predictions as indeed do the “hard” theories (including those based on integral calculus—and we must never forget that the Universe is the integral par excellence of physical Reality!) on which they can stand or fall. Relativity is just such a soft theory, as Sciama, a relativist, all but openly admits but fails to show the courage to reject it for that sufficient reason, ostensibly for its being “the best theo-

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

§102. Every relativist knows that the strength of relativity as a scientific theory lies on its ability to handle concisely the general problem of the transformation of coordinates. But physically, this does not suffice! If pre-Copernicanism was objectionable for its placing the Earth at the center of the world, how can it fail to be infinitely more objectionable that, as relativity asserts, every observer regardless of his position truly is at the center of the world, solely because he thinks or imagines he sees the world around him as if he were at its center while in fact he has no idea whatever of how the world truly looks when seen from its center? It is as though you ostensibly solved the problem of Rome as the seat of world empire by calling every point of it “Rome”! If Rome were once right, that right is not thus spread around! And if it were wrong, you only make matters worse by spreading that wrong around! Nor do you eliminate the problem of a wrongful claim to a right by permitting that very same wrongful right to an infinite number of claimants, and this while you also, with the very same breath, assert the non-existence of that right!: For this is exactly what general relativity does: it both asserts that every observer is at the center of the world, and denies the existence of a(ny) center! This in fact is the psychological satisfaction Einstein has invented and offered to everyone! But only fools can be thus satisfied! Relativity is nothing less than a return to pre-Copernicanism for all and the denial of it! All dressed up in the awe-inspiring relativistic formalism! If the world has a center, an absolute scientist (i.e., one who respects his science absolutely) is honor-bound to try to discover it and show it to us all. If the world is finite, it ipso facto does have a center! If the world does not have a center, every observer must be denied the right to claim centrality for himself, appearances notwithstanding! If the universe is infinite, it does not have a center anywhere, let alone an infinity of centers, even though it may look alike in that case from every position! Looks and Reality are not the same, and if a “scientific” theory cannot, or refuses to, distinguish between the two, it simply confuses Reality and illusion, and is thus not scientific in the least despite its impressive-looking structure. What makes a theory scientific is not that it was con-
constructed by a scientist, for even such a one can still tell us beautiful-looking tales, but its ability to relate directly to the underlying Reality and make it stand out apart from illusions and appearances. A relativist (and as such, by definition, no absolute scientist) feels no such compunctions; he spends his time manipulating infinitesimals leading to no integral picture! It is not immaterial that exactly in relation to these matters, Einstein, till the day he died some almost forty years after his invention of the general theory, had no idea based on it or any other so-called “scientific” (of the accepted sort) evidence as to whether the world was finite or infinite! Nor has anyone else either, after fifty more years, based on all the currently accepted “science”! And this is a very sorry hard fact indeed!!! Unless the syllogisms made so far and specifically those in this section are demonstrated to be in gross error (and everyone is welcome to present one’s arguments, following and all subsequent presentation remaining to be here presented!), the general theory of relativity introduces the insane problem of splitting the L&MSP apart, separating Logic from Mathematics (that is if you accept the theory as a legitimate part of it!), and of confusing the Clear Simplicity of Absolute Congruence of Reasoning with so-called “findings” of unspecified psychological desires (only as above beginning to be made at all understood) given a differential mathematical dress! Those unwilling to give up this overall Principle, without which we definitely belong in an insane asylum, must stand up and declare all relativity a theory suitable only for its inmates!

§103. As Einstein showed with his box and rope thought experiment, an accelerated system cannot be told apart from a system at rest, if one restricts his measurements within the box. But why so much fear of the outside world, so much claustrophilia, so much peasantry, regionalism, so much psychological attachment to the closed system, the caste, the ghetto? Because only in such a place does one feel psychologically secure with the immediately familiar, toward which alone he feels relative, while he has since childhood been taught to avoid considering and relating to the Whole, and to the Absolute, and cannot or will not for the sake of freedom reject this mentality even when he becomes a “scientist”!

Einstein did not confess this openly but only semantically, in the quotation we already have given (pp. 50 and 56)! But as everyone who has studied relativity at some depth [and so too all rela-
tivists] knows that, transformations such as that conducted in the above thought experiment (in reality, the feeling that it cannot be told apart from a system at rest!), can only be conducted an the single direction in which the system moves; that there is no way by which an entire spherically symmetrical gravitational field can be transformed away by any transformation of coordinates! So, despite its name, which it thus misappropriates, general relativity already fails this first test of true generality, and only falsely claims to be a substitute for, and a correct theory that includes, gravitation! Whereas Newtonian gravitation is a true spherically symmetrical, global, Universal phenomenon, “general” relativity continues to be a miserably local one that at best is correct in a single direction! So, the relativists choose to stick to their theory, not for its veracity, but only because it is a cunning “scientific” [for it lets them do tricky and not above suspicion mathematical manipulations of symbols] and so, in reality, is only a pseudo-scientific instrument that permits them to uphold, in the eyes of the uninitiated, the philosophically and psychologically convenient, for all who fear the Absolute, principle of relativity! Those who object to this complete travesty of Logic, the relativists impudently do not hesitate to call second-rate brains, thus cowering into submission those not confident enough both in themselves and in Logic, and preventing them from standing up to this grossly unsubstantiated charge! To pass off as a first-rate brain today, you only need to memorize the general relativistic formalism, learn its tricks and be ready to charge those opposed with “inability” to understand! But look:

§104. (a) Faithful from the beginning to his program to set down a scheme to expel and replace the Personal God even of his Jewish tradition, and realizing that holding such a Principle as that of faith in the Logical and Mathematical Simplicity present behind even the hard facts of nature is a purely mental process referring to the Presence of another, the Ultimate Mental Process, neither of which can hang up in mid air let alone in the complete vacuum, Einstein had to, and did, choose: (i) the explicit abandonment of that principle and the attachment to the psychological factor as we already have twice discussed (pp. 50, 56); and (b) to turn inside, to his own mental capacities. This however required some mental juggling: as the unavoidable world process sets the appearance of humans to follow that of matter, the knowledge that mental processes do not exist in inanimate nature, nor hang up in
mid air, let alone in the complete vacuum but solely in minds was nevertheless not enough to keep him from believing them as having come into being out of nowhere at all! But he conceived this nowhere at all as having an innate twist, as being the complete vacuum possessing a gravitational field, i.e., gravitational energy even before there appeared in it ordinary matter, which for all we know causes the appearance of the gravitational field! But whereas we understand energy as the product of matter and the square of the velocity with which it moves, namely, \( (\text{mass}) \times (\text{velocity})^2 = (\text{mass}) \times (\text{distance})^2 \times \text{time}^2 \), or as the product of a force acting on a mass and the distance it covers while under the influence of that force, namely, \( (\text{force}) \times (\text{distance}) = (\text{mass}) \times (\text{acceleration}) \times (\text{distance}) = (\text{mass}) \times (\text{distance}) \times (\text{time})^2 \times (\text{distance}) = (\text{mass}) \times (\text{distance})^2 \times (\text{time})^2 \), that is, whereas we understand energy in terms of those other real quantities, when Einstein reversed that order and set the existence of the gravitational field, that is, energy prior to the existence of those others, he did not, as he ought, feel it incumbent upon himself to give the world the definition of those others in terms of the vacuum and the energy it contained as gravitational field! In Logic, definitions proceed in the exact strict sequence from cause to effect, and never are the anterior defined in terms of the posterior! It follows that in Logic, even our posterior mind may never be used as a determining cause of events prior to its being! Einstein and the relativists have never discussed this reversal of physical and Logical order! Instead, and fully in the spirit of the wide discussion about fields during the nineteenth century, and at least being right in regarding the gravitational field as the most important of all fields, he could not but invent the existence of yet another field (which he called “gravitational”, though he conceived it distinct from the one already then known, the one due to ordinary matter) already acting in space completely empty of all matter and all energy resulting from it! Up until then, it was thought that fields were particular products of real and particular material entities. His invention was the inversion of that real relationship: His new “gravitational” field, he called upon us all to believe, was the progenitor of all that later followed, by him said to act very much, even if not quite completely, in the fashion of what later followed! Thus was God up on high replaced—by Einstein’s “gravitational” field as ostensible natural “fact”, and his mind setting the world rules! The “details” of inexorable
Logic and the Complete Logos notwithstanding!

(b) How did Einstein manage to do this? By avoiding to draw direct attention to the assumptions he made, referring to them variously; which makes it almost impossible to tell them apart and evaluate them with all proper consideration! So, in his Section 14, he says: “[w]e make a distinction hereafter between ‘gravitational field’ and ‘matter’ in this way, that we denote everything but the gravitational field matter. Our use of the word therefore includes not only matter in the ordinary sense, but the electromagnetic field as well. Our next task is to find the field equations of gravitation [which he regards as possessing energy of its own in addition to that due to what he calls ‘ponderable’ matter] in the absence of matter...” But this is nothing less than a fundamental infuriatingly licentious assumption! Physically, only matter possesses energy, and only matter produces a gravitational field! This is the common experience of all scientists and engineers. Now, Einstein tells us that, “something else” also produces a gravitational field and possesses energy, and that is nothing other than the “field” itself! God to exist on His own—that Einstein rejects, as do all atheists. But what cannot, even by his own definition, exist physically—that, Einstein and the relativists state, both produces a physical gravitational effect as well as possesses physical energy identical and additional to those possessed/produced by “ponderable” matter! The belief in the existence of God—ah, that is “religion”! The belief in the existence of this “field”—ah, this now is “science”! As K. Popper has shown, theories are only as good as their ancillary assumptions are scarce. In the case of general relativity as gravitation, all assumptions made, stated and unstated, must come out right, or else, the entire theory fails! Assuming the probability of each assumption made to be an “impartial” (but in reality very favorable to the theory) 1/2, the probability of only all five aforementioned assumptions being correct simultaneously is \( (1/2)^5 = 1/32 \). And it is infuriatingly preposterous to state that it is as likely as not that gravity is produced by matter as by nothing material at all! If it truly were based on such probabilities, science would already have been proven a pitiful farce, producing only tears, not laughter! So what is the real probability of Einsteinian gravitation being correct, remembering that it already has failed the global test, because in Einstein’s own words “the gravitational field generated by a material point in its environment certainly cannot be ‘transformed away’ by any choice of the system of
coordinates” [loc. cit. §14, p. 144]? When pressed the “experts” choose to remain silent, or they would have to close shop! All this is more to the point of tractability of the theory in meeting, as itself a “logical” construct, the demands of Logic.

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

A. Fundamental Considerations of the Postulate of Relativity.
2. The need for an extension of the postulate of relativity.
3. The space-time continuum. Requirement of general covariance for the equations expressing general laws of nature.
4. The relation of the four coordinates to measurement in space and time.

B. Mathematical aids to the formulation of generally covariant equations.
5. Contravariant and covariant four-vectors.
6. Tensors of second and higher ranks.
7. Multiplication of tensors.
8. Some aspects of the fundamental tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$.
10. The formation of tensors by differentiation.
11. Some cases of special importance.
12. The Riemann-Christoffel tensor.

C. Theory of the gravitational field.
13. Equations of motion of a material point in the gravitational field. Expressions for the field components of gravitation.
14. The field equations of gravitation in the absence of matter.
15. The Hamiltonian function for the gravitational field. Laws of momentum and energy.
16. The general form of the field equations of gravitation.
17. The laws of conservation in the general case.
18. The laws of momentum and energy for matter, as a consequence of the field equations.

D. Material phenomena.
19. Euler’s equation for a frictionless adiabatic fluid.
20. Maxwell’s electromagnetic equations for free space.

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

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

(c) Einstein’s requirement of general covariance is that “[t]he general laws of nature ... be expressed by equations which hold good for all systems of coordinates, that is, are co-variant with respect to any substitution whatever. (generally co-variant)” (emphasis in the original, loc. cit. p. 117). But as we saw above, the view of things occurring in a box pulled by a rope cannot be made fully compatible with the general view of the world, because an entire spherically symmetrical gravitational field cannot be transformed away! As a result, the requirement of general covariance denies the possibility that the universe establishes a general spherically symmetrical gravitational field. But even if this be true for the whole (about which matter patience is required in view of what is to follow, Ch. 22), there are places in it where a spherically symmetrical gravitational field does in fact hold locally! As a result, in such places, as the requirement of general covariance cannot apply, neither can the
whole of general relativity! [It is surprising, therefore, that locali-
ties, such as the believed to exist black holes (that are nothing if not
areas of extremely strong local spherically symmetrical gravita-
tional fields) are attempted to be understood in terms of general
relativity!] So, as there at least exist “islands” in the universe where
the general theory of relativity cannot rule, at the very best, the
so-called general relativity can only proceed by making such gene-
really unverifiable simultaneous stringent assumptions that make the
theory generally unverifiable as practically all operable, regardless
of what is still being believed! [The supposed verification of the spe-
cial theory regarding the dependence of mass of a body upon its
velocity has already been shown above (F/n. 22, p. 147) to be due
to the fact that photons are massive, for which reason also, the path
of light is bent ²⁶, while the precession of the planetary perihelia
depends on matters that relativity theory never considered (see
discussion in §101. p. 164)] And there are places, such as ours,
that are far better understood by much simpler theories! All this does
not make the general theory of relativity generally operable! Ge-
eral operability means that a single version of the theory (with the
identical same assumptions, if some such must be made) apply to all
cases barring none! The non-transformability of a spherically sym-
metrical gravitational field stands against general covariance,
without which general relativity simply cannot make sense of it-
sel! As a result, the moment it is shown that the entire universe
creates a spherically symmetrical gravitational field shall be also
the moment in which the theory of general relativity shall have
been shown to be false!

(d) In Section 9 of his 1916 paper, Einstein defines the geode-
tic line in four-dimensional space such that, independently of the
coordinate system in which it is stated, the length \( \int ds \) between
two points on it is “stationary” and its variation is \( \delta \int ds = 0 \). By this
definition, he in effect states that in this universe, distances be-
tween fixed material points remain static and unalterable. It is the
old vision of the universe consisting mainly of fixed stars. Ignor-
ing (or only truly forgetting?, at any rate not canceling!) this part,
in his Appendix IV of the Fifteenth Edition of June 9th, 1952 to
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his book Relativity of December 1916, he states that “[his] original considerations on the subject were based on two hypotheses: (1) there exists an average density of matter in the whole of space which is everywhere the same and different from zero (2) the magnitude (“radius”) of space is independent of time. Both these hypotheses proved to be consistent, according to the general theory of relativity, but only after a hypothetical term was added to the field equations, a term which was not required by the theory as such nor did it seem natural from a theoretical point of view (cosmological term of the field equations). Hypothesis (2) appeared unavoidable to me at the time, since I thought that one would get into bottomless speculations if one departed from it. However, already in the ‘twenties, the Russian mathematician Friedman showed that a different hypothesis was natural from a theoretical point of view. He realized that it was possible to preserve hypothesis (1) without introducing the less natural cosmological term into the field equations of gravitation, if one was ready to drop hypothesis (2). Namely, the original field equations admit a solution in which the “world radius” depends on time (expanding space). In that sense one can say, according to Friedman, that the theory demands an expansion of space...” Physicists still debate the question of whether or not the addition of cosmological constant (Einstein’s confessed “greatest mistake of his life” was proper. This however is clear: There absolutely were no cosmological considerations included in the 1916 paper! Those were the subject of the 1917 paper! So, Einstein’s above statement that the two “hypotheses proved to be consistent, according to the general theory of relativity, but only after a hypothetical term was added to the field equations” cannot apply to the 1916 paper. The two hypotheses go inseparably together in the considerations of the geodetic line. His term “stationary” regarding the length of the segment $\int ds$ does not permit universal expansion. Without the second hypothesis, retention of only the first goes against the Hubble findings, as “an average density of matter in the whole of space which is everywhere the same”, i.e., a constant density of matter in the whole of an expanding space requires that all elements $d\tau$ of three-dimensional space expand at the same rate, whereas Hubble discovered that the rate of expansion increases with the distance from the observer, which means that the density at greater distances decreases, unless one is prepared to accept the addition of new matter to the universe in proportion to the distance from the observ-

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

(e) There are more points on which one is well justified to re-
main reserved in view of the general theory: E.g., in Section 19 of
his original paper, Einstein discusses the matter of the “complete
solution of the problem of motion”, in relation to the numbers of
functions and equations required for it. He admits to there being
only seven independent equations available on the basis of the
theory, when ten or eleven are needed, but he attributes this lack
of *mathematical* definition to our freedom of choosing the three
(or four, if time is included) functions of space “at will”! Here,
there definitely appears confusion: (i) the how many equations
physical matters truly demand for their complete definition, (ii)
the how many equations the theory truly supplies, (iii) the wheth-
er or not we may add *whatever additional equations we think* ade-
quate, and (iv) the whether or not motion in space is fully control-
led by nature, or remains at all undetermined and haphazard, and so, beyond understanding, all these are completely separate matters needing separate and strictly logical consideration! As the motion of bodies in space is definitely not undetermined nor undeterminable (or else, astronomy would be impossible!), the absence of mathematical definition cannot be attributed to the freedom of the student as a “good reason for it”, but solely to the theoretical apparatus available to him! Einstein supplies no suggestions [he simply cannot do so, or else he would have given the needed missing equations as a part of his theory!] as to how best to proceed adding three (or four) equations to the only seven his theory puts forward, in order to get over the conundrum!

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

\[- (κ/8π)\int(ρ/r)dτ, \tag{9}\]

which he then proceeded to compare with

\[- (K^2/2\pi^2)\int(ρ/r)dτ, \tag{10}\]

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

\[- K(ρ/r)dτ, \tag{11}\]

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

---

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

\[ \kappa = \frac{(8\pi K)}{c^2} = 1.87 \times 10^{-27}. \]  

(12)

Accordingly, one, and specifically an engineer taught in his very first engineering lesson never to forget checking his equations for dimensional correctness, is very hard put to imagine what the appropriate local coordinate system must be that converts physical quantities such as K and c, having respectively the physical dimensions of \[ [M^{-1}L^3T^{-2}] \] and \[ [LT^{-1}] \], and the quotient K/c² having dimensions \[ [M^{-1}L] \] to dimensionless numbers! This κ was first encountered in Einstein’s Section 15 “for reasons that [would] be made apparent later” and also used without explanation in his Section 17 as a part of Poisson’s equation, which he wrote as \( \nabla^2 \phi = -4\pi \rho \), where \( \rho \) denoted the density of matter, here written as \( \bar{\rho} \). Obviously, what Einstein wanted to “be made apparent later” was the above value of κ, by which Newton’s law is claimed to be a part of relativity theory to “a first approximation”, though the utility of κ is neither obvious, nor at all shown by Einstein! Since Newton’s theory sets \( \phi = -Gm/r \), where \( m \) denotes the attracting mass and \( r \) the distance at which the gravitational potential due to it is measured, an equation, corresponding to Poisson’s own, must on the left-hand side have the term

\[ \nabla^2 (-Gm/r) = -Gm \nabla^2 (1/r) \]  

(13)

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

\[ d\mu = (4\pi r^2 dr) \bar{\rho} = 4\pi \bar{\rho} r^2 dr, \]  

(14)

which upon integration from 0 to 1 gives the total mass
\[ \mu = 4\pi R^3 \bar{\rho} / 3 : \mu / R^3 = 4\pi \bar{\rho} / 3. \] (15)

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

\[ \nabla^2 (-G\mu / r ) = -G\mu \nabla^2 (1/r) = \]
\[ = -G\mu \partial^2 (1/r) / \partial r^2 = -2G\mu r^{-3} = -(8/3)\pi G \bar{\rho}. \] (16)

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

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

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

§106. The fundamental point of how the theory of relativity translates into Natural Law nobody has ever discussed! It is one thing just to say that “gravitation is geometry”, even when nothing can be geometrized because there is as yet no geometrizable “ponderable” matter, and energy depending on it. It is totally another to demonstrate that an axiomatic system of purely human thought truly was an acting feature of Nature, even before there was any nature as the one we know, characterized by the “ponderable” matter we all know! If a ball is set to move in a frictionless elliptical groove, it will do so with constant tangential velocity \(^{29}\) on the sufficient principle of conservation of momentum, even as that is a vector, not according to Kepler’s second law, for there is nothing in either focus that forces it to move as that law requires! So, that “gravitation is geometry”, or its opposite, that “geometry is gravitation”, is already a baseless and conscious lie!

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

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

30 See again F/note 26, p. 173, above.
§108. (a) General relativity has never explained how, i.e., by what physical (meaning, objective in Nature out there) agents the velocity of light is kept generally constant! The theory of special relativity accepted that constancy as a mere hypothesis. The general theory tacitly turned that hypothesis into a Law of Nature, except where extreme “curvature” of spacetime is said to demand otherwise! Both theories consider the photons massless! Relativity theory is concerned with the picture of the world as seen from specified coordinate systems. Spacetime, it states, affects only the velocity of bodies and photons as seen from such systems, not themselves as such. How the “Law” [whatever it regards as “Law”] obtains in Nature has never been the subject even of philosophical, let alone scientific investigation!: The hard fact remains that the constancy of the velocity of light was fundamental in building up the special relativity, without which the general relativity could not be constructed. When the general theory was done, it denied the principle upon which its own foundation was built! That is gratitude!: You establish the solidity of the ground upon which you build the foundation upon which you build a tall tower; when all is done, you proceed to claim that the solidity of the ground upon which you built was never there, but your client whose money you spent on the project must continue to regard the tower safe! As an engineer, I have no license even to dream of such things! Obviously, some physicists and all relativists feel licensed to claim that Reality consists of just such a dream! With the theories now believed sacrosanct, all discussion bearing upon their foundation is considered scientific taboo! The excuse is very thin that special relativity is an approximate theory, good only for areas away from heavy bodies. We do not live in such an area: The entire universe is too small even for the special relativity to be “approximately” correct anywhere in it! [Indeed, who sets the standards of approximation? What do they think that “approximately” means when it comes to building the World? Do they take the World to be an oriental bazaar, where qualities and prices are “approximately” set? When Newton’s Law is believed approximate, what is the value of a theory that produces a result approximate to something approximate? What we need is the truth about the world, and only after that is at hand may we judge how approximate to it was some particular theory!] Newton’s Law has no distance limit beyond which it becomes inapplicable! General relati-
vity has never produced the general Law for the motion of light far or near heavy bodies, all the way to the limits of the Universe! The whole issue is cunningly masked behind the transformation of coordinates and the “perceived” (perhaps insinuated as only illusionary) red-shift. It is claimed that things do not really change for the bodies themselves that happen to fall into a “black hole”, even as they appear (hence the illusion!) reddened or retarded, or accelerated, or even as they vanish for somebody standing safely away. What is astounding is that general relativity attempts to “resolve” the scientific issue of light so that it satisfy its own “special” and “general” view of the world, without ever addressing the issue of the real effect of the entire universe on light, on every single photon in it! If one star, or galaxy, or black hole, affects the light so much as to make it the subject of so much apparent “scientific” discussion, it is ignoble to ignore the examination of the effect of the whole Universe upon every photon in it! The haughty professors, again, choose to remain silent, thinking that in their so doing their proverbial imperial nakedness will not be noticed!

(b) Nor can it surprise us that since Einstein’s work of 1917, Friedman’s work of 1922 and Hubble’s work during most of the 1920s, nobody seems willing to confess clearly that the theory of relativity cannot be a theory of the universe! The assumptions of Einstein we discussed in §105d (p. 173) and his incorporation in 1917 of the cosmological constant to the original field equations were not a spurious choice of a scientist but had an unconfessed singular purpose: Having rejected a Personal God as the Ultimate Absolute Reference, Einstein felt obliged to ensure that the physical universe remained forever static as that Ultimate Absolute Reference! Undoubtedly, this was for him a most important quasi-theological matter! His belief at the time was that under his original equations, gravitation would eventually bring about a collapse of the universe. He thus introduced the cosmological constant, representing a repulsive force between masses at great distances, exactly in order to avoid collapse and ensure staticity. Friedman’s considerations showed that Einstein’s first hypothesis (“an average density of matter in the whole of space ... everywhere the same and different from zero”) could be preserved even after rejecting Einstein’s second hypothesis (of “the magnitude (‘radius’) of space [being] independent of time”). Einstein’s subsequent statement (see above, p. 165) that, in light of Friedman’s work, “the original field
equations admit a solution in which the ‘world radius’ depends on time (expanding space). [and i]n that sense one can say, according to Friedman, that the theory demands an expansion of space...” runs directly contrary to Einstein’s own earlier understanding of his own theory that (without the cosmological constant and the second hypothesis ensuring a static universe) the universe would collapse! Faced with Friedman’s and Hubble’s works, Einstein forgot his own estimation of his own theory and his earlier fear based on that estimation and adopted Friedman’s later opposite expansionary proposition, thus claiming guarded paternity even for that, but did not bother to state the cost at which the average density of matter would stay constant in an expanding universe, nor how the theory accounted for it! The original field equations under gravitation must bring about collapse. Einstein’s original fear was not unfounded. Constant density of matter in an expanding universe can only be brought about by the addition of new mass, but that does not by itself eliminate the danger of collapse unless there is some independent agency counteracting the increased gravitation due to the addition of new mass. More mass in a bigger universe does not eliminate the problem of collapse. This is the main reason for which the relativists have taken a second look at Einstein’s “blunder” and have ceased to consider it a “blunder” at all, notwithstanding the Hubble findings, which they attempt to attribute to expanding space, forgetting that, unless distances and velocities are measured across all kinds of space with standard measures, they must close shop! Originally, Einstein obviously feared the collapse of his quasi-God; later, he and his followers did/do not seem to mind their quasi-God growing bigger—at least he retains the dubious “dignity” of constant density! Their inability to account for what they consider “missing” mass remains intact! But such are the vagaries of the respected “scientific” theories nowadays!

(c) Having not seen Friedman’s work, I cannot comment on it. Based on Einstein’s own guarded statement that “the original field equations admit a solution in which the ‘world radius’ depends on time (expanding space). [and i]n that sense one can say, according to Friedman, that the theory demands an expansion of space...”, however, I and we all must be skeptical about his so very much having missed this “demand” (if it truly existed in his original field equations) at least until 1922, that in 1917 he found he had to add the
“cosmological constant” term. With that constant gone under expansion of “space-time”, a constant everywhere (and of course non-zero, or else we would not be here talking!) density of matter [in Einstein’s own confused and confusing expression “an average density of matter in the whole of space which is everywhere the same and different from zero”, for if the density is the same everywhere in the whole of space, the “average” is definitely wrong as indicative of variation that alone legitimizes the term; and if the “average” is insisted upon as legitimately used, then clearly the density cannot be the same everywhere!] becomes possible only if new matter is added to that present already! Otherwise, i.e., without addition of new matter, and without the matter already present being infinite, it is impossible that an average density of matter can be kept constant for very long! Einstein did not discuss this matter! So, even the extent to which even Einstein comprehended the full consequences of his entire theory must remain questionable! Otherwise, his claim that “Hubble’s discovery can, therefore, be considered to some extent as a confirmation of the theory” 31 cannot be less than an effort to appropriate the Hubble findings as yet another “prediction”!

Passing between authors introducing slight changes in the assumptions and minute unevaluated alterations to the original equations, the general theory of relativity is made the father of nearly every subsequent finding! Yet, it remains a hard fact of Nature that both gravitation and universal expansion are too fundamental to the structure of the universe to be claimed for itself by any theory that did not incorporate them both in itself clearly, unequivocally consciously and correctly from the beginning, but only attempts to appropriate them either by means of such manipulations or through pure serendipity! Putting it only a bit more austerely than Sciama, a theory that “predicts” everything is not good for anything! Specifically as applies to relativity, this is by no means too harsh a judgment: Universal expansion is a fundamental characteristic of the universe. As such, it can only depend on an unequivocal universal measure of time, having absolutely nothing to do with arbitrary measures, frames of reference and observers who relative to each other cannot even decide which of the two moves or stays put! This being its game, its spirit and its field, relativity theory

may claim absolutely no rightful part of universal expansion!

(d) The Hubble’s findings depend on the Doppler shift, as classically understood. Never before was the Doppler shift associated with an expansion of “spacetime”, but only with the relative velocity between observer and observed acting in the classically understood ordinary three-dimensional space and time. The Doppler shift is and has always been understood fully in the ordinary sense. The appropriation of Hubble’s findings by relativity, therefore, involved a physically unsupported and thus impermissible reinterpretation of the Doppler shift. Such is the only way in which claims in support of relativity can and have been made on phenomena entirely foreign to its spirit! It is important to remember Einstein’s oblique and even more confusing (when viewed from its practical consequences) defense of his original position (already mentioned in §105d, p.173, above) who found it necessary “to remark that [the general relativistic Friedmanian] theory of expanding space, together with the empirical data of astronomy permit no decision to be reached about the finite or infinite character of (three-dimensional) space, while the original ‘static’ hypothesis of space yielded the closure (finiteness) of space”. Only thus can the relativists claim at once the validity of the concepts of general relativity, of the curvature of spacetime, and of the expansion of the latter! But from Einstein’s statement just quoted, it is clear that the inability to reach a decision follows only from the status accorded to the theory as co-equal (note that “together”) to “the empirical data of astronomy”! It is unbelievable that a theory can make such a claim for itself, even as it seeks confirmation in experience! For if one considers the Hubble findings without the blinkers set by relativity, one is less than one half-step away from declaring unequivocally that those findings and the instantaneous conservation of linear momentum [truly conserved in instantaneous transfers of momentum, though not over time due to the cosmological decrease of velocity, see below] suffice to set all events in the Universe in absolute spatial and temporal order, while the denial of these both is the founding argument of relativity!: And this because, the Hubble findings and the just stated cosmological conservation of momentum suffice to establish as an incontrovertible absolute hard fact that the Universe has indeed an immobile absolute center: at the point where expansion began, where/when all momentum vectors then summed up to zero, as they still and always do! This point
suffices as the center of a preferred (Cartesian or polar) system of reference, in which all events are fully spatially ordered!!! The moment of the Big Bang at that exact point establishes the moment of zero time as the absolute temporal origin of the World, sufficient to put all events in absolute temporal order!!! Thus the Hubble findings discriminate unequivocally between universal expansion as an absolute fact of the objective Universe out there, on the one hand, and the purely subjective relativistic concoctions of “observers”, all bent on establishing themselves as co-equally legitimate centers of the world in a logically impermissible attempt to return to an even worse pre-Copernicanism for all, on the other! In other words, the theory of relativity has already been refuted by Hubble’s work, and no longer has any validity!!! Its original claims of spatial and temporal indeterminacy are thus summarily debunked. But atheistic “science”, preferring to serve the interests on which it feeds rather than the Truth that inspires, refuses not only since Hubble, but even since 1986 to discuss the entire issue and acknowledge its complete resolution.

(e) Putting it all most succinctly, the unquestionable psychological problem of Einstein and all his followers, which he never resolved, as neither will they, was the living presence in the conscience of society around him/them of the Personal God, in Whom despite their personal faults the vast majority of the people believed and continue to believe. Him did he, as they too, try to supplant by his pure invention of the “field”, of which he is honored as the father by all like-minded people, ignoramuses and fools! How “successful” this effort has been, this exposition has already begun to show: and the following shall put the unbreakable nails and seals in its coffin!
§109. As regards Einstein’s special theory of relativity, its much desired conclusion, namely, the relativity of measurements in space and time can more easily be seen to have been in the sights of “scientists” even before the tools were invented that “justified” it. The conclusion was desired not for its scientific value, as none such was at all visible before the theory was invented, but for its philosophical significance in subverting determinism. Only later were the means sought that could allow the desired conclusion “legitimately” to be drawn. True, classical determinism had made some use of ill-advised assumptions and principles, only gradually understood and removed, as they were discovered to be contrary to the hard facts and to cast doubt on the value of measurements regarded as absolute though referred to arbitrary coordinate systems. But that such findings can neither invalidate the basic correctness of objective determinism, nor permit stating that there is no naturally preferred system of reference is beyond the vision of atheists: they, in typically arrogant fashion, thought it opportune to attribute the human failure to see the incontrovertible Reality of things firstly to Nature; and secondly, if it were to be shown that Nature still needed an Author, to God as His own defect! Only thus can the gloss be explained that was right from the start put over some very thorny issues by none oth-
er than Einstein himself. Later, as P. K. Feyerabend has aptly remarked (and F. L. Hill had before him observed), physicists were satisfied to regard the “theory of relativity [as] consisting of the formal Lorentz transformations and the mass-energy equivalence”, and to ignore the very legitimacy of the physical and logical basis of, and the steps that led to, those two. Today, so scared have the “scientists” become of the issue of the legitimacy of the bases of relativity, that the editors have long surpassed the bounds of civility, and even those of the Physical Review have reduced themselves to using thin and transparent ruses to avoid expressing a reasoned rejecting opinion on papers reviewing that entire issue (see §112c, p. 194)!!!

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

\[ x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = c^2 \tau^2 = r^2 \]  
\[ \xi^2 + \eta^2 + \zeta^2 = c^2 \tau^2 = \rho^2 \]  
uniformly to each other. True, the relativity of measurements of position and time follow from the “Lorentz’s transformations”, but are these transformations truly legitimate? Careful thought reveals that they are not: Consider the above equations separately from each other. Each expresses the distances \( r \) and \( \rho \), traveled by light as measured in two coordinate systems \( K \) and \( K’ \) having arbitrary respective origins \( O \) and \( O’ \), and arbitrary respective measures of space \( (x, y, z) \) and \( (\xi, \eta, \zeta) \) and of time \( t \) and \( \tau \), under the assumption that the velocity of light \( c \) remains constant regardless of the system in which it is measured. Consider also that (a) system \( K’ \) is traveling relative to \( K \) with velocity \( v \) as measured from \( K \), (b) the two origins \( O \) and \( O’ \) coincide at the reset time indications \( t = \tau = 0 \), (c) the distance from \( O \) the origin \( O’ \) travels in

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

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

(c) Now as to the physical phenomenon of light emission: Since the velocity of light is [said to be—so here stated in order to draw attention to all pertinent matters that shall be discussed later] independent of the velocity of its source, there can be no question that, at least in empty space, light emitted spherically forms an expanding front remaining perfectly spherical and centered at the true point of its emission. Even though we may “lose” or come to doubt the coordinates of this center, it certainly is by no means lost, or in any physical doubt. It can be regained exactly from the geometry of the spherical front, in exactly the same manner in which the center of a circle can be recovered from its periphery in plane geometry. This is basic. B. Russell, a confirmed atheist
and avid supporter of relativity has recognized the existence in nature of “hard facts”, that is, phenomena the physical nature of which cannot be doubted and is not subject to arbitrary human linguistic manipulation. Light and a spherical light front are such phenomena. The independence of the velocity of light from the velocity of its source [despite the remark in brackets at the top of this paragraph] is another such hard fact. Taken together, these hard facts guarantee the equally hard fact that [at least in empty space] the expanding spherical light front does not translate in space as a whole as a body translates as a whole along a trajectory, nor does it deform. This is absolutely identical to saying that its center, the point of its emission remains absolutely motionless in space! An “observer”, with the lantern (that for an instant just flashed the light) in hand, may remain at that center; or he may move about. However, his state of motion may no longer be doubted: It is unquestionably determined by the advancing light front: Only if he remains at the center of the light front may he claim to remain absolutely motionless, since only that point is the true, and truly motionless, point of emission. If he has moved relative to the light front (which is another way of saying relative to the absolute point of its emission), he then has definitely moved! So, only if he remains at the true point of origin may he use either of the two equations 17 given above in §110a, p. 187! A second observer has the same rights as the first only if he remains truly coincidental with him. The two equations are equivalent only if the two origins O and O’ remain truly coincident and at the point of emission, the only difference between them being in the size of the units of length and time used, that are then very simply related. When O’ moves relative to O, at the very best, only one of the two equations is correct. If neither observer has remained at the center of the light front, neither of these two equations expresses a hard physical fact! The true light origin, call it if you will O_o, is not physically the same as either O or O’, when either or both of these move!

§111. (a) Einstein and the relativists following him have completely ignored all these indubitable hard natural facts. Instead, they all have regarded as true that every observer casting a light may claim for himself to remain at the origin of the light front he once in his past cast, regardless of his own state of motion, as if he carried along with him the entire light front still expanding out there, and as if it formed a solid non-transformable body with him! Einstein
succeeded in “showing” that the equations 17 (given in §110a) transform identically to each other under his “Lorentz transformations”, that he set as:

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

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

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

$$\xi^2 - c^2\tau^2 =$$

$$= \beta^2(x - vt)^2 - c^2\beta^2(t - vx/c^2)^2$$

$$= \beta^2[(x - vt)^2 - c^2(t - vx/c^2)^2]$$

$$= \beta^2[(x - vt)^2 - c^2(c^2t - vx)/c^2]$$

$$= \beta^2[(x - vt)^2 - (c^2t - vx)^2/c^2]$$

$$= (\beta^2/c^2)[c^2(x - vt)^2 - (c^2t - vx)^2]$$

$$= [1/(c^2 - \beta^2)][c(x - vt) + (c^2t - vx)][c(x - vt) - (c^2t - vx)]$$

$$= [1/(c^2 - \beta^2)][cx - cvt + c^4t - vx][cx - cvt - c^4t + vx]$$

$$= [1/(c^2 - \beta^2)][x(c - v) + ct(c - v)][x(c + v) - ct(c + v)]$$

$$= [1/(c^2 - \beta^2)][(c - v)(x + ct)][(c + v)(x - ct)]$$

$$= [1/(c^2 - \beta^2)][(c^2 - \beta^2)(x^2 - c^2t^2)]$$

$$= x^2 - c^2t^2, \hspace{1cm} (19)$$

and only thus to claim that the two equations of §110a transform to each other. However here, it is necessary to enquire as to the nature of the $x$ appearing in $(x - vt)$ and $(t - vx/c^2)$ above. There can be no question that the $x$ in the first parenthesis is the $x$-coordinate of the light front; so that the first parenthesis ought more carefully to have been written as $(x_{lf} - vt)$; for if that $x$ were the $x$-coordinate of the origin $O'$ as seen from the origin $O$, the first par-
enthesis ought to have been written more carefully as \((x_{O'} - vt)\) and it \textit{would} immediately be seen to be equal to zero. As for the \(x\) appearing in the second parenthesis, Einstein himself admits \(^{33}\) that “the quantities \(x, t\) and \(\tau\) ... refer to the position of the [moving] clock [at \(O'\) as seen from \(O\), for which] we have, evidently, \(x = vt\)”. But if, as he ought, had written \((t - vx_{O'}/c^2)\), the above transformation \textit{would have stopped at the its seventh step as the eighth could not possibly be written}, as clearly seen below:

\[
\begin{align*}
\xi^2 - c^2\tau^2 &= \\
&= \beta^2(x_{\text{II}} - vt)^2 - c^2\beta^2(t - vx_{O'}/c^2)^2 \\
&= \beta^2[(x_{\text{II}} - vt)^2 - c^2(t - vx_{O'}/c^2)^2] \\
&= \beta^2[(x_{\text{II}} - vt)^2 - c^2[(c^2t - vx_{O'})/c^2]^2] \\
&= \beta^2[(x_{\text{II}} - vt)^2 - (c^2t - vx_{O'})^2/c^2] \\
&= \beta^2/c^2[(x_{\text{II}} - vt)^2 - (c^2t - vx_{O'})^2] \\
&= 1/[(c^2 - \beta^2)][c(x_{\text{II}} - vt) + (c^2t - vx_{O'})][c(x_{\text{II}} - vt) - (c^2t - vx_{O'})] \\
&= 1/[(c^2 - \beta^2)]\{c(x_{\text{II}} - vt) + c^2t - vx_{O'}/c\} - \{c(x_{\text{II}} - vt) - c^2t + vx_{O'}/c\}. \quad (20)
\end{align*}
\]

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

one was willing to re-examine the Logic of the experiment. Un-
questionably, the “Lorentz transformations” represent the slick-
est ever “scientific” slight of hand, or more figuratively, nothing
less than the grandest ever hat trick performed in the circuses of
the world! As two wrongs do not ever make a right, and careful
professors, acting correctly, do not give passing marks to students
committing such errors, one must wonder as to how they never-
theless accepted such an “error?” as “scientific” Holy Writ!

(b) It follows that, Einstein’s claim that the two equations of
§110a together express the constancy of the velocity of light and
its independence from the velocity of its source, understood with-
out regard to the positions and states of motion of the sources O
and O’, that coincided but for a moment was flatly false! Since the
two equations may not be written together as a system except for
the trivial case of coincidence of O, and O’ at O_o, the conclusion
that the “Lorentz transformations” transform these two equations
to each other continuously regardless of the relative to each other
state of motion of the two origins O and O’ is illegitimate! The in-
stantaneous equivalence of the two equations does not make the
two equations continuously equivalent to each other simply be-
cause the moments of emission are separated by an instant! As
every light source moves in space, its continuous emission does
not result in one advancing light front; but in a series distinct fronts,
each distinguished from the immediately previous one by the ds
difference in the path of motion of its source and the dt difference
of emission in the scale of time. To every instantaneous flash of
light there corresponds its own distinct advancing light front. We
may not confuse, as we do as cinema viewers, the fast presenta-
tion of distinct consecutive events/pictures as a continuous one-
only event. These distinctions are incontrovertible!

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

(d) Only for the true instant of emission is the light source at the
true point of center of the light front emitted at that moment! When
the source, shining continually, moves in space, it does not carry
the same light front along with it, but is instantaneously at the center
of the particular light front being emitted at that same moment!
The centers of instantaneous emissions form the locus of motion
of the continually emitting light source. The source retains its
own velocity in space, but that may never be associated with the ve-
locity of light as was confusedly attempted to be regarded as
ture through the use of the “Lorentz transformations”. Two con-
secutive light emissions separated by an instant, form two dis-
tinct light fronts. These will arrive at a fixed distant point after
traveling different distances (the second obviously traveling a
shorter distance if the receiving point is in the direction of instan-
taneous motion of the light source), while the interval of their ar-
ival will equal that of their emission only if the velocity of light be
truly constant!
(e) Finally left without the barbarians called “Lorentz trans-
formations”, now proven to have been derived from this confu-
sion, we see that there is no physical relativity, at least such as ad-
dvanced by Einstein! The “constancy” of the velocity of light, its in-
dependence from the velocity of its source, and the various “su-
cesses” of his theory, to the extent that they approximate or seem
to be true physical facts, must be derived directly from the Natural
evidence, and not from any theory based on faulty “logic”!
§112. (a) On account of this manipulation of the “Lorentz trans-
formations” by Einstein, forests have been cut and untold
tons of ink poured in the effort to “explain” what an observer
speeding away from his point of origin sees at “his” clock and an
identical clock left there. As the point of origin O is regarded mo-
tionless, the traveler considers himself occupying the moving
origin O’, to which there corresponds the time τ, reduced relative
to t by the factor $(1 - v^2/c^2)^{1/2}$, i.e., getting ever younger than his
twin brother at O, as he speeds ever faster away from him. Event-
tually, when $v = c$, relativity says, $\tau = 0$, or in layman’s terms, im-
mortality shall have been gained. So, when he returns, those left
at home shall have grown old but he shall have remained young!
Not just the age old dream of immortality, but of eternal youth!
That is exactly how tricksters attract the gullible—through con-
sciously false promising, that is never confessed!: Because, relativi-
ty cuts both ways, or else it is not relativity: We all, sitting in a
car of the tramway, depending on how we concentrate our field of vision, can see either ourselves or another car going the opposite way as moving or standing: If this happened in deep space, nothing could prevent the twin at O to regard himself as traveling ever faster and remaining ever younger! So, upon reunion, what shall we conclude? The relativists avoid all pricks threatening to blow up their balloon this way: They simply never answer “inferior” minds! Again, suppose the traveler to be none other than a photon emitted at the exact moment of Creation. At the present universal age T, it of course is at the very front of the expanding universe! Will it be right to conclude that the universe has not aged at all, or just only its front? If not, how is it not still at the point of Creation? If your wristwatch has not stopped and you are supposed to be in motion, is it not by the sufficient fact that it still shows \( \tau = 0 \), that you with full confidence state that you have not moved at all? Is it not with complete Reason that the photon at the universal front has no option other than concluding that it truly is as old as the Universe itself? Where indeed then is this supposedly famous “relativity” of time?

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

(c) How can you avoid expressing an opinion on this matter if you do not want to admit the obvious, that is brighter than the Sun, and you do not want the public to be told about it? Only by means of a ruse! This is what the PHYSICAL REVIEW reduced itself to in 1987: A paper of mine “On the Relativity of Clocks”, discussing succinctly the problem of mixed x-s present in the “Lorentz transformations”, received at the PHYSICAL REVIEW on April 10, 1987 got the Code Number SD3605D. Inquiring, on May 29, 1987, I telephoned the Journal and spoke to Mrs. Pionski. She told me
that “the Physical Review was not a suitable vehicle for my paper as they no longer published papers on Relativity, and as a result they did not even send the [my] paper for review”! In disbelief, I asked her to suggest some other “suitable” journal. She declined to do so! I requested that all she told me kindly be put in writing. On June 1, 1987, Dr. D. Nordstrom (Editor, Physical Review D), sent me a letter stating: “We regret to inform you that your manuscript entitled ‘On the relativity of clocks’ is not considered suitable for publication in the Physical Review”. The reader will notice the shift of “suitable” from the journal to the paper. Speaking of Relativity in action! I cannot honestly take as true Mrs. Plonski’s oral statement, as that would mean that the Physical Review no longer takes seriously its own name! Nor can I consider it possible that either she or some other single individual at Physical Review would undertake the responsibility of not sending up to the Review Committee every submission! I cannot but conclude that she uttered the first excuse she could think of! If the Physical Review acted as Mrs. Plonski stated, one is fully justified to wonder as to the exact meaning of the word Review in the title of this most highly esteemed bona fide scientific journal: If after only seventy to eighty years a “scientific” theory is so well “established” as to need no reviewing, how did we dare review Ptolemy’s theory after fourteen centuries? Wasn’t that theory at least equally well “established” during all that period? Without Copernicus, there would have been no Newton, whose theory was reviewed after it also was well “established” for more than two hundred years before we arrived at relativity! What I mean is that without those earlier reviews, there would today be no relativists around! Therefore, will the kind gentlemen at Physical Review be kind enough to tell the world on what grand projects they think they would be spending their precious time today, had they somehow been born in the absence of those earlier reviews of science? Einstein, by the conscious decision to write $x$ for the correct $x_{cy}$, performed a now all too evident deception, by which he “produced” the relativity of time fully in “a cat from a hat” fashion; not merely to the great amazement of the world, but also to the satisfaction of formal “Science”! And the rest, as they say, is history!

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

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

---

34 The distinguished astronomer Professor Fred Hoyle on p. 416 of his Astronomy and Cosmology, A MODERN COURSE, [W. H. Freeman and
greatest importance in the Universe! “Democracy”, however, “works”! Long live the slaves—on whose flesh “WE” feast!

(f) Faced with this situation, I did not fail to do my duty as a citizen of the World: On April 21, 1987, I sent an 8-page, about 3900-word Press Release/Public Announcement to all corners of Science-related News Media. The response was meagre to say the least. Science editors too, as all News editors, are well taught what to inform the world about! News that upset the standing Co, San Francisco (Library of Congress Cat. No: QB 43.2.H69—520—74-28441), ISBN: 0-7167-0351-3] states: “We now know that the difference between a heliocentric theory and a geocentric theory is one of relative motion only, and that such a difference has no physical significance. but such an understanding had to wait Einstein’s theory of gravitation in order to be fully clarified”! The good professor seems to forget that the difference between the two theories is not due to the perception of “relative motion only”, as that is understood in relativity theory, but to the revolution of the Earth about its axis [that, in addition, is inclined relative to the plane of revolution about the Sun], which is a totally other matter. If the Earth, as does the Moon to it, presented always the same face to the Sun, both things on Earth and our perception of the universe, if we could still exist under such a condition, would have developed totally differently! Besides, there is indeed a huge energy difference between a heliocentric and geocentric system, whereas the potential energy of the Sun-Earth system, being the product of (force)×(distance), remains the same, regardless of which is taken to be the attracting mass at the center, the kinetic difference is vast: Seen from the Earth, the Sun performs one revolution per day; seen from the Sun, the Earth performs on revolution per year. So, the respective kinetic energies stand in the ratio of 4.44×10^{10}; about which, relativity theory is totally mute, and the professor does not inform his students in his relativity advertising textbook! Is this a matter of “relative motion only”, and is it really true that “such a difference has no physical significance”? And what indeed “had to wait Einstein’s theory of gravitation in order to be fully clarified”? That the above ratio is insignificant? Or “clarified” was only the way to hide the Truth? Can it be that the possession of one dollar and the possession of 44.4 billion dollars is only a matter of “relativity”? Why doesn’t the noted astronomer first ask the multibillionaire whether he would be willing to exchange places with a pauper before delivering his lecture on “relativity”? In his novel The Black Cloud, the professor mentions the occasional reception of messages about proof of the existence of a (the) Superior Intelligence; that are, however, never verified! After comprehending the way of the professors, one understands who truly are that manically suppress the messages, drowning them in their relativistic noise!
world-order are not allowed to get through, on pains of immediate dismissal. That, however, does not mean that my findings were not leaked through to all people of high science. I, too, had seen to it, by contacting them directly, across America, Europe, Asia. In 1995 I finished writing two more books, the 745-page "REALITY, TRUTH, FAITH AND REASON" (Athens, ISBN: 960-85044-1-4) and the 150-page "CONTRA PHILISTINES AND SYCOPHANTS, OR FALSCHERGÖTERBESCHÄMUNG" (Athens ISBN: 960-850441-2-2).

Again I sought reputable publishers. I found none. I delivered copies of these two books to a professor, who visiting me some years later announced that he had an interesting book to show me. I awaited his arrival with anticipation. He produced the second of the above two books! At my exclamation of surprise he answered "of course, and a very interesting book, too! But you know, George, even professors have second mortgages on their homes! Why don't you start by sending a paper on your re-analysis of the Michelson-Morley experiment to NATURE?" I replied that I was not about to start that game again. He assured me that it was his belief that this time it would be published. Without, out of tact, pressing him to produce reasons for that belief of his, I replied that talking about the intelligent structure of the Universe cannot reasonably be made without all due reference to the Intelligence that produced it, and that I would not be side-tracked to abandoning direct reference to Him; that all I had to say had essentially been said, and it was the responsibility of the world scientists either to refute the arguments, analysis, contents, and conclusions of my first book, or to admit them in public! Some years later, he sent me a copy of the article by Steven Weinberg in the NEW YORK REVIEW (see F/note 2, p. 15, above), in which the author admits to "even when physicists will have gone as far as they can go, when we have a final theory, we will not have a completely satisfying picture of the world, because we will still be left with the question 'why?' ... Quantum mechanics is the one part of our present physics that is likely to survive intact in any future theory, but there is nothing logically inevitable about quantum mechanics; I can imagine a universe governed by Newtonian mechanics instead. So there seems to be an irreducible mystery that science will not eliminate", and later to "... although I really don't believe in a cosmic designer, the reason that I am taking the trouble to argue about it is that on balance the moral influence of religion has been awful". There are many ways to say a thing you want said. So, the latter quotation is a clear confession of an atheist stating his unbe-
lie in God. A God who is not the Designer, quite simply is not the God. If you believe that the Universe has come about without Design, you simply do not believe in the God! When even Nobel laureates speak as Steven Weinberg, the responsibility is not entirely theirs, even as you reasonably expect particularly of them to be leading the world in the most pregnant thinking, and not merely to hold a prize for achievement in a narrow field of endeavor: Religion has been around far far longer than Nobel laureates, and it has been formed gradually by people as ignorant of the great questions as their fellow men. From their sayings and examples you, we all, Nobel laureates too, may only extract and keep what passes the most austere critical judgment, nothing more (or else we too fall victim to thus perpetuated past ignorance)! All the rest, even when taught as if from on high, is nothing more than human talk. Alas, when it comes to religion, even the Nobel laureates speak practically as do all ignoramuses! They have not stopped to see, which is their responsibility, where Reality obliges Science and Religion to come together! We all speak from the surplus of our inner selves. The first answer we must give is where our own intelligence came from, for if on the whole the World is senseless, to be consistent with this sort of “philosophy”, we owe it to ourselves to admit that we first, if we retain some shreds of honor, must shut up, for the sufficient reason of thus preventing the latest crop of nonsense, that we produce by talking, to pile upon that already produced! Therefore, that Nobel laureates continue to research and to talk is a tacit admission that the world they accuse as nonsensical in fact belies exactly that their statement! With this first lesson firm in their minds, the Nobel laureates owe it to themselves to submit all their statements to the Lydian touchstone of objectivity, which requires as prime admission that hypotheses set down as first principles are not objective natural hard facts, but themselves subject to the most austere critical examination. What do we use as standards? Objective hard natural facts! No one can deny that Newtonian gravity is such a fact, for the sufficient reason that no one has produced an alternative natural frame of reference in which Newtonian gravity is unknown! Newton’s Law is a hard natural fact, not a theory!35 As such it

35 We must once for all understand that the modern use of the Greek term “theory” differs drastically from its genuine meaning: It de-
deserves far more attention than all theories combined! The Nobel laureates of physics, have tacitly decided to reverse this natural order, and to believe even Newtonian gravity as inferior to man-made theories! Had they not done so, they would

rives from “théav ióó”, meaning “I look at a view (= examine what I see)”. If we then desire to understand what we see, we must examine minutely what we see, and restrict ourselves to a meaningful presentation of our findings, according to how well tied together what we see, namely, the hard natural facts, are. Therefore, théoria = theory ought only to mean the “meaningful presentation of our findings according to how well tied together the hard natural facts truly are” We, before exhausting our minutest examinations, constructed narrow aprioristic statements (such as the principle of conservation of mass; the principle of conservation of energy; the mere hypothesis, elevated to the status of stiff Law, of the constancy of the velocity of light; the idea of the uniform everywhere mass density of the Universe, to the extent that we reject horrified the possible need for a different mass distribution; the idea that light is on the one hand energy, but on the other is massless, forgetting that we comprehend and define energy in terms of mass, length and time, and therefore energy divorced from mass is totally meaningless; the idea that the perfect void possesses gravitational energy; the idea that the found expanding universe may perhaps re-collapse, without giving a single thought to how the light, begun to be sent out from the first instant of expansion, is going to be recalled when the universe re-collapses, to the extent that renowned astronomers are horrified at the demand that light finally be given all honors that it deserves, pitifully defending the present status of what they have the temerity to call “Science” by asking me how I dare to speak of such things and call to account the so-called “experts” none of whom has had the moral and intellectual courage to ask for the license and intellectually obligatory Law by which such propositions as they put forward and adopt must be revered by all as the absolute criteria by which Nature must be judged! the idea of a unified four-dimensional spacetime, or an even-more-dimensional “space”, forgetting that the simplest “two-dimensional” x-t diagrams exist only on paper as a vehicle may only travel along the x-axis while the time may only be measured along the t-axis, and there is nothing natural that can step off these two axes, to find itself on some point of the paper off the x- and t-axes, which are not at all like the real two-dimensional x- and y-axes that leave free a walker to go anywhere on the real two-dimensional plane; and so on!), put them together as we willed, thus constructing “theories”, which we subsequently determined to test for veracity in Nature, and then had the temerity to insist saying that it is Nature that obeys or does not this or that “theory”! People who do not understand why the backdrop of the night sky is black, mere specks of some seventy kilograms of weak flesh,
have stood up and taken the challenge of re-examining the full consequences of Newton’s Law, as I proposed they do. Where I am shown hard-factually wrong, I shall stand corrected. Where such showing is not produced, what I [not the “I” of an egoist, but that of a witness!] have stated stands: Even if contrary to all theories put together! Because theories are just theories, not objective hard natural facts! It is impossible that between 1986 when I presented the analysis of Newton’s Law and 1999 when Weinberg published his article in the *New York Review*, nothing reached him as a result of my strenuous efforts and challenges brought to the attention of the world academic community. Not a mere scientific needle falls down, the noise of which these people fail to hear! Therefore, that Weinberg does not include the relativity theory in those that are likely to survive intact, but can imagine instead a universe governed by Newtonian mechanics, as per the first quotation mentioned above, is coming as close as I have ever seen a Nobel laureate admit, without stating it openly, that my analysis of Newton’s Law stands! But then, as all Laws do, so also Newton’s Law poses most starkly the question of its Lawgiver. Weinberg does not discuss how in a senseless universe Newton’s Law along with all its consequences got established! This does not pass the criterion of the most austere critical judgment! The Nobel laureate showed himself shorter than expectations! An unneeded personal self-sacrifice upon the altar of Atheism, the current, cruelest, insatiable of flesh, souls and spirits of all his faithful, and most ungrateful God of those calling themselves “WE”! It is said that peoples deserve their governments. I ask all the Nobel Laureates: Do they judge themselves to be deserving the “God” they worship?

§113. All this brings us, alas, back for yet another look at it to the question surrounding Einstein’s two blunders, the first being the belief that an observer in motion may continue to consider himself as the central source of the same one light front expanding about him, and the second that he mixed the \( x_u \) and \( x_{\gamma'} \) as a single \( x \), that permitted the relativity theory to advance: If the have the temerity to order a universe some fifty orders of magnitude larger how to behave in order to please their psychological insecurities! This is not mere temerity, it is what the Greeks called \( \alpha\tau\nu\rho \), namely, infatuation caused by delusion produced in the effort to forget the guilty rashness!
first can at all be forgiven (which in itself is a questionable proposition!) was the second a conscious, and if so was it a deliberate deception, or was it only an ordinary (though in view of its consequences a thoroughly extraordinary) blunder? Which of the two questions, these only two options, is the less devastating to the father of relativity? As I have already indicated, I prefer to choose the second, modified only in order to make it less devastating to him: Such was Einstein’s own desire to produce the “result” of the relativity of time that he committed the blunder in honest innocence [to the extent, of course, that atheism can at all be called innocent while it refuses to calculate anywhere near the exact probability of the world being scientifically investigable in the absence of the Creating Logos]! Although he used the equations of §110 (p. 187) to produce the “Lorentz” transformations, his mind was already transfixed on the idea that “all” (at least, the physical “all”) is relative. So, he did not watch out to ensure that his use of \((x, t)\) and \((\xi, \tau)\) was indeed legitimate throughout. What is surprising is that he did not realize it for another almost fifty years! So committed, we (being merciful) must conclude, was his transfusion on relativity, as indeed is of all his followers. But at least since 1987 the atheists no longer have any excuse. If in 1905, Einstein’s paper met with total incomprehension and its publication was permitted despite the two blunders [for in the opposite case, we can only have the greatest intellectual conspiracy in the history of humanity committed in full earnest right from the start by the editors colluding with the author!], and, unbelievably, between 1905 and 1987 nobody caught them, in 1987, upon the previous incomprehension was compounded the additional great burden of naked conscious and deliberate deception!!! So, now, since 1987 by the latest, we live in the Shameful Age of Deception, pure and simple! If in 1987 I was wrong in explaining the above, it should have been very easy for the “experts” at Physical Review, and all those others to whom I since wrote, to point it out. They did not! They all refused publication, using ruses and silence! “Scientific” atheism is a far more squarely dishonest proposition, for the weight of “Science” it purports to carry, than is all the

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

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

(b). When people dedicate their lives to the study of the physical world, only rarely do they make a respectful allowance for the possibility that the world is a work of God, in which case, all they may say about it does, in fact, refer solely to Him! Instead, they rush, rather than examining the plentiful objective evidence the world itself offers, to produce "theories" within which they attempt to straight-jacket the world, and through it God Himself! The wise man starts from the evidence: Does he find some sense in it, some law casting its light on it all? He investigates further, building on that law, on the wise belief on the one hand that laws are never products of chance, and on the other that God, should He exist, would not throw laws around mindless of the outcome,
for if His laws collide, they would produce a God-given lawful anarchy, which is worse than total lawlessness! Total lawlessness implies the God’s nonexistence. The declaration of a God-given lawful anarchy only profanes Him! [With this in mind, do the indescribable lawgivers in these latter days, with the judges and all who vote them in office, comprehend at all the terrain in which we all conduct our “regular” business?]

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

(d). This was not all of it. All the talk about “ether” and the supposed resolution of the matter provided by the Michelson-Morley experiment was, as we already have seen in Ch. 18, a badly stated and “resolved” riddle! It was not realized that although the interferometer was constructed as a two-dimensional (in the x-y plane) instrument, as it was carried around on the surface of the
reverting globe it became in fact a three-dimensional (in the x-y-z space) instrument! Nor was it realized that the direction of the total motion in space of the instrument had to be involved right from the start. Nor was it realized that the mathematical analysis of the measurement necessarily based on the quantities \((c + v)\) and \((c - v)\), where \(v\) is the velocity relative to the ether of the instrument, and so also of the light source carried on it and of the mirrors acting as secondary-reflecting light sources, may not later be used as “proof” of an “explaining” theory that considers the light source as always at the center of an advancing light front on account of the fact that “the velocity of light is independent of its source” and accordingly such sums and differences are nonsensical! If so, the velocity \(c\) rather than the sums \((c \pm v)\) ought to have been used in the mathematical analysis right from the start; but then, neither the Michelson analysis of the experiment could be used, nor interference could be expected to be observed, as in fact it was not! But then also, the so-called FitzGerald contraction, inescapably involving that \(v\), would be impossible to be written down, and Einstein could not have sought nor found such coordinate transformations that would fit that contraction! If \(v\), as per special relativity theory, is immaterial in phenomena involving the motion of light, not only is its use within the theory proper improper as contradictory to its spirit, but it may not even be used as a prop of any theory that rejects it! In the pure surreal fashion of the time, these Obidian Metamorphoses of the Tales of Hoffmann had the velocity of the interferometer relative to the supposed but proven non-existent ether turned into the velocity of any two material observers relative to each other, that was both involved and then removed from the scene, as the scenariographer thought the story should develop! None of all these has for one hundred years worried the Science “experts” one bit! The fact is that the sums \((c \pm v)\) retain their full meaning on account of the facts that (i) ordinary bodies are composed of light; (ii) the velocity of free light relative to them involves exactly those sums; (iii) the velocity of free light in space is constant everywhere in the expanding universe only in fixed time, due to the particular distribution of total matter in it seeing to that effect; (iv) the velocity of free light in space, thus being constant everywhere in the expanding universe in fixed time, varies universally only with respect to its age, and (v) the fact that the seeming ordinary matter also partakes in the ex-
pansion with topical velocity $v = (r/R)c$, where $r$ is the topical distance from the immobile center of the universe; in full accord with the Hubble finding, that is due to this particular structure of the universe! As all the “experts” together started considering the universe with the blinders of their arbitrary hypotheses rather than a close examination of Newton’s Law, they naturally could not conceive of the universe as an organized whole; nor would they, unwilling, as they are sworn to be, to confess the unavoidable presence of the Organizer! As none of all these comes out of their theories, the “experts” prefer to stick to their barren theories, pretending ignorance of the complete operation of Newton’s Law, that exposes all their theories as totally useless!!! When the astronomers refuse to accept the hard fact that the universe always extends to the ever advancing front of the first light thrown out of the central point at which Creation took place, a front that naturally no physical observer can possibly ever see; and when they also refuse to consider that ordinary “astronomical” matter truly exists beyond the outer limit of every conceivable astronomical observation [on account of the hard fact that the age of the universe sets a limit to all we see, as the first part of the universal age was “spent” while every (and so also the farthest) observable body traveled to the site at which it is now observed, and the second part of the universal age was “spent” while light from the site of every body observed reaches us here and now]; this entirely new body of ideas cannot but leave them totally speechless. One may not thus be surprised to see it written [as Prof. Edward Harrison of the University of Massachusetts wrote to me on Sept. 15, 1988] that, “[u]nfortunately, to make an impact, a scientist nowadays must offer modest contributions and not revolutionary ideas”!!! With eyes shut for the fear of the full impact of light, it is natural that all minds, too, fed by such eyes, shall be shut tight in the face of Light, and only in the Darkness will they accept to conduct all their “regular” business! In the Age of Darkness you may only expect an Unbrave New World! This World does now its future write and seal! The rest cannot but silence be!
§115. (a) In my efforts to bring about an honest dialogue with the "scientific" authorities on the real issues that truly matter, I have found that we truly talk past each other: Suppose the art experts talking about Mona Lisa, developing theories about its merits and demerits, such as: is it a piece of art consciously conceived and executed, or is it a piece of chance that somehow came into being curiously, solely in order only to befuddle us? And suppose that they came to support the second position. Are the “non-experts”, the millions that go to the museums to admire the work when exhibited, truly to believe the “experts”? We all, expert and non-expert have heard of somebody called Da Vinci and his “alleged” association with Mona Lisa. Are the “non-experts” obliged to adopt the “expert” position that the allegations are all “old women’s tales”? We all have seen lesser artists trying to produce lesser works. Are we to dismiss the possibility that Mona Lisa was truly produced by a greater artist? What finally is the real significance of Mona Lisa as a piece of chance that the “experts” feel justified to spend their entire comfortable lives, ultimately at the expense of the “non-experts”, and to press upon the society at large the belief that Mona Lisa is a purposeless piece of chance—or a piece that has always been there, unworthy of further investigation, except as the “experts” decide and the “non-experts” are called to foot the bill of the investigation? Here comes a “conscientious objector” who challenges this system of ulti-
mately blind faith in barren theorizing, which is what this whole debate about *Mona Lisa* truly is, and suggests that, instead, we take a real close view of the work, and find out what *it* truly says about itself. Ordinary conscientious objectors are, society has decided, to be respected for their differing positions, *if proven* to be honest, even though their objections ultimately expose to opprobrium only themselves and affect only minimally the rest of society. This one is different, no less honest (he has put some at least thirty three years of his life so far to what he says), *he insists and begs that the issue be given the fullest possible examination it deserves for the sufficient singular reason that it affects not only his own soul but the soul of everyone*! Why is he not listened to? Are all those souls less worthy of real attention, than the single soul of an ordinary solitary objector whose view is protected? What *must* the legal experts decide? Surely, *this could, if not would*, bring about a real revolution in thought; but if this should come about, will it be for the better or the worst, and whose? Mustn’t the legal experts decide that too, even on automatically understood long-established democratic tradition, if no written law yet exists for the lack of sufficient wisdom on the part of the lawgivers? In a democratic world, citizens are protected against the abuses of petty criminals. *Who ultimately guards us all against the far more weighty abuses of the guards?* Is it really the foundation of our society so shaky that it may not even be touched for its betterment, or only the high chairs and the balance of those sitting upon them, for the sake of which, as Prof. Edward Harris put it, “[u]nfortunately, to make an impact, a scientist nowadays must offer modest contributions and not revolutionary ideas”?

(b) Let me exhaust all allowances in favor of my opponents. Let’s accept the view, as I have some clear indications from my private correspondence with some of them and as I have already suggested above, that we use the same terms but do not apply to them the same meaning: When a mathematician expresses a *y*-variable in terms of a series of $x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots$ -variables, he *may*, staying fully legal within the mathematical domain of thought, conceive of all those variables in a *pseudo*-geometrical sense, thinking them all as each perpendicular to all others at once, and call them all “dimensions” of the *same* kind. Mathematical physicists have adopted this mathematical mode of thought, but have *forgotten* that he fourth “dimension” already, called “time” is of a
totally other kind, as no one can walk as he pleases on, say, the \((x, y, t)\) plane, but solely along its axes, with the added constraint that he may only “walk” along the \(t\)-axis unidirectionally and at a prefixed rate called aging! All theories not withstanding! And we know and therefore, we may not, as physicists, condone the belief in the existence within Natural Physics of additional “dimensions” and treat them all, except the three \textit{true} Euclidean geometrical dimensions, as if they were just such! This is the understanding of “dimensions” as used by mathematicians and mathematical physicists and the objections to them, that may not be ignored when using them. The use of the term in engineering is different: All three Euclidean dimensions are summed up to one called “length”, another is matter and it is called “mass”, another is ordinary unidirectional time and it is called simply “time”; others are force, electrical charge, temperature, pressure, etc. Of all these, \textit{only three are are taken to be the fundamental ones:} mass, length and time, in engineering dimensional analysis represented respectively by M, L, and T. All other ones, to the extent possible are referred back to them. E.g., as energy is the product of \((\text{mass}) \times (\text{length})^2 \times (\text{time})^{-2}\), its dimensions are \(|E| = |ML^2T^{-2}|\). The reason for this engineering practice is obvious: That \textit{never dissimilar things be equated}!: that the left and right sides of equations \textit{always have the same dimensionality}. Whereas for a mathematician dimensionless are only the arithmetical zero and the geometrical point of zero size, for an engineer dimensionless also are \textit{all} numbers, because they have no \textit{physical but only mental} existence: The cgs and the British system differ only in the sizes of the units they use, related by numerical dimensionless ratios, because the physical quantity they both measure, be it mass, or length or time is the same. But energy as shown above, is \textit{not} the same as mass, and for this reason it is a \textit{blunder} to equate mass to energy, as the relativists, Einstein, Russell and all the rest do! As also, \textit{it is a blunder}, committed even by Einstein in his 1916 paper, to equate the ratio \(G/c^2\) to a pure number and ignore the \textit{hard fact} that, dimensionally, \(G\) and \(c^2\) are \textit{not} equivalent, in which case alone (that is, \textit{if} they were) would it be correct to equate the \(G/c^2\) \[Einstein \text{ used } K \text{ for } G\] ratio to a dimensionless number, as we already have mentioned (p. 177).

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

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

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

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

\[ G = a / (d \times t^2), \]  

(21)

where $a$ is a yet to be determined clearly numerical physically dimensionless constant [I still feel forced to use all these defining adjectives, that by now ought to be automatically understood, in view of the reservations expressed from certain quarters still having, or merely pretending to be having difficulties accepting this so far unused analytical tool which makes it incontrovertible that just as $G$ is a universal constant, so too necessarily is the right-hand side of this equation! But first, what sort of universal constant truly is $G$? Only as it relates to the two-body gravitational interactions, even those involving as one body just one fundamental photon and as the other body the rest of the universe, or also as it relates to the one undivided Uni-verse in the fullest possible sense? How important
this question is becomes clear the moment we realize that since G already applies to the interactions, if another, call it G', of the same physical dimensionality but different numerical value applied to the entire universe, to avoid serious trouble, the Mathematical and Logical Consistency would require that an additional Law should exist determining which of the two values applied in each particular case! This is incontrovertible, unless Simplicity orders that the two G-s be not only dimensionally but also numerically identical; which makes them not two, but just only one! If Simplicity do not so order, this shall become obvious at once through some in-consistency the moment we try to apply the already known value of G to the whole Universe! [Keeping in mind specifically the arguments just presented, and preparing the way for what follows, it is of the utmost importance to remember Plato’s always standing challenge: “Let anyone find fault in and improve upon what we here present, and the friendly wreath of victory shall be his”! Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity are unforgiving mistresses that never miss a step! Commit one mistake and a myriad other ones follow! Overlook an important detail, and wherever the road takes you, whatever you believe about your findings, it shall not be the Truth! Do we doubt the application even of Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity? We can only find out their power if we put them to the test, against the wall, by calling their bluff! But it goes without saying that, we cannot test them without at the same time also testing our own logical consistency and honesty! On the road we now walk, the stakes are so high that we may not be lenient even towards ourselves!] And now second, what must the d and t be that make the right-hand side of the above expression a universal quantity? Incontrovertibly, for the product d×t^2 to be a universal quantity, the d and t must themselves be universal quantities, and no other than D (the instantaneous average mass density in the universe, this in order not to pre-judge the questions of time variability and uniformity of mass distribution but keep our minds open to all options and finally to the only one correct mass distribution, something the present fashionable cosmological considerations have not allowed for!) and T (the variable/instantaneous age of the universe) respectively! No other mass density and time period can be suggested of still greater universal significance! Therefore, anything else, any lesser consideration of these facts and any alteration of these two items smacks
of prejudice! Such being the hard facts, we are not free, as long as we assert that we are seeking the objective Truth to prejudice the issue! Insertion of any prejudice, however well hidden, will not be for Truth’s sake, but for biasing the works in favor of an unconfessed outcome! Thus here, principally here, all seekers of Truth (that is nothing if it is not objective), must remain uncompromising!

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

$$G = \frac{a}{DT^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

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

$$V = \frac{GMT^2}{a}$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

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

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

§118. Now, *what happened at zero universal age? And can we be at all sure of anything that did happen then?*  
– First, *we can be sure* that, consistent with the above, whatever happened happened *in totally free space as we understand it in the strictest sense*: Obtained solely from Newton’s Law, the above expression speaks only of the volume of the universe, *not* of space, *nor* of “space”? On the Newtonian fact that the entire universe was then confined in zero volume, we *can categorically state* that the surrounding (and entire) space both then and always was/is free of everything physical (pertaining to mass, length and time)! Beyond this, we may not speculate on space!  
– Second, *equally categorically*, we can therefore state that it was in free space that the universe was set on its course, subject only to its internally applicable laws operating smoothly from zero age!  
– Third, with the universe started on its course in free space explosively or *not* (of which in a moment), *also applicable from the start along with the above laws*, we must take the law of conservation of (instantaneous) momentum! It seems to me inexplicable and suspect how totally this law has been overlooked in relation to the expansion of the universe in the context of current theories! It *is* clear that, unless a body is *given* a physical push from outside, it cannot get started on a translational motion! As nothing was/is physical outside the universe, translational motion was/is *out of the ques-
tion! Therefore, all subsequent motion was obtained from within the universe, with all impulse supplied from within, under the operation of this last law!

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

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

– Sixth, the first light necessarily at all times constitutes the spherical front of the expanding universe! What happened in the beginning cannot later be recalled! Under the continuous operation of the Law of momentum, nothing subsequent can skew into aspherical the expanding front! [And it goes without saying that, we shall never be able to see the front or anything that happened before a certain substantial age: First, in order to see the front, light must come back to us from the front, which is impossible, as it would require that the front, under the local application of the law of momentum, accelerate to a superluminal velocity simply in order to be able to send back to us some of its light! Second, we can only see as far as the ra-
dius at which matter had already reached when light from it started back towards us: The age of the emission of light and the time light has since been in transit towards us must sum up to the present age of the universe! *Every current theory has missed these hard physical facts also!* Professors of physics and astronomy are shocked to see it written that their theories of universal re-collapse (that is they through them) are exposed for having failed completely to consider what must then happen to the light also, that as part of the *Universe must also* reverse course!

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

\[ R = \left(\frac{3GMT^2}{4\pi \alpha}\right)^{1/3} \quad (24) \]

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

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

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

\[ \frac{d^2R}{dT^2} = -\left(\frac{1}{3}\right)\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)\left(\frac{3GMT^{-4}}{4\pi \alpha}\right)^{1/3} \quad (26) \]

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

\[ \mathcal{G} = -\frac{GM}{R^2} \quad (27) \]

producing

\[ a = \frac{1}{6\pi}, \quad (28) \]
\[ D = \left(\frac{6\pi GT^2}{\alpha}\right)^{-1}, \quad (29) \]
\[ D_{\text{now}} = 5.45 \times 10^{-30} \text{ g cm}^{-3} (T_{\text{now}} = 12 \text{ billion years}), \quad (30) \]
\[ R_{\text{now}} = 1.70 \times 10^{28} \text{ cm} = 18 \text{ billion light years}, \quad (31) \]
\[ Rc^2 = 2GM, \quad (32) \]
\[ M = 1.15 \times 10^{56} \text{ grams.} \quad (33) \]
\[ \phi_F = GM/R_{\text{now}} = -4.514 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^2/\text{sec}^2 \quad (34) \]
\[ \nabla^2 \phi_F = -(8/3)\pi GD_{\text{now}} = -3.047 \times 10^{-36} \text{ sec}^{-2}. \quad (35) \]
While, in order to have the same velocity of light everywhere in the universe at constant age, it is necessary that the same field of gravity apply everywhere as at the universal front, which produces the local density as a function of the reduced local radius \( \rho = r/R \):

\[
d = (9\pi\rho GT^2)^{-1}. \tag{36}
\]

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

\[
T_1 = T_2 (1 + \rho)^{-3/2}, \tag{37}
\]

subject to the law of conservation of instantaneous momentum.

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

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

(e) But also indeed, the above relationships permit us to test even the hypothesis of a young or old universe: since $c = dR/dT$ and $M = 3c^3TG^{-1}/4$, an age of, say, 6000 years requires that $M = 5.73 \times 10^{46}$ g, $R = 8.51 \times 10^{21}$ cm $= 9000$ light years, $D = 2.22 \times 10^{17}$ g/cm$^3$. Thus, unless the adherents of the notion of a very young earth can prove the validity of these figures, they cannot in good faith still hold fast to the notion of a young universe. If they are willing to give up that notion and accept instead an age of, say, 12 billion years, they will find the values given above on p. 204, that are all safely within an order of magnitude of what the atheists themselves have calculated to be the best estimates. If the creationists do so, they shall vastly be rewarded, as the carpet is pulled from under the atheists’ feet! Little did the latter expect, when they produced them, that their own estimates would come back to hunt them! For it can no longer be held that the numbers here produced are biased in any way! Nothing has been assumed that is not known as basic science; here in addition examined under a microscope of very much higher power, permitting the removal of all that does not fit! By the token by which Newton’s Law is a highly accurate natural Law (even if they still should insist that it is not accurate “absolutely”!), to the extent that even
Einstein felt he had to produce it even if only as a “first approximation” by way of at least five assumptions added to all those he made before, by that same token they must also accept the equally highly accurate (if “not absolutely” accurate to a corresponding measure) validity of the relationships given above! So, if the above relationships need at all some correction, it cannot be more than at best “second order”, by the “arguments” they use! Nobody can reject these relationships who cannot reject Newton’s Law and the intrinsically objective nature of the reasoning given above, yet insists on a theory that intrinsically cannot even touch the Simplicity of the solid relationships given above! This refers to the atheists. Because vis à vis the creationists, the question is highly simplified: Why do they insist on “worshiping” God only with all their heart, yet refuse to do so with all their intellect also? Do they trust it so little? No man-written Scripture is worth more than what the Holy God by His own Hand wrote in the Heavens above! Distrusting themselves, in effect they join the atheists!

(f) So, now, as you too Dear Reader speak of Truth, please let me ask you: can we ever reach It while stubbornly ignoring these hard physical facts, made available to both the world “scientific” and “theological” communities, that have mutely ignored and suppressed them since 1985? So much about their commitment to Truth, to Science, to the Cause of God! And they walk the Earth, smiling, unashamed! At which point, an honest man will surely ask: But why did/do they act so? The reason is clear: It is not just that the twentieth century science is thus shown to have diverted itself fruitlessly and embarrassingly to a dead end! Rather, it is its “philosophy” that stands exposed, having always claimed that nothing other exists than this present material but ultimately senseless universe! This “philosophy” [so-called by people completely ignorant of what it truly means to be a Φίλος τῆς Σοφίας, a Friend of Wisdom, or else they would not be talking of senselessness!] caused even Einstein not just to commit his admitted “greatest blunder”, but the far far greater blunder of his entire relativistic scheme, before which that other one now pales!: Because, examined closely, the above relationships prove conclusively that the physical-natural Laws observed to be obeyed by matter are not its properties!: Were they, the Laws [understood solely as tangibly rational “things”, products of the Purest Spirit, of Logos Himself!] too, came into being out of nothing at all some 12 billion
years ago! Consideration of just one example should suffice: Light and all matter is shown to be made made up of fundamental photons. But the Law of its velocity (that never caused any anxiety to current “science” as to how it can possibly apply forever constant!) is now seen to depend by means of the Law of expansion not on the mass of the fundamental photon, but on the mass of, and its distribution in, the entire universe; and besides, on Newton’s (now proven to be a true) constant and the age of the universe! The Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity of the above expressions show them to be neither of the fundamental photon nor of the universe as a whole as we have understood it up until now! The universe is not made up of mass, length and time, as science has so far claimed; but rather of G, mass, its measured age and Law! Without the latter, all other three cannot even stand, cannot produce one iota, cannot make themselves sensed! What we had thought was a mere proportionality constant is now shown to be a fundamental ingredient of the universe! While length has no independent existence as another “dimension” of the physical world, but is a derived dimension dependent on those other three and the Law that connects them! While what we call physical time is nothing other than the age of the universe; and, as such, the latter has not always been around! The mere fact that what we thought was a mathematical proportionality constant (and of dubious nature at that) is now found to be fundamental shows that the “laws of nature” are not just properties of matter, but Laws in the strictest sense of the word, obeyed by the entire universe from the fundamental photon on up! Although we have a direct sense of mass and of the age of ourselves and of the universe in terms of what we call “time”, and although we also have a direct sense of distance, we do not have a direct sense of the hard fact that length is a derived property of the universe due to its expansion controlled by Rational Law; while we cannot have a direct but only an indirect purely mental sense of G, the fundamentality of which we never till now imagined but may no longer doubt, the existence of which we only most dimly acknowledge for the “fact” that a fabled apple fell on Isaac Newton’s head some three hundred years earlier! Which all brings into sharp focus the next pricking question: Were these Laws thought up by, brought into being by, in order that they be obeyed by, communicated to its members by, imposed on itself and its members by, and reported on by its members
to, the Universe? Or were they imposed by an outside, the only other remaining, Rational Authority, the one we call God-Logos?

In the first case, all machinery needed for thinking up these mathematically and logically consistent simple Laws; their being brought into being; their being disseminated to members; and the reporting back on by its members; on a very complex and foolproof communication network extending from the center to the front of the expanding universe and permitting of infinite transmission velocity (since only thus can the universal laws have an immediate moment-by-fleeting-moment application everywhere); these all and perhaps more must be present and must, therefore, be physically discoverable within the universe! Given the aforementioned findings, the atheists would jump with glee, if these other physical desiderata were there and at their disposal! Well, they are not! And because they are not, there remains an one only conclusion, coming in two parts: The first being that, the universe could not bring the Laws of Nature into being on its own along with itself! The second being that, therefore, God is the outside Law-imposing Authority, Whose existence is ipso facto and sufficiently proven by the operation of the Uni-verse under these mathematically and logically consistent simple Laws! But the atheists would/will not admit this finding! They are first and only atheists! And even if they appear as “scientists” too, honest they are not! On the other hand, my total inability to find even one “agnostic”, in a position of authority within the “scientific” establishment, willing to take up the challenge of these findings upon his word, as a true agnostic, of intellectual honesty and integrity, exposes the entire sorry myth of the existence of such an animal! The Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity is too tough a nut for the “scientific” establishment to crack and in their mouth keep their teeth! So, in the purest primate fashion, they did the next best thing they knew: They suppressed the news and have since refused to give my findings the hearing they deserve in the Holy Name of Truth! Earlier, we called this the Age of Deception! Now we come to know even of the size of Deception! Because, before the End, there shall also be the Age of Revelation, during which the Deception shall be exposed in all its horror-producing nakedness! Do you still fail to get it? Their name is Legion! And this is Dies Irae! Irae of both kinds: Holy and unholy! And we all are called to choose a side, not to stand aside! We all must examine all our beliefs critically, and determine which of them stand by The One Logos! Only they deserve to be kept!
§120. (a) In the annals of human thought, the theory of quantum mechanics is the prime example of how little the obvious deeper issues of existence and Logic have influenced the development of a most substantial branch of science, and of how resolutely those issues are refused proper scientific consideration! To this latter, allusion has already been made. [The Reader may want to refresh his memory by once again looking up the materials on pages 15, 48, 50-1, 71, 80, 97, 98, 102, 141, 185, 198] Here now, I must lay bare what the scientists in this most unique case have determined to take unquestioned. First off, I find it most curious that no link has been made between quantum theory and the ancient Democritean atomic theory, that in truth was the first quantum theory! When Democritus spoke of the atom, he only spoke of the minimum fundamental particle of matter; in other words, of the least quantum of matter! In his days, the great variety of chemical and subchemical particles was unknown, but even if it were known, the ancient Greek sense of Simplicity would have remained unimpressed: Before us still is the fundamental philosophical obligation to choose between two options: The simplest and most elegant creation that uses an one only kind of simplest fundamental particle/building-block and all the rest of complexity by a combination according to Law of the needed number of such similar particles; or a less elegant creation that uses many kinds of fundamental particles and combines according to a then necessarily much more complex law many particles of each kind with similar particles and with many particles of other
kinds to build up the observed complexity, but still in order to attain the same objective? How are we to prefer the second that is obviously far more demanding of unneeded additional effort in imagination, invention, creation, combination under a mathematically and logically consistent law, and management, than the first? Doesn’t Simplicity and Elegance reject it in favor of the first?

(b) Would you say that, “it depends”? [I determine to use the impersonal terms you and your for the compelling immediacy they impose on us all in our facing these issues.] But on what, given the same objective? Don’t forget that, all true and especially the Greek philosophy always seeks a rational purpose! Purposelessness is never an option a philosopher may honestly countenance; and should one choose it, we shall never be wrong to call him a total stranger to philosophy! Now you of course see at once the purpose-driven cart of Design! Do you want to avoid this cart, fearing it smacks too much of God to suit your taste? First off, why do you hate so much even the idea of God that, you deny this universe itself the possibility of being God, and of desiring something and adjusting itself to its desire? Don’t we too do very much the same? Or is it that you sense this to be impossible for the universe, before even you examine the scientific requirements of this possibility; which leaves you with the only other option, that of God Whom you do not like for the rational and moral responsibility He cannot but expect of us all who seek Perfection, to which Design is tuned? If not so, please suggest something else on which “it depends”! To save yourself from all possible embarrassment, whatever you suggest must be more reasonable than here suggested! The predicament becomes obvious! You see, the ancient thinkers lived in daily intercourse with the artful practical creators! Modern theoretical physicists live in ivory towers, worlds all their own! The ancient Greeks judged Logically their options, uninhibited by preset, immediate, oppressive pro and con theological consequences! But not because they were atheists, or “idolaters”! But because they considered it their duty as honest men of intellect to think Logically and to stand erect even before their gods, which meant that they were fully cognizant of the hard fact that they profaned the gods, if they thought less of them than of themselves! Don’t confuse the philosophers with the poets. The latter, as always, along with the current public wisdom also expressed the ignorant public opinion; just as their counterparts still do today, who either accuse God of cruelty when events turn against
them, or decide that He therefore cannot exist; which may on the one hand save them from thinking of Him as cruel, but on the other still subjugates their “logic” to their unconfessed desire to avoid even a slight insinuation of theological meaning, that causes them to fail realizing that to ignore God’s presence, should He exist, is no mere slight! The ancient philosophers would commit neither slights nor profanities! Today, people such as Weinberg, Hawking and Company try fervently to devise a purely theoretical scheme of supposedly “logical” thought that will make the Creator superfluous; yet, without first proving the universe to have been standing on its own eternally! As, in the absence of proving the latter, the invention and proof of such a scheme as attempted must inevitably exceed a scientist’s lifetime, as it now becomes obvious given the limitations at least of practical experimentation, any scientist so spending his time must be held to account for possible mismanagement of it, unless he can show that he could not have spent it more profitably for mankind in another field of endeavor, given the hard fact that it is mankind that foots the bill! Since he cannot yet show that his effort will ever reach a conclusive dead end (in Popper’s sense) that only thus would eliminate the need to think of a Creator [that would then be valuable for mankind to know, even as it would bring us to facing alone our responsibilities without any help from anywhere!], the accusation that said effort is driven by the desire to avoid rather than meet the present need of a fully possible definitive answer about the Creator, given the hard facts already before us, cannot be shaken off! Therefore, unless we make all our scientific effort a priori blind to possible theological consequences while keeping ourselves open to facing such consequences should they arise by the proof through the hard facts already before us of the existence of a Creator, we cannot show that our science as so far developed has truly been our wisest and most honest option!

(c) It is this sort of beneficial blindness that points inexorably to the option of a one only kind of fundamental particle; which has not been what the modern quantum theory (contrary to the ancient) truly, even if subconsciously insinuates! Indeed, it must be deemed a lame “mathematical and logical consistency and simplicity” that overlooks these basic issues! The Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity that is truly worthy of our consideration and is Logically taken to reside in the Mind of God cannot but opt for an one-only-kind-of-fundamental-particle universe;
unless of course, and in keeping with overall parsimony and total econ-
yomy, the desired objective was more demanding of means than all
that such a universe could possibly give! Which, however, will take
us too far afield if we cannot, as we surely cannot, show cause!

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

(b) Then again, why should the Planck h be a true constant?
On what solid arguments do scientists apply the notion of a con-
stant Planck “constant” back to the age of the initial singularity?
Back then, it cannot logically have been otherwise than that both
the least action as the minimal step of action possible and the to-
tal action of the universe were both zero! Sufficiently, because no-
thing had yet happened, as all time and all action was then in the future! By what Law then did, if it did, the least action suddenly come in the amount of the Planck h? Imagine the first moment of time, of duration $\delta t$ following the Big Bang at $T = 0$; i.e., with the clock already marking the continuous flow of time. Now imagine $\delta t$ so short that multiplied by $\delta e$ [the entire amount of energy then produced and present in the universe, given that $E = Mc^2$ and $c = (4GMT^{-1/3})^{1/3} = \infty$ at $T = 0$] produces a quantity of action less than h, i.e., $(\delta e) \times (\delta t) < h$, i.e., contrary to the Heisenberg uncertainty principle [never stopping to bear in mind the inexorable mathematical truth that even zero times infinity, and infinite times zero equals zero, not infinity!] During that period, if $h$ were truly constant, even the entire universe could still produce absolutely nothing! Would you try to escape the quandary by saying that this is a “good” argument for the “quantization” of time? But how, with absolutely nothing yet happening, could the universe mark out even the first quantum of time? Doesn’t the marking out itself involve action, being itself action? It challenges not just imagination but also Logic to conceive of time quanta laid out one after the other serially and distinctly yet without break between them! Any break at all would involve a void in time, unbridgeable even by the entire universe, since “during” it (or if the term offends, “temporally within” it!), the entire universe would of necessity remain inactive! Would you say that the breaks could involve no void in time, by being of zero “duration”? But how could that differ at all from the time continuum? For the universe to be always active, it is necessary that the time continuum have no break at all! But then, with the clock running, it is necessary that the universe produce action even during however short a period of time one cares to imagine! [Today, we all have seen digital clocks operating, marking out whole seconds: Even as such clocks seem inactive during most of the time we do not lose the sense of the continuous flow of time! Would you dare say that we are wrong?] But this only does mean that the Planck constant can only have risen gradually to its present value, having started out with the value of zero at the instant $T = 0$ of the Big Bang and increasing since in proportion to $T^{1/3}$, in view of the fact that action is (energy)$\times$(time) and the universal energy decreases with the $T^{2/3}$ due to the decrease of the velocity of light! Then again, action is involved in the activity not just of the entire universe, but even of the fundamental particle/photon. And under Mathematical
and Logical Consistency and Simplicity, least action truly means a common measure, a one-only, the common at the time measure of least action! Thus, any minimal activity at all (be it of the fundamental particle/photon, or of ordinary bodies being made up of no other than light, or even of the entire universe) must only come in the contemporaneous least measure; and this while activities of more than the simultaneous minimal must only come in exact multiples of the contemporaneous least measure; and the total activity to date must come as the sum of the activities to date of all the particle/photons in the universe, each having a present value measured in terms of the present contemporaneous value of the action quantum!

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

§122. (a) Of all the above, no discussion at all has ever taken place in the context of the presently accepted quantum theory! Just as no discussion has ever seen the light of day respecting the relation of amount of mass contained in the particles and their geometrical size! The largest, if composite, body of sorts is surely the entire universe, of a huge geometrical size! What then would you say is the geometrical size of the fundamental particle/photon? How tiny or large would you say it is? Here too, another of our assumptions, scientifically unwarranted yet accepted by scientists, requires that the least massive particle also be the tiniest! The quandary of more mass said to be hiding individually in particles involved in particle-smashing reactions in accelerators than the particles reveal when weighed as packages, I have already discussed [§65, p. 103]. I now will discuss the parallel problem of the geometrical size of the particles and bodies in the universe: The neutron is both heavier and smaller than the entire hydrogen atom! [Remember: deuterium is not hydrogen!] Similarly, back at the initial singularity, the entire universe, the heaviest body that ever existed, was all contained in the “room” of zero volume! The wavelengths of more energetic photons surely are smaller than those of less energetic ones! These examples suffice to show that compatible with Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity there is out there an inverse relationship of mass and geometrical size (to which even the speculated black holes are subject)! Surely then, our current science has a lot to explain: Except for those it assumes existing in the nucleus, for which it reverses the rule, it regards all less massive particles to be smaller!: Example, the electron! Yet it avoids discussing honestly and exhaustively the problem of action at a distance, necessarily present between massive particles having both tiny volumes and standing apart! Example, the proton and electron within the hydrogen atom; in which case undoubtedly only for the sake of electrostatic attraction between those two has the invention of a “bonding particle” been resisted! Our current “science” invented “curved spacetime” in order to avoid the problem of action at a distance, alleging the force of gravity at all distances to be an illusion! It has ignored the very same problem in the case of electrostatic charges! It invented the particles it calls “gluons”, “hooks”, “strings” etc., on which other particles latch, to mediate
the interactions of other tiny particles standing at a distance within the nucleus! It thereby insinuates the existence of a whole menagerie of geometrically-tiny and geometrically-extensive particles; needing the latter to hold the former together in a scheme designed to avoid the action at a distance; which it hates for never discussed purely theological reasons! How such menagerie meshes with Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity, which rather than respecting it modern “science” only insults, this, too, modern “scientists” leave unmentioned!

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

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

(b) Though the electron microscope had not yet been invented in 1913 when Bohr proposed his “old” quantum theory, the main facts and the understanding of their nature were already in place; as was, or ought to have been co-developing, the substance of the above
arguments! At any rate, Bohr lived to see the electron microscope and observe things under it; but he never revised his view of things! It will be a gross slander to his intelligence to state that he played the central figure in the development of the still dominant “Copenhagen interpretation” under any illusions! It will be an equal gross slander to the intelligence of those who followed him to state that they still operate under any illusions! But what does that leave us with? What other than that they deliberately insist on it for a reason? The “old” (particle-mechanical) quantum theory was abandoned not for its unacceptable and uncorrectable geometrical problems but for the fact that it could not be made to apply numerically to other atoms. The “new” (wave-mechanical) quantum theory, incorporating the three-dimensional Schrödinger “wave-function”, permitted numerical calculations on the energies of other atoms by the variational method; and Hylleraas used it with the embarrassingly high number of fourteen specifically adjusted parameters in order to calculate a value for the total ionization potential of the helium atom (containing just two electrons) reasonably close to the value experimentally observed! But not only did the “new” theory not resolve the geometrical problem, it compounded it:

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

—For another, with the electron assumed tiny, the haphazard revolution around the nucleus of many electrons becomes an exactly-unsolvable many-body problem, that can only be attacked by approximation methods! This must be understood in terms of what
it truly implies: that the defect is not of our mathematics, but of Nature, working ever approximately and never exactly!
—For yet another, it is in the nature of the Schrödinger “wave-function” that it do not deal with the real physical things (in this case, the electrons) but with their presumed “probability” that they are where calculated! This while there exists no objective method for the experimental verification of the prediction of this probability! The real electrons in the real atom were thus and most conveniently replaced (though only in the wily minds of quantum mechanicians, where alone the reality and the probabilistic concept are willfully mixed together and their distinction is cunningly blurred) by their “probabilities” in “probability space” in which alone the so-called “electron cloud” lives!
—For a fourth thing, how limited though contrary to experience the “improvement” allowed by the “new” theory truly is can be seen when recalling how limitedly in space are distributed the probability density lobes or “orbitals” of such common electronic states as the 2p, 3d, or 4f even of the hydrogen atom, which in fact mean that the probability of finding the electron in any of all other directions is strictly nil, which in turn means that the nucleus is not ever spherically as it always ought to be covered by the electron being in one of those states in any of all those other directions! Only for such as the rarer 1s, or 2s states is the probability density spherically distributed around the nucleus! In simpler words, while our experience of the atom is that of a sphere with the electron being a spherical shell around the nucleus, so that it be completely protected, the wave-mechanical picture of it is still that of a dipole in which the position of the electron can only be probabilistically stated to be exactly here or there, leaving the nucleus totally naked in all other directions! In real time, absolutely nothing did in fact change! Rather than the “new” theory proving the atom always spherical when unperturbed, as is logically required, it instead retained the dipole, just as before; with additional constraints superadded to it, as it, by fiat of the so-called “experts”, forbids all discussion regarding the manner in which the electron moves from place to place around the nucleus!
—For a fifth thing, on top of all the above, now introduced was the chaotic scattering scatter of the electron or electrons around the nucleus! Forgotten was the old principle that when unperturbed, a body (and thus also the electron) carries on as before! The “new” theory never bothered to explain what it is that causes the electron
to jump from one place to another scurrying about in an unper-
turbed atom! For **without a physical cause causing** such activity, the
electron **must remain in its fixed trajectory, if it is a trajectory along**
which it **must move**, and the three-dimensional spatial, even if lim-
ited, probability distribution **must collapse into a near two-dimen-
sional one**, and that in the shape of a **very thin** ring! [While it takes
a string of about 74000 pearls each the size of the earth to fill its
trajectory around the sun, it takes a string of about 314000 pearls
the size of the electron to fill its **least** trajectory around the nucle-
us! The probability of finding the unperurbed satellite **outside** its
respective ring **remains exactly zero at all times**!]

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

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

§124. What is all the more remarkable and infuriating to see done by scientists is their insistence that we may not [that is, they attempt to prohibit us to] look further into the nature of things, for “there is nothing more in the nature of things than just this”!

Which, however, has not stopped them from milking the social cow for precious funds, most frivolously spent, if they are right, in their high energy physics work, where the existence of things can never be ascertained but only conjectured even after expensive “successful” experiments, and nobody but very few and of their own can “test” the truth of Nobel-prize caliber work! I, as an engineer, am discipline-bound to belong in the category of “show me, the real thing!”, and to draw from my engineering experience, which is no other than common, yet disciplined, experience!: As an applied industrial engineer, I have worked in mines and done precise underground geodetic work needed for the exact positioning, in the solid bowels of the earth burrowed hollow, of galleries and shafts and other facilities. But as an applied research engineer, I have also done work at high temperatures and determined solubilities of elements in solid and liquid metals from steel and above down to sodium; in which, small amounts of dissolved oxygen will cause corrosion in the stainless steel container, that will cause a fast breeding nuclear reactor, denied cooling as a result of corrosion and corrosion-induced fatigue and failure, to blow up in the span of two seconds! These show the need for precise work, geometrical the one, quantitative the other. Whence the question: Where does Nature stop, or begin from, caring about precise work? Even if it be argued that all macroscopic work is at a level above the Planck h, dilute chemical solutions work such as is involved in fast breeding nuclear reactors most certainly is not! The Planck h figures significantly in chemical reaction kinetics. Therefore, if nature stops, or begins, caring from some level up, that level cannot but be within the limits even of my work! So, even such people as I ought to be greatly concerned about indeterminacy, and are by the nature of their work entitled to voice their opinion on the matter; which, as is here shown, is not the exclusive domain of quantum mechanicians! Besides, as nature most certainly is of one kind, the same for
quantum mechanicians and astronomers, so too she is the same for engineers! Therefore, only fools may dismiss as out of place the legitimate concerns of engineers! But my engineering experience teaches more: For I have yet in my professional life to see certainty built on uncertainty, unless there is a law underneath that resolves the uncertainty into certainty!: Take the simple experience of all, that, all games of chance rely on their intrinsic uncertainty. The cause of which however, no intelligent human may misunderstand!: That uncertainty is itself built on certainty! E.g., the certainty of equal probability of heads or tails in the throw of a coin! Which depends entirely and can only be secured upon the underlying law of construction of the good coin! I refer here to this fact because, though probability and uncertainty play an important role in science (and not only in the context of the present discussion) and engineering (where the assurance of the quality of industrial products is often studied statistically), not only every common human, but, obviously, not even every famous scientist, knows, fully appreciates and respects the fact that, historically, their scientific study began with the study, by Gauss, of what truly happens in the common games of chance, that are all built on the certainty of the strict law of good construction of such things as coins, dice and packs of cards! Even the famous quantum mechanicians willfully ignore this truth!: They insist on the probability being primary when it is only derivative, of intent based on certainty! [In the case of casinos, the intent of profit, and the certainty that the operators shall not lose their own shirts!] And they refuse to explain how if uncertainty is primary in Nature, that uncertainty brought about the certainty of their own “principle” of uncertainty; which certainty they cannot and do not practically ignore in insisting on the primacy of their “principle of uncertainty”!

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

(b) The above are more correctly said to be my own misgivings regarding quantum theory. This does not mean that other people have not expressed their disagreement and reservations about the theory. Notably Einstein himself; who in effect parted ways with Bohr over the dispute as to whether or not a probabi-
listic theory as fundamental as the present form of quantum theory claims for itself can be both natural and correct. Of the rest, nobody called more vociferously than Paul Dirac for the need to develop a really new quantum theory that would eliminate the weaknesses of its present form. It is not a little thing that even a non-believer in a Personal God as was Einstein could not accept it as reasonable that, putting it most succinctly, “God plays dice with the world!” or in other words that, “basically, physics should be of a deterministic character” Of the rest, most do not mind! And some, as we have seen, do not mind at all to go to the extreme, believing the world to be meaningless! Dirac conceded that as things now stand, the majority of scientists stand with Bohr, especially as many tried but failed to produce a better understanding than provided by the Schrödinger “wave function”. But he did not mind to “think that it might turn out that ultimately Einstein will prove to be right, because the present form of quantum mechanics should not be considered as the final form. There are great difficulties, which I shall mention later, in connection with the present quantum mechanics. It is the best that one can do up till now, But one should not suppose that it will survive indefinitely into the future. And I think that it is quite likely that at some future time we may get an improved quantum mechanics in which there will be a return to determinism and which will, therefore, justify the Einstein point of view. But such a return to determinism could only be made at the expense of giving up some other basic idea which we now assume without question. We would have to pay for it in some way which we cannot yet guess at, if we are to re-introduce determinism”. What Dirac disliked the most was the “departing from standard rules of mathematics and [the] neglecting of infinite quantities” that is constantly involved in what is called the “renormalization out of infinities”, that is regular fair in the current form of quantum theory. On this point, Dirac was quite explicit: “I disagree with most physicists at the present time just on this point. I cannot tolerate departing from the standard rules of mathematics. Of course, the proper inference from this work is that the basic equations are not right. There must be some drastic change introduced into them so that no infinities occur in the theory at all and so that we can carry out the solution of the equations sensibly, according to ordinary rules and without being bothered by difficulties. The requirement
will necessitate some really drastic changes: simple changes will not do, just because the Heisenberg equations of motion in the present theory are all so satisfactory. I feel that the change required will be just about as drastic as the passage from the Bohr orbit theory to the quantum mechanics.38

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

38 Ibid. p. 36-7
Absolute Determinism! And that meant the overthrow of all inexactitude in the current form the quantum theory also! It was with this philosophical analysis in mind, all based on nothing other than the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity, as the applied part of the Most Elegant Design that I presented myself with my own dilemma: Either to show them wrong in their own game of basic Faithlessness, or just shut up accusing them of heinous intent against the Holy God! If, I reasoned, Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity exists and is operative in the world, it cannot fail to show them wrong! If I too can see what all can indeed see, then it is not the eyes that do not in fact see, but the minds that refuse to acknowledge what the eyes are sending to them for processing!

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

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

§127. (a) If we imagine the electron as an elastic spherical spring harmonically vibrating under force $F$, but never collapsing down toward the nucleus, first off, the problem thought to exist of the failure of the electron to fall onto the nucleus and release its potential electrostatic energy as required by the classical conception is automatically resolved by fully classical means! But second off, because the Coulomb electrostatic $F_e$ (or the lesser gravitational) force of the nucleus cannot be ignored, a balancing force $F_b$ (incorporating the gravitational and all other ones) must be re-
garded to exist such that
\[ F + F_c + F_b = 0, \] (38)
where
\[ F = k \cdot |r - r_o|, \] (39)
\[ F_c = -Ze^2r^{-2}, \] (40)
\( r \) is the instantaneous radius of the electron, \( r_o \) its average ("equilibrium") radius, \( k \) the elastic constant, \( e \) the unit electrical charge and \( Z \) the number of protons in the nucleus of a hydrogen-like atom. This scheme frees the chemical atom of other than thus present internal sources of tension, yet, keeps it subject as a whole to both external forces (including both perturbing forces at close range and the gravitational forces of all external bodies) and the force-free cosmological expansion as it applies to it! Under this scheme, no force, whether internal or external, remains unaccounted for, while the idea of the atom as a stable wholesome unit is fully assured, except as its stability must be affected by the cosmological expansion. The clear superiority of this scheme over the Bohr and current conception, both of which consider as operating only the Coulomb force is already evident!

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

(c) Without doubt, all these, relating closely to the sphericity of the unperturbed chemical atom, are most important characteristics not only of the atom as a whole, but also of the vibrating electron and the nucleus; bearing on their structure too, bridging the superatomic and subatomic structure of matter; and making a unity of the two and indeed of the whole physical world! Yet, not only they so far have been ignored, but the quantum theory has failed to consider the full implications of all our observations! Whereas our ordinary observations, begun to get scientifically organized with the development of modern chemistry, point to the unquestionable fact that
nature reserves for the chemical atom the bridging position between the subatomic and superatomic components of matter, our cosmological observations have equally unquestionably not affected the quantum theory: We did not, as we ought to, rush to redraw the quantum theory on learning that the universe expanded from zero volume and was once smaller than the present atoms; which cannot have left unaffected even the atomic and subatomic matter! There has been one of these two options: either the micro-world always did and does participate in the universal expansion under the very same laws as does the macro-world; or else, additional universal laws have decided (a) the dimensions of the components of the micro-world, (b) the time of their fixing if they ever were fixed, and (c) how they participate differently in the universal expansion, if they do so! There can be no question as to which option is indeed preferable under the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity! All this has so far been ignored! All reference to the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity under the now accepted theories has been so loose as to reveal our total failure to appreciate its commanding position over what we ought to be thinking about the world!

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

(i) The Balmer law was reproduced!
(ii) The Rydberg constant was reproduced!
(iii) The wave number was reproduced!
(iv) The Planck “constant” h of action was not introduced arbitrarily, as in the Bohr and current theories, but naturally, following the recognition that the rate of change of the polar moment of inertia of the spherical oscillator has the physical dimensions of action!
(v) The amount of action involved was not assumed to come only in whole units of h. Rather, the action involved was introduced as the quantity nh, where n was taken to be some but not neces-
sarily whole number. That \( n \) is indeed a whole number came directly from the spectra that were reproduced only for whole and sequential values of \( n! \) [exclamation, not factorial.]

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

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

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

(ix) The energy at each state is positive. This has the effect to reverse and correct the picture we have of the atom. As energy is added, the electron in the atom pulls together and becomes geometrically smaller. And ionization does not obtain from an infinite radius, but from a radius very close to that of the so-called ground state. This resolves the quandary, that the Bohr and current theo-
ries chose to ignore discussing, of the atom increasing in size and progressively engulfing the world as the electron takes more energy and progresses towards ionization! And the resolution is compatible with the general picture we obtain of the entire world, having had more energy when it was smaller and gradually losing energy as it expands to an infinite radius, at which there shall be no gravitational or other force left to cause it to return from by some no longer possible re-collapsing!

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

(i) The electrons are arranged in atoms onion-like!
(ii) The electrons vibrate in tune!
(iii) Each electron has one quantum number!
(iv) The energy levels producing the spectral lines are not those of the singular electrons but of the entire ensemble of electrons!
(v) An additional factor \(\frac{q_1}{q_1} + \frac{q_2}{q_1} + \frac{q_3}{q_1} + \ldots\) containing the quantum numbers of the electrons of the ensemble multiplies the energy expression obtained for the hydrogen atom. Here, \(q_1\) is the quantum number of the first electron (as is the case of the hydrogen atom), \(q_2\) is the quantum number of the second electron (as is the case of the helium atom), \(q_3\) is the quantum number of the third electron (as is the case of the lithium atom), and so on!
(vi) At energy levels far from ionization, the quantum numbers of electrons are equal, meaning that the electrons have equal energies. But also meaning that as \(\xi^2\) takes on values \(1/2, 1/3, \ldots\) for helium, lithium, etc., the product \(\frac{q_1}{q_1} + \frac{q_2}{q_1} + \frac{q_3}{q_1} + \ldots\) retains a value close to unity for all electrons in all atoms at energy levels away from ionization!
(vii) As the energy increases towards ionization, it is unquestionably the inside electron that takes on the higher quantum number and acquires the more energy!
(viii) At ionization, the total energy of the ensemble divides between the ionizing electron and the remaining ensemble, the energy of which fits exactly the resulting configuration of quantum numbers and energy, as well as provides a seamless transition from the neutral atom to the first ion, to the second ion, and so on!

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

(c) To the detailed findings given above, an additional statement must be added: that in order to obtain them, absolutely nothing was adjusted [just remember Hylleraas]! Which clearly demonstrates, even to those remotely familiar with the claims of the now accepted form of the theory, how vastly superior to that envisioned by it the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity of the Most Elegant Design makes the order of Nature!

Thus it is that it now becomes scientifically incontrovertible that to the extent the picture of Nature here revealed is imperfect, its true picture must be even more ordered than is here revealed, and not less ordered as the present form of the theory insists on teaching! What this makes of its present form, vehemently denying the so-called “hidden variables”, and of all efforts to obtain an “equation of everything” based on no better than the present form of the theory, now also becomes all too clear! As also of the value of the belief in the supposedly intrinsic uncertainty of Nature, here shown to be totally false! Uncertainty remains only as it relates to prediction of some specific result in terms of direction and velocity of particles flying off after an atomic (or subatomic) collision, hereby seen to result from the oscillatory nature of the electron (or nucleus) and our ignorance of all values applicable to the event observed at the exact moment it is taking place! Just try snooker billiards with vibrating balls bouncing off the vibrating balls of equal size making up the walls of the pool table! But just as before, when the uncertainty in games of chance was shown to result from the underlying laws of the construction of such as dice and decks, so too now, the uncertainty of prediction is shown to result from the totally incontrovertible underlying Laws of the structure of the atom! Uncertainty remains within bounds exactly as a result of those Laws determining both the time-dependent size of the unit h of action
and the sizes, amplitudes, frequencies, and vibratory velocities of the colliding particles, that cannot but fly off with transitional velocities and in directions dependent on the sizes, amplitudes, frequencies, and vibratory velocities of the colliding particles at the exact moment of collision!

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

$$F = \epsilon \frac{(q_1)(q_2)}{r^2},$$

(41)

where \(q_1\) and \(q_2\) are the two electrical charges, \(r\) the distance between them and \(\epsilon\) the universal electrical constant, fully analogous to the universal gravitational constant, it becomes clear that the very same physical dimensionality holds for the product \(\epsilon (q_1)(q_2)\) as does for the product \(G (m_1)(m_2)\). The negative unit -e electrical charge we know is that of the electron; and the physically identical to it except for the sign, positive unit +e electrical charge is not that of the proton but that of the positron [there being little doubt that the difference in signs between the two is due to some, as yet unknown, kind of mirror-image structure-arrangement of the masses forming the two otherwise identical particles]. It follows that if the entire mass of each of these particles is involved in this spatial arrangement, the physical dimensionalities of \(\epsilon (+e)^2\) and of \(\epsilon (-e)^2\) being identical to that of \(G(m_e)^2\), give the exact dimensionless ratio of the strengths of the electrical and gravitational forces \(\epsilon (e)^2/G(m_e)^2\), that does not give the hydrogen atom. The determination of this ratio and of the exact physical nature of both \(\epsilon\) and \(e\) requires additional input. Under the force of attraction \(\epsilon (e)(-e)/r^2\) acting between them, the electron and the positron starting from a (practical) infinity reach each other sufficiently close to effect their annihilation under production of (usually) a pair of \(\gamma\)-rays of a total energy of 1 0215201 Mev = \(1.6366576 \times 10^{-6}\) ergs. But this is none other than the energy of transferring the force of attraction from (practical) infinity to the distance \(r_o\) of annihilation, which is \((\epsilon e^2)/r_o\), that is also equal to \(h\nu = hc/\lambda\), where \(h\) and \(c\) are respectively the Planck constant and the velocity of light, while \(\nu\) and \(\lambda\) are the associated frequency and wavelength of the \(\gamma\)-radiation. If the wavelength equals \(r_o\).
the distance at which annihilation takes effect, then the value of \( \epsilon \) can be determined, there then being:

\[
\frac{(e^2)}{r_o} \frac{hc}{\lambda} = 1.6366576 \times 10^{-6} \text{ ergs},
\]

\[
r_o = \frac{\lambda}{hc} = 1.213722 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm},
\]

\[
\epsilon = 1.6366576 \times 10^{-6} \left( \frac{r_o}{e^2} \right) = 7.738484 \times 10^7 \text{ cgs},
\]

\[
e = 1.60217733 \times 10^{-12} \text{ cgs},
\]

\[
= 1.60217733 \times 10^{-19} \text{ C},
\]

\[
\Lambda = \epsilon (e)^2 / G(m)^2 = 3.5876003 \times 10^{45}.
\]

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

[It should be carefully noted that in this presentation, the universal electrical constant \( \epsilon \) is used in the numerator of the Coulomb Law, contrary to the permittivity of free space \( \epsilon_0 \) placed in the denominator of the Coulomb Law as used in the historical long-standing development of the unrationlized and rationalized electrical units of measurement and in the parallel deve-]
lopment of electrical practice and theory. Current practice and theory adds the ampere as a fundamental unit to the kilogram of mass, the meter of length and the second of time. The use of the universal electrical constant, along with the corresponding universal magnetical constant

$$\mu = \frac{c^2}{\varepsilon} = 1.1614098 \times 10^{13} \text{ cgs},$$  

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

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

$$\varepsilon(\varepsilon)^2 = \Lambda G(m_e)^2 = 3.5876003 \times 10^{45} \times G(m_e)^2,$$  

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

$$\varepsilon / \mu = \kappa = 6.663009043 \times 10^{-6} \text{ cgs},$$

and the electrical charge $e$ becomes none other than

$$e = 6.808549 \times 10^{18} \times (G^{1/2}) m_e.$$  

[It should also be noted that, contrary to the belief that the electron has a diameter of about $10^{-13}$ cm, and in the face of the fact that the size of the hydrogen atom is determined by the diameter of the electronic envelop surrounding the nucleus, the annihilation distance $r_o$ of $1.213722 \times 10^{-10}$ cm suggests as truer the diameter of about $10^{-8}$ cm and a practical total overlap of electron and positron, both shrinking under attraction to the annihilation distance, before their spatial internal structure can be destroyed and the (presumably structureless) gamma rays appear. This also explains the failure to detect the proposed “positronium”, a structure in which the positron occupies the position of the proton in the hydrogen atom. The observed since 1951 annihilation of the positron, does not require the existence of “positronium”, but rather demonstrates its non-existence, as annihilation takes effect at the radius of about $10^{-10}$ cm, i.e., before the positron even comes to shrinking to the size of the hydrogen nucleus. This also explains the failure to detect the (expected to be double) characteristic emission spectral lines of “positronium”.]
§130 (a) If all these, made in addition to my earlier discussion of energy, gravitation, relativity, and the Michelson-Morley experiment, surprise you Dear Reader, you surely will not be less surprised to learn that the scientific establishment has been duly notified of them, since 1985, has not refuted them, has refused to admit their existence, has suppressed them, and has continued to teach the now all too clear falsehoods of the still accepted theories to trusting students paying them good money, whom they thus miseducate and corrupt in no ordinary but the corresponding extraordinary measure! The accusation is indeed heavy! But it is not leveled by me! Only by the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity; that may not and does not mince words, numbers, significance! Science is a deadly “game”! For it involves not only the good name and honor of scientists and the integrity of Nature, but also the integrity and honor of the Holy God Logos Himself, no less! To add to blasphemy, not only was the “Scientific Establishment” notified: So was also the Church! That the world saw and heard nothing from either quarter only shows the respect to which all those people hold what they claim to be their “Faith”! The world has reached the point we all, except those paid to smile, now lament for the active inactivity of the people appointed to guide it safely along the razor’s edge! Now, even the end of that is in sight!

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

(c) Because the public, on learning of the underlying Laws, shall demand to know of their source! Which, however, our pseudo-agnostic and atheist friends, all of them vehemently practicing anti-Theists, are not willing to reveal! Because, what can they then say? That the underlying Laws are of the making of the physical universe? But have they not all along refused to recognize any mentality, and so also any and all Law-making ability, to the universe, in effect recognizing only themselves as the sole proven to exist sci-
cientific conscience and consciousness of the universe? Other than their own brains, consciousness and conscience, the universe out there, as we have already discussed but can certainly bear repeating, cannot be shown to possess a central Law-making establishment or Law-emanating and report-receiving mechanism as are indispensable if the underlying Laws are from this universe! And they have surely missed the existence and weight of all that is here discussed! What other can they thus say regarding the source of the indisputably existing underlying Laws? That it is a “mystery”? Call it a “mystery”! Or call it what you will! Have we humans not given the name of Lawgiver, and Maker, and Creator, and Logos, and A and Ω, to exactly that “mystery”? If, then, the irrefutable existence of the underlying physical-natural Laws, here revealed in all their glory lying in the irrefutable numerical results of our scientific experiments, makes the existence of that “mystery” equally irrefutable, how exactly does that differ from the equally irrefutable proof of the existence of God, Lawgiver, Maker, Creator, Logos, and A and Ω? Is it not an ipso facto negation of its “mysteriousness” to reveal a thing in all its glory? How much “mystery” remains in Him, then, now that He is thus revealed scientifically in all His glory? For very long have people sought proof irrefutable of His own existence! Now, that proof is given them scientifically! In what other Logical form, could/would one think, the scientific proof of the existence of God could/would possibly come? It is the compelling nature of the obvious answers to all these questions that the “Scientific Establishment” of our time cannot avoid facing, except by puerile denial! Is it not thus also shown that geniuses can be puerile? Is it not thus also shown that geniusness is most certainly not equal to wisdom? And is it not also known, if only to the wise, that you cannot make vanish what only puerilily you deny?
THE PASSING OFF
OF THE SUBJECTIVE AS OBJECTIVE
AND OF
THE FALSE AS TRUE

§131. Following all the above, hardly can any longer this statement be disputed: That a scientist calling himself a creationist has less-than-half-done his duty if he only points out the fallacies and blunders of atheistic “science”; and that he will only have done his work when he presents the correct scientific vision of the objective world, of which only he is objectively capable. This, of course, will chagrin and infuriate the atheists. But it is true that only the creationist, exactly for his believing in the infallibility and absolute perfection of God is capable of true objectivity, knowing full well that the Perfect God cannot but shall in the end objectively triumph, for having absolutely nothing to fear: For, this is certain: Without perfection, all, even if it for a moment can be assumed to exist, is nothing but genuine trash! The atheist scientist, being scared of objectivity, fails to realize that of everything that he objectively faces and of which he can intrinsically have the best possible knowledge, it is himself that he degrades the most: For this incontrovertible simple hard natural fact: that the human body, within which even his own atheistic spirit dwells, is a perfect solution of the most complex known quantum-mechanical problem! And it is the saddest of all our social hard facts that, the Nobel prizes are awarded by and among people who totally discount exactly this appreciation first of themselves, standing to receive the highest accolade for reasoned achievement, believing themselves to operate
on a sound “philosophy”, though it is in the most fundamental conflict with the foundation of their own living existence! To spite the Mathematician Who first wrote down the grandest of all equations and then all the solutions, one of which is even each of themselves, they declare the universe they study and themselves “Onatop” as totally meaningless, yet deserving both the respect of the rest and the million! Objectively evaluated, this, by definition unrecognized, is the highest schizophrenia! Ordinary lunatics think of themselves as Napoleons, here we have the Doctors who think of themselves as trash, and teach this “philosophy” to the world! All the very worst for themselves, if they truly believe it! But they don’t, they are mere cheats, sycophants of the very worst kind, licking the dirtiest boot on whose pay they subsist, profaning the Holiest Spirit by Whose Grace they truly transist! Nothing does the atheist scientist fear more than solely himself! Nothing does he avoid to study, speeding most hurriedly past it, than of himself! For, very deep down, he still cannot but concede that he is a cheat, knowing himself to be by all standards sane! Except the one by which his “philosophy” dares be profanely nonobjective, which the atheist dares not discuss even with himself, remaining psychologically not just constrained but literally bound: just remember Einstein’s aforementioned statement! The atheist’s extreme touchiness is solely due to his unmistakable consciousness of just this his own omission! Perhaps nowhere else among the writings of the great scientific figures of the twentieth century is this tragedy more obvious, and all the more so because it is left unconfessed, than in the stark juxtaposition of theistic and atheistic science presented in the writings of A. S. Eddington on the philosophy of science. But even there, the juxtaposition is very far from being complete; for the theistic science is deliberately left undeveloped and well kept from the hurried ordinary view. On p. 161 of his The Philosophy of Physical Science (Ann Arbor Paperbacks; 1958), Eddington states that “it has been my special task in these lectures to study the subjective element of the physical universe, so that the objective element has been kept out of the limelight”, doubtless for the already confessed (on p. 156) fear of his critics! It is nothing short of tragic how Eddington distinguishes the “subjective element” of (atheistic, though he does not call it so!) human science from the sole meaningful “objective element” (though pretends to have difficulty with this term!) of the objective (the
theistic, the created, which he does not call it so!) world, and how desperately, in evident order to mollify his atheistic critics, he attempts to avoid raising the heavy question of the innate objectivity of the objective world (the physical universe) and of its total separateness from the “universe of physics”. Elsewhere, he gives ample examples of his respect of God as any true believer having searched his own beliefs understands Him. But in his attempt to equate those two universes (p. 159), he behaves as a fully fledged atheist, with all consideration of the relationship of the objective world to God gone! To mollify his critics, on p. 158, he “reject[s] a definition postulating objectivity”, for even this is deadly to the atheistic dogma; and so, his otherwise fine intellect finds nothing wrong, despite the fact that on p. 217 he “take[s] it as axiomatic that the external world must have objective content”, with stating on p. 159 that “there is no difference between the physical universe and the universe of physics”; the latter, of course, being no other than what the atheists have decided constitutes the sole domain of reality! Just imagine a host of uncouth guests feasting on a table decked out as never again, never once for a moment toasting the seemingly absent host! An unseemly picture! The atheists! And their fellow-travelers, people of soft “faith”, thinking it proper to belong to both camps, dispensing broad smiles in all directions, in a desperate attempt to be pleasant to all, except the Holy God!

§132. The whole discussion and “understanding” in Eddington’s writings, just as is nearly everywhere, is marred and confused both consciously and unconsciously by misunderstanding and double-playing with the meaning of Greek words used in science, of which the non-Greek has no innate knowledge and is ultimately dependent on a dictionary for a definition. “Physical” derives from “physis”, not “physics”. Physis is nothing other than the constantly objective natural world as it exists and functions, both as a whole and in detail, regardless of whether or not humans understand either it or the manner of its functioning, and thus as it already existed and functioned even before man appeared, and thus without any “physicists” being around atheistically to “rationalize” its manner. On the other hand, physics is the “science”, our constantly developing and changing understanding, of physis. Broadly, physis means nothing other than Nature; but the two words have different etymologies, φυσις (physis, deriving from φύειν, the coming into being like a phytón, a vege-
table, requiring nurturing, not being autophýés, coming into being entirely on its own), whereas nature derives from natum (= that which is born; but seen narrowly as apart from parents, automatically having its own developing nature). But since the Age of Reason, and in the aftermath of the abuse of “natural law” by the medieval scholastic “naturalist” moralists (literally beating into the souls of men the fear for disobeying the human, not the divine word, rather than most tenderly cultivating in them the love for Logos, Who oversees all, and so even their dicta, for which sole reason they have chosen to remain foreign if Him!), physics has come to mean something entirely different from the science, the study of objective physis and of the objective Laws “out there” that regulate it. Thus has “physics” now been appropriated by the atheists, and means no more than the “science” of their own devising that falls under the purview of the human sensory apparatus (stated as the sole legitimate conduit of information examinable by “science” after transmission to the human brain, where “alone” it is religiously believed information is comprehended and science develops by human reason alone, yet atheistically biased to consider as “scientific” only what is obviously materialistic, under complete disregard of the clearly intellectual processes inescapably underlying the natural Laws that apply out there independently of human mental activities, that as Laws are not, cannot be, products of thoughtless processes. All this despite the inescapable need, studiously ignored remaining to be scientifically satisfied, of how the “real Law out there”, not the “in here supposed natural law” obtained in the absence of an All-controlling Logos, i.e., before all such human “scientists”!

§133. In its deepest and widest sense, human reason is innately superior to the sensory equipment feeding it with external experience. Thus it is by right permitted, and indeed obligated, to separate the proper, legitimate and thus Logical experience from all illusory, illegitimate and illogical seeming “experience”. And thus it is obligated to hold scientific reasoning most of all in constant check, by refusing (which the atheists do not do) to generalize (which the atheists do) beyond what are the utmost reasonable-legitimate bounds, in view of the built-in uncertainty due to the imperfection of our sensory experiences obtained by our imperfect sensing devices both natural and man-made. As, strictly, science is knowledge obtained by studying and experimenting
with the objective world out there and systematized by the most austere reasoning we are capable of at any one time, it most certainly cannot be said to extend to imaginary, supposedly existing, yet even forever unobservable but still called “physical” objects! So, scientific reasoning in constant check also means delimiting our reasonable certainty regarding the physical world inside the bounds of our limited sensory experience. Only as that experience broadens may we expand the bounds of our reasonable certainty. Only as our Reason improves does our reasonable certainty become firmer. The atheists scientists do not operate within these constraints of Reason: they hasten to declare all Reality beyond what they call reality “non-existent”! The open, still unexplored horizons before human Reason are not tolerated by the atheists, unless they control even them, even as they still remain unknown! Thus does their “physics” and “science” deny and suppress the existence of anything that is not subject to and does not conform to atheistic materialism! For atheistic “science” there is no metaphysics, not even as the objective substratum on which matter exists; let alone the substratum that determines its purpose! However, it does not hesitate to presuppose without the slightest indication, let alone proof, at least the past everlastingness of the physical world, so in effect elevating it to divinity in substitution of God, though it still calls it ultimately purposeless! The moment the world is shown to have had a definite beginning and to operate based on objective, not “scientifically” imagined Law, showing that “science” false, the definite news of it is suppressed to all extent possible! This is why Hubble’s findings so stirred the murky waters and Einstein chose to pretend to have learned nothing by the black backdrop of the sky at night! This is why desperate efforts have never since ceased to be made proposing as “solution” a “possibly infinite universe of universes” permanently invisible to each other on account of the relativistically “expanding space”! This is why the definite news produced in 1986 of the physical universe built integrally around Newton’s Law of gravitation declaring dead all relativistic speculation has been suppressed!!! Because the atheist physicists cannot tolerate the true objective world that works independently of them: Relativity, even as it is now dead, “must” go on ad infinitum! The now accepted form of quantum mechanics “must” continue to be served, even as it is Logically unacceptable! Undeterred, the professors consciously continue to
proffer falsehoods, believed as truths by the uninformed, the badly misinformed “masses”! In the modern atheistic parlance, the “physical world” is not the objective natural world out there, but the fiction of the “world” had in the skewed minds of “physicists”, laboring to create a mental picture of the real world as real as Picasso’s pictures are those of the real world, rather than only of sick souls, ghastly figments of aimless souls pretending to be living! Such is their arrogance! Such their teachings! And such their fruits, that we all now taste!

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

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

---

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

A seemingly cogent argument! But is it? What [here, the probability of intelligent life appearing on a single planet] “is no greater than one part in, say, a million million”, can also be no greater than, say, one part in a quadrillion quadrillion (which may not be denied under the suppositions Weinberg sets, including the true, not the supposed odds hiding in natural selection, as we already have indicated as exclusively reasonable; namely, the building up of all complexity found in Nature starting from the supposed flux within every Planck cubicle during every Planck time interval (“timecle”?) in a universe self-set to expand as already presented, through to the proton and the electron and all elements and then to organic matter all the way up to the present generation of homo species, and not from some already present (indeed, how developed?) primordial cell with genes already in place, from which Dawkins and Company arbitrarily start, conveniently ignoring all evolution of physics and chemistry (including the evolution of the laws governing those sciences); which the more they are studied all the more are they stupendously found to be subject to the structure of otherwise totally abstract mathematics, that in itself is a noetical universe of pure thought, independent of the particular physics and chemistry observed out there! All those who love atheistic evolution can only impress us if, as indeed they are honor-bound to do, they take and make sense of the entire gamut of the natural evolution they proclaim, and not pick and choose from it what they please à la mode de la carte)! And that is certainly smaller than one in a hundred billion billion! What we really need, which Weinberg
does not give us, is an actual calculation of realistic probabilities; most certainly not suppositions on probabilities! It seems that quantum mechanicians are so far removed from reality that they can only conceive it through unexamimable suppositions! Then again, is the real question about intelligent life (on this or perhaps also many other planets) in the universe, or rather about the intelligence of what Weinberg consciously chooses to diminish by calling them “impersonal natural laws governing chance events”? And this when in the main body of his essay he admits that “[t]oday we understand most of these things [the physical phenomena] in terms of physical forces acting under impersonal laws. We don’t yet know the most fundamental laws, and we can’t work out all the consequences of the laws we do know. The human mind remains extraordinarily difficult to understand, but so is the weather ... I see nothing about the human mind any more than about the weather that stands out as beyond the hope of understanding as a consequence of impersonal laws acting over billions of years”. Now, does he or not arbitrarily call the laws we believe we know “impersonal”, even as he admits ignorance of the most fundamental laws [on which the laws we believe we know are based], that may well turn out to be not in the least impersonal but beamng with what we here already have seen to be elegantly understated intelligence? Isn’t this intellectual license inexcusable of a holder of the Nobel prize? Or shouldn’t every reader stand aghast at the admission this Nobel laureate makes who “see[s] nothing more about the human mind than about the weather”? Spinoza wrote his “Ethics” without a single reference to Justice! Einstein wrote his general relativity theory having as “main object to develop the theory so that the reader will feel that the path followed is psychologically natural” [his own phrase only slightly smoothed out!]. “Scientists” deliberately keep on “confusing” the mind and the brain. Just as the brain is made up of particles of matter affected by the processes they suffer under forces they do not understand yet certainly “feel”, so indeed do the particles of air. But is the human mind a mere feather carried on the “wings of winds”, concerned only about its own psychological needs? [Will such “scientists” at last give us the physical bridge between the molecules of the brain and the psyche of man? Einstein bequeathed his brain to science; and slices of it are kept in an untold number of university laboratories having ascertained that
it too was just another brain! The psyche is beyond the reach of such investigators! These are hard facts!] If as per Weinberg, there is “nothing about the human mind any more than about the weather”, I propose that henceforth all Nobel prizes barring none be awarded to the “weather” (not the meteorologists!); that despite all its whimsicality, nevertheless manages to keep most of us breathing and luxuriously fed, which is a real accomplishment, altogether far beyond chance (or else, we all would have vanished long ago!), supposition, dispute, or sophomore pedantic debate! At least, this way, the “weather” would pass the annual Nobel rewards to quite a number of hungry babies to which it fails to give food under the normal course of events!

The real question being about the Designer, we may not call impersonal the Laws He has chosen to impose upon Nature, and thus attempt to divert attention to side matters! This may be attempted by a crafty advocate in a human court of law, but most certainly is (at least ought to be) beneath a Nobel laureate! The real question is not about the intelligence of our “principles” and the “laws” we think apply to Nature under them, but about the intelligence of the Designer’s Laws!

(c) It is also astounding that this quantum mechanician simply “[s]uppose[s] that calculations showed that the chance of .[etc.] is no greater than one part in, say, a million million”, rather than using quantum mechanical reasoning to obtain some far more realistic probabilities. For the theory has advanced to the point of speculating about what happens down to the level of the so-called “Planck length” \( l_p = (\hbar G/2\pi c^3)^{1/2} = 1.6605 \times 10^{-33} \text{ cm} \) over periods of time as short as the so-called “Planck time” \( t_p = l_p/c = 5.39056 \times 10^{-44} \text{ sec} \). The use of Newton’s gravitational constant permits us to remember that, as we already have mentioned, Newton’s Law of gravitation recognizes no limit of applicability from zero length to infinity; thus applying not just only to this but to all conceivable universes. Let us therefore confine ourselves to a mega-universe a billion times as large as this one, extending one thousand times as far as this one in each of the three spatial directions. The cube circumscribing this mega-universe is of size \((1000 \times 2R)^3 = 8.5846 \times 10^{192} \text{ “cubides”} \) (tiny cubes of Planck length in each direction). Over the period of 12 billion years (the presumed age of the universe so far) there have been
\[ T/T_p = 7.0251 \times 10^{60} \text{ “chronides” (periods of Planck time duration each). Imagine a huge lot machine thoroughly mixing up all the cubides and then letting them settle in their exact places each! Why exact? For the simple yet sufficient reasons (i) that as there are no voids between the cubides, their orientations must be so exact that there absolutely be no misfits; (ii) that a cubide suitable for an exact place on the retina of your eye, or a particular rose petal in your garden, most certainly may not be thrown either in the far inter-universal space, or at the center of the sun, or at the center of a galaxy; and (iii) that from each cubide there pass lines and surfaces of a whole multitude of isodynamic potentials of exact value and exact gradient each, suitably unique to the exact positions in space of each cubide! This despite the speculations of the theory regarding the state of things within each cubide during each chronide! It makes no difference that the universe develops as it does in its own stately manner. Under no law whatever, under pure chance, over the life of the universe, the lot machine has let things settle down some \( 7.0251 \times 10^{60} \) times, and each time each cubide has found its exact place, for it is in/from that exact place that each cubide has participated in the development of the mega-universe!

(d) How exact must the geometrical fit be of each cubide? Certainly, no worse than a second of a second of a degree in each of the three spatial directions. This makes the total probability of this requirement no better than one in \((360 \times 60 \times 60)^3\), or \(4.5939 \times 10^{-19}\). The probability of each cubide to find its place (apart from orientation) depends on the manner the places are filled. If all are filled at once, the probability of each one to find its right place is one in \(8.5846 \times 10^{192}\), or \(1.1649 \times 10^{-193}\), so that the probability of each one to find its own place and fit geometrically is no better than \(5.3513... \times 10^{-212}\), or one in \(10^{211.2715...}\). It follows that the probability of all cubides to find their exact right places is this last probability raised to the power of \(8.5846 \times 10^{192} = 10^{192.9373...}\), that (after expressing all numbers as 10 raised to powers of 10) makes it one in \(10^{10^{195.2622...}}\). So, it is not the probability of a partial occurrence that seems “reasonable” to happen somewhere in the vastness by which we must be impressed, but the probability of the entire occurrence that permits the part to appear somewhere! And this latter probability gets reduced faster as the whole gets larger! And if
these numbers are impressive enough, in fact they are not yet impressive enough, as this last probability, minute as it is, is that for a single throw as it were, for the happenings in the mega-universe during a single chronide! But the mega-universe has already been around for $7.0251 \times 10^{60} = 10^{60.8466}$ chronides, which requires that the probability for the entire mega-universe to have developed as it so far has by pure chance is no better than one in $10^{211.2715}$ raised to the power of $10^{192.9373}$ raised once again to the power of $10^{60.8466}$. Expressing all numbers as 10 raised to powers of 10, we find that the probability of the mega-universe to have lasted for so long by pure chance is no better than one in $10^{256.1088}$.

[One gets a better idea of the size of this number by considering one’s chances of picking one particular hydrogen atom painted, say, white, out of the entire thoroughly mixed universe in which all the rest of its mass is converted to atoms of hydrogen painted black. That chance is about a mere $10^{80} = 10^{10.19031}$, which makes the ratio of these two probabilities $10^{10.254.2057}$. Are you still not duly impressed? Just consider that if pure chance is in fact at work, as our luck has already lasted for 12 billion years and has been extraordinarily good, it gets to be all the more likely to run out in the very next chronide, lasting only $5.39056 \times 10^{-44}$ sec! At which point it is entirely proper to ask whether Weinberg, and all those preferring to believe in chance and meaninglessness rather than in God and His meaning, and all nihilists and opportunists it is by this time span that they make their plans, organize their lives, produce children, get educated and are consumed at work in an effort to produce something worth their while, something meaningful! For otherwise, there can be no escaping from the thought that there are plenty of professors and “specialist” Nobel laureates who still have not thought through the Reality in which we all spend our lives, and the “reality” they have chosen to teach, freely riding on the real one!]

These are the best probabilities we may consider, because the more strictures we conceive as operating purely by chance there enters yet another power to which the earlier probability must be raised! To put it in more pedestrian terms, ladies and gentlemen, we are not escaping from God by considering a yet larger universe, we only increase our obligations as thinkers! Failing to consider them, we
constrain ourselves to adopting the yet narrower view of even worse peasants ensconced in a yet smaller and narrower valley; more like moles burrowing out tunnels and raising molehills, or even like little ants, as we think that we liberate ourselves from the obligation to consider the whole and how it came about! When at last will we realize that the more we play the lottery the worse off we get? Our chances to win against God? Simply, none whatever! Simplicity, Economy, Logic demand that the Universe be the least that can serve its objective! And the Universe, as we shall show, indeed has a most worthwhile objective! Only peasants, moles and ants think narrowly of themselves!

§135. (a) In his essay we mentioned above, Weinberg admits that “there seems to be an irreducible mystery that science will not eliminate” because “even when we have a final theory, ... we will still be left with the question ‘why?’”. If we all agree that answering this question will go far toward satisfying our ultimate quest, I, for one, will argue that, answering this question involves a great deal more objectivity than we so far have exhibited and are willing publicly to admit from positions of eminence: Having already sent so much material (which some, not altogether unreasonably, just call it trash!) into the universe, we may suppose that in a remote planet, somebody having no knowledge of us yet indeed finds (which is our admitted objective!) a mechanical piece of ours, hopefully not altogether reduced on falling there to scrap. Would he be right to conclude automatically that its purpose was/is non-existent, because he cannot answer “why?”? If not, how right can we be to conclude that the entire universe, evidently governed by Law, or else all our so-called “Science” is a farce, has no purpose and is ultimately meaningless; which is the standing position of atheism? As Weinberg also admits that, though “quantum mechanics is the one part of our present physics that is likely to survive intact in any future theory, ... there is nothing logically inevitable about quantum mechanics [and he] can imagine a universe governed by Newtonian mechanics instead” [which indeed presents the most compact set of Laws governing the entire universe down to its fundamental Democritean atoms since the moment of the Big Bang, as presented to the physicists since 1986], why does he (along with all formally chaired professors) still refuse to admit “seeing in that] the hand of the designer”? If besides the (scrapped?) mechanism, the aforementioned discoverer found no trace of life on
that remote planet, should he, having the knowledge he does, consider himself obligated to call the existence of the mechanism a mystery? Or would he, rather, conclude that somebody did indeed drop it there? With our present knowledge, how well justified may we consider ourselves if we judge as mechanisms pieces made of metal or low-grade “inorganic” and “organic” matter; but dismiss, excluding from consideration, “pieces” of living matter? Why indeed only the former should demand a conscientious constructor, a mechanic in a workshop to give them the form they have, yet the latter should demand no constructor but just be products of “evolution”? If nothing but chance originally shifts through all materials as Dawkins insists, why should only the latter go through the subsequent stages of “development” and not also the former? Just only because only the latter are “living”? When quantum mechanicians speak of the “froth” down at the level of the so-called “Planck length” and “rudimentary” processes taking place down there in the span of the so-called “Planck time”, of which all matter non-living and living is made up, how do we define “life” quantum-mechanically? Indeed how intellectually honest is it of an atheist quantum mechanician to take refuge behind “evolution”?

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

(c) We simply are not objective enough; so, we remain victims of our subjectivity! Of which, Weinberg offers himself as example worthy of studying!: For he attacks belief in God because “[He] in the Old Testament tells us to bash the heads of infidels and demands that we be willing to sacrifice our children’s lives at His orders”. Yet, in his reply to his respondents he stated that “… but I think that in fact my non-designer argument is eminently falsifiable. All that’s needed is a miracle or two. In reply to a question after my talk ... I suggested that everything I had said would be refuted if a bolt of lightning were to strike me down at the podium”! So, here is a Nobel laureate who dismisses belief in a God Who supposedly demands blood, yet is willing to believe in just such a God if He were to strike him down, in evident retaliation for his unbelief in Him! The laureate does not realize that he thus does indeed offer obeisance to a God publicly proving Himself evil, even as he despises Him for being such! So, despite his claim, he does not really reject belief in a cruel God, yet he thinks he produces a reasoned argument for withholding and rejecting belief in a kind God, the one freely self-offered first to the Jews in the person of Jesus Christ, Who offered them only benevolences in miracle after unbelieved miracle and suffers seemingly nonchalantly [for we may not forget the Perfect Justice of the Kind God, Who would not be Kind unless He also dispensed Perfect Justice!] even this his own so public blasphemy! Thus in effect, this Nobel laureate tells us that if he were present at the time of Christ, he too would have acted as did his forefathers; but would have gladly become an ardent follower, had Christ shown Himself to be cruel as they expected of Him and had struck down not just the general evil, but only those they considered the enemy! So, even an atheist, at least the one so talking and writing, cannot escape from just the very same age-old grip of subjectivity that supposedly characterizes uniquely the believers—but not in God, but their own advantage! Here comes a Nobel laureate who utterly fails to see that he attacks
personally God but only for the blasphemous misconceptions of men, that have been put down even in the Holy Writ of his own forefathers; who fails to see that frail and vicious men dare speak and write of God even as they think of themselves! Who does not see that even “the God of traditional Christianity and Islam damns us for eternity if we do not worship Him in the right manner”, yet solely according to men’s interpretation of man-written so-called [semi]-“Holy Scriptures”, having taken after the example of the Old Testament, and taught not even quite as written by men who only care to maintain and advance their own grip on society, rather than solely the Cause of the Holy God! A laureate who continues with “I know, I know, we are not supposed to judge God according to human standards, but you see the problem here: If we are not convinced of His existence, and are looking for signs of His benevolence, then what other standards can we use?”, and conveniently “forgets” the benevolence of Christ; and refuses to declare his belief in Him for just His always healing miracles [but by his own admission, he rather is willing to believe in an evil miracle!]; and thus he does not put to shame the Christians of two thousand years for not taking after Whom they call their Master!

(d) So, Weinberg regards it innocent to ask “what other standards can we use?” (obviously meaning: “other than our own?”)! This is exactly the crux: the, our, subjectivity! Both in his essay and his response he does not fail to attack Hitler, about whom he admits that “[n]o one would say that Hitler was a Christian zealot, but it is hard to imagine Nazism taking the form it did without the foundation provided by centuries of Christian anti-Semitism”. What do we have here, you ask? A general attack on centuries-old “Christian anti-Semitism”! The Nobel laureate “forgets” that “Christian anti-Semitism” was not universal either during the Second World War or during the centuries; that there have been untold numbers of Christians who at the risk of their own lives hid Jews from the Nazis; that it is not gentlemanly to attempt to pass on the evil of one man or a narrow group of people to a whole nation (in this case the German) or to the followers of a whole religion (in this case the Christian); and that it is particularly offensive to the intelligence of his audience and his readership for a renown physicist to consider an action, even if it be social, without an equally austere review of the reaction. Surely, after a war that cost upward of one hundred million lives, of whom six million Jews, and after
more than fifty years after the end of that war, it is most certainly not intelligible that no one has called for a general study of the relationships of Christians and Jews during the twenty adjacent centuries; of how and why it was that the Jews continued to live scattered all over among the Christians even long after the reasons for their expulsion from Palestine no longer mattered; of how it was that the Jews adopted personal names indistinguishable from those of their Christian neighbors; and what the intimate local structures, both social and religious, were of the medieval societies, in the midst of which the Jews lived and could not but stand apart from but even thus also affect them, and how easy or difficult it then was for such societies to tolerate the always simmering in their midst conscious rejection of the benevolent Crucified! We may not, for the fact that we almost all now ignore the Crucified, judge past generations by this our atheistic contemporary standard! Are now or ever the Jews right to wage such a general at least verbal attack on the “Christians” even from within what used to be Christian societies? Then, also, objectivity demands that the remaining Christians ask: by what right do the Jews even now continue to want even the name of the Crucified completely erased from memory? Two thousand years after the fact, we must at last find the courage to ask: What other than pure benevolences did He shower upon them? The crimes of “Christians” may not be charged to Him! This cannot be Justice, but evil unjustified attack against Holiness once made visible! Are we clear? Are we clear? I know, I know, that I dare raise and ask the most prickly questions! But at the present age of globalization, it is intellectually and morally inadmissible to continue, for the sake of subjectivity standing thus to be damaged, to evade exactly the most prickly questions, by an honest answer to which alone may we advance as a global civilization proud of its standing! All else cannot but be cheap excuses, attempting to cover our indifference about our common global civilization, and conceal our singular care about “our” always crass “profit”!

(e) So, to continue with Weinberg’s question, “what other standards can we use?”, I for one cannot but state “but certainly not our standards”! Because even little children teach us, if we truly care to observe: Little girls play adult women by trying on their mothers shoes, yes? So, why do we not try to step in God’s shoes, and just begin to think of His obligations first toward Him-
self setting the example and then toward the world, whom He cannot but govern by exemplary Justice? If we did, we would see that asking Weinberg’s last question yet insisting on our standards is equivalent to trying to see the world from the perspective of the little girls, rather than that of the grownups, i.e., God’s Himself in this case!

(f) Returning now to the end of the quotation from Weinberg’s essay discussed above in (b), what “special role” (in other words, purpose) would Weinberg consider satisfactory for life, specifically our life, to exist, for which God would consider His effort and time well spent in bringing into being the universe, especially if it be solely for our sake? A Nobel laureate for work done in physics is honor bound to consider especially this possibility, and he may not constrain himself to just asking “Why?”! He must also dare propose an answer to his own question! After all, he got the prize for proposing a theory! So, why not also proposing just only yet another simple hypothesis, on which if not he someone else may build? Stopping at the “Why?” is never stopping to wonder like little boys; while little girls, assuming the airs of their mothers, try on their shoes! Moreover, a Nobel laureate may not accuse the religious for not asking and attempting to answer themselves the question for feeling satisfied to consider “that God ‘by definition’ is the ultimate answer to any chain of ‘why’ questions”, as Fr. Ed. T. Oakes, S. J. stated in his letter on Weinberg’s essay, if he is not willing himself to make a plunge! May I assure him that the water is indeed deep, but is also well oxygenated; and once in it, one may swim like a fish? May I suggest that the answer to the “Why?” that surpasses all subjectivity and reaches at the feet of objectivity is nothing other than “For the sake of Holiness, both God’s and ours!”? Isn’t that the extreme opposite of the nihilism he prefers but is ever so careful as never to mention, hiding behind the innocent-looking general atheistic assertion that “God does not exist; therefore, life is utterly meaningless”? And is it truly too much for a Nobel laureate to realize that Holiness is unattainable without the possibility of evil, which only we bring into being by choosing it rather than Holiness? Is it truly too much for a Nobel laureate to realize that the world would not be better without the possibility of Holiness, that alone requires the objective existence of the possibility of its opposite? Weinberg says “I don’t need to argue here that the evil in the world proves that the universe is not de-
signed, but only that there are no signs of benevolence that might have shown the hand of a designer. But in fact the perception that God cannot be benevolent is very old. Plays by Aeschylus and Euripides make a quite explicit statement that the gods are selfish and cruel, though they expect better behavior from humans’ Question: How legitimate is it for a twentieth century Nobel laureate to “argue” for the nonexistence of a designer, based on playwrights of a period in which the qualities, not of God, but of gods and men were all mixed up in the minds of ordinary people, who had deified even their own Fates; playwrights intent only on stirring up the questions in the minds of ordinary people while entertaining them, rather than educating them on the depths of Science, Philosophy and Theology: playwrights who chose not to sit down with their contemporaries Socrates and Plato who had already decided, without the benefit of the light of later days, that God is Good? [Does Weinberg ignore that playwrights are far more akin to the poets than are to philosophers, or does he forget that Meletus, one of the plaintiffs against Socrates, represented the poets? Or has he never heard of selective, at best second-hand hearsay and how it is treated in our present judicial system? If so, what witness indeed can a poet of any age bring against God that can today command some attention?] Can Weinberg bring just one citation from Socrates and Plato stating the nonexistence of God? Socrates was wrongfully accused of introducing “new gods” when he obedient to Apollo the God of Light only sought to cast God’s Light to the souls of men, to the point of teaching them even how to give up their lives as free, erect/correct, standing up citizens believing in righteousness! This was a benevolent civic lesson come to men either from the God of Light, or from a mere man the like of which and of whom the world has never before or since seen! Most certainly it was not a nihilistic lesson in the meaninglessness of the world! Four whole centuries later, Jesus Christ filled Palestine with benevolent miracles (not the malevolent miracles Weinberg concedes would be persuasive!), but Weinberg continues to state that “there are no signs of benevolence that might have shown the hand of a designer”! But he also admits: [n]ow it doesn’t settle the matter for me to say that we cannot see the hand of a designer in what we know about the fundamental principles of science. It might be that although these principles do not refer explicitly to life, much less to human life, they are nevertheless craftily designed to bring it about”. But quite
apart from the “fundamental principles of science” that are mostly our “principles” that we have elevated to the status of universal laws (and perhaps it is only for that reason that we do not see them to refer explicitly to life), the real question about life Weinberg does not answer is whether he regards life beneficial. If not, his entire argument regarding all manifestations of malevolence in the world become simply vacuous! And if he does, and at the same time admits that it is not our principles but the Laws of Nature that “are craftily designed to bring it [i.e., life] about”, why does he still refuse to confess that benevolence in the world starts from very deep down indeed, as it is the Laws that are “craftily designed to bring [life] about”? Is it not a deliberate distortion of the meaning of language to use the passive voice [here, “[life] craftily designed”] without clear reference to the active agent Who so craftily designed all these matters from so very deep down indeed? We need more honesty, more objectivity than Weinberg is obviously capable of! The “Christians”, those he may accuse; their crimes are indeed legion! But Christ (i.e., God’s own face as the Creator), Him he may neither accuse nor ignore; for He only healed! And only for that has He to this day by the Jews been rejected! In studying the world, we need more honesty, more objectivity than Weinberg teaches from his high professorial chair and the podiums the world offers him! Pity on you, Herr Professor! And, alas, pity on us too!

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

(h) Indeed, what lesser than Holiness purpose would the Holy God and a self-respecting man consider for any life endowed with intellect; all of which the Nobel laureate Weinberg equates to nothing? How can he possibly fail to see that from the war of Good vs. evil the Holy God could neither possibly absent Himself, nor appear in all His Glory that objectively would burn the
material eyes of all sinners, if they by some miracle could but for a moment see Him in Person? How do we all fail to see that the human flesh is the proper dress the Holy God had to choose to make Himself visible to us all, to deliver His Lesson? And how can a Nobel medalist possibly fail to see that in this war only freely can a Good Man choose to stay sinless? The whole debate among Christians has been how we men are to understand this union in Holiness of God and the Good Man in a seeming single person called Jesus Christ! If He were only the Holy God, what gripe can any man have against Him, other than that He indeed showed us the Way? And if He were "only" a Good Man, as at least every honest man must concede, how come do the Jews not take particular pride in Him and become His followers to the last man, exactly for His having been one of them, leading the world to Holiness?

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

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

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

§136. Eddington was, of course, not as explicit as all this. His admitted fear of his critics held him in check and prevented him from denouncing openly this sort of pseudoscience that insists on passing for objective truth (loc. cit. pp. 185, 217). but his basic honesty prevented him from not alluding even tangentially, between the lines, to the intrinsic and unavoidable distinction between the subjective (i.e., the physicist’s own) and the objective (the truly existing) “physical universe”. Yet, his fear of the critics prevented him from showing that, human scientific knowledge, for its insisting by selective subjectivism on including in “science” only what the atheist physicists deem proper, is therefore basically incomplete and even outright false. He was far more in the cast of an atheist scientist himself and far less in the cast of a fully rationalist thinker to examine the full implications of modern atheistic science. He was the first to expound on relativity theory, that he adopted, so much so that his “Mathematical Theory of Relativity” of 1923 was held by Einstein himself to be the best presentation on the subject. But even for his contributions to atheistic science, the atheists could not and still cannot forgive him. His insistence on the selective-subjective nature of “physics” was indeed the monkey wrench in the inner workings of atheism for the doubts it raises of its validity, for them to tolerate him.
§137. With the complete separation of Science and Religion in the modern times, we have yet to realize the nearly impossible place in which we have placed the subject matter of mathematics! To most readers, this statement will appear peculiar, until they think back of the Greek statements of “μηδεὶς ἁγεμέτρητος εἰσ-ίτω” and “αἰεὶ ὁ Θεὸς ὁ Μέγας γεωμετρεῖ” [respectively, “no one ignorant of geometry may enter” and “always does the Great God geometrize”], and the infinite mathematical care with which the Greeks built their temples! There has been nor can be a better example of the Logical unity of thought with which any other people that ever lived conducted their daily lives more constantly bearing in mind Science (that inescapably includes mathematics), PhiloSophy (that is near empty words when it ignores mathematics) and TheoLogy (that most certainly reduces itself to “theology” and profanes the Lord the moment it ceases to regard Him also as the Ultimate Mathematician). [And if this reads and sounds “Masonic” to some traditional “Christians”, I shall offer no apology, but only a plea that they themselves reconsider what they have wrought for two thousand years by means of their rejection of the ancient Greek mode of Reasoning, that by no stretch of anybody’s imagination may be accused of having had anything to do with Free Masonry!] It, alas, has been the nearly unbearable price civilization has paid on passing from what obstinate ignoramuses still call “idolatry” to, in essence, Jewish-oriental Christianity that has made “piety” of haughtily ignoring the perfect and complete intellectual attributes of the Personal Deity, in Whom
the “Christians” merely pretend to profess belief, without in the least realizing that their love of God is nothing at all beyond pathos (relating to the possessive, selfish and malicious, rather than the healthy sympathetic aspects of passion in standing with the Spirit-Lord, Whose icons we are in all that Holiness regards Just), as long as they neglect to love Him also “with all their power and all their intellect” (and thus also with all the power of their intellect), that is inescapably lame when its mathematics is being restricted to the mere counting of obols collected (in which effort we certainly cannot afford to displease any giver!), that is the second most important activity of the Churches; the first being the constant pursuit of absolute power, that is all the power they can get for the men at the top, who have never given a thought to the unforgivable blasphemy of the Spirit, that we certainly practice when we neglect to offer the Lord all that is due Him, including the mathematical aspects of the Spirit! That Christ among the Jews acted as He did had only to do with what was then there most needed! He left it for the Holy Spirit working in us to remind us, supplement His statements, and guide us concretely on Up! The “Christian” priesthood decided, alas, otherwise: they stuck to the Jewish paradigm, and completely neglected the Spirit! It is in bitter sorrow that I have to say all this, as I can no longer expect from them a confession of the ultimate sin! They simply refuse to realize how Jewish they become in their still continuing slander of the ancient Greek Spirit, that bequeathed the world its language, without which Christianity would inescapably have come to nothing at all! Nor, alas, do they realize wherefrom the continuing war of every probable and improbable origin against the Greek paradigm springs, that is also a war against the Lord up on high! The slandered Greek “idolaters” never committed this supposedly “pious” blasphemy! When prominent prelates and theology professors ignore the pleas of reconsidering their crime of splitting the Spirit in half and surrendering Science and Reasoning to the enemy, one cannot but suspect conscious intent, or, else, idiocy!

§138. This work would be incomplete if it did not include an examination of what is enacted against the Spirit of God even from within the basic quarters of theoretical mathematics. It was in 1931 when the theorems of K. GÖdel and in 1936 of A. Tarski appeared and have had their impact. They were developed on researching the axiomatic cohesion of the foundations of theo-
retical arithmetic, dealing in the unlimited set of natural numbers (N = 0, 1, 2, 3, etc.). Since ancient times, arithmetic has recognized what we call numbers and their interrelations that hold them together by such additional and clearly extra-arithmetical connective “particles” such as ‘not’, ‘and’, ‘or’, ‘if ... , then ... ’, ‘if and only if ... , then ... ’, other operators; symbols such as: ‘equal’, ‘not equal’, ‘larger than’, ‘smaller than’; etc., without which we simply cannot have arithmetic. In themselves, the numbers are purely mental constructs that attached to other “things” help us in considering the latter, that can be other mental constructs or even physical items or “things”. It is thus that we speak of “one or two ideas that may be helpful”, “three friends”, or “two pairs of horses”. It appears that, before the beginning of the twentieth century the mathematicians had not undertaken a rigorous research of the strength of the logical foundations on which the science of numbers has been built. Then, three distinct “schools” undertook to lay the new, self-consistent and hopefully unshakable foundations of mathematics: the “logistic school” of B. Russell, the “axiomatic school” of D. Hilbert, and the “intuitionist school” of L. E. J. Brouwer. By common agreement, none of these schools supplied an entirely satisfactory complete proposition regarding those foundations; either proving itself, or verified by the methods of the other two schools, nor did it answer the specific problem created by the Gödel findings. This failure cannot but lie in our still incomplete understanding of the specific quantitative only mental nature of numbers and our obviously faulty appraisal of their limitations within the far wider (for including the qualitative universe) content of mind, and of how rationally may qualities and quantities relate at all; of which Gödel’s procedure is but an example:

§139. Carefully expressed, Gödel’s first theorem states that “there exist arithmetic propositions (even of comparatively elementary nature) that are evidently true yet cannot be deduced from within the formalism of arithmetic”. Carefully expressed, Gödel’s second theorem states that “a formula (consisting of axioms and, optionally, additional truths) written in accordance with the rules of the formalism of arithmetic cannot be shown to be consistent (i.e., free from hidden contradictions) within said formalism”; or, in other words, that “arithmetic cannot prove itself to be free from
contradictions”\textsuperscript{39}. Together, these state that “any proof that a formal system is free from contradictions necessarily requires methods beyond those provided by the system itself; accordingly, one cannot prove that number theory is free from contradictions by means of finite methods in the strict sense. Today, there is still no clear agreement on the type and the range of admissible extensions of finite methods. ... [F]inite investigations are not limited to the question of freedom from contradiction, but refer [also] for example to decision problems and generally to the analysis of the finite core in fundamental mathematical and metamathematical results of infinitistic nature”\textsuperscript{40}; a situation that has not yet changed.

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

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


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

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

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

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

One need only consider the “if ...” sentence: the expletive sign cannot always have the same any some value: the complete sentence for which it stands has in every case a different character, structure, quality, importance, unquantifiable value, weight, it can even contain several other similar-looking “if ...” sentences, each with its own unique characteristics: how are all these justly assigned a purely numerical value during “Gödelization”? What numerical value do you justly give an axiom such as that the velocity of light is constant, and what must happen to the entire construct based on it when it is found that the axiom opposes a Law of nature such as Newton’s Law of gravitation?

One reads such as “let $L$ (a ‘formalized’ language), $U$ (universe of discourse) and their and their semantic correlation be included in a new universe of discourse $U$ and let $L$ be an adequate language for $U$. Thus $L$ is called the object language of $U$ and $L$ the metalanguage for the system $\langle L, U \rangle$. The coding of $L$ makes it possible to project certain predicates of $U$ which in the first instance are only metalinguistically expressible into the object language $L$. An example of a predicate in the metaobject domain is the one-place predicate ... To this there corresponds a certain arithmetical predicate ... Under the assumptions made on $U$ an expression $Nb(v)$ can now be constructed so that on substitution of a natural number $n$ for the variable $v$ so that the statement $Nb(n)$ says ... By means of a further device, a so-called diagonal argument, one can now find a natural number $m$ so that $m = Nb(m)$ The statement $Nb(m)$ can then be regarded as self referring statement with the meaning ‘I am unprovable’). But this is neither bona fide mathematics, nor language construction that a rigorous linguist could regard adequate, but mere substitution of “this” for “that”, under assumptions based of doubtful axioms, newfangled “diagonal arguments” having no place in formal logic, and a “can then be regarded” standing as if it were “must then be understood to mean only that...”! Under such a scheme one cannot

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

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

§142. Close examination shows Gödel’s procedure to be so axiomatic as to produce no justification of its own method, and his “proof” to depend entirely on a highly ingenious yet contrived series of remarkable but arbitrary finite steps taken in arithmetizing the formalism. But axioms are used in theories, and they need not supply a priori justification of the axioms they use. Nevertheless, all theories, and especially those producing highly unexpected conclusions, depend on subsequent independent practical verification to gain acceptance; and when they are not so verified, either their axioms are revised, or the theories are rejected in their entirety. This does not seem to have happened in Gödel’s case; his findings have in fact been swallowed, though with difficulty yet with resignation! As if in this unique case, it were allowed for the axiomatic theory to stand for its own proof! Can it be that the axiomatic nature of his procedure together with the abstractness of the field have obscured (or have they excused?) the fact that Gödel’s is just a mathematical (but still a) theory, that must be treated as
any other theory before it is accepted? Or, is it possible that it too has been allowed to stand for the “support” it provides to the entire set of twentieth century “scientific facts” that supposedly permit us to doubt right and wrong; here and there; now, future and past; to be uncertain on principle about practically everything, and thus finally also about Truth and falsehood, and Good and evil? In these thoroughly suspect times, when even God is academically doubted and the Church prelates remain inactive, no human activity bearing on the universal may be held to remain above our suspicion! Congratulate the teachers of our world!

§143. (a) Consider H. Weyl’s choice of the simple formula 1 + x ≠ y (loc. cit. 226), by means of which he “attempt[ed] to de-
scribe Gödel’s discovery with as much precision as is possible without becoming too technical” (loc. cit. 221). In the description, the for-
mula was treated as if x and y were both variable. But it is here already that a non-expert in symbolic theoretical mathematics is stuck, who may not for the sake of technicalities overlook all other co-indicated facts: for if x be variable, so indeed is 1 + x; and there is no way that this sum can never be set equal to another variable, here named y!(exclamation, not factorial). Though the formula 1 + x ≠ y seems legitimate technically (though thus only for most, but most certainly not for all cases!), qualitatively it is il-
legitimate, as it in fact states that “what is a variable is not a vari-
able!” But in the specific example of 1 + x ≠ y, that Weyl picked to demonstrate the method, there is indeed more: the formula contradicts also the recursive nature itself of number; that is secured by its opposite formula 1 + x = y, that is correct in every case in which x and y are consecutive natural numbers! Yet, neither Gödel [hinting at a theory in which “every concept is significant everywhere except for certain ‘singular points’… so that the paradoxes appear as some-
thing analogous to dividing by zero…” (loc. cit. p. 234)] makes any allowances for such conflicts as just pointed out (that are not paradoxes but gross logical errors, if they are not excluded from Gödel’s treatment, that thus ceases to be universal), nor Weyl takes note (let alone sharp exception) of these exact conflicts (even in a book named The Philosophy of Mathematics and Natural Science, even as he clearly laments the state mathematics was brought in
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with Gödel’s theorems (loc. cit. 219-20! So, there is indeed more to the “integers [natural numbers, that] were created by God, [while] all else is [incidental, transient and] man-made” (according to L. Kronecker’s famous saying), as is indeed verified by the analysis of the emission spectra of the atoms to which we have already referred ($128v-vi, p. 245); that in so far as these here remarks are valid can continue to be trusted as since ancient times within arithmetic and with them the structure of the world is still completely secure and is not threatened by the Gödel catastrophe!

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

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

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

§145. Considering now Tarski’s theorem stated above on p. 278, and in view (a) of the fact that there is no language that is richer than arithmetic, and (b) of the fact that all common languages (including as we showed above Gödel’s on which Tarski’s reasoning was based) have their weaknesses, what are we to say? At least these: (a) That given the infinitude even of the prime
numbers, every word we utter and every nuance we give it, and every statement we can make made up of words, given the fact that the human inventiveness and power of synthesizing complex meanings is not infinite, can each indeed be represented by a unique to it prime number. (b) that even in so organizing all these words, nuances, statements, thoughts, we must take so complete care as to exclude every and all contradictions, or else we somewhere shall get in trouble! This is exactly what Gödel did not guarantee! Tarski basing his reasoning on Gödel’s erroneous theorems could not but reach an erroneous conclusion! In other words, searching for Truth is indeed hard, but it is not hopeless! The Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity of the world based on the Most Elegant Design is not shaken by the wrong findings of Gödel and Tarski. Truth is indeed There and it is calling us Up! The question is whether we shall be careful enough to avoid all traps of contradiction, persistent enough to ascend, humble but erect enough to admit that even ascending has its invaluable rewards! Of the Beauty at the Top we cannot yet speak—not because it is not there, but because our misguided “science” in its more than one hundred year old effort to turn us ever down rather than constantly Up has denied us even the imagination to come closer to it! It is for our rejection of Reason that we go headlong for the abyss, despite the misty eyes turned to the stars of such as the late Carl Sagan, despite the mixed utterances of Einstein, the resignation of Bohr, the total surrender to doubt of Heisenberg, the false conclusions of Gödel and Tarski, and the naked atheism of such as Hawking, Weinberg, Dawkins! Reader, make no mistake: Faith in Reason is not Religion! It is Faith and Duty first of all in oneself! That we are not all insane, only misguided! That we are not resigned to alms from God, Who in His Holiness did not seek to make passive beggars of us, but active seekers of that same Holiness seeing it to be our Duty to ourselves to earn our Way! Insanity is to go the easy way down to the abyss, lured by the Sirens! For all their faults, the Greeks taught us lessons immortal. The trouble is we misunderstood them! We chose to make violent Hollywoodian scenarios of their struggles, not debates following up on their debates, συζήτησες, common researches of the One Truth! Misguided not by the scientists, but by the so-called “theologians” of West Asian origin who drove the impious wedge right down the middle between what can only be called their “faith” in God
and the correct Faith in the one indivisible God-Logos! So is it that nearly all we do is first disrespectful of Man propaganda serving current insatiable demands, and then blasphemy of the Lord! Christ was crucified once, and the evil ones cry out that we forget Him! In order that they shamelessly serve us even worse than do so already! The daily rivers of hot human blood won’t obviously be enough until after if ever we turn ourselves into veritable devils maddened by the cunningly taught daily madness! If not themselves criminals, and insane, then at least degreed imbeciles rule from their high seats the world! The obvious “leaders” are only pawns! The queens and the kings never show themselves! Even charlatans have recognizable limits. When elevated high, these people do not even see, let alone imagine, the naked incompetence they exhibit. Only imbecility has no limit! Let us all, each and everyone of us take a good look at ourselves and decide who and what on the side of What we would rather, had better be: However unpleasant as it indeed is, this now becomes the most personal! We all must confront ourselves, all the way down to the abyss of our souls! Only there may there still be something giving a pulse! If not, we are dead! So, does it become our very personal duty, of every self-respecting still thinking person to demand of himself, and to his utmost capacity to contribute to the badly needed debate on the clarification and the ultimate meaning of our entire planetary civilization! Doing anything less, and so far we are doing far much less, is tantamount to resignation from our spiritual essence, on account of which we are called in Greek Ἀνθρώποι, ἄναθρούστες ἀπερ ὅπωσαι, that is to say Immortal Spirits, not just destined to rot as does mere flesh, re-examining all that already has come to our attention!
§146. (a) It was after the following two chapters had been written that I realized that the previous chapter had to be included, as errors have occurred not only in the broad field of tangible (experimental and theoretical) physics, but also in the understanding of intangible (for it possesses no experimental counterpart) mathematics that by the findings of Gödel and Tarski was brought in broad agreement with the twentieth century’s theories regarding the said to be doubtful deeper nature of Nature.

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

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

— Nor indeed does it seem to me, as it must to anyone willing to give the matter serious thought, to be reasonable that I or anyone should remain mute on theological matters who is not licensed
to speak on them by some or other religion. As indeed physical science is one for us all, sufficiently for the fact that Nature too is one, so also theology for the fact that is seeks to answer the still harder spiritual facts of the same one overall Reality, cannot either be cut to pieces so that everyone may take the part he likes, or be restricted to be spoken about solely by those whom essentially self-appointed human religious authorities license to speak about theological matters. Let us all be humble enough to realize our common spiritual essence, recognized as inalienably personal for each one of us in the face of Reality. This recognition cannot but be followed by the right Reality itself has given to everyone to contribute his bit to the common search, and be judged for its value. Faced with this fact, only those who doubt their own spiritual foundations seek to limit the license given to us all to be concerned about these matters, in order that their grip on the minds of people may not loosen!

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

§147. (a) There is yet another and by no means little problem that these words call our attention to, duly to register and resolve. I have alluded to the difference before. As this work nears its closing, it is not a tiring repetition to bring together the facts that the Reader needs to make clear in his mind before he can make sense of Reality. The words anthropic and human are not equivalent: every living so-called “animal” is a human; not every “animal” is an anthropos. I do not know whether the word “man” is in fact an abbreviation of “human” (= soily and moist) [rather than related to the Latin “mens” (= mind, intellect, reason, disposition etc.)]. If so, one can immediately understand where the true source of our infinite troubles is located: “Dust to dust!” The terminal full stop! The ancient Western Asian axiomatic statement of nihilism! All dust does finally settle and harden to senseless rock! Why ever look Up? All those who want to put you down, need only remind you of this axiom, to which they demand that you
subjugate yourself! On which the religion of the Old Testament does indeed rest as regards “human nature”. God spat and of the mixture with the soil He made Adam! As he returns to dust, Holiness, the ultimate form of Up, is out of the question, for both him and God! Don’t be amazed, see second axiom below!

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

— The second axiom is that He thus (as above) made Adam. In His image are we told, and in His likeness! And here it is that the second big trouble enters: As we know not and have not asked to learn a thing about Who God truly is, we also understand an exact equal nothing about ourselves, too! And as the religions tell us that we are dust, how indeed do you, Brother, avoid concluding that God too “must” be made of the same materials, having made us in His image and likeness? [Where in Genesis (or even elsewhere in the Old Testament) are we told Who/What God is? All we are told is that the spirit of God was bringing itself about (ἐν φερέτοι) over the water. It is out of Christian piety that that s is capitalized! Remove all the Christian interpretation and see what you are left with! By “spirit” the Hebrews understood only wind! And non-Christians, going back to the “original” (what the Jews reconstructed as the now known Masoretic text), do not have to accept the Christian interpretation! But if everyone “understands” what he pleases, how if not guided by Logos are we to come to an agreement, as Reality affects us all equally?] But then, unless you take us as something like the portraits (as they, too, are in somebody’s image and likeness!), how and why do we need Him at all? If like is like, if the portrait is like the original, how isn’t the original like the portrait also? And if we judge ourselves to be origi-
nal enough for being alive and “clever”, who needs the Original?
— The third axiom is a well-hidden one: The serpent provoked Eve. She sinned. Then Adam, too! They were expelled. The serpent, however, remained in Eden, though condemned to crawl on its belly. How did it move about before? We aren’t told! But what is this if not ancient Western Asian theological Dualism, only later manifested as Manichaeism, allowing Good and evil to co-exist even in Eden? [Obviously, we should not get attached to the historically accepted appearance and recognition of these ideas but seek their most ancient essential Logical and ontological though for long gone unrecognized presence in the Scriptures of the world.] Then, in the New Testament, we are told to beware of him by whom temptation comes. Yet, we also pray daily that the Lord Himself lead us not unto temptation! So accustomed have we become through rote repetition that we don’t understand, nor do we question, how all these reasonably mesh together! But this cannot be Faith in Logos! The Holy God-Logos cannot possibly lead us unto temptation, even as it is so stated in the New Testament as part of the Lord’s prayer! The presence of the possibility to commit evil is necessary for the preservation of our freedom. Only if free may we be rewarded or punished. This does not permit us to regard the Holy God as the one who leads us unto temptation, nor to pray that He do not do so! This is very nearly tantamount to holding God responsible for our sins for leading us unto temptation! Well hidden Asiatic Dualism, alas, continues to govern our souls; though not our minds as long as we keep them alert to avoid committing the unforgivable sin, which goes on being ignored by the “theologians”! This is why this sort of “theology” deserves to be placed within quotation marks! Those believing in the Good God can no longer accept the essentially blasphemous mumblings of the “experts”, who have finally brought us to the present impasse! Now, do I still have to spell out in black on white the names of all those who by the Scriptures co-taught and keep on teaching us through their teeth the letter of faithlessness?
— The fourth axiom refers to the beings called “animals” for having anima (= breeze, breath, life, and what makes them to be living, which was called “soul”). Of these, “man” set himself apart, saw that life was good, and death was bad, and sought the way to make himself immortal. Religion was founded on the “human” desire to defeat death. The dead bodies rot; Ah, but on dying,
they give out the last gasp, their anima-soul that will in time re-enter the bodies God will reconstruct! If He made them once, He can make them again! Do you question the power of God, now? Certainly not! But why should the Lord resurrect the bodies, what is so special about them other than the fact that we love them so? Didn’t they fulfill their purpose while they were alive? And what legitimate (read: Logical) purpose can they serve by being resurrected that could not be served by the creation of brand new bodies unstained by sin and death? The Greeks, as they then best could, were abhorred on listening to these Asiatic ideas: They had already solved the problem: The bodies rot; the Spirit lives on, and in the Elysium duels on purely spiritual matters, having learned the lessons of this world. By getting syncretistic, Christianity carried the day for the love of the flesh, that was “dressed” with “spirituality” that is ontologically foreign to it! To this day you cannot find a “Christian” who can give you a Logical argument. That the Lord is pure Spirit, and only in that sense are we in His image and likeness, is an idea that the Greek loves, but the still Asian “Christian” abhors. He is shocked to hear that the material bodies have no place in the purely spiritual world. He thinks that this contradicts the Lord’s Resurrection. He does not understand that the Lord resurrected Himself as the finest possible material light, of which all material bodies are made up, and in that form, so to say integrating in Himself the entire creation also, was He able to enter rooms through closed doors, though He still had for our sake to reappear in the form our ordinary material eyes could see Him!

I honestly don’t understand what is ilLogical or blasphemous about this statement, and I respond by saying that for two thousand years, the Christian Churches have ignored, as they ought not to, the Lord’s statement that the Kingdom of God truly was then at hand, and it came with His Resurrection, by which the essential duality of Reality [made of the Holy God-Logos-Spirit and the creation (also made up of our also created Spirits and matter, (or else we would be talking of Pantheism!))] was gloriously demonstrated; after which, ever since, Logically inescapably we truly experience the Day of Judgment! During which we continue to misbehave as we are being judged! The “theologians” refuse to separate the separate! And playing mute, they think they can escape the consequences they have brought about! Now, the Truth is upon us, and we blaspheme ignoring the now hard evidence that
the Spirit is Master! And He shall decide all seemingly remaining unresolved matters solely according to Logos, that is one with both Justice and Love, since it is just to love only the lovable and worth loving only the just, that are solely spiritual matters. For the love of matter and of the flesh, and for the love of power they through them exercise on men, Churches and Religions have failed to lead the world that Way! It has been for that failure that only now do we just begin to see the consequences that are due! What other can I say that it must be degreed veritable imbeciles who still follow the old tried and failed ways of war, bloodshed and mayhem while idiotically Churches and Religions watch on, and other idiots, purely for the extra business it will create if it be adopted, propose that we bury the carbon dioxide we produce in order that we avoid the “greenhouse effect” (the antechamber of living hell) simply because we intend to continue wasting prodigally both the carbon we unearth and the oxygen we breathe, that in addition we do not allow to be regenerated in the forests we cut down; thus also destroying the ozone shield that protects us? All this very democratically done! If that is not the conspiracy of organized Religion and Science against the "Ἀνθρωπος", I, for one, want, Brother, that somebody tell me! Again the Scripture says: "Μημανε ὁ Κύριος ὃν βουλέταν ἀπολέσαι", namely, “the Lord makes fools of those He wants to destroy”? Most certainly, the Lord does not want to destroy anyone (but neither does He want to enslave us by denying us our freedom to sin—and only if we do, to reap all its then due fruit)! This is purely the “theologians” language, trying always to refer the blame constantly on Up!

(b) Consequently, to call, or even however indirectly through other statements and acts insinuate that, God is illogical, unJust and unLoving is the ultimate blasphemy, regardless of who it is that commits it! Going to war for gain, calling the war “justified” is blasphemy! Shedding blood, let alone killing, in the name and for the sake of God you believe in is blasphemy! Because we are subject to death, our life is not the very highest good! Therefore, we may only risk our life for a still higher good, and as such, no rational person shall not recognize the honest pursuit of Holiness! Once you do that, you must regard yourself dedicated to that purpose! Killing somebody means denying Heaven the possibility to rejoice and get richer by the reception of one more saint! Punishment shall be proportional to that greater than any usual offense!
(c) This cannot but apply generally and equally to all, regardless of position or authority in society, or of power among the nations of the world. On the contrary, high position and power is accompanied by the proportional higher responsibility to lead justly, not only by mere and usually empty word but even by the living example. Alas, the world is rarely if ever so taught and so led. As a result, some assume they can commit all sorts of crime, not just solely of the ordinary kind, but even of the extraordinary; as is every legally protected criminality, hardly if at all hiding the conspiracy of “white collar” criminals committing their criminal acts from visible and invisible positions of power which the ordinary person does not even suspect, making it trying or even impossible for others to lead their peaceful lives in justice and the pursuit of a place in Heaven. How are these others to react? The freedom given us by God, may not in any way infringe upon the freedom of others. If, e.g., I so abuse my freedom, others indeed have a right, and even the obligation to protect theirs, in their inalienable effort to protect honestly the interests of Heaven. For people and societies truly believing in God, absolutely nothing can take precedence in their interests over those of Heaven. If, e.g., after thorough searching of mind and spirit society judges the Heavens will be better off served by the incarceration or even the execution of a so hardened criminal that he cannot be trusted to terminally discontinue his criminal acts, then it indeed cannot have the option to let him go unpunished. The interests of Heaven must be protected even by the prohibition of establishing a law for escaping just punishment on the grounds that society may not touch a criminal because the moral Law supposedly indiscriminately prohibits killing. This has nothing to do with exacting retribution on the “eye for an eye” principle. One must justly regard that that principle was set as a constant reminder for the potential criminal not to enact a crime deserving such retribution; not as a general right of the party offended to demand and under the supposed cover of moral Law exact retribution! One must justly regard that that principle has been taken to establish the general right of the party offended to demand retribution solely for the hardness of heart of the party that demands retribution! Religions, and their leaders, pastors and priests have by and large failed to see things in this light! So has it been that there is so much hatred of “religious” origin lashing us!
(d) Here we appear to set so high standards that by today’s loose habits will appear almost (?) inhuman. However, we also must demand of ourselves to set even our principles in just order and to abide by it. Belief in God cannot but include the belief in a reason for the fact of our mortality. Our mortality does not bestow an obligation that we attempt to extend this short life beyond the limit to which it is useful to the purpose for which it was given us! It was no accident, nor did it just not occur to the Greeks to allow lashing a citizen, or the institution of an executioner in their ancient cities; so much so that even Socrates, though condemned to death for (contrived) impiety, he was not executed but instead asked as a free citizen though in prison to relieve of his presence the city he obviously loved by freely in prison drinking the hemlock, totally out of sight of everyone, even of the guard respectfully standing outside his cell! That today we wonder what may be the meaning of such statements as “free citizen though in prison” and “freely in prison” only goes to show how far removed we are from the Greek conception of the meaning of “city” and “citizen”! The example (with all its rights and wrongs) the Greeks set, the dubious example the Athenian Court of the Five Hundred set, and the unique example Socrates set have yet to be fully comprehended in all their significance! Such as theirs civic behavior is totally beyond our modern supposedly “sophisticated civilization”!

Lesser criminals were then expelled from the Greek cities and were left to care for themselves as best they could. There were still expanses of land where one could hide himself. Today, no inch of land remains unclaimed, and no society can be imagined let alone tolerated unloading upon another its own incorrigible criminals! We, therefore, despite all developments since, continue to have a duty to consider every aspect of each our act. The human lot has not in the least changed. Rather, we are called upon to become even more circumspect of the integral problem Reality constantly poses upon us as we “advance” (toward what we still know not!), even as now the world gets visibly unified (“globalized” is now the term—a direct measure of how, alas, uncivil we truly become!).

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

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

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

§149. (a) It is on exactly this matter that we foolish men differ from God: Neither our intellect loves Logos enough, nor our love is guided perfectly! And as we act ourselves, so too do we think that the Lord acts also! Or else, at least we Christians would have developed a much better TheoLogy than the one we have attached ourselves to for so many long centuries, taking after the Asiatic mode of thinking about the Lord. After the First Oecumenical Council (A.D. 325) we “believe in one God, Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of everything that is visible and invisible” In Asiatic fashion, while we recognize God as the Father, we ignore all the attributes God as the Perfect Father cannot but have and immediately jump to His Power! And we call Him Maker, but fail to pay all due attention to all the Logical self-inspiring, purposeful, intellectual, executive etc. attributes without which no maker can be Perfect. We call Him one not One, and for all this
our incomplete reasoning we then also declare faith “in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, Who was born of the Father before all ages. Light come out of Light, True God come out of True God, begotten not made, being of the same substance as is the Father, through Whom all things were made”. Question: “Is the only son of an ordinary father of the same substance as his father [kindly forget the contribution of the mother, here we are talking of the co-substantiality! And it is unquestionable that an ordinary father is indeed co-substantial with an ordinary mother!]?” Answer: “How not so? Of course he is!” But the son is also another person! Is the Son of God another Person in the exact same sense? In an absolute monarchy, everything belongs to the king, nothing is done unless he says so, and in this very real sense he is the maker of all that is done in his kingdom. But it is also true that of himself he does nothing! He has a chief executor (and he in turn delegates authority). Is the Son of God His Father’s chief executor “through Whom all things were made”? Is the Father no more than acting as an Asiatic absolute monarch? We must answer this and all related questions also, or else we shall be accused of not having a very clear idea of the God in Whom we declare belief! Then again, we declare that the Son was “born of the Father before all ages”. Do we understand the illogicality, incongruence and antinomy of this statement?: Before the act of birth, there necessarily was indeed a time during which the Father had no Son! How then do we say that the Son was born before all ages? Will you admit that there was indeed a difference between the “all” and the all? Don’t say: “Ah, details, let me alone!” Absolutely nothing referring to the substance and essence of God is a “detail”! Everything appertaining to the substance and essence of the Lord God is the one indivisible crux! As set down in A. D. 325, the Creed was a compromise of screaming bishops all/each arguing in favor of their/each-his-own view of the Deity; it was not the anguished outcome of strict and austere Philosopher-Logicians having for very long turned repeatedly their own brains inside out before each turning in their wondrously identical, uncompromised opinion! The Church never, alas, had such all her bishops! That the Church’s understanding of God was then and in fact remains still incomplete is demonstrated by the historical fact that it was during the Second Oecumenical Council in A. C. 381 that the Creed included the remaining (8th through 12th articles), starting with the “And in the Holy Spirit, the Lord,
the Giver of life, who proceeds from the Father, Who together with the Father and the Son is worshiped and glorified”. The Great Schism of the Church over the “filioque” is the solid proof of our still inadequate understanding of God. If you give all these “details” all due proper deep thought, you cannot but conclude that all conflicts and all debates about the seeming incongruences vanish under the proposition that the Lord God is not three separate Persons, each of Himself incomplete without the other two, but One, Perfect and Complete unto Himself, possessing all attributes of αὐτεπνέεσθαι, αἰσθάνεσθαι, συναισθάνεσθαι, σκέπτεσθαι, γενικῶς καὶ ἐπὶ σκοπὸν, ἐνθραίωσθαι, καὶ γενικῶς ἐν πλήρει τελειώτητι λειτουργεῖν (self-inspiring, sensing and feeling, being fully conscious of oneself and what is opposite and/or beyond, reasoning generally and towards an objective, expressing oneself, and generally functioning in the fullest possible perfection) which all are spiritual attributes, that we still think as divided among the three Persons, to which superadded is also the power to perform works (and miracles) outside the purely spiritual realm. The Father never was or will be without the ability to express Himself, nor without the ability to inspire Himself. The Son never expresses Himself separate from the Father and the Holy Spirit. And the Holy Spirit does not dwell in the vacuum but in a Complete and Perfect unto Himself One Person. The term “Holy Trinity” expresses, in men’s inadequate understanding of personhood, the Perfection of Ultimate Personhood. And so also, it takes no great brains to comprehend how this understanding unites the fundamentals regarding God of all three monotheistic religions! Therefore, all further resistance, unless it can further improve our understanding of the Holy God, cannot possibly be from Him. The believers of all three monotheistic religions must therefore take due note, and immediately cease warring about the Essence of God: Their friction so far was due to their inadequate reasoning. Should they continue warring, it shall now be due only to their now exposed as malicious and evil intent! One need only consider the deliberate emotional sentimentalism, or the vitriolic attack against the believers of other creeds and religions always under a seeming cover of “pious sanctity”, often un-selfconscious of its own sanctimoniousness or the pure total nonsense of abstract words thrown together in an effort to “explain” what is so expressed, or the visible chagrin due even to the felt inability to hide the inability to present a solid TheoLogical argu-
ment by an ordinary “theologian”, to fathom the present true state of intra- and inter-religious affairs spilling over as naked raw feeling affecting the daily personal and social behavior even of laymen! We simply do not understand how truly expressive of our unchecked faulty conception of God all we say and do truly is!

(b) Kindly don’t return to re-argue this last question. Here we don’t discuss aprioristically-axiomatically-dogmatically the question of Who/What God is. We do it aposteriorically, having studied the physical universe, and having found it imperative to introduce the needed spiritual-mathematical attributes, which are part of the indivisible spiritual-Logical whole. And if you find that the word “miracle” offends, be kind enough to consider that the entire physical universe is nothing short of the grandest there is miracle! Once that is recognized, all else falls in its proper place!

No one who has seen a scientific laboratory, let alone one who has built one with his very hands, shall ever be found to argue that it is the product of throwing all those innumerable dice up in the air, that, on falling, they produced the operating laboratory!

It boggles the mind that there are bona fide scientists believing themselves serious when they “argue” that the operating universe is not an operating laboratory that somebody built!

§150. That somebody was none other than the one indivisible Lord-God exhibiting His capacity of ἐκφράζεσθαι, of expressing Himself, of making tangible even physically part of what He has in His Mind! That somebody was none other than the one known as the second Person of the Holy Trinity, the Lord Jesus Christ.

You have as much right to deny entrance of the Creator in His own world, as you have doing the same to a scientist who owns the laboratory he built at his own expense! But Jesus Christ did not appear in a capacity capable of persuading us of His true identity? But is it not an expression of short belief to demand that God appear as He truly is in all His Glory? Are you sure you could stand to see Him as you demand? Here you cannot stand Him even as he appeared in the very mildest form possible for the Holy God, His full Glory of Holiness: Restlessly for three whole years, including the Sabbaths, He performed miracles under the tight scrutiny of priests, supposedly worshiping God in His abode, yet unable to stand Him in person, trying but failing to find in Him the slightest fault, watching Him as ravens watch their victim. If you, Brother, can give me a better definition of Benevolent Holi-
ness walking the Earth than Jesus Christ presented to the eyes of those priests, please kindly do enlighten me! That He performed miracles even on the Sabbath was a violation of God’s or man’s strictures? Had He finally entered Jerusalem not on a humble little donkey but on an armored warhorse, surrounded by a host of similarly armed angels, and had He delivered the world on the platter to those very priests, as they expected that the Messiah would, please be honest and tell me: would they all not be at His feet, the staunchest “would be Christian” yet hardest masters of the world? [Let us all be objective: Here we do not accuse solely the Jews: No nation in their position would have done otherwise. Even the Greeks under Alexander had not done so; and to this day, no nation aspiring to world domination does not believe it does so under God’s orders and protection, regardless of whether they admit it or not. That they believe in this or that conception of God makes no difference! They believe it to be their “destiny”, not their greed! That says it all! Nor is it only the nations, but even the priesthoods of the religions. See how they treat their faithful, whom they literally milk, supposedly under Christ’s license, calling themselves their shepherds! Compare Christ’s service and Holiness to theirs! Don’t for Truth’s sake dismiss God for the doings of men! Teach yourself to see the distinction! It is not in the interests of the people on top to teach you that! Each shall receive his just reward. Temptation comes in many forms, and the excuses of men are countless! Nor does the Jews’ claim that the Romans crucified the Lord stand serious scrutiny: Pontius Pilate found no fault in Him. Rather than Justice, he chose the interests of the empire: he sacrificed an innocent man in order to avoid having to quell a major riot, when besides, he was told by the priests, no other, that if he did other than as they demanded he would be accused of covering up somebody opposing the deity of the emperor! Pilate was protecting the peace and his own head! It is always dangerous to go to war against the dicta of the priests, and if you do, you better have an insuperable argument. Nor was it true that their Law forbade killing: They had stoning! But cunningly, they judged stoning, which having not come to his attention they hid from Pilate, not exemplary enough! Then again, had Jesus Christ opposed the Romans, the Jews must be judged for the fact of completely neglecting during two thousand years to honor Him at least for resisting the occupier! To this day,
they would rather see His name completely excised from men’s memory! It is the name of the heir in the parable of the farmers asked to deliver the produce of the vineyard they were hired to cultivate! Today, we all commit a disservice attempting literally to burn history rather than diligently learning from it! Ours is all the world’s history, and the present clash of civilizations is still more aflame by those flames! The clash shall be quelled only in our hot, not hypocritical, tears!] Their rejection of Him was for the gift He brought to them [to us all; who in their position would not have acted at all differently!]: The gift not of world mastery, that we all idiotically seek, but the gift of the example of Holiness that indeed conquers the Heavens! Alas! Such a gift is no good for the lazy, nor for the soft-handed, nor for the weak-minded, nor for the narrow-hearted. It takes hard labor, worked hands, a strong dedicated mind, a broad heart to embrace and conquer the Heavens! Not everyone is willing to deposit the sweat this worthy conquest demands! So it is that we all are constrained to the “Kyrie Eleison”! So it is that there are people freely choosing to spend some sweat in order that the world completely forget the Lord’s example of Holiness! Rather than work their way Up, they choose the abyss! Solely in order that they spite the Lord. So we now all see their already accomplished result: the world, starting from the environs of Jerusalem, has already begun to turn into ashes! We all are insane who think of vast future possessions. It is ashes we shall inherit! It is ashes we shall bequeath! Acting insanity’s just reward! Will you call me a pessimist? I see the rivers of blood that with untold malice we shed daily—solely in order to tell the world the details! What do you only see, Brother, dollars, pounds, euros and yens? It is Easter time again. And the deadly poison is out again: Shamelessly in all manner attacking the Lord! Some directly, some indirectly; the latter by pretending piety, aiming at the collections! Don’t get confused: We started out to examine the connection of Religion to Logos. Having found it severed, we could not but find religion having become irReligion, and Logos become empty insane words! We still wonder who Jesus Christ was. The One Lord God personally teaching us Holiness! The true Owner of the vineyard, judging all the workers in it! Tremble, Brother, no longer the Judgment: that is being already enacted, but the Just Judge’s final gavel! Not much more is left to be done!
§151. I have considered it necessary to include Chapter 24, though it deals with what are called “highly sensitive matters”. I discussed them with all severity that I deemed necessary in order that all the better we all finally become acutely conscious of the compelling necessity (for we must feel it as such) to understand the vast difference that exists between subjectivity, to which we falsely have subjugated even the “science” of the physicists and the objectivity of the real world the Science of which cannot mince words, however “sensitive” we choose to regard certain matters. As for personal offense, I naturally meant none whatever; I never had personal dealings with the people whose writings, all in the public domain, I had to analyze in order to show how intertwined Physics and Theology, both principal aspects of our integral personal and social lives, truly are, despite the ill-considered teachings of centuries. In the strictest of senses, there are no atheists!: They all believe in a God. Some confess Him to be a Person. Some call Him Nothing! A Person does not have to be physical; in truth, a Person is not physical! We talk face to face; but it is not the faces that speak to each other; those are only our physical masks, and not only are they trainable to appear to be this or that in almost no time, but they also are carefully trained to and speak with both ends of the mouth! Then, they or their spokesmen (i.e., other masks) undertake to make “sense” of the deliberate verbal mess, delivered by the earlier masks, but designed to say this or that or both at once by the mind hidden behind! We said it once; and we
shall repeat it: the brain is matter, like the face, only softer; but it is not mind! Einstein’s brain was sliced! Most certainly not his mind! Why is it so difficult for the professors to understand that? Such professors, regard their person insulted, but they don’t understand that they far more than anyone else first insult their persons by admitting allegiance to Nothing! Which they confess their God! Nothing is nothing at all! And it produces nothing at all! Those, therefore, who believe in nothing at all first insult themselves as progeny of the nothing at all that preceded them, and then insult their audiences! Such speakers choose not to object to such their teachings, though they insult their parents and all their lineage; the audiences, however, are entitled, if they so freely choose, to take offense!: Now then, with correspondingly greater justification than that of the professors who feel insulted when the audiences do not take kindly the insults proffered from on high by the ultimate meaning of Nothing delivered! Atheism is the belief in the “God” called Nothing! Speeches delivered?: Poisoned feathers carried on the “wings of winds”! On the other hand, scripta manent! The poison becomes permanent. The written atheism is not simply ink dried on paper, in order to transmit the heavy written word, loaded with meaning! It is the ultimate negation of the exhausting process of committing to paper the entire civilization of this planet, and all its history—of the civilization, not just merely of the planet! Because, Nothing, also means meaninglessness. So, by what right do the believers in Nothing use the heavy written holy words? How do they dare attempt to destroy, to empty, what by nature cannot be rendered meaningless, the heavy holy words and the lives of generations spent in forming them, not just their outer shape but the solid inner Reality of the Spirit they contain?

§152. (a) What professors teach from their chairs, the podiums offered them, and the books they write affect personally all of us everywhere, rich and poor, in the “North” and the “South”, literate and illiterate, educated and uneducated, people who understand the significance of every word and every equation and people who do not! Mainly the professors, but also all those who stand on the podiums may not throw about words loosely! For they are sharper than Japanese swords that split hairs alongside in half! And they cut and kill not only bodies, but also the consciences they house! In fact, they cut and kill the bodies, after they
have already done all possible damage to the consciences within! Now, what consciences do professors have who are not conscious of the hard fact that conscience (= con science) forms after all the science commanded by the individual comes together to inform one’s consciousness? Most of them simply assume, hypothesize, theorize, that all is built on simple, but mostly unexamined assumptions, thrown together. The result, at the absolute best, can only be what the assumptions that are thrown together really mean. Most of the time, what we know doesn’t even come close to that level! Yet, so much are the professors carried away by this their “accomplishment”, that they have the temerity to call what they produce “Science” and firm knowledge of the objective world!

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

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

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

(b) The market, both this and that side, is secretly fixed! Both sides attempt to corner the market! The competition is fierce, literally deadly: It is called MONOPOLY, on a small planet, with ever more stomachs to feed, ever greater, insatiable appetites to satisfy, demanding ever more of everything that is supposed to please the human senses—except, that is, what truly is decent of anthropos! After the Second World War that cost more than a hundred million lives, the Third War was fought with totally other means, so much so that the victors couldn’t believe their victory: The shock of the sudden loss of the “Evil Empire” left the victors with the sharply biting hunger of “what do we do now without an
enemy, how do we satiate and justify the habit?”! Because MONO-
POLY takes two to be properly “played”, we needed a worthy op-
ponent, but none offered himself. Europe had caused two Great
Wars, and it risked a third one through her demand that she too
be covered, by what in the end turned out to be the only-five min-
ute warning, not even enough to make two decent phone calls! It
soon dawned on us that the “Evil Empire” would not just let be
destroyed along with Europe and leave us intact! We attempted
to devise the “Stars War” plan. We had a Hollywood actor for
President. On the screen, all seemed easy. The nation began to
spend real money taken from its future! The “Evil Empire” sim-
ply did not have, having from its own inception rejected it, this
sort of will and financial expertise! So, it capitulated! And as be-
fits the defeated, it gave up huge expanses of territory of its own
West to the victors. Now, it attempts to become leaner and mean-
er, but in fact just one like us! No, for quite some time, it won’t
do as an enemy. So, we were left with the East Asian Dragon and
the Tiger of the Subcontinent! Only they too were still much too
weak! We had to help them get stronger so that we then set them
up as proper opponents! When they began to show nail and tooth,
we saw that two and a half billion people brought to our stan-
dard of living meant real business, which we simply could not let
run rampant as does ours, even as it meant at least another bil-
lion automobiles added. Excellent for huge profits, catastrophic
for the price of oil and the time span until the wells run scorched
sand dry! [As for what air we shall breathe the world over, with
so much pollution and rising heat (call it temperature), i.e., the
thermal death inevitably attending the “economic development”
of patently idiot politicians and financiers on a limited planet, not
a sensible word!] So, we attempted to prop up at once both the
Far Eastern markets and the the price of oil, with all the planet
under our tight control! Excuses were made out of gossamer.
Countries in between were invaded. To pump up oil and keep it
under our control, we need to send down real hot human blood,
even if some of it be our own! “Our own” only in name, only of
our poor! That are an embarrassment, even as they man the bri-
gades and constitute fodder! It is to them that the patriotic an-
thems are sold. The rest are simply watching, wave the flag, and
stay determined to play the market! To get the support of the na-
tion we needed a script, with the proper ingredients of eastern
entrepreneurial expertise, unparalleled western ability to make it come alive on screen, and southern “reborn” faith in both beef and “God”. The team players were called “Neo-conservatives” (an improbable mixture of supposed devout “Christians” and Jews)! Coming also in equal mixtures of “Science” and purported “Religion”: Imagery of the “Shiny City” up on top of the Mountain, “Jerusalem”, Armageddon, hellfire, gore and mayhem; and fittingly to crown it all with the horns of the Devil on its head, the image of the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center coming to crush down in the Inferno! The whole show was directed as nothing before Hollywood had ever attempted! Cameras were preset to record the coming catastrophe! That, simply, could not stay hidden! Themselves the pictures do tell where and how the cameras stood! On the platter was the needed excuse served! Proclaiming the appearance of the “New Evil Empire” caused the calling to arms the “Crusaders”; and in totally fitting response the “Jihad”! That the Holy God is profaned does not matter a bit! He is ours, but not that we worship Him, but that He serve us! See how the world wide priesthood of all three monotheistic religions protested! More idiotic observers the world had not seen before! Fittingly has the marriage of “Science” and “Religion” been blessed in the temple called the New York Stock Exchange.

(c) The names “Science” and “Religion” as today are used by the marketeers of ideas are phony, but still useful remnants of a past almost forgotten! The New York Times of November 21, 2006 in its Science Section tells the “Free-for-all debate on Science and Religion” the world only reads but does not really comprehend, but not because they cannot, but because the actors on the well set up stage are simply not persuasive: The venomous antitheistic attack by the principals Steven Weinberg [“the more the universe seems comprehensible the more it also seems pointless”, “the world needs to wake up from its long nightmare of religious belief” and “anything that we scientists can do to weaken the hold of religion should be done and may in the end be our greatest contribution to civilization” and calling “religion a crazy old aunt”, whom “when she is gone, we may miss”], Richard Dawkins [with his take-no-prisoners approach, calling religious faith “God Delusion” and the education it provides “brainwashing” and “child abuse” and declaring that “[he] won’t miss the ‘crazy old aunt’ not a scrap, not a smidgen”] and their side, and the creationist camp around the Templeton Foundation...
on the opposite side once again got on stage and crossed swords, but the marriage is real, happy and indissoluble: funds are collected, the players still stage the surrealist play. So what if the people need solid answers no stage side has enough faith in its own bag of tricks by which to pull the needed proof out? And what if the Holy God is profaned? Of course all these people have nothing to do with the Objective Reality! That’s what the people want grasped! But those on the stage simply are not equipped to grasp It! And their bags of tricks are too small to contain It!

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

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

(b) Then realize that given an immovable Natural Law, no other Natural Law can contradict it! Nature may not and is not confused solely for the fact that she never is called upon to choose between or among mutually contradictory Laws, the inner strictly rational structure of which remains invisible to us, yet solely for the fact that we (namely our professors) have not recognized (because they refuse to do so!) the basic rationality of her system of Laws! That’s how disorder in Nature is avoided! Confused are only those who throw about mutually incongruent theories and so-called “laws” standing in mutual conflict. This is why professorial theories get into trouble; for the fact that they refuse to recognize the natural order described by age-old statements referring (in)directly to it, yet in a manner that is accessible even to people not steeped up in the way of academic expressions! In what other spirit do you think was the question “Are grapes gathered from thorns, or figs from thistles?” (Matt. 7, 16)? Solely for this failure do still the professors insist on theories of disorder, chance and uncertainty; all of which Nature under the strict application of objective rational Law has never adopted and human language has since long ago already repudiated; which no self-respecting person permits oneself to ignore in the name of some presumed “science”! In a not too old article by Carol Kaesuk Yoon published under the title “Is Evolution Truly Random” in the New York Times, the admission is made that “scientists have begun ... finding that what they thought were the random vagaries of evolution are not so random at all”, after Loren H. Rieseberg of Indiana State University stated that “[t]here is a lot of phenomenal data coming out [to the effect that] there’s clearly more to repeatability than we’d suspected a decade ago”, whose Group “found evidence that evolution can repeatedly produce the same species”, and Richard E. Lenski at Michigan State said that “a lot of studies are finding quite a lot of surprising replicability of evolutionary outcomes”. Surprising in the face of the accepted “wisdom” of such as Stephen Jay Gould that “any replay [of history] would lead evolution down a pathway radically different from the road actually taken”. Though the view “seems impossible that anything like life on earth today, given how it has been reshaped by accidents large and small could actually re-evolve” [this being a slightly here re-cast statement of C. K Yoon report], this indeed is phenomenally contradicted by the findings of the Lenski Group who
back in 1988 set up a dozen of genetically identical populations of E. coli bacteria in 12 separate flasks of broth and have since observed their evolutionary fates over more than 30000 bacterial generations, only to discover “what is becoming one of the most striking examples of repeatability yet, [namely that] all 12 populations show the same patterns of improvement in their ability to compete in a bottle and increases in cell size; all 12 have also lost their ability to break down and use the sugar called ribose; and more surprising, many genetic changes underlying these adaptations are very similar [as] every population, for example lost its ability to break down ribose by losing a long stretch of DNA from the same gene”. And some scientists, like Simon Conway Morris of the University of Cambridge who argues “that some features are so adaptive that they are essentially inevitable”, admit that “the evidence for repeatability is rampant”. What other is truly all this than that what is called evolution is not at all chancy or random but follows the carefully laid down underlying Laws? When nothing simple exists without the strict Law that supports it, how indeed can it be that the more complex organisms made up of simple things stand without an even more all-encompassing Law? There is nothing in the Universe more complex than an advanced (the most advanced) living organism! That it reproduces itself with (practically) no mistake (but for causes unknown), this simply cannot be accidental! Will the professors at long last find the courage to admit that there is no sensible effect without a strict underlying Law, and no such a Law without Lawgiver? That all effects and only effects do indeed have their causes, and what seems to be only an “accidental” effect, it is so called for our ignorance or neglect of its cause?

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

§155. (a) Responsibly looking around in all of Science as it has always stood, regardless of our own firm understanding of the significance of what we for so long have been seeing, we find on-
ly one Law that truly stands out as a reliable candidate for letting us see through all human conventions to the world of objective hard facts. It is the same Law that secures us firmly on Earth, has taken us to the stars and has safely brought us back: Newton’s Law of gravitation, traditionally written as \( F = G \frac{m_1 m_2}{r^2} \), but still better written as \( F = G \frac{m_1}{r_1} \frac{m_2}{r_2} \). Its simplicity, scope universality are arresting. True, to discover it we use rods, clocks and balances. To a surprising degree, the law holds true. Its perceived weaknesses are not free of our suppositions and definitions of rods, clocks and balances: There is nothing in objective Nature that demands the separation \( r \) to be singular and measured along the Euclidean straight line joining the two masses! This is an as yet unevaluated assumption we have made, that may or may not be true, and can definitively be settled by a separate objective Law that alone determines how the separations are to be measured. [As every mass acts as a center of gravitational attraction, in a many-body universe, a test particle starting from the second mass and ending up in the first cannot but follow a different path from a test particle moving in the opposite direction, as both paths depend on the momentary placement of all masses in the universe as seen from the two main masses considered as centers. This is why the above is the correct way of writing down Newton’s Law, that only thus, i.e., supplemented by this Law of separations recognizes the presence of the entire universe in which it operates and makes for a neutral, completely favor-free, application of a Law over the entire universe!] If our assumption of the Euclidean path is not correct [and now, viewed as above from the universal perspective it cannot be correct], the perihelia of the planets will precess!

(b) Responsibly looking around besides, we must confess that there is nothing in objective Nature that demands that the planet not gain or lose mass as it accelerates (and thus gains energy) or decelerates (and thus loses energy) in its orbit. It is irresponsible to build a whole “science” on the mere assumption that there is no correlation between the force acting on a planet and the energy it gains or looses on the one hand and the mass simultaneously gained or lost by it on the other. If \( f = \frac{dp}{dt} \) and \( p = mv \), it is an erroneous supposition that \( dp = mdv \) rather than \( dp = mdv + vdm \). The former is no stronger assertion of the conservation of mass than the latter. Conservation of mass does not necessarily mean that every ordinary body conserves its mass regardless of how it
moves, but only that the universe as a whole conserves its mass! As the mass of the universe is distributed among a constant number of equal (for if not equal we still have transfer of mass between) Democritean atoms, or else we have a constant creation and disappearance of Democritean atoms and violation of the constancy of universal mass, then necessarily as energy depends on mass and a planet gains or loses energy, it also gains or loses the corresponding mass coming always in the form of Democritean atoms, in each of which a unit of energy (not yet proven to be constant!) is invested! Seen in this manner, the acquisition by a body of energy altogether ceases to be a process of a mysterious cause, as it involves always the corresponding to it acquisition of mass, in terms of which alone is energy not only defined but is now seen to be also transferred. If energy really is $\epsilon = mc^2$, then even if you assume $c$ to be constant, then necessarily $\delta \epsilon = (\delta m)c^2$, and thus a planet does not remain of constant mass. When a planet takes or gives up mass, the principle $\Sigma(m) = \text{constant}$ is not violated and the relationship $dp = m dv + v dm$ leads naturally and independently of relativity to the very same mass-velocity relationship claimed by relativity, while then also the perihelion of the planet precesses!

(c) On the other hand, considering matters responsibly, we must confess that if Newton’s Law were so overloaded with supposition that its objective universal nature was hidden from view, it would be impossible for us to find, which we do, that $G$ is universally constant. No human supposition can force the value of $G$ produced from the Cavendish experiment to be identical to that obtained from astronomical observation. The numerical value of $G$ can change with the units of mass, length and time, but it is not intervention that produces the same value for $G$ in all sorts of experiments when the same units are used; the physical dimensionality of $G$ can not be be made to vanish! In other words, $G$ constitutes a hard fact of Nature, too pervasive, too central, just utterly universal to be ignored.

(d) This re-discussion of matters already discussed is meant to show how moral and intellectual responsibility may not be separated, because responsibility is either altogether complete, or it simply does not exist! And this is not confined to matters of Science or of “science” but involves all aspects of life; that being ignored offers a secure footing to atheism to invade and erode the complete social structure! Yet, it is by “Churches” and “universi-
ties” that this truly *universal* vision of the world is *deliberately* being ignored and kept hidden, solely because it offends mortally the “establishment”!

§156. (a) An “establishment” that to this age continues to behave as the Cavalleria Rusticana did in the days of old, *stubbornly continuing despite the facts to see the world narrowly as consisting solely of its valley and the surrounding mountains!* It obviously was not for nothing that Kitty Ferguson mentions the old oak chair she inherited from her grandparents: Because, closely examined, that old chair ceases to be just only what we all see it to be and becomes a *veritable universe in disguise*: atoms in empty space. And atoms, we all now see, are themselves universes made seemingly of electrons and protons and the swarm of so-called particles of all too dubious existence and presence “discovered” in the machines of high energy physics, *all* of them composed of Democritean atoms. *If* we had a mechanically impossible microscope-telescope of *adjustable yet infinite* resolving power and depth of field, there would be nothing physical we would not see with it; all the way to the deep darkness beyond the frontier. We just do not stop even for only a moment to realize that everything physical is a *veritable celestial body* hanging along with the entire rich company in the void. We all recall the image of Carl Sagan telling us solemnly of the beauty above; which makes the astronomers proud for having the privilege of observing it nightly: In essence, the *brute* power of *disorganized yet needed* Fire! We are fooled by what we see under the microscopes, *all of them of insufficient* resolving power to disclose the far far greater glory of *that same brute Firepower by Law brought under total control in the meticulously organized universe within!* The universe consists of about $10^{120}$ Democritean atoms. One of us weighing 75 kg consists of about $10^{69}$ such atoms. The entire universe consists of the equivalent of “only” $10^{58}$ grams of mass. The *organized universes, that for remaining globally uncultivated peasants unconsciously of what they are truly walk on this poor earth as in fact they do, ignore cavalierly the hard physical fact that they themselves are celestial bodies of such beauty and purpose that is nowhere else told in the heavens! “Purpose?”, you will ask! And “Yes!”, do I reply!: As that all seeing microscope-telescope is mechanically impossible to produce [and if it weren’t, what we *would* see by the mind would still have to be processed!], why before the Heavens do we insist refusing in
it to process the complete picture of the world that we already collect piecemeal? Here we are talking of the Pythagorean “know thyself” brought up to the context of the entire Uni-verse! Because, for all we know, we alone are its sole living and thus sensing it conscience! Even the atheist scientists, it is over that that they consume their lives! Isn’t that a sufficient first purpose? So, it is not just I/we that demand to have the ultimate answer! It is the entire Creation that by us seeks to find its Raison d’ être! How then dare the atheists tell the entire Creation that “It all is nothing, come from nothing, destined to nothing?” And all this for the spiteful, the vitriolic unwillingness to accept the offer of free choice of Holiness, consciously overlooking which even Nobel laureates freely choose to go for nothing? Alas! By such people are we formed! Look at us, at what we engage, stubbornly ignorant of who we are! “Educated”, even in the very best schools, even by professors who claim to have fathomed the heavens, to repeat by rote, unsieved by the intellect within, the lessons they surreptitiously branded in our soft brains! Which is how “tradition”, literally of all sorts, is alas being passed on!

[Nobel laureates of the exact sciences still dare hide behind the inexactitude of the theory of evolution and its escape behind “development”! They are satisfied to speak of the “chemical bond”, that, e.g., in water sets the two hydrogen atoms at a distance of 0.96×10⁻⁸ cm from the oxygen atom standing at the apex of an angle of 104.5°, but they have yet to produce the convincing quantum-theoretical explanation, based on the exact disposition in space of the electrons, that so bond together the molecule of water. Water makes that bond by far the most plentiful on this planet, and without that bond there could have been absolutely no life on earth! Still, they all, atheist physicists, chemists, and biologists speak of evolution and the “development” of the species, but they “forget” to explain how even that H₂O bond “developed”! And they show us only the schematic picture to the double helix of DNA (that is a flexible “ladder” spiraling about its axis made up of two polyphosphate backbones held together by side chains of nucleotides forming its “steps”) without a single word of the hard-fact physics based on Law that determines the way the electrons are shared by the adjacent atoms that hold together all this complex, but obviously not in the least spurious structure! When
all this complexity is held together based on hard Law, and upon cell division the DNA produces on its own exact of itself copies obviously based on Law, it simply cannot be either science or honesty that has the temerity to call the evolution of species simply “development” due to “mistakes” that are, however, still subject to the still unknown underlying Laws of the bonding of atoms by electrons! “Nucleic acids are as large as, or larger than, the largest protein molecules, with molecular weights ranging into the hundreds or millions. They are as important as, or more important than, proteins to the working of living tissue”\(^{44}\). It is they in toto that make us all complete to perfection, bone for perfect adjoining bone, flesh and variegated tissue, organ for organ, from hair and nail to brain and marrow of bones, all performing exact functions—except for the “mistakes” that are not mistakes at all but exactments due to the confluence of conditions that cause the misbonding of atoms, conditions that ought never to have been allowed to pass. Throw your deck of cards to eternity: The story of the complete You, whether you regard yourself a natural “success” or a natural “failure”, by the cards shall never be told! Nobel laureates still speak of “evolution”, “development”, “chance” and meaninglessness. To the exact extent to which they have resolved to struggle for the passing of this their “message” to the world, they themselves prove exactly this to be their personal though ill-conceived purpose! The Uni-verse allows this aberration, in due respect of their personal freedom: Even as it means exposing the extent of the gratitude they feel towards the Law that keeps them alive! For the obvious need that the rest of us learn even from this ultimate negative lesson of blasphemy!

With which heavily loaded, we simply do not comprehend the unity of the Uni-verse of which we are the very best parts, alas by such teachers taught how “best” daily to commit ever greater blasphemy!

(b) Tradition of old origin Eastern: King David tells of himself, “Ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἐν ἀνόμιαῖς συνέλήφθη, καὶ ἐν ἀμαρτίαις ἐκέλευσέ με ἡ μητέρ μου” \[^{318}\] \[^{318}\] \[^{318}\] \[^{318}\] \[^{318}\] \[^{318}\] [in exact meaning: “Look at me: In iniquities was the seed

that produced me ejected, and in sins did my mother receive the seed that produced me” (Psalm 51, 5), in effect laying the blame for his iniquities to his parents for from the start having produced him in iniquities and in “sins”, whom he thus judges, and proceeds to find them guilty! But logically, this reference to his own immediate cause does not terminate at it: it goes all the way back, from his parents on to the whole Creation and, ultimately, on to the Creator, Whom he thus orientally dares address! This generation of Easterners, so “piously” taught, lives on! And they are not any more solely of Jewish extraction: The psalm is read in the original Septuagint even during Holy Week in the Greek Orthodox churches! English translations attempt to hide the meaning by blunting the language! Just count the Davids [the beloved ones, obviously by their parents first of all!] around the entire world; who, named in honor of the original David, by thus returning the favor, permit the profanity to live on and inform our lives! The evil knows all too well where to hit to obtain a kill: At the heart of the matter! The blasphemy of Holy God is never greater than when it is purposefully spread to affect the holy procreative act, so that it make us all children of sin! Thus it is that the “higher” Orthodox and the entire Roman Catholic Christian clergy remain unmarried, to avoid committing the “sin”! Thus it is that women are still being believed to be a lower specie and in certain religions are not even allowed within their temples! The belief is not confined among men: among women does it spread also, desiring to avoid the “sin”: Thus it is that the orders of nuns are also created! But, aren’t all “religious” useful? Of course, but they do not perform all their duties, but only those they consider to be their duties!: For it obviously is not enough to have monks-priests and nun-teachers!: We need more Christian citizens, who properly considering all their duties will spread among the general population and by their constant exemplary presence in all decent walks of life inform the entire society how the Christians ought to fulfill their duties, not just as thoughtless-unquestioning, obedient servants, clerks, plant managers, company directors, but even as dutiful intellectuals, research workers, professors, and parents producing even more Christian the following generation! Isn’t it obvious that by not so doing, but solely acting as they traditionally do, all these “religious” are in effect thinning by this sort of unconscious selective breeding the percentage of true Christians in the general
population as the generations pass? Without the action here proposed, is it not obvious that the “faith” withers to an ever more pitiful state? Is truly Christian the European or American general social life? That the faithful go weekly to church most certainly is not enough! We simply may not call ourselves people of God by so seeming to “devote” ourselves to God, while we truly devote ourselves to the Mammon for at least six days every week! No, I do not propose that we spend all seven days of the week in church! I propose that we make churches all our lives, our desks, our thoughts, our total behavior, our researches, our dissatisfaction with the current modus vivendi et operandi in the world, that clearly is not informed of God’s everpresence; of else the world wouldn’t walk as it does, guided by such politicians, presidents, legislators, judges, advisers, generals, financiers, bankers, directors, professors, citizens and all other voters!

(c) It is not just the “religious”, who acting as they do and remaining celibate attempt to elevate themselves from the level of the general populace [who thus freely choose to commit “sin”] to a higher level of “grace”, with whom one has to contend, but in addition with all those also who learned their lessons upon their knees, even as there have been centuries since! Because, the very same pharisaical arrogance met directly in the story of the healed blind [”Ἐν ἁμαρτίας σὺ ἐγεννήθης οἶδοσ, καὶ σὺ διάθεκες ἡμᾶς.”, literally: In sins wast thou entirely first conceived and then born, and now dost thou teach us? (John 9, 34)] has also imbued the branch called Academy, that was first taught upon the knees of the Church during the Middle Ages. So it is that even I am now asked how indeed I dare introduce a “new” God, Who has not passed the imprimatur of the Church and Academy, who silently for their total lack of serious counter-argument still exercise the power to prevent every new thought that attempts to limit the darkness by letting the Light to spread! How indeed have I dared forget the lesson the world was taught by juridically poisoning Socrates? Well, the “establishment”, both “scientific” and “clerical”, has indeed lost though only some of its teeth, but by no means all of them! By the teeth they still have, outwardly seeming exquisitely polite and cordial, they nevertheless still apply that much greater spitefully biting pressure! For it all too well can, colluding, bury all dissenters alive in silence! By such people guided is blasphemy continuing to advance! But the signs are now ripe: “As the seed, such the
fruit”; as their long-centuries-old teaching has been, so too the planet can no longer bear us: Only now does it just begin to be understood that, for the unity of Creation that dutifully expected more from us, in its hot tears (getting continuously hotter by the extra waste heat we produce in our maniacal search for ever more instantaneous material satisfaction of our insatiable appetite for more matter, not Spirit!) will this planet slowly simmer us; in order to cleanse itself of the sin committed upon it! In case dull minds still do not get it: we, thus during long centuries taught, are the devils that fan the flames of Hell!

(d) War has been called “politics by other means”. Conversely, politics, too, is no less than war! Having as object the truly big profits of both so-called “Peace”-and-War! In it, the blood of men and ultimately their Spirit is no object! The more of them both we waste, the greater do the profits become! The fools we are, we simply do not understand that the profits fan ever hotter the flames! No! In this thoroughly dirty business, in which principally the faithful of all three monotheistic religions engage, with all others not at all minding giving a hand, don’t ever believe any partaking side! Left, middle and right, obedient citizens, just as also all anarchists simply position themselves as best they expect the profits in the market to be disbursed! Their motto is this: “Long live the Hell! May it never freeze!” Only the fools won’t ever see that, in the now definitely fast coming End, this wish shall be granted them! The Lord and His Justice shall not much longer be mocked!

§157. (a) All the physical and logical hard facts so far discussed present a horrendous problem for the atheists and blasphemers under all pseudonyms in every corner, niche and hideout on this blessed but for our acts made pitiful globe: they are challenged to disprove the reasoning and the structure of the universe thus revealed and, by still stronger reasoning, to justify what, in the absence of such stronger reasoning, inevitably show themselves to be their multiple blunders. And if they cannot do so, they are challenged to explain scientifically how it was possible, purely by chance or its own legislative and executive powers, for the universe so to organize and arrange itself right from the start! And if they cannot do this either, how it is still possible to accept the view that the universe does not need a Creator! The statement that there is out there an infinity of universes (all invisible, except
this one!) arranging themselves purely by chance in all sorts of ways, one of which is the one here revealed, is not Science, that as already discussed must be based on absolutely firm knowledge, but an altogether suspect purely religious belief presented solely in order to counter the Logical belief in the Creator of this so-structured universe! This their attempt to escape could perhaps stand as an argument if they could just point to us a, say, austere Doric column standing here on earth, self-made by pure chance, i.e., totally without the intervention of the human mind and hands! The chances of such a happening must be judged exponentially vastly superior to those they imply about the universe, since as regards this one column, all the other requisites are here already, except for the interference of the creating human! The silence of the atheists is understandable, but so also is their dishonesty, demonstrated glaringly by their silence, the two together being the solid proof they provide of the infallibility of the reasoning here developed on Newton’s Law! That they have the monopoly on so-called “scientific” and popular publications in which they are given ample room to expound volubly, but not persuasively, on their views isn’t surprising: all the social forces hiding behind the media are in tacit collusion against the Creator! Their own corruption is so well known to themselves that, in order to hide it from the public, they must shake all belief in Order; and the best way to begin doing so is none other than cursing the sacred ground on which we all stand!: When that is equated to the dirt, waste, filth, excrement and rotting corpses they proudly dare exhibit daily to the world on high-definition living-color screens, in the general effort to “argue” for the total meaninglessness of everything for being a product of chance and nothingness, all the unspeakable crimes, committed right in front of all decent inhabitants of this sorrowful Earth who are in this manner deliberately kept speechless and numb, cannot be passed as a moral aberration but only as a mere appearance of just another possibility! Do we all, powerful and powerless, understand that? Nothing gives the militant atheists greater pleasure than their so-contrived public “disproof” of God, Whom they do not even condescend to mention by name; and nothing gives those pillars of “learning” and social stature greater chagrin than being found wrong and unable to dispel the charge of their bottomless indivisible intellectual and moral dishonesty!

(b) But the argument cuts both ways: In the face of the dis-
proof of a young universe, nor can the “creationists” still insist on their old views and claim intellectual honesty for themselves! For them the question truly is far more weighty: Are they prepared for the sake of the far far greater good of accepting this scientifically proven creation of the Living Creator God, to sacrifice their own theologically and scientifically “(in?)consequential” notion of a young earth [in order to continue offering their public support to the “holiness” of every word, and that all too frequently mistranslated, of ancient “holy” writings, now proven erroneous by none other than the creation itself of Holy God] and to stand beside these findings, or will they continue, like those others, to support their earlier own beliefs now shown erroneous? Will they at long last understand that by continuing to hold fast to that notion, they thus elevate to supreme doctrine their own importance, even as it is being refuted by the creation of God, Whom they thus only appear to adore in the stubborn service solely of themselves? Will they at last understand that by so acting, it is the earlier glorification of God on Whose behalf they profess to act that upon the altar they now consciously sacrifice, rather than their only ever so slightly by comparison nicked egos, nicked by the consequential mistake of believing men’s ancient writings, critically unexamined, to be superior to the direct in the heavens writing of the Lord? For, obviously, if they too cannot disprove these here findings, and they too choose to keep silent, they shall show that for them, their only slightly nicked egos count for far more than those of the atheists!!! If such “believers” and such “scientists” keep silent in the face of such news, how can it be shaken that in unison do they act pushing the world ever deeper into the bottomless pit of ever greater moral depravity—for nothing other than what each of them regards of supreme value over and beyond God’s Truth and Justice? When that is done ambilaterally how can we ignore that the end does indeed fast come upon us? Of all Holy God’s virtues, only His patience is not inexhaustible, as that would mean equating vice to virtue and canceling His Holy Justice! How can it by such “believers” be missed that their own responsibility increases far faster than that of the atheists with every breath they draw in silent unison with them? For, is it not true that their now conscious silence for the sake of their confessed “faith” will indeed be more blasphemous and direct than that of the atheists? Was not his ego that counseled Adam to sin?
Who truly thinks can escape the consequences of playing dirty games behind God’s Holy Name?? King Solomon’s Temple fell because it carried his name! The Parthenon and the Temple of Holy Wisdom fell because for the Greeks, too, to empty shells the heavy words were reduced! The rest of Christianity has dedicated magnificent Temples to this or that Saint, standing antagonistically against each other, all for the sinful occupant bishop’s sake [and only dull minds may fail to draw the due lesson from these here words!], not one directly to the Sinless Lord Christ, the God Himself made Man, for the sake of Victory over evil even at our level! We, having understood nothing, continue to choose evil! Some creationists state that the question of a young universe is secondary! Not quite! Indeed, not quite! Because even that is an indelible part of the writing in the heavens! Nothing done by God is secondary, everything has its place! And we owe it our corresponding to it respect! Neither more, nor less! Well???

(c) Brother, please mind this: I most categorically do not mean to put you on the spot, any more than it is incumbent on all us Christians to put each other on the spot for the Glory of God. I do not see you or anyone as an enemy, but as a fellow sufferer in this state of being; It shall be the same Heaven we shall enjoy, and the same hell we shall endure; as God is One, and all the rest we may choose stands against Him! As a brother and for the Love of God do I fervently hope that than mine your faith is greater! So, I don’t expect you to charge me with “bad manners” for so bluntly stating all these tastefully bitter truths! As you well know, true politeness and Truth do not conflict, and it is not a Christian nor a true believer in God whoever demands that the Truth not be told for the sake of what the “world” calls “politeness”!

§158. (a) As it is not a legitimate excuse for a scientist [see §117b, pp. 212-3], it is neither for a creationist sensible to attempt saying that the above analysis of G, on which all this effort was based, though pointing to facts and agreements with independent findings already on record, is nevertheless based on a pure coincidence; namely, that the G entering the Law of gravitation as so far “understood” (but, obviously, not in fact comprehended!) is in fact “different” from that seen in the light of the present analysis and all that attends it! It is exactly because the atheists understand that such a coincidence is impossible because the logic of the above analysis cannot be refuted, that they consciously
choose to bury this whole effort in silence! It follows that, even less may Creationists and believers in God in any way suggest that such a central question and any coincidence could have escaped the attention of God, Whose Wisdom overlooks nothing!

(b) Nor, of course, is it legitimate to contend that “we theologians and creationists are both scientists and believers, but we are more believers than scientists, and for the sake of the greater good we are forced to take the Bible at its very every word on the belief that it is the Word of God, and so to reject the analysis of G along with all the consequences that attend it”! Religious leaders obviously have it in them to claim that what they write down is the Word of God: otherwise, they will simply not be believed! But nobody has so far claimed that the entire Bible in whatever language is the exact word of the Hand of God! On the contrary, all believers believe that the World is the exact Creation of the “Hand” of God! And it is exactly on this claim alone that some nonbelievers believe that as such is the world not perfect enough! Clearly, all believers and nonbelievers argue about the understanding that the World is His most ancient statement we know! The Old Testament repeatedly states that God had had second thoughts. I leave it to all rational men to decide whether God truly has second thoughts, or such statements only reflect men’s unconfessed (if at all conscious) ignorance! The Lord requested that we study the Scriptures (obviously, in order that through them we get to the Spirit of God), not that we memorize them verbatim word for word, and stick to them all. Indeed, which human language can claim infallibility worthy of God? Writings and translations may and will differ, as words of men. Only the Spirit of God is infallible, and only It may not be misconstrued! For at least our fear (if not our love) of God, let us at long last be dutifully serious: Which particular text of the Scriptures did God endorse? Why did He allow the old Hebrew books to be corrupted and to perish, and the “Translation of the Seventy” to remain intact already for a longer period of time than any original Hebrew text? The text presently used by the Jews is just about only a thousand years old, as all earlier documents then in Jewish hands were, by men, not God, ordered destroyed! And why do the creationists not take even the New Testament word for word? Why do they not take with all the weight of Logic the statement that “In the beginning was the Logos”, not the poorly translated “Word”? Do they deny
that Logos and God are the same, or that Logos precedes the Creation of heaven and earth? And do they deny that the belief in a young earth is only based on inference?: Indeed, where does the Bible state that we owe allegiance to this inference, more so in fact than to direct statements, such as those about the Logos?? So, it is not every single word in the Bible (and especially in the Old Testament), nor every inference out of context to which we owe our allegiance, but the central meaning of it, that God is both Logos and Truth; never forgetting that Christ Himself said that He came in order that the Scriptures be fulfilled (iνα ἦ Γραφη πληρωθη; be completed and perfected), even as He left a crucial part of fulfilling to be done by the Holy Spirit, that would remind us of every Truth; obviously, as we would gradually grow in it!!! And how indeed can at all be asserted that, given the imperfection of human speech, even the Bible is capable of superior Theology than is the direct writing of God Himself in the heavens, which is the World itself that He created and "saw it was good"? God cannot have given man two Theologies, let alone two contradictory ones, that of the Bible and that of the World He created, and He made to speak of Him, as that is contrary to the general absolute Logical necessity that no two objective laws, quantities, qualities and even theologies pertaining to the same subject-matter can both exist that are mutually exclusive or in any sense contradictory to each other; as in such a case those (be they the objective Nature or even men) called to obey those contradictory laws even Theologies would be lost in disorder and chaos for not knowing which of these two to follow!

§159. (a) Do you then, my Friend, think that for minor, secondary, doubtful elements relating solely to human pride, the Creationists, the Theologians, the Churches and the Religions are still well justified even at this late hour of general immorality and the now daily satanically designed and executed hecatombs of believers of all three monotheistic religions of the World in the Middle East and Africa, to keep silent on this issue, thereby conceding the field, the battle, the entire war of Good vs. evil to the atheists?? If today Christianity, despite its said belief in a wholly perfect God, is being ridiculed on account of the transparently unChrist-ian private and public behavior of most so-called "Christians" from the "Heads" of their Churches on down, not daring for their obvious absence of true Faith, to call to account themselves, those in high
public offices, and each other for the absence from our lives of God’s vision of moral propriety on Earth, can the creationists from every faith everywhere in the world add to that ridicule their own intellectual impropriety that shall not be lesser than that of the atheists, if they themselves hold to views that imply God to have been even ever so slightly imperfect in His total and integral consideration of His Plan of Creation? Would that not add to the general blasphemy? My own great yet failed efforts, among the atheist scientists since 1985 to see these matters publicly discussed and acknowledged for their obvious scientific and moral value, must have left no doubt in their minds that I also have made similar failed attempts in the direction of both Creationists and the Churches! Given the atheist scientists’ own inability to disprove the basic reasoning, they know that the absence of universal public discussion of this central matter is solely due to the failure of the Creationists and the Churches to force the issue into the public domain, that can only be due to disinterest, fear, pride and the absence of true faith on the side of both those two camps, that alone prevent them from using this uniquely powerful weapon against atheism. The atheists already know the power of this weapon. So, not only do they rejoice at this exhibition of faithlessness of those two other camps, by they also despise them for it! Yet, they are not about to make too public their scorn and rejoicing, as that would give them, too, away! The present communication, my Reader, absolves you of culpability, for I acknowledge my failure to obtain better results sooner! But from the moment you read this, should you too choose silence, you too shall become just as responsible [and indeed all the more so for the great length and detail of this present effort] for this conspiracy of silence—unless, that is, you Brother, disprove my reasoning! This is why did I earlier say that I hope your Faith than mine is greater, so that it guide you through to see my mistakes, if I have committed any mistakes! For if not, this is nothing other than proof irrefutable that in this now exposed long since firmly established oriental bazaar, all sellers, in general tacit collusion involving and those who choose not to object, sell to the still innocent remaining buyers intellectual goods that are known to be rotten! As all the sellers in the bazaar make a huge profit, not one of them shall willingly ever confess that this whole market is indeed fixed!

(b) If the questions are horrible, as indeed they are, it is only because our times, too, are so horrible! What defense shall we
present to Christ, the Lord Judge, for our present faithlessness? Mind you, Brother, these are *not* questions over which I myself have not agonized for long, long years! It is in this that the Christian differs from the non-Christian: He has chosen to live this Divine Agony, that asks of him to put God ahead of self. But only *thus*, by succeeding in exactly this, does the life of the Christian become a joy above all others, even as he is being battered on all sides. The first Christians were indeed heroic figures, and justly saintly for their heroism. In the last Days, the Christians shall be called upon, *are* already being called upon, to be even more heroic, for the times *are* already worse and promise to worsen still more. Shall we for the fear of the enemy throw away the shields, that is, Christ Himself, the Creator, even as we claim faith in Him, and are already known to the atheists for our faithlessness that alone has prevented us, to the extent we could do so, from forcing the matter into the public domain? As of a Brother in the Faith must I beg you: By your greater Faith show me wrong; or else do no longer keep silent!
§160. The true impact of the theory of evolution cannot be felt until it is realized that the theory was only the first and weakest, conscious yet covert pseudo-scientific effort to subvert determinism as the possible product of Design. The vehemence with which the theory is being defended even by atheist students of the exact sciences despite its inexactitude is indicative of their full appreciation of its contribution to their overall cause. If they let it fall, their other atheistic theories are certain to follow! It is not by simple general oversight that has “mysteriously” struck all atheists scientists that, unquestioning, they swallow, e.g., Dawkins’ wily effort to defend evolutionary theory by including on p. 16 of his *The Blind Watchmaker* the details of the eye and of the retina (the latter down to a single cell), that on p. 17 he accompanies with the statements that the human body consists of about 10 trillion cells, and that on “eat[ing] a steak you are shredding the equivalent of more than 100 billion copies of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*”, in order that he then proceed to “explain” how all that was due solely to “CHANCE”, followed by “SINGLE-STEP AND CUMULATIVE SELECTION”, and then finished off by “DEVELOPMENT”! The human optical system would all be for naught if it did not correctly connect to the brain to which the entire body connects! All that supposedly for no purpose at all! Would they all agree that the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (and thus, by their own admission a far smaller project) was composed by some “analogous” process with absolutely no purpose in sight? The theory of evolution was only
the first covert effort to subvert the belief in the existence of the Designer setting down the full details of determinism! Today, we make so much of “human life and health”! Whatever for, if it be for just nothing?

§161. The theory of relativity was the second “success” of the very same conscious effort to subvert determinism and discredit its Creator. Still, when it first appeared, the theory attracted, as it still does retain some thoroughly improbable supporters even among the theists!: The pre-relativistic materialists had insisted that absolute determinism delimits the freedom of Man to act and thus be fully responsible for all his acts as a moral entity. A predetermined world in which, according to stupid “theologians”, human beings are predestined to be saved or doomed, as some in the Catholic Church so foolishly asserted, is a world permitting no room for freedom, and thus neither for dignity, either for Man or even for God, Who thus has only created marionettes! Those among the theists who for supposedly theological reasons saw Man as an intrinsically indivisible entity in which the division of body and Spirit is purely linguistic and in reality nonexistent, were, as it could be expected, uneasy with Laplacian determinism, so akin they thought to predestination. All those people welcomed the theory of relativity as a liberator from determinism, which they thought oppressive. The very same category of people, ever ready to believe foolish and wily pseudo-scientific assertions, rejoicing welcomed even more enthusiastically the third notorious atheistic theory of the century, the theory of probabilistic quantum mechanics, that supposedly “restored” freedom by putting the locking nails to the coffin of classical Laplacian determinism.

§162. Such improbable supporters have perhaps been more impedimental than well informed theists have been instrumental to the proper scientific and philosophical evaluation of these theories, and they have done more damage to the cause of Truth than the atheists themselves! The thesis of the indivisibility of the bodily-spiritual nature of Man predates, it is only fair to point out, even Spinoza [whom Einstein acknowledged as his teacher]. It is even possible that he too was influenced by it. It goes back to the grossly misunderstood doctrines of the resurrection of Christ and the dead. It only seeks to justify, ex post facto as it were, those so misunderstood doctrines. Since the early Christian Fathers,
many Christians have seen in that doctrine the eventual deification, by the power of the Grace of God, even of the matter that makes up the human bodies [and thus of all matter]! Traditional, and even highly regarded, theologians and mystics, as well as innumerable sentimentalists who have thought there is “value” in the eventual salvation of all matter [thought “fallen” through our sins, as we over long centuries are still being taught, as if sin were the product only or also of unthinking matter, rather than only of our undisciplined Spirit, that so remains weak, is ever so ready to pass on to others its blame, and so grossly fails to see how the Holy God could not possibly charge the innocent but ultimately spiritually useless matter of sin], ignorant of science and the full factual philosophical, theological and scientific implications of Creation, have badly confused the fundamentally different natures of Spirit and matter, of which both the Reality we all know consists!

§163. God created the world, but in creating it, He also invented it out of not preexisting materials. God is Spirit. The created world of physical reality is not Spirit but matter (the gravitational constant, mass, its age and space in which those others exist develop and are being sensed). As such, the created world is naturally uniquely antithetical, i.e., totally foreign to the totally other Nature of the Spirit. In creating the world, God thus demonstrated His absolute control even over things totally different from His own purely Spiritual Essence. Matter is not, by its own nature inimical to the Spirit, but its obedient (yet in a sense, fully “understanding” the orders and their implications for itself), but ethically, morally and spiritually unconscious and uncomprehending servant. The Spirit that exists in the world, as we cannot fail to recognize both in us humans, and in the speaking eyes, “voices” and behavior of the trainable animals, was also created, but was and is in addition to matter, not of or from it! Only in reference to the Spirit in us are we in God’s image and likeness! Freedom applies solely to the moral character of the Spirit, and thus is in addition to the determinism that only characterizes the inanimate Nature! True, our freedom is not absolute but delimited by the material circumstances of the created Nature; but proportionally delimited, too, is our responsibility, or else God would be unjust! These two come together: We do not deserve absolute freedom, because we do not, nor can we, carry absolute responsibility! We are too weak and unwise for that burden! (Just imagine how we litter the space
around the Earth with the same obscene abandon with which we litter the streets!) But morally, it is hard to see in what more a still greater freedom could (had we had it) consist, given our present ethical status. Nothing we can imagine as humans has morally been denied us! Our human nature partakes of both realities the physical and the spiritual, as no other species that we know of or indeed can imagine, apart from the indescribable monsters coming out of the terminally sick minds in charge of Hollywood and similar places, that are mere caricatures solely of themselves! It is only by our physical nature that our freedom inescapably is being curtailed as indeed is the freedom of every physical entity that cannot but remain naturally obedient to the Law that is proper to the physical Nature. By our spiritual nature we remain totally free, far far beyond even our wildest dreams, that Hollywood and the politicians that are guided by it do alas constantly bring into being; If we do not fully appreciate the fact of this dual statement, it is only because we take undivided freedom for granted, that is contrary to the dual nature of Reality, that for our intellectual immaturity we fail to see as it is. The undivided freedom that we seek is the ultimate form of compulsion: once we realize that we cannot do otherwise than our basest instincts dictate! It is exactly for our being moral (not just only physical) entities also that we have been spared of that compulsion! And in it is for our spiritual immaturity that we keep on asking for still more “freedom”, staying ignorant of the extent our true freedom has already been given: that within Reason-Logos we indeed have it all!: Being totally free to descent even to hell! Being totally free to ascent to even to Heaven! What we fail to see, abusing the language, is that Freedom is not without its appropriate cost! Being Free does not mean that there is no charge due! We are not “free” to mess up with the facts of Truth and Reality, to mix up unwisely what by their nature must remain unmixed! Such so-called “freedom”, in exact language license, the Holy God has denied even Himself! We must know the length of our bed in which we sleep! We may not spread our legs beyond its lower limit!

§164. It is equally hard to see what moral obligation must God recognize as having Himself vis-à-vis created entities such as protons and electrons, that are not spiritual but only material; and why He should feel obligated to preserve them too [indeed in what presumably steady state of theirs, given the unsteadiness of
their physical nature by which they partake in the expansion of the physical Universe?) as His eternal companions [even after they have fulfilled the office assigned to them]? I am not saying that He may not extend His Grace even to them, in His own way. Who am I to fathom the depths of God’s Complete Grace, or delimit Him in any way? What we may only assert, fully without hint of profanity or disgrace is that God is never unreasonable! But to assert consciously or unconsciously the salvation of inanimate nature as co-equal to the Spirit in us, that alone is in God’s image and likeness, and so to color our Philosophy, Science, and Theology, goes beyond, impermissibly beyond, the call of our duty as reasoning moral entities. If deification of all matter is thus to be asserted as a supposedly Logical requisite for the assertion of the doctrine of the Lord’s Resurrection, it makes it almost if not totally impossible to see the value of the struggle against sin; without which struggle, Holiness becomes meaningless! That both sinners and righteous shall be saved solely for being bodily made up of electrons and protons, rather than judged according to the moral weight of their deeds stretches imagination!: Electrons and protons are constantly in the natural for them physical state of “hell”: the physical universe constantly goes through untold fire and cold to make our physical home! Hell retains its meaning solely for the Spirit that chooses depravity!

§165. The no less important doctrinal belief in the eternal punishment of the unrepentant poses an equally very thorny problem for matter: My body constantly exchanges protons and electrons with the environment. By what graces or faults of theirs should those innocent of moral consequences follow me to Heaven or hell? How can it be said which of them should be deified and which “devilified”, which employed in the singing of hymns, and which in the gnashing of teeth!? True Deification is one thing! Salvation is another! Everlastingness (whether of the righteous or of the sinners) is yet another! In Christian parlance, “deification” stands only for salvation, and it can only mean the enjoyment of the company of God, not the absorption and complete assimilation (especially of matter!) in the Eternal Spiritual Essence of God; because in that case, He too changes, and in a way that permits the Logically impossible mixing of the unmixable essence of the Spirit of God and the essence of matter created minus Spirit; as, otherwise, we speak surreptitiously only of Pantheism! There may
be no question: The “theologians”, ignorant of their ignorance, have not thought matters thoroughly through: Vastly more is here confused than the inability to tell apart lemons and apples! The rest of us owe them nothing compared to what we all owe directly the Lord! Everlastingness can be granted even to inanimate, soulless entities, should they be useful to some particular purpose, should such purpose exist, which they can serve as physical entities; but this does not and cannot carry any moral metaphysical connotation! But for the resurrected to be re-instituted to (regain and henceforth retain) their physical bodies, fully as those bodies were before their physical death (though only somehow “transformed” in some manner and state unspecified) in order to be returned to a life not much unlike the present—this smacks of delayed transmigration, a varied but still old Asiatic belief! This cannot be a Christian doctrine of afterlife! Afterlife, in order to be worthy at all, must involve fully only the Spirit: It cannot be transmigration as asiatically understood, but transfiguration! This is a new, uniquely Christian term, still not understood fully! Transfiguration, passing into another figure, uses terms known to humans, to “describe” a state unknown to humans, for which we lack descriptive words! The resurrected being transfigured shed their previous physical nature and are altered into a new, no longer physical nature! How do you convey this change, except by means of Divine Economy, using human words to describe the Holy? The Spirit in you is immortal! Trust It; and save yourself all that trouble! Otherwise, you shall get mired into the quagmire of the impossible “things” of this “spiritualization” matter! The Lord told us absolutely nothing of the sort the later “theologians” undertook to “explain”. He only spoke of the Kingdom of God being at hand, being immediate, no longer to be awaited! His Suffering and Resurrection, His body turning to light and His Spirit separating from its temporary fleshy home, truly were the ultimate Transfiguration. All the rest, we have it on the basis of obscure statements made up of uncertain words! Asians undertook to describe states of being of which they literally knew absolutely not one thing, either about the matter, or about the Spirit! While the Greeks had already for centuries understood the Elysium as the Field of Philosophical, i.e., purely Spiritual endeavor and action!

§166. The Christian must learn to trust God to do what is best in His own eyes! This means that we must adopt an attitude
about matters beyond our experience and understanding that will not delimit the Wisdom and Power of God by any sort of illogicality! The doctrine of Resurrection had to involve the change of the body, but only in order to be seen, as it had to, by our material eyes! This does not necessarily mean that the body became Spirit, nor indeed the reverse! When matter is nothing other than Democritean atoms [and Creation remains the simplest only if it involves them!], or in other words, the finest by definition form of physical light, the body did not really experience a fundamental transformation of its very nature, but only of its form! The freedom of the Lord to do what He must, namely, the best and noblest, is thus fully preserved! After Judgment, the Spirit goes Its way, and matter its own! But as Judgment inevitably means the end of things as we know them now, what then becomes superfluous cannot be considered survivable!

§167. This is a subject admittedly most difficult and profound. I am compelled to discuss it in some detail, and I certainly have only merely touched it,

(a) in order not merely to assert it without the least explanation as attempted by the “theologians”, but solely in order to dispel the supposed incompatibility of determinism and moral freedom, that are by no means at all incompatible: The Laplacian determinism is applicable to the world of matter; but solely for the fact that matter is subject to Law that is not its product by its master! The Spiritual determinism applies not only to Man but also to God, for the fact that God being Perfect and Holy cannot bypass Justice, that determines the Sacred Order of all things! While moral freedom, applicable solely to the world of the Spirit, only mistakenly is believed to exist when determinism is removed; and

(b) in order to help cut the tie with which some creationists have bonded themselves to the profoundly atheistic and pseudoscientific theories of relativity and the current probabilistic quantum mechanics.

§168. Let me repeat it: Freedom does not belong in the world of matter but only of the Spirit! Protons and electrons are not free but firmly bound under the Natural Law they cannot disobey. Only moral entities are free to obey or disobey the Moral Law, that is here to guide, not to determine; to impel, not to compel. There is this hard fact: Freedom is not license. Perversion may not be excused as due to some natural inconsequential defect, that by some hard
“luck”, God set upon our genes! The content of the Moral Law is determined, or else it would not be a Law! Our acts are not! We are free to act as we please. But we seek license rather than Freedom when we demand that the Moral Law be erased in the name of our supposed unlimited freedom! When we do that, we demand that we be delivered from all Responsibility for our acts! The hard fact is that, there is no Freedom unless there is content in the Moral Law, for otherwise how can we say that we are indeed free? Free of what? To do what, when doing is not even defined unless it is delimited? Free to choose what as our destiny? Rejecting Heaven or hell as destinations nonexistent, we are left to “choose” nonexistence! This certainly lightens the guilt of the guilty, be they professors, politicians, or criminals—to the extent they thus can put their consciences to some restless sleep! But is this freedom of choice? When you cannot on your own choose to exist or not to exist, despite all your statements or even a successful suicidal act, you belong in another world, and it is there that you must make an honorable stand! Thou art not a worm, but a Man! So, honor at least thy grand name! Be at last then a Man! Accept the Responsibility that befits thy station!

§169. Further progress in Philosophy and Science cannot be made until after we dispel the fears we have on this point. We must assert both Moral Determinism and our Freedom, as both go together!! Only this seemingly dual position is Logical, as only so is the world made complete! To assert, or even to be fearful of, the opposite is to fall into the trap of atheism, pantheism, materialism and finally nihilism: Which all choose to be blind to the Presence of the Spirit!
§170. (a) We have finally come, after quite some distance, to the end of this exposition. It pays to take a final view: Having argued for the unity of the uni-verse in which we live, we still need to comprehend our position from yet another perspective: For all we know, none than us in the uni-verse is more intelligent, and from none in it do we expect any help, yet masters of it, quite clearly, we are not. Still below us, here on earth, stands the globe itself, and all the creatures on it! Some eighteen years ago, raking leaves on the lawn, I was favored by a little male cat, who took it upon himself to trust me and make his home with us. He developed to be quite a character: headstrong, independent, demanding, obviously needing love yet always on his own terms, never entangling himself in our feet; when sick, showing his need always with dignity; quite old now, he cries only when very sick, and we do not miss how embarrassed he feels, which he clearly shows, when he is inconvenienced by sickness. With his very thick coat of long hair, last summer he almost died of heatstroke, and was saved only by a close haircut, that revealed how really small he was inside the rich plumage. Fluffy recovered, but he is getting on as best he can, as we all are. To him, we are Gods! And he expects of us to tend him! A faithful four-legged picture of us in the face of the real God! We are resolved: As long as the Lord above suffers us, we may not give up suffering him! After all, we humans are closer to him, rather than Him! If He tolerates us, we may not abandon an old cat that has only us literally to look up to!
(b) So are we caught up in the middle! And taught as Fluffy chooses to teach us: We may not prove lesser than he expects of us! Which makes you think how deeply the Lord must have taken it upon Himself not to prove lesser than we would think of Him seeing Him standing on the uppermost rung of Perfection! Cats are proud animals. They plead, but they also know when to turn their back when they think you ignore their pleading! The more they expect of you, all the more determined do they turn their back when they interpret as a personal insult your seeming neglect!: Faithful four-legged pictures of us standing before the real Lord God! But, surely, we can reason better than cats do!

§171. (a) Honestly, who would not love God if He instantly satisfied our every whim? Not for nothing did the Jews welcome the Lord Christ upon His final entrance into Jerusalem: They were convinced given His entire performance that indeed He was the Messiah! So, had He done what they expected of Him, they all would have become Christian; absolutely no question about it! But not only did He not perform as/what they expected; He moreover upset the tables of the sellers and money changers in the Temple! My cat’s turning his back on me is absolutely nothing compared to the rejection of God by those whose whims He fails to satisfy! My cat cannot raise me on my cross. For two thousand years already, we all keep on crucifying God for not performing as we still keep on expecting of Him! Christ cleared the Temple of all traders; and they crucified Him. He then gave them some forty more years, to which He added another some sixty; ample for them to consider what they kept on doing inside the Temple. To terminate the blasphemy, He allowed that the Temple be destroyed as we all too well know! But we all still have not learned the lesson!

(b) Two more monotheistic religions have since sprung out of Judaism! Let us all at long last stop shedding blood in the name of God, Whom we all continue to regard our servant! We certainly have more “brains” than does Fluffy! The constant wars in the Middle East during the last sixty long years, involving the “faithful” of all three monotheistic religions, is nothing short of a performance of marketeers literally making a daily killing by the hundreds no longer of animals but of men in the most profane chase of profit the world ever saw, all under the tacit approval and blessing, or else they first would have raised “hell”, of the priesthood
of all three monotheistic religions! The placid faces with the forked smiles that are tirelessly exercised before private mirrors on how to deliver false words of soothing that dripping poison dress the ever unquenched hatred cunningly taught by the men at the religious pinnacles of the world as only they know how to make it appear for virtue, all these can no longer hide the all too brutal truth of the matter that translates into “legitimate” profit of tens of billions of dollars and euros per year for untold corporations, that eventually percolates down to make a “better” life for their wily followers! Most naturally, not for them all—or else the “better” life would not be as good for all those who split among themselves la crème de la crème!

(c) Let us all dare see the brutal reality we have created: The Second World War devolved immediately into the Third. The debate was not about the “need” for it but about the strategy and the means. An arms race began and the players bluffed even beyond their means. Naturally, the weaker player abandoned the race when the final bluff was called. The victor was then sincerely shocked: It is not comfortable suddenly to be found with your main industry, that till then was the war, without a customer! The pressure “had” to continue until all nations accepted the victor’s dictation. That included the Hollywood products, that for the sake of profit spread all over the globe the “American Dream”. Had that dream remained an internal affair funded by internal sweat, tears and blood, the peoples of the world would unquestionably have reacted in a more sane manner. The trouble began with the exportation of that dream and the pressure upon local governments to fund in all conceivable manner the Americans’ Dream; which some of the rest took minus the sweat, tears and blood its realization meant! This is when and how the peoples began disliking the Americans—except such local people as could follow that Dream at the superadded expense of their own compatriot citizens thus becoming poorer still! At least comparatively, even if not in absolute terms! That’s how the local leftist uprisings sprouted: It simply is not safe policy to show the poor how you waste wealth; and it becomes positively dangerous for the exhibitionist when even a small part of it is taken from off their skins! To create greater corporate profits, the jobs were expected, but the foreign workers, though thus gaining more than before, saw themselves falling ever farther behind the thus ever faster
forward racing Dream. And naturally those left jobless at home moved to the political left and formed terrorist bands. When upheavals such as the Second World War creates this final outcome, the victor must see his victory as a sacred trust from Above; not as a license to loot the world for himself, or to lead the world to a never ceasing ever more prodigal way of life! The world is much too small and much too unable to withstand the complete consequences of an ever advancing American Dream turned Universal! Not only can we not fuel five or six billion American cars, and these at the American pace of constant replacement along with everything else that accompanies this way of conduct, but we shall literally suffocate in the world smog and the rising heat and humidity. World air conditioning is an impossibility: thermodynamics forbids it! This sort of “sustainable development”, or however else it is called, is an obvious dangerous lie, but the professors, making extra salaries as “advisers”, simply are not about to tell the world! So, they choose to tell the world that other still greater lie of “nothingness”!: It is a world pleaser!: This generation of professors will be long dead when the full consequences of their false teachings hit us all on the head, the lungs and the heart! The motto “let tomorrow mind its business” is no longer wise: we are almost upon the absolute limit of means, and the world may not be led to struggle about the possession of the means that will keep only the few in their safe extravagant luxury! If the victor refuses to consider along these lines the problem, he is not up to the weight of the Globe loading his shoulders: He is not Atlas! But of all the peoples, it is he, exactly for being the victor, that must also correctly teach both himself and the rest and lead the way!

§172. (a) So, let us all be absolutely sincere as these brutal times demand: Those who claim unbelief in God only do so for not having their every whim, including blank license, instantly satisfied! It is in retaliation that they, feeling insulted, call God non-existent! The cats are as faithful as four-legged pictures can be of us standing before the real God up Above! But only when we too choose to think with our bellies, as cats do! But for thinking other than about the bellies, God has endowed us with a far more suitable device: Not our brain, but our mind, our intellect, our whole dia
diva, that is here to encompass the Whole, if only we two-legged ones dare look up and consider the Whole, not just the ground from which our noses are set safely distant! Just consider the order:
Forehead on top, to be closest to the Logos above; then only below it set is the nose, to sniff not only the lighter essences dutifully escaping to higher elevation, but also the most useful to us heavy ethereal substance with which as salt from the Spirit we ought to sprinkle our lives to make them truly worth living; and then underneath it the mouth—but not just in order that we as animals graze the ground, but in order that we, having put all we gather together, express our well considered evaluation of the Whole!

(b) Rather than doing all this, those who attack God start thinking from their feet! And as they inhabit well-heeled shoes, by which they are raised by about an inch off the ground, they only mind their comfort in them and their “needs”, manufactured to keep them in keeping with that “higher” elevation! It is such unneeded “needs” that God refuses to satisfy, as they keep the wearers most distant from Him! No! God is not for the sake His egotism jealous, but solely for our sake and safety; wishing us, before we come to the end of the road, to understand full well what all this business we call the World is truly about: Not the lavish debauchery in which the prodigals waste lives and riches during the very last night before the sun never rises! Which, alas, truly is what those preach who teach the meaninglessness as the “meaning”; be they professors, be even they holders of prizes such as the Nobel; without the slightest puff of demur from their tacit forked tongued fellow-walkers in pseudo-religious slippers sharing the other half of the power exercised over the souls of men willfully divided into camps determined to fight it out till death! The “business” of the World is Holiness! Nothing less! God’s Holiness! Not men’s so-called “holiness”! Nor so-called scholarly “eminence”!

§173. (a) Alas, standing against It, we worldly “saints” and “scientists” and supposedly dutiful “citizens” having, the ignorant fools, consciously separated God from Logos, have chosen to usurp even God’s Holy Objective and turn it to “business”, to a dual profession, the one half ostensibly never stopping “worshiping” Him, the other half openly never stopping profaning Him—both at the expense of every foolish obedient buyer! For naked, yet well dressed power; for the strongest all-controlling empire; for the empty applause of worshiping ignoramuses believing mere glowworms to be the “illuminati”; and last but certainly first, as it today buys the rest, for no other than money! Imagine: such is today the “education” the “masses” receive! Some even demand to have
it for free, believing that there is or should be anything at all today or ever given for free! Forgetting the eternal “quid pro quo”!

“Forgetting” that, only at best, does the cost reflect the quality, that as you pay, such you receive! Expecting to get true Quality both from those supposedly “theologically praying” (in effect only murmuring indecipherable incantations) in order to lull the souls they need to stay in sin, as also from those supposedly “scientifically laboring” (in effect only scribbling altogether dubious equations) in order to justify the enterprising intellects that keep oppressing those souls; all of whom together comprise the camp that truly disdain the Intellect, calling Him nothing!

(b) Surely, it does not need brains to understand that you do not pack the churches when you call the faithful only to offer Glory and Thanks: You pack them and the coffers to overfilling when you keep them in fear!: It is not out of faith alone that the very rich are also the great philanthropists, donators, benefactors and patrons. The Lord only knows what part the fear dictates! More than is given is gathered through overcharging! Nor does it need brains to understand that the system of “Justice” (from law-making to defending, to adjudicating, to policing, to imprisoning, and to all ancillary social services) vitally needs the criminal just in order to stay in business!: That’s why the laws are deliberately made complex and conflicting, in constant need of the experts to show you how to channel yourself through, or at least how to obtain a narrow escape! That’s why we now have those so-called “independent commissions” supposedly protecting the so-called “personal data”, among which principal are the transgressions, fully proportional to the positions from which they were committed! The big criminals must be protected, their social status must remain intact, in order that the lawful citizens be again grandly transgressed, the police fill their allotted quota of arrests, the lawyers have customers, and the courthouses never collect dust, wiped off by dresses and trousers! Paying the due respect to the Intellect eliminates all this truly wasteful “business”!

But we, true “professionals”, certainly do not want that! People naturally knowing and keeping from within their Spirit God’s Law are certainly “antisocial”: Just look at the “social upheaval” they would cause if ever they came to be the great majority! Especially they must be misled! That’s why God and Logos are told to be total strangers. That’s why both the Churches and Academia haugh-
tily ignore Heraclitus’, Socrates’ and Plato’s teaching regarding the Logos, and the former even have the temerity to profane Him calling Him simply the “Word”! Of the billions calling Him the “Word”, please Brother tell me, *what truly do they make of it?*

§174. (a) *Once and for all, all educated citizens must understand that all games are being played on our backs! Especially the game, which is what they have made of it, who have taken it upon themselves to represent to us the Biblical, not the political, Right and Left! Not all that shines, especially today, is gold! Not everything especially today called “progress” is true progress! Most of it is regress, or at best rewarmed tasteless matter, having once been food! Nor everything come to us from the past as “tradition” is worth keeping. Tradition and dim scattered disorganized memories and remembrances of the past were all people had during the long centuries of darkness. Unexamined were those branded into the consciences of the people. It is close to necrophilia still to attempt to retain “alive” what duly belongs among matters buried for ever! Tradition is worth keeping only if it continues to enrich the Spirit of Man, that keeps on spurring him ever higher, toward Holiness! And Holiness cannot be attained without considering all the lessons the passing time keeps on amassing on what must become our ever more critical Spirit; which only after the most critical examination must determine what truly fits and is worth keeping! *That adds meaning to meaning!* So, *nothing is truly meaningless; if, that is, we also determine to learn even from our mistakes, yet solely in order to commit ever fewer of them! Without this process *that alone is true progress*, if we keep on learning nothing at all even from pain, we most certainly do not deserve better, but continuing punishment! Anything less would be unjust!*

(b) This sounds cruel to say; yet more cruel to read! But, you Brother, please tell me what it is you propose we do when even pain does not teach us! Do we throw those refusing to learn in a cell and let them rot there in their pitiful misery? Is *that* humane? Or do we, in the name of “humanism”, let them roam free and ravage society? Isn’t that even more inhumane? Or, rather, do we punish them, but *not* inhumanely, in order to jerk their Spirit back into Action? Those on the Left please consider: *If adding meaning to meaning* that alone enriches the Spirit and spurs us to Action, that we simply call Him Logos and Intellect, is not from God, *where does it come from? Only* indifference regarding the
consequences and total abandonment to the belief of a not coming Future come not from God! Which is the position they advance! But just as even they cannot deny that still exist people that indeed care for Meaning, ultimately leading to Holiness, about which by definition only God truly cares, can they deny that it is exactly because they insist on fighting Him that they stand against Meaning and those that still seek It? Unquestionably, there is Meaning! Even the meaninglessness they attempt to pass on is a meaning, though meant to be the exact antithesis to Meaning! Indeed, God cares! Which is why despite our transgressions that almost touch Seventh Heaven He has not yet tired of us! But beware: the moment He does, by definition that is the End! That He has not yet given us up means that He still expects of us to make good use of the now short time remaining!

(c) Both the Biblical Right and Left must understand this: We do not make good use of the time if we continue to swallow stale food critically unexamined! They both must understand what it is they all agree on, and where their roads part, mainly on account of the traditional Biblical Right! For it is they that, consciously dropping the Greek Ideal, adopted the oriental position that God and Logos do not stand as One! It was only later, and as a reaction, that the Biblical Left rejected the belief in the existence of God and discovered “Reason” as His opposition that purportedly banishes Him to the Tartarus! Had there not been the split between God and Logos introduced by the traditional Biblical Right, the Left could not have found the ledge on which it established its totally false footing! This must at long last be digested as the truly nutritious food it really is by the people finally choosing to stand on the correct Right. Meaning that, not all “Tradition” is sacred! How else, and how much longer do we all think that the Holy God can expect us to revert to the Ideal Tradition, if that is not what He wants us to do, now that with the passing of time and the ever faster fading memory we come that much faster to losing it altogether? We said it once, and we shall repeat it: The Holy God’s patience most definitely is not inexhaustible. And those on the Right, who supposedly had it once right, are all the more truly responsible for the loss of the Ideal Tradition, that we all lost for their first rejecting it as the Great Greeks had already perfected it, and for their later tiring to care for it as our only true Treasure! “Tradition” is not well tendered when left among the thorns and
weeds! It needs clearing and refreshing the ground, it thirsts for water and it needs fertilizer! Old ideas need new questions to help them get rid of the barnacles; otherwise, the ship gets overloaded, its speed slows, the engines sputter exhausted and they finally die! He is not a good Traditionalist whoever refuses to deliver his valued old ideas to the fresh air! Mildew is not bad only for paper, linen and wool; it is even worse for ideas that are not exercised in the morning’s fresh air and the sun’s warm rays!

§175. (a) So here stand I, in the crossfire between the two factions fighting it to the death! And I challenge them both, shaming them both! How dare I? Solely by the Grace of God! Alas! For the reasons given already, the weight falls more on those on the Right. They may only continue to think as orientals rather than Greeks if they, first, prove that I am wrong attempting to reunite in the consciousness of men the grandest of all Ideas that ever crossed the Mind of Men: the Idea that God and Logos are but One! And if they, second, prove that God without Logos is superior to the God-Logos! Those on the Left must in turn show that their intelligence, and to the extent that they are even prouder of it, indeed came from nothing and to it it shall return! And if so, why at all do they keep on fighting, what can then be for them the meaning of their struggle?! Simply the also nonexisting honor of totally meaningless arms? Hardly worth their self-called even less than vegetable, for it too is then meaningless, peace! Gentlemen on both sides: Kindly honor yourselves! All of you show me wrong! Or else, throw down your rusty, altogether misfiring arms and join me in the middle! Surely, your bottomless pride that leads you to shoot down each other with all the fury but not the least grace of sophomores can no longer pretend to be valueless in the face of by far the most important question before us!

(b) The proud men on both sides, those of the religions and churches and those of “science” and the atheist camp, rather than humbly admit while alive what is now revealed to be the unshakable knowledge of Truth that has always stood right before us but had so far remained unseen for the immeasurable pride of just all these men, refusing to consider the natural, not manmade, simplicity and elegance of the physical Reality established by the Absolute Rationality that includes Perfection and Holiness, are fully determined to take it with them to their graves! This is what I, standing in the middle, must conclude after more than twenty
consecutive years of effort devoted to pleading them all to see their duty before God and Man. The years pass and one cannot say how much time he still has to continue the fight. One must prepare to make his exit, leaving behind his bequest. The outstanding great question is whether those *alas now few* who continue to state belief in God and in Reason and Science will finally find the heart to *force* the issue to the attention of the entire world. This is why I pray they find the Faith that is still needed, still greater than I commanded, *both to refute all that in these findings must be refuted on account of error unseen, and to become the champions of all that cannot be shaken*. I no longer am in the "loop". In fact I *never* was! Faith in Logos and Science allows *no* compromises! Entering and staying in the "loop" means *never* stopping to compromise for naked power! What has been here refuted is none other than the foul statements issuing from the mouths of the dragon, the beast and the false prophet calling the world to war against the Almighty! The refutation is *the defeat* of the forces of Darkness and Falsehood. In its utter silliness does the silly world think that that war will be fought by both sides with manmade weapons! Such are only the weapons of Falsehood. The real war is conducted *only* in Spirit, where all values lie, as also do the reward and the punishment. Saying more is unneeded. The Spirit of God will lead to the rest.

§176. (a) So are we led to recall Dawkins’s “argument”: As the complete works of Shakespeare are themselves dwarfed letter for letter for chemical atom even by the amoeba, so is the number of combinations available to those letters dwarfed by the number of combinations available to the chemical atoms to form the amoeba, if those atoms are packed without a guiding Law (see §75k, p. 122), despite all of Richard Dawkins’s *utterly false* “arguments”; the accolades heaped upon him by wily commentators notwithstanding! Because, biological evolution *cannot start except from the packing of atoms, and they from the packing of subatomic particles all the way down to the Democritean atoms*; and all these Richard Dawkins has *not* seen it fit to consider! But *no* biologist or other so-called “scientist” is enough of a scientist who propounds an “argument” against Logos and Law while ignoring the underlying chemistry and the still deeper lying physics! How many so-called “generations” *without a preconceived end result to aim at* manipulated in computers, and how many *real* combinations of atoms (and, be-
fore those, of still smaller particles) here on Earth, given no Law, would it have taken to obtain the smallest living organism out of each of the immediately lower state of being, all the way down to the Democritean atoms? It is by their own desperately half-cooked “arguments” that the evolutionists are embarrassed!

(b) But the argument is still far from being complete: What is far more embarrassing is the fact that the evolutionists and Dawkins ignore that, as scientists, they are duty and honor bound to think things fully through to, and then back out from, the deepest possible level from which their scheme could possibly have developed! Can Dawkins or someone else produce an equal “feat” of dove from hat in respect of the vastly more unlikely probabilities of producing out of nothing at all the specific Laws demonstrated above that control our universe? I.e., not just only as mere mathematical entities, but also as factual operative Laws out there, as they are needed in order fully to control our universe? Both these under the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity? Is it not obvious that even the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity itself cannot exist without all laws needed (and as needed intertwined even for it to exist) being there; without even one missing or being in excess, and without even one being other than it truly is? To understand what all this truly means take an example from the visible level of laws! Take Newton’s law of gravitation! See that it belongs to the already simplified [as the masses are considered having exponents equal to 1] category of laws expressed by

$$F = G\left(\frac{m_1}{r_1^x}\right)\left(\frac{m_2}{r_2^x}\right),$$  

where x can have any value at all, not only whole but also fractional, not only positive but also negative (with a proper adjustment of G)! To each such value of x a separate universe corresponds! A true infinity of universes! How each of them would be or look need not concern us! What need concern us is that, without Logos and solely by chance, if that be the operating principle, none of them all is a priori excluded! Only to the exact value of x = +1 does this complete universe correspond! Before anything that is ever existed, and if also God did not exist, how does Dawkins & Co. think that that category of Law and that exact value of +1 were chosen? And by whom? Science means absolutely nothing, unless it means Complete Knowledge! So, how do “scientists” state that all those universes, all except this one never seen, “are” nevertheless out there and are all definitely physical; but we, supposedly confused lesser minds
think solely of this particular one simply because we belong in it? How can this be at all Science rather than a yet other religious faith, far worse than all presented so far, concocted in absolute desperation? As we have seen regarding this amazingly beautiful Universe, the physical-natural laws are not properties of matter, but what holds matter together that makes it have the properties we observe it possesses! Matter in this entire universe, Newton’s G, time, and the Law, have not always been! Before Hubble, people were excused to think otherwise. No longer! The uni-verse that gravitates also expands! Under Laws now shown to act as do the two faces of the same one coin! Dawkins and all like-minded people are not excused when they still choose to remain willfully “unsuspecting” of the effect of that cardinal fact upon their “theory of evolution by natural selection”, that is worthless unless it is complete right from the start, right from the zero instant of the Big Bang! Within zero time did the world come into physical-natural being, matter and the Laws it obeys, that alone make it have the properties it exhibits! Is Dawkins willing to play his entire game of combinatorics in zero time? Calculation shows that there exist out there some about 5.891 \times 10^{120} fundamental particles/photons, but an exact number! Why and how that exact number? I cannot help regarding any scientist supposed to be dealing in fundamentals not a serious scientist when he chooses to remain “unsuspecting” of the cardinal fundamentals! Again, please note that it is not I that cannot help thinking so! Rather, it is the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity that cannot help making me think in these terms!

(c) A demanding mistress? A compelling mistress! And by far the most beautiful ever!: The Judaic theology dealt only in the transactions of Man with his God and established a quid pro quo Covenant, that still remains alas central in all monotheistic religions that to this day have failed to see the God-Man relationship as one of consenting intimate spiritual friendship seeking to become union; it did not dream of examining God’s own nature. The falsely called “idolatrous” TheoLogy of the Greeks attempted to examine the various distinct faculties of God: So, it spoke principally of Zeus (genit.: Διός, another expression of Θεός, > Deus) father of the “lesser” Gods and of Men; and of Goddess Athena (= ‘Α Θεός Νομος, that is God’s Augmentative Complete Faculty of Mind, born fully grown out the head of Zeus), and of God Apollo (the God of Light, Enlightenment and Divine Inspira-
tation, Who was worshiped by all peoples not only the Greeks at Delphi and guided Socrates). After entire centuries of development, the Christians spoke of the “Holy Trinity” (the “Father”, the “Son” and the “Holy Spirit”). Which are only human expressions for the conception of what most definitely is not the “mystery” it is said to be of the One Complete-Perfect God, collecting into one the three distinct faculties of Logos that are Reasoning (the Father”), Expression (the “Son”) and Inspiration (the “Holy Spirit”) to perform only Good and incessantly seek Holiness! Standing before These, what disposition may dare demand to be called noble that chooses the nihilism of complete meaninglessness??? Brother, dare to weigh the gravitas!

§177. (a) So, what is the very worst case that believers and non-believers, we all, are compelled to think of? Special creation by species means that God after creating each species started all over again to create the next one, from soil and His saliva! Which He then had to make fit in the world! And then all over again! But we are not talking of a tailor here, making suits to fit! Nor does God make species and individual organisms in series, fitting them one at a time, like a tailor fitting suits in series, one at a time! However much such individual God’s time-consuming attention would satisfy our microniac arrogance: “Hey look, God is fitting me now!” Such production is not economical in the highest possible sense of the term, nor particularly, if at all, wise! Wise producers do not produce a substratum of existence and only then see what, if anything, fits! Truly wise producers see through the whole set of considerations necessary to their final objective and make that whole fit together right from the beginning! We do not make our best science when we think of the Creator and His creation even in slightly lesser terms! To make a long story short, the very worst case then is that each individual organism (belonging in a species) that ever existed, exists, will exist, was made to fit an exact, unique to it, particular, numerical solution of an exact, unique, particular quantum mechanical equation (in the newest sense indicated earlier); one such equation per species and particular to it; all considered from the beginning in the form each was designed to take, commensurate with the function each was designed to play, when each was needed to perform that function, while a clock would be marking out the time each would come into being, in the most God-economical manner, out of preexisting organisms, and the simplest of them out of preexist-
ing inorganic matter, and it out of the Big Bang, when all was set to go in space and time, as it had been predesigned to develop towards its final objective! If this sounds simply fantastic in the extreme, why should it still do so when, now, science discovers that out even of a tiny bit of tissue a whole organism can be reconstructed? What other does this demonstrate than the fact that even each piece of tissue belongs in a specific quantum-mechanical solution of matter arranged according to Design, within which solution even that bit of tissue finds finally its exact fitting place? Does Dawkins and all like-him-minded people still object to Design? Without such an exact sort of Design, how do they propose the bit of tissue reproduces the whole organism, and finds its place within all that whole? With Schiller and Beethoven, one is tempted to cry out aloud

“For God’s sake, for Truth’s sake, for our own sake,
O Freunde, nicht mehr diese Töne!”

(b) Does it sound fantastic that there are exact, natural, living, physico-mathematical quantum-mechanical solutions out there, namely, none other than us, of such complexity as to be endowed with self-and-environment-awareness as to ask the ultimate questions about the exact Nature of Being? Both Churches and atheists, first the former and only then the latter, all of them stuck in their ossified dogmas about the nature of man, have rejected and continue to reject the idea of the independent, at least as far as man is concerned, existence of the Spirit and matter! The Churches accept the purity of the Spirit only as regards God and His Angels. The atheists reject the independent existence of the Spirit altogether, and consider the Spirit of man as a physically unexaminable cryptononphysical consequence of the vastly complex operations of matter that makes him up. But now look: Even as they deny the Pure Spirit in us, in me, you, themselves, it is matter, their materialist matter, no other than the rocks themselves, that rise up to hit them on the head and speak to them, that endowed with self-and-environment-awareness asks through us the Great Questions! And the answers it gets point to the ‘Αλήθεια, the Unforgettable Truth that God alone, the Ultimate Pure Spirit alone, that is [this being the ultimate ontological is] in His own exclusive right! While we, all the rest, down to the fundamental photon, exist only by His Grace! Created self-and-environment-awareness, finally advancing to the lev-
el of being able to consider and judge even the purely spiritual fundamentals of Being, and to home in to the Creator Spirit that made it! Who is anyone else who judges his the temerarious right to demand that He not be written as the only He, but simply as another mere “he”; or else, he, ill-bred brat, will not, not, not, give his permission for a book proving the existence of the Holy God to be published? What exactly do the atheists think they materially are, other than just such a solution? Is it then that the only thing they, the (according to them) dirt of this earth, still deny is none other than their own, Designer, cursing the Father who brought us here, but not in order that we may curse Him; while the stars above and the photons everywhere sing only His praises and breathe only His Fire? For one last time, how else without Him did all that is come into being? Can the atheists of all hues, dressed in a sheep’s infinite kindness that is not, at long last rationally tell us, dispelling all arguments here presented accusing them of dastardly blasphemy with the full crushing weight of this functioning universe? Or will they continue with their puerily obstinate silence that only exhibits exposing it their “science’s” shallowness? When they visit “another” world (as when some of them visited the Soviet Union at the peak of the Cold War), do they think, on seeing that world’s laboratories, that nobody designed them, that they came into being alone? How, then, without a far far more exact Design did we, all humans, come here; each one manly to present, argue and, if he can, protect and defend his explanation of all that exists, along with the propriety of his doings in the presence of all that exists? Even if we are nothing more than it, we at least are walking, talking, breathing thinking quantum-mechanical solutions of a particular fully working Design!

§178. Dear Reader-Brother:

(a) Consider: I made this presentation as short as my powers of complete clarity would allow, given all the fronts that I had to fight against in the effort of proving that Truth, fearing nothing, contains no mystery! As certainly as the natural world shows its Design and center, it ipso facto proves its Creator! If ever the scientists find the courage honestly to review the problems here presented, they shall be very hard pressed to dispel the main arguments here presented. You will ask, “but can all this be true?” Consider whether at all someone could in the short period of 12 years (between 1974 and 1985) produce first the proof and then the sup-
porting main argumentation (as this was the sequence of development), since made stronger and clearer still as here presented, if the product of his efforts were at all false! What do you think rather is with God: Falsehood or Truth? Since only the Truth is with Him, ergo, the falsehood, that people also call “devil”, is not! How then do you think the devil would even dream of tempting a man to prove the existence of God from within this world; from which only he could possibly lose? No! I am not claiming superlative genius! If I could show all this, then a great number of other people could too—if they attacked the problem with all due respect to the visible suggestive detail! I only found what already was there! I have not invented a thing! This is the Truth! What you will do with it, I shall leave it to you!

(b) And then ask: Can the opposition show all here said false, playing the blank card of definite meaninglessness? If they cannot, with Homer, adapted to this situation, one is tempted to cry out aloud:

‘Ἤσεστ’ αἴσιμοι, κάλλιστοι, ἱστιμοι ἴμαρ
ὅτ’ ἂν ποτ’ ὀλόλης Κύριος τὰν ἱερίμων ψεύδους!
(There shall be the inescapable best-ever homecoming day
when the Lord shall wish to destroy
every priesthood of falsehood!)
Dies irae Dei is right upon us!
The day of pseudoscience and pseudotheology has now set!
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Absolute Wisdom:
— is not found in the particularity of separate creations, but in the singularity of Creation under a single Law, that brings about all the riches of forms! 264-5

Action at a distance:
— mediated by the totality of all diffuse light 231

Action (least):
— comes in exact whole-number units directly from the physical-natural system of the world, not the arbitrary human assumption/invention! 245

Age of Deception
— “Faith” and “Atheism” during it:
— while only the second wins, the first “tolerantly”—idiotically smiles 203
— now we know even its magnitude, that is also needed before the Age of Revelation! 223

Agnosticism:
— and the question of source of admirable virtues 52

Agnostics questioned 53

Aristotelian Logic:
— forbids an infinite regress of intelligent causes of supernatural Intelligent Causes! One such is all that is needed; exactly There does all this search logically end! 139

American Dream:
— and the unconfessed impossibility of turning it universal 339-40
— in the face of which, the professors spread the lesson of “nothingness” that continues to create profits for some, along with ever more world terror and blood shed 340
— the victor cannot as Atlas carry the weight of the world, nor teach the world the lesson he still has not learned himself 340

Anima-soul
— and the question of death 291-2
— Asiatic ideas that abhorred the Greeks having the souls dwelling in Elysium and debating matters of the Pure Spirit 292
— the power of God and the resurrection of rotten sinful bodies 292
— the syncretism of Christianity carried the day for the love of the flesh, that it dressed with “spirituality” that is ontologically foreign to it! 292
— no “Christian” can give you a Logical argument;
— the Lord is pure Spirit, in that sense only are we in His image and likeness,
— this idea the Greek loves, the still Asian “Christian” abhors 292

Anthropic and human:
— things not equivalent: 289
— “dust to dust”: the ancient Biblical Western Asian axiomatic statement of nihilism 289
— as man returns to dust, Holiness, the ultimate form of Up, is out of the question, for both him and God! 290
— telling apart “human” and “mens” 289
— Anthropic principle
— an attempt to reverse cause and effect 258

Asians, Greeks and Christians
— the former undertook to describe states of being of which they literally knew nothing, both about matter, and Spirit
— those in the middle spoke of Elysium:
— Field of Philosophical, i.e., purely Spiritual endeavor and action 334
— the latter must learn to trust the Lord to do what is best in His eyes, adopt-
ing a view that will not delimit the Wisdom and Power of God by any sort of illogicality 334-5
Atheism:
— and the question of world’s scientific investigability in the absence of the Creating Logos 202
— its method of subverting society: most evident in the USA 45-6
— proof of how little we have understood of the implications of God and Man 46
— “scientific”:
— a squarely dishonest proposition 202
— sworn to dishonesty 87
Atheist “scientists”:
— disregard completely the clearly intellectual processes underlying the natural Laws that apply independently of human mental activities, that as Laws are not, cannot be, products of thoughtless processes 256
— operate outside the constraints of Reason 257
Atheistic “science”:
— cannot tolerate a definite objective world and devises schemes to deny it! 257
— recognizes no purposive objective substratum 257
— suppresses indisputable findings demolishing atheism 257
Atheists:
— designing experiments in a said “undesigned” world simply profane Reality 80
do not allow serious discussion 98
— strictly there is none:
— it depends on the name you give Him 304
Atheists and blasphemers under all pseudonyms
— challenged by the physical and Logical hard facts
— either prove the reasoning and the structure of the universe thus revealed; or to explain their multiple blunders
—or else, to show scientifically, how it was possible, purely by chance or its own legislative and executive powers, for the universe so to organize and arrange itself right from the start; or to show how it is still Logic ally possible that the universe does not need a Creator 321
— the monopoly they have on so-called “scientific” and popular media isn’t surprising; all the social forces behind the media are in tacit collusion against the Creator! 322
— their corruption is so well known to themselves that in order to hide it from the public they must shake all belief in Order; and the best way to begin doing so is none other than cursing the sacred ground on which we all stand 322
— when the sacred ground on which we all stand is equated to the dirt, waste, filth, excrement and rotting corpses they proudly dare exhibit daily to the world on high definition living-color screens, in the general effort to “argue” for the total meaninglessness of everything for being a product of chance and nothingness, all the unspeakable crimes, committed right in front of all decent inhabitants of this sorrowful Earth, who are in this manner deliberately kept speechless and numb, cannot be passed as a moral aberration but only as a mere appearance of just another possibility! 322
— the statement that there is out there an infinity of universes, all invisible except this one, arranging themselves purely by chance, one of which is the one here revealed, is not Science that must be based on absolutely firm knowledge, but an altogether suspect purely religious belief, designed to counter the now inescapable Logical conclusion that creation based on non-self-conflicting Law requires a Logical Creator 321-2
— what are the chances of an austere Doric column standing here on earth, self-made by pure chance? 322
— their silence is understandable, but so also is their dishonesty, demonstrated glaringly by their silence, the two together being the solid proof they provide of the infallibility of the reasoning here developed on Newton’s Law! 322
— nothing gives the militant atheists greater pleasure than their contrived public “disproof” of God, Whom they do not even condescend to mention by name;
—and nothing gives those pillars of “learning” and social stature greater chagrin than being found wrong and unable to dispel the charge of their bottomless indivisible intellectual and moral dishonesty! 322

Atheists and the Truth:
—the former demanding that the latter be not told 351
—by their own admission being the dirt of the earth, dare deny and curse their own Designer-Father who brought us here, but not in order that we profane Him; but join the stars above and the photons everywhere that universally sing only His praises and breathe only His Fire 351

Atoms:
—are not dipoles or multipoles 232

Axioms (see also under Gödel’s procedure examined):
—cease to be human opinions once recognized to be parts of what we too see to be the structure of Logos that refers even to us for the fact that it is we that are in His image and likeness, and not He in ours 297
—if irrational properly belong in a lunatic asylum! 280-1

Beethoven, L. van 350
Beethoven’s Ninth:
—demands its own “metamusical” source called Beethoven 126

Belief in other universes:
—a religious “belief” concocted in absolute desperation 348

Believers:
—it cannot by true believers be missed that their own responsibility increases far faster than that of the atheists with every breath they draw in silent unison with them! 323
—who thinks can escape playing dirty games behind God’s Holy Name?
—by his ego led was Adam to sin!
—King Solomon’s Temple fell because it carried his name!
—the Parthenon and the Temple of Holy Wisdom fell because for the Greeks, too, to empty shells the heavy words were reduced!
—the rest of Christianity has dedicated magnificent Temples to this or that Saint, standing antagonistically against each other, all for the sinful occupant bishop’s sake!
not one Temple anywhere has directly been offered to the Sinless Lord Christ, the God Himself made Man, for the sake of Victory over evil even at our level! 323-4

“Believers” and “scientists” in the face of the proof of God’s existence
—if they all keep silent it shall not be shaken that in unison they act pushing the world ever deeper into ever greater moral depravity, for nothing other than what each of them regards of supreme value over and beyond God’s Truth and Justice! 323

Bible:
—its language and interpretation under Logic 112 et seq.

Biblical age of Creation 32

Biblical Flood:
—problems with 77-9

Biblical Right and Left!
—especially today, not everything is true progress, nor everything come to us from the past is worth keeping 343

Believers:
—must understand what it is they all agree on, and where their roads part, mainly on account of the traditional Biblical Right that consciously dropped the Greek Ideal that God and Logos do stand indivisibly as One! 344
—necrophilia attempts to retain “alive” what duly belongs among matters buried for ever! 343
—tradition is worth keeping only if it continues to enrich the Spirit of
Man, that keeps on spurring him ever higher, toward Holiness! —standing in the crossfire, and the distinct duty of each —so, were it not for that position of the Right, the idea that Reason stands against God would never have come into being —therefore, not all “Tradition” is sacred, and the return to God’s Ideal demands other that the “traditional” means not all “Tradition” is sacred, and the return to God’s Ideal demands other that the “traditional” means

Biblical theological criteria: —the fallacy of setting them at the top 72 et seq. 72 F/note Bohr, N. 233, 286 Brain is not mind —Einstein’s brain was sliced, not his mind 305 Britten, Roy J. 129-31 Bronowski, J. 278 Brouwer, L. E. J. (intuitionist school) 277

Calorimeters and energy measurement 94 Carter, Jimmy: —how he once referred to the state of the Union, and the present true state of the world 9-10 Cats, we and God: —we are like the former when we think with our bellies, but the latter endowed us with the mind in order to encompass the Whole, if only we two-legged ones dare look up and consider It, not just the ground from which our noses are set safely distant! 340 Cerberus: —how he collects his toll 62 Certainty and uncertainty: —and the Most Elegant Design Principle that cannot miss any detail 240 —former never built on the latter, unless a law is a law underneath that bases the latter on the former and reconverts back to certainty the seeming uncertainty! 237 —and how the specialists stand before them and the civil and criminal Law 237 Challenging established Authority 26 Chemical atom: —bridging the subatomic and superatomic components of matter is not unaffected by the universal expansion, which has not been considered as an integral part of quantum theory 243-4 —its correct structure: —demolishes the forced belief in the nonexistence of “hidden parameters” 245 —each electron has one quantum number 246 —electrons surround the nucleus as concentric onion-like spherical shells vibrating in unison 244, 246 —obtained without any adjustments, contrary to the work of Hylleraas 247 —rather than assuming it, it shows the action of the oscillator to come in whole units 244-5 —reproduces the Balmer series, the Rydberg constant, the wave number 244 —reveals the action to be a natural property of the oscillator, and its unit to be the same as found in the black-body radiation and the photoelectric phenomenon 245 —shows that the Planck constant need not be introduced a priori 244 —shows the rate of change of the polar moment of inertia of the spherical oscillator to have the dimensions of action 244 —the energy levels producing the spectral lines are not those of the singular electrons but of the entire ensemble of electrons! 246

Christ 13, 26, 29, 39, 41, 44 Christ, Christians and Holiness: —He constitutes the center of world history and attention: —so, their debate about His Nature is fundamental —thus, no other life is better than the one that unites but does not confuse the natures of God and Man in the common search for Ultimate Holiness! 273 “Christian” belief in God and the Creed: —fashioned after the Asiatic belief, ignores all the proper attributes of His Perfection and Holiness 298 —the Holy Trinity expresses the Perfection of the One Ultimate Personhood 300
—the ontology of the Holy God is not “details”, but the most essential crux! 299
— the ontology of the Trinity, and the need to have a clear understanding of the God in Whom we believe 299
Christian Church:
— teaches Faith foreign to Logos 39-40
— unguidable by Reason, commits the unpardonable sin consciously yet wrongly choosing to stand against the Logos 18-20
Church, A. 278
Church and Academy:
— at the knees of the former nurtured the latter, there it learned the manners of not letting more Light dissolve the still thick darkness 320
— have I forgotten the lesson the world was taught by juridically poisoning Socrates?
— the “establishment”, “scientific” and “clerical”, has indeed lost though only some of its teeth! by those they still have, outwardly seeming exquisitely polite and cordial, they nevertheless still apply that much greater spitefully biting pressure!: for it all too well can, colluding, bury all dissenters alive in silence! by such people guided is blasphemy continuing to advance 320
— the fruit takes after the seed:
— that’s why the planet can no longer bear us! in its hot tears will it slowly simmer us! in order to cleanse itself of the sin committed upon it! do dull minds still not get it?: we, thus during long centuries taught, are the devils that fan the flames of Hell! 321
Church and the Scientific Community, duly notified did not react 251
— according to the measure of their “Faith” in what they both say they believe! 251
Church of Christ:
— its unpardonable splitting 26
Churches and Religions:
— for loving matter, the flesh, and the power they through them exercise, have failed to lead the world the Way the Spirit suggests 293
— watching idiotically as very democratically, degreed imbeciles lead the world to war, bloodshed and mayhem, and in pursuit of profit propose that we bury the carbon dioxide we produce (so that we avoid the “greenhouse effect”, the antechamber of living hell), as we continue to waste prodigally the wealth of the planet and the oxygen we breathe, that by cutting down the forests we do not allow it to be regenerated; thus also destroying the ozone shield that protects us 293
— while by the Scriptures, they suggest that “the Lord makes fools of those He wants to destroy”, thus always trying to refer the blame constantly on Us! 293
Churches sanction games of chance! 80
Civilization, global and the courage to face the most prickly questions 268
Classical science’s stations:
— Newton’s dynamics and gravitation, conservation of energy, Darwin’s natural selection, 71
“Closure” of space: can only refer to its ordinary three-dimensional character, and would involve reversal of the Hubble findings 175
Conceptions and “things” out there 67
Contention: kinds of:
— friendly: an honest effort without bitterness or animosity to declare the best, and
— inimical: a dishonest effort for absolute supremacy and annihilation of the opponent 203
Copenhagen interpretation:
— rejecting incomprehension forces us to look for a reason 233
Coulomb Law 249
Creation:
— options to choose from regarding its nature 224
Creation by Design:
— the function of Law in 81
Creation by specie and Designed Specific General Creation:
— casually looked at, the latter looks like (is interpreted as) being of the form of the former! 113
Creation of the world:
— the confusion of dividing issues and people about it 112-4
— and the judgment of God and men
—its exact nature remains uncomprehended
—Biblical and other conceptions of God’s Wisdom admits of a single and simple answer
—General: the only one possible:
  how it can be recognized as the product of Divine Wisdom
—Special: requirements for and associated problems
—Creation Science:
  —an introductory statement that has yet to be made
  —borrows heavily from atheistic science
  —fallacies of
—reason for
—Creationism:
  —meaningless if not a total commitment in a rational Personal God
  —must revise its strategy
  —some of its arguments are improper
—Creationists:
  —believing in a young universe are challenged, too:
  —some of them say that the question of a young universe is secondary!
  —it is not! because even that is an indelible part of the writing in the heavens; nothing done by God is secondary; everything has its place!, and we owe it our corresponding to it respect! 324
  —distrusting themselves, join the atheists! 221
  —their belief in a young earth is based on inference
  —how is allegiance to it superior to that due to Logos? 326
  —will they for the greater glory of God abandon their erroneous beliefs, or will they not, just for pride, thus also blaspheming the Lord by Whose Hand the Law was written in the heavens? 322-3
—Current activities:
  —disrespectful of Man propaganda and thus blaspheming the Lord! 287
  —and the duty of all still truly alive to examine the abyss in themselves 287
—Darkness of the Abyss:
  —the free choice of eyes and minds shut tight! 206
  —did not discuss the deeper causes of evolution
—Dawkins, R. 411, 329, 350
(see also Aristotelian Logic)
—supported by atheist “scientists” equates the human body to ten trillion copies of the Encyclopaedia Britannica”, and proceeds to attribute it to the action of “CHANCE”, followed by “SINGLE-STEP AND CUMULATIVE SELECTION” and finished off by “DEVELOPMENT”, yet fails to learn from the lesson of the sheer impossibility that the Encyclopaedia could be due to just such a process! 329
—ignoring all the underlying physics
—how he fixed the program, yet failed to admit this fixing as equivalent to a law! 136
—disrespectful of Man propaganda and thus blasphemy of the Lord! 287
—its mass: about 10^-65 g 231
—its size: that of the universe 231
—and application of universal law 96
—and the effect upon it of universal expansion!
—ignoring this, Newtonian mechanical calculations err! 149
—light, too, is thus subject to cosmological retardation 149
—naturally follows a curved path passing by massive bodies 149
—under the present velocity of light, the universe could not have come out of the original singularity? 149
Democritean atoms: —are they making up the universe by chance? 41 F/note
Democritus 211, 224
Demos and Democracy: 10 et seq. —and calling to account the men at the top 11
—and the Theological General Commonweal 11
Design: —always driven by a rational purpose 225
Detail: —always does the Master reveal 240
Determinism: —and (moral) Freedom: 329, 335
—their supposed incompatibility dispelled 335
—Laplacian determinism applies to matter for the fact that matter is subject to Law that is not its product by its master 335
—Spiritual determinism applies to Man and God, for the fact that God being Perfect and Holy cannot bypass Justice, that determines the Sacred Order of all things 335
—attacked in the wake of the pseudo theological doctrines of the indivisibility in man of body and Spirit, and of predestination limiting the dignity of God and man 330
—the effort to subvert it as a possible product of Design began with the advent of the theory of evolution, being the first covert effort (then more overtly followed by relativity and the current quantum mechanics) to subvert the belief in the existence of the Designer setting down the full details of determinism 329-30
—proven by the support the theory receives from atheist "scientists" 329
—the effort to understand the proper action of determinism and the proper evaluation of these theories has been undermined by improbable confused thinkers who more than honest atheists have done more damage to the cause of Truth 330
—by their grossly misunderstood doctrines of the Resurrection of Christ and of the dead 330
—leading to the eventual deification by the Grace of God of the human body and thus of all matter, erroneously thought as the source of our falling from grace 331
Determinism vs. relativism: —Laplacian determinism "had" to be undercut 144-5
Dimensional analysis: —when the need for it arose 204 Dimensions (physical) and their use and abuse 209
Dirac, P. 239-41, 249
Doppler shift 184
East and West: —never successfully married 17-8
Easter time: —not accidentally is the deadly poison poured:
—the people must be distracted from the lesson of Holiness taught from on the Cross by the Judge and Owner of the vineyard 303
—as not much more is left to be done, the final gavel is about to fall 303
Eddington, Sir A. S. 57, 164
—despite his fears, distinguished the subjective from the objective view of the physical universe 274
—distinguishes the subjective and objective elements of the world, choosing for fear to discuss only the former! 254-5
—stigmatized the fallacy of relativity 143
Educated citizens: —what today is that they must understand 343
—a constant density of matter is contrary to the Hubble finding under constant total mass 174
—about God 88
—"All is relative": —a lemma of relativity theory 142
—and his box and rope thought experiment that ignored the outside world 167
—and the Michelson-Morley experiment: problems 153
—and the true question of clocks and rigid rods 178 et seq.
—as read by a rationalist cynic 56
—attempted to appropriate the Hubble findings as yet another “prediction” 183-4
—attributing expansion to Friedman avoided direct expression of own opinion 175
—avoided drawing direct attention to his assumptions 170
—he bequeathed his brain to science, and we have learned that, it too, revealed itself to be just ordinary! 36 F/note, 260-1
—both atheist and determinist! 97
—by his “philosophy” guided to commit his blunders 221
—he chose the “psychologically natural path”, which his Reader is called to discover 142
—despite his theories, unable to tell whether the world is finite or infinite 167
—an example of an atheist not blaspheming God 33
—excused the inability of the theory to supply all the needed ten (or eleven) equations for the “complete solution of the problem of motion” on the freedom of the student to supply his additional three (or four) equations! 175-6
—his psychology 50
—his blunders regarding special relativity:
—which is the less devastating? 202
—and his discussion of universal expansion did not consider the question of how the average density of matter in it stays constant 182
—his general theory as sectioned by himself 171
—where in it the telling principles hide 172
—and his psychological anxieties: due to Israel’s contention with the Personal God 203
—his real reasons and intentions 57-8
—his true greatest blunder was starting his entire relativistic speculations 216
—his true greatest error 191, 192
—his unsolved psychological problem: the Personal Lawgiver God 185
—reversed the physical and Logical order of cause and effect and confused the ordinary gravitational field with the “field of the vacuum” that he called “gravitational” also! 169-70
—the extraction of Newton’s law from the relativistic considerations ignored the required dimensional compatibility 176-8
—the real probabilities of only some of his assumptions 58
—the real reason for his introduction of the cosmological constant 181
—the requirement of general covariance contradicts the obvious conflict between the rope-box idea and the universal spherically symmetrical gravitational field that cannot be transformed away 172-3
—the 1916 definition of the geodetic line and the 1917 consideration of the cosmological constant are contrary to universal expansion, later said to have been “predicted” by the 1916 paper! 173-4
Einstein and Bohr parting ways 238-9

Einstein-deSitter solution:
—mathematically similar but applicable to a universe of vanishingly small mass expanding with an ever increasing velocity 218

Einstein, Russell 209

Electrical charge:
—mass, and the constants are not further analyzable 249
—seeking to resolve its mystery 248
—electron and positron must differ by some reversal in the arrangement of their masses, the physical dimensionalities of $e (e^2)$ and $e (-e)^2$ being identical to $G(m_e^2)$ 248
—their force of attraction brings them, from (practical) infinity to the distance $r_0$ of annihilation under production of energy $(e^2)/r_0 = hv = hc/\lambda = 1.0215201$ Mev 248
—unavoidable the effect of the detailed micro-structure of matter 249

Einsteinian indeterminacy 15, 50

Electron:
—as a hollow spherical shell, contains its mass and charge 242
—has determinable operational characteristics 245 et seq.
—has positive energy at each state 245
—added energy pulls the atom together and it ionizes from a radius close to that of the so-called ground state, not from an embarrassing infinite radius, fully in keeping with the picture of the whole world 245-6
—is a fully classical harmonic spherical oscillator! 245
—its geometrical and operational characteristics combine into a factor [having a unique value for each state and element] multiplying the known expression for the energy at each state 245
—the exact disposition-and-motion of one or more electrons around the nucleus constitutes the mechanical structure of the atom 242
—the nucleus-electrons interactions must to a lesser degree affect their separate internal structures, while to a greater degree must relate to the structure of the atom as a whole 242
—transits smoothly as the amplitudes of oscillations of adjacent states overlap spatially 245

Electrons in all atoms:
—as their arrangement is singularly ordinal, Nature is shown to “know” how to place itself in order, thus also greatly simplifying the energy-level diagrams 247
—at ionization, the energy divides between the ionizing electron and the remaining ensemble; whose energy fits exactly the resulting configuration, thus providing a seamless transition from the neutral atom to the resulting ions 247
—far from ionization, all have equal energies 246
—near ionization, the inside electron acquires the higher quantum number and energy 246

Empire building:
—its foundation 27
Energy:
—and the unification of forces 99
—forms of 99
—kinetic energy total: depends on observer’s position 101
—thermodynamic view of: all constant, some unavailable 93
Energy and mass conservation 94-5
Energy conservation principle 140
Epimenidean paradox:
—its latest pseudo-scientific version:
—Gödel’s procedure 284
—never perplexed the Greeks:
—by its biting humor reminded of the duty never to overlook self-contradiction 279
—today’s thinkers regard it very nearly as a perplexing intrinsic defect of formal logic! 279
“Ether”:
—no other than the very present diffuse light itself 231
European and American general social life:
—is it Christian enough? 320
Evolution:
(see also under Theory of evolution)
—according to a not yet sensed need: absolutely illogical 116
—advocates a hidden inferior god 118
—and devolution:
—their equal chances under purposelessness are not seen 116
—and morphogenesis and ontogenesis 118
—and the choice of criteria 118
—and the rate of mutation 118
—and the reversal of the logical ontological connection of causes and effects 117
—and the social effect (turned into a cause) on the theory 119
—as “law of the fittest” cancels all scruples 40
—atheistic and theistic:
—distinguished by their differences 79-81
—based on chance is a lie 38-9
—by mutation:
—the problems of theory in the face of the absent evidence that would support it 115
—how it ought to be faced and compared to Gauss’ laws 49
-license to exploit the “less fit” 42
—maintains much of the present social structure 42
—“philosophy” of barbarism masqueraded as civilization 42
—the atheists’ “weapon” of bad “logic” 39
—the cultural effect may have decided
the form of the theory and the search for the “missing links” 120-1
— the shame of teaching it and letting be taught as at present 41
Evolutionists:
— freeloaders in a system of order 117
Evolving nature:
— does she, too, act in “mysterious ways”? 121
Expanding universe:
— had zero initial volume! 149-50
— its main other initial and developing properties 150
Experimental facts and metaphysical faith in Logos 17, 20
Experimental verification:
— whimsical the approach to it 93
Faith:
— in Logos and Science allows no compromises, and is still needed to dispel unbelief 346
— in Reason:
— is not Religion, but Duty to oneself; we are not all insane, some are only misguided; we are not resigned to aims from God, Who in His Holiness did not seek to make passive beggars of us, but active seekers of that same Holiness, seeing it to be our Duty to ourselves to earn our Way 286
— in the defeat of the forces of Darkness and Falsehood 346
— in the Scriptures and in science 33
— its ultimate definition 290
Faith and Logos:
— the problem of common understanding in their absence 290
Faith, life, salvation 86
Falsehood:
— of God’s “unprovability” 47
— neglects His ontology and attends to His “existence” 47
— on it “scientists” and “theologians” meet 47-8
— heavy its implications 48
— based on the theories of evolution as understood, of relativity replacing the Designer and of quantum mechanics establishing chance, all leading to “meaninglessness” 48 et seq.
Falsehood or Truth:
— which rather is with God? 352
— since only Truth, ergo Falsehood, that people call also the “devil” is not! 352
— the “devil” cannot even dream of tempting a man to prove the existence of God from within this world; from which only he can possibly lose 352
Falsehoods:
— believed about the Scriptures 32 et seq.
— by whom and how they now are spread 30
— their source and mold 26 et seq.
Falsification of atheism:
— method of 82 et seq.
Fear and Faith in Logos 30
Ferguson, K. 52-4, 59, 232, 316
— and arguing against the established “authorities” 20-1, 23
— and the Principle of Mathematical & Logical Consistency and Simplicity 66
— her grandparents’ old oak chair is a veritable universe in disguise of atoms in empty space, themselves composed of Democritean atoms 316
— “Truth also seeks us” 251
— we just do not yet see that everything physical is a veritable celestial body hanging along with the entire rich company in the void 316
Feyerabend, P. K. 16, 187
— contraction 151-3
— contrary to special relativity 153
— its relativistic explanation is wrong! 191
— the true contraction proves the presence of the objective Natural Law 153
— exposes all relativistic considerations 154
— exposes the deliberate silence of (not only openly atheist) scientists since 1985 155
— exposes the questionable honesty of professors 156
Ford, J. 59
Fossil record
— free of “thalidomide” findings 41
Freedom:
— and the inalienable rights of Heaven 294
— and the Moral Law:
— the former is absent when the latter has no content 336
— given us by God, may not in any way infringe upon the freedom of others
—its spiritual form:
—applying solely to the Spirit, is independent of, distinct from, and in addition to the other determinism that is a feature of the inanimate Nature 331
—having its own determinants, only mistakenly is believed to continue to exist solely as a result of the removal of physical determinism 335
—ours indeed is delimited by the circumstances of the created Nature; but so, too, is our responsibility, or else, God would be unjust 331
—had we had more of it, it is hard to see in what more we could use it given our present ethical status: as nothing we can imagine has morally been denied us, we partake of both realities, physical and spiritual, creating even imaginable monsters, caricatures solely of terminally sick minds functioning in government, corporate “think tanks”, Hollywood, and similar places 332
—split as is the divided-dual nature of Reality, seeking undivided freedom, we aim at serving solely our base instincts, not the purpose of being
—yet even that has not been denied us! we already descend deep into hell!
—denied us is only the mixing of Heaven and hell, that is no longer freedom but license, that the Holy God has denied even Himself! 332
Friedman, A 174-5, 181, 182

Gauss, K. F.
—and the law of chance 40, 237
General Theory of Everything 162
—and the hunger for meaning by the very people who, denying God, call the world meaningless, while they attempt to place themselves in His place! 163
Geniuses facing the statistics 58
Glory of God:
—and the choice between hard facts and the Bible 325
—and the correct manner of facing the great questions 324
—as we all face the same Heaven and hell the tastefully bitter truths must bluntly be stated, as true politeness and Truth never conflict, contrary to what the “world” thinks 324
—arguing that this here whole debate based on the Newtonian G is due to a mere coincidence is not legitimate 324
—because the atheists understand that such a coincidence is impossible that they consciously choose to bury this whole effort in silence 324-5
—so even less may believers suggest that such a central question and any coincidence could have escaped the attention of God! 325

God:
—Absolute Reality and Logical Consistence 66 et seq.
—all conceive Him as a He-Person 62
—and His own moral responsibility toward preservation of created entities such as protons and electrons:
—for these, “hell” is the constant state of being as they make up our physical home
—Hell has meaning for the Spirit that chooses depravity!
—“theological” doctrines may not hide behind these hard facts! 333
—and matter:
—the latter is not inimical to Him, but remains His servant 331
—though ethically, morally and spiritually unconscious and uncomprehending His eventual purpose, it nevertheless understands and obediently serves His orders and their implications for itself 331
—and our way of thinking of Him 65 and praying that we understand Him, as we, by our choice of guides, brought ourselves to the edge of the abyss 23
—and pantheism
—seen under the question of “deification” of matter 333
—and the Creator’s materials and “way”, shown by His Laws 64
—and the fallacious way of “science”
—and the hard choice of creation at its best standing before us and deserving our respect 349-50
—and the laws of nature, that are not intrinsic properties of matter 64
—and the respect of opinion 84
—and unbelief: as reaction to not having our every whim, including blank license; instantly satisfied 340
—and the lightest thing speeding the fastest, $c_\text{os}$, $c_\text{on}$, $c_\text{on}$, $c_\text{on}$, Godspeed, intertwine least and greatest 34
—as the highest Logical category of Being cannot have a yet higher reference, 71
—as Zeus: the most solid He-Person ever conceived, 62
—being pure Spirit:
—He both created and invented the world out of the not preexisting materials known as the gravitational constant, mass, its age and space in terms of which all material bodies are being described 331
—so, not only are God’s and the world’s natures totally different, but He has total control even of things different from His purely Spiritual Essence 331
—does not hide, nor is He afraid of anyone 63
—does not throw about laws, mindless of the outcome 203
—employs the most economical means toward that purpose, which allow for “miracles” 63
—finished works, forgetfulness and design 64
—has a purpose in Mind 63
—His capacity of $\text{exord\'\'}$ is stated as the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, the Demiurge, the Lord Jesus Christ dressed not in Glory, but only in Holiness, and even that we could not stand to see! 301
—His economy forbids all licentiousness 65
—His existence: proven by Reason and Science truly confounds the atheists 89-90
—His Logic, our common sense and the fallacies about Him 64 and things superfluous and unneeded 64
—His patience is not inexhaustible 344
—His purpose and man’s power 90
—how thinking of Him simplifies things 63
—in what Logical-scientific proof His being could/would possibly be established? 252
—the “Scientific Establishment” refuses to face the problem! 252
—more in the mind of scientists than of the clergy, but both sides do not evaluate the problem correctly 54-5
—our theories and the Reality out there 66
—positively profaned when depicted as “throwing dice” 79-80
—praying that we understand Him has yet to begin 18
—profaned by all who believe the system of laws haphazard 204
—profaning Him is the true terror 91
—rationally made the world secure: 23
—the proper conception of Him can no longer be a priori/axiomatic, it must only be a posteriori of all that Logos concludes to be needed 301
—the source of all Reality except of sin 44
—the touchstone that secures the genuineness 64
—we wrapped Him in mystery 18
—when seen and why “unseen” 90
wrong the belief that He cannot be proven 18, (proof 33)
God and chance:
—He underwrites the Laws.
—it underwrites nothing at all 38
God and Logic:
—and His unfalsifiability 85
God and Man:
—best understood as Spirits and Persons:
—even religions do not comprehend fully this part of Truth 35-6
God and the Old Testament:
—despite all statements there, God never has had second thoughts 325
—the request that we study the Scriptures intended us to get to the Spirit of God, not to memorize verbatim without getting to It every word! 325
—words of men will differ, the Spirit of God is infallible and It may not be misconstrued 325
God, His plan of creation and the proof of His existence:
—and the now suspect silence of all Religions and Churches in the face of the terrible daily bloodshed 326
—proof and disproof
—and the assessment of guilt for the failure and the silence 327
—if disproof be not given, the long since firmly established oriental bazaar of rotten intellectual goods shall be shown to have been fixed by general tacit collusion! 327
—in this state are we to prepare our defense, especially those called Christians, called more than all others to live the Divine Agony of giving God all is due Him 328
—today ridiculed and blasphemed by all atheists, "believers" and "faiths", for their not daring to face the facts 327
God, the Septuagint and the corruption of older Hebrew texts 325
God, the world and our standing in it:
—he hates the lavish debauchery of the prodigals wasting lives and riches during the last night before the sun never rises 341
—we miss the hard fact that the “business” of the World is nothing less than God’s Holiness; not men’s so-called “holiness”, nor so-called scholarly “eminence”! 341
God-Logos
—and His love of Perfection 26-7
—and the created world 65
—and Truth 29
—miracles, power, rationality 32-3
—never commits mistakes and improprieties 34
—respects even the sinful;
—never dictates, only suggests 33
—substantive, not uncertain 26
—the full weight of the term 35
—the highest possible category of Being 68
—the scientific proof of His being 33
“God” called Nothing:
—insults and negates the entire civilization, the entire meaning of Spirit 305
Gödel, K. 276 et seq., 286, 288
Gödel and Co.
—ignoring the inescapable qualitative facts and dazed by the infinitude of natural numbers attributed the blame for their logically expected negative finding to a supposed shortcoming of the language, rather than to the logical impropriety of their game itself 282
Gödel and Tarski theorems:
—products of the times in which they appeared (in light of the failure of the “schools”, and the advent of relativity, quantum mechanics and the uncertainty principle, that all attacked the ancient belief in Logic having the world unshakable for being constructed on Laws that do not contradict each other!) 278-9
Gödel’s procedure or “Gödelization”:
280 et seq.
—a highly axiomatic series of remarkable contrived arbitrary finite steps of its own, possessing neither a priori justification of its axioms, nor independent proof of its findings (as do ordinary theories that eventually gain acceptance), that has in fact been swallowed, though with difficulty yet with resignation, for the extra “support” it provides to the entire set of “scientific facts” that supposedly permit doubt on right and wrong; here and there; now, future and past; certainty and uncertainty, even about Truth and falsehood, and Good and evil 282-3
—evaluated and found to contradict itself 284
—his “arithmetizing”, i.e., converting non-arithmetic elements of the mind and language to numbers is so totally an arbitrary operation that it cannot be rigorously be tolerated 280
—how do we dare give arithmetical values to such elements? 280
—as arithmetical operations produce only numbers, how do we rationally convert those numbers back to non-arithmetical elements of thought and speech, that clearly refer not just only to numbers but also, through the use of numbers, to vastly foreign fields, such as those of logic, physics, philosophy, and even Theology? 280
—intrinsically flawed and scientifically worthless 285
—under “Gödelization”, one cannot possibly find it impossible to set down a number standing for the
meaning “I am not a number”!

—under “Gödelization”, qualities converted to fixed quantities here produce a certain sense, there a totally other—or, mostly, sheer nonsense!

—where would “Gödelization” of such as poems, sonnets, stories, novels, treatises too, the contents of entire libraries too, lead? 282

—so, the fate of Gödel’s (first) “incompleteness theorem” was preordained! 282

Gödel’s theorems’ consequences:

—correctly did P. K. Feyerabend attack scientists for inventing fuzzy theories, A. Einstein been in gross error, in vain does S. Hawking attempt to invent and found a believable theory of everything, and we all fatuously believe in everything we have ever thought we know about the world! 279-80

—so too must all believers in God be upset, mainly for their own standing inactive on hearing that there is any thing fuzzy in the Mind of God! 280

—so, too, the question: are we all the rest mere charlatans, or Gödel alone and those that admire him for his findings? 280

Gould, Stephen Jay 312

Gravitational constant:

—its fundamentality not understood, only dimly is its presence acknowledged 222

Gravitational field 100

—Einstein’s view of 100 & F/note

Great Schism of the Church:

—all due proper deep thought resolves all debates and conflicts: the seeming incongruences vanish when the Lord God is not three separate Persons, each incomplete without the other two, but only One Person, Perfect and Complete in Himself 300

Greece today:

—a nakedly representative specimen of the more prudish world 12

Greeks:

—taught lessons immortal.

—*we rather* make violent Hollywoodian scenarios of their struggles, *not* debates following their core researches of the One Truth! 286

—misguided not by scientists, but the so-called “theologians” of West Asian origin who drove the impious wedge right down the middle between what can only be called their “faith” in God and the correct Faith in the one indivisible God-Logos 286-7

Greek terms:

—abused by scientists 255

Harrison, E. 206

Hawking, S. 20, 52-3, 103, 162, 196, 286

—uses imaginary numbers to avoid the necessity of the Creator 55-6

Hawking, S., & Co.:

—admit the breakdown of relativity during the earliest stages of the universe 158

—challenged to surpass the Newtonian findings 219

Heaven:

—denying It its due shall accrue fair punishment proportional and greater than any usual offense 293

—its interests must be protected even by the prohibition of establishing a law for escaping just punishment on the grounds that society may not touch a criminal because the moral Law supposedly indiscriminately prohibits killing 294

—this is not exacting retaliation on the “eye for an eye” principle, established as a constant reminder against enacting a crime deserving such retribution; not as a general right to demand exact retribution, under the supposed cover of moral Law 294

—the right to demand retribution is a measure of the hardness of heart that demands it!; religions and their servants have failed to see things in this light; so has it been that so much “religious” hatred is brutally lashing us! 294

Heat:

—reverse flow of it and the second law 99

Heisenberg, W. 51, 278, 286

Heisenberg uncertainty principle:
—and the law of least action 227
—denies both the existence of the center of the universe as the point of zero total momentum, unquestioned under the law of momentum, and the then also exact velocity $c_0$ with which, at $T = 0$, the universe started expanding 229
—denies the unquestioned fact that the universe reacts with total knowledge to the action of any one body within it, on account of which fact alone we are able to measure the inertial mass of a body and find it equal to its gravitational mass! 229
—forbidding even the last iota and dot to be out of place, comes into conflict with Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity! 229-30
—ignores the physical package named quantum of matter, energy, volume and thus also of action 227
—requires the certain Planck constant! 227
—runs into problems in the beginning even as regards the total momentum 229

Heisenbergian indeterminacy 15
Heraclitus 13, 15
Hidden parameters:
—thereir existence denied for the fact that admitting them would introduce the existence of a philosophically uncomfortable Rational Law at a much deeper level! 238

High position and power:
—means proportionally higher responsibility to lead justly, not just only by mere empty word, but by the living example 294
—not making it trying and impossible for others to lead their peaceful lives in justice and in pursuit of a place in Heaven 294

Hilbert, D. (axiomatic school) 277
Hitler, A. 267, 273
—having not been a nihilist is unfairly attacked by self-confessed nihilists as by Weinberg 271

Holiness:
—among Christians the whole debate has been about how we are to understand the union in Holiness of God and The Good Man in a seeming single person called Jesus Christ! 272
—and God’s personal presence in the war of Good against evil
—from which He neither could be absent, nor appear in all His Glory 271-2
—and the life-supporting universe: are utterly meaningful even if only one Saint ever appears in it, especially when all others, despite the rich gifts showered not by chance, choose to call themselves and the universe utterly meaningless! 273
—cannot be attained without considering all the lessons the passing of time keeps on amassing in our ever more critical Spirit: 343
—which only after the most critical examination must determine what truly fits, is worth keeping, adds meaning to meaning! 343
—conquers the Heavens 303
—by hard labor, worked hands, a strong dedicated mind, and a heart broad enough to embrace them 303
—in the war of Good against evil, only freely can The Good Man choose to stay sinless 272
—is unattainable without the possibility of evil, that only we bring into being by choosing it over Holiness 269
—nothing less than it is a purpose proper for the Holy God and the self-respecting man endowed with a healthy intellect 271
—the atheists cannot accept either the proposition of Holiness coming out of nothing, or that the material universe is Its presentation!; that’s why they insist on the universe being meaningless 272
—they know that Holiness is not meaningless! Therefore, a Good Man can neither appear nor rise to Holiness in the absence of God! So, the opposition to God imposes the opposition to the Good Man also!; that’s why the atheists will have nothing to do with Jesus Christ! 272
—nothing less than it is a purpose proper for the Holy God and the self-respecting man endowed with a healthy intellect 271
—the human flesh is the proper dress the Holy God had to choose to make Himself visible to us all, to deliver His Lesson 272
—the world would not be better with out the possibility of Holiness, that alone requires the objective existence of
the possibility of its opposite! 269
—those rejecting it choose the abyss
303
—and starting from the environs of
Jerusalem, they have already
begun to turn the world into
ashes:
—the just reward of insanity! 303
Holy Apostolic See of Rome
—and the claim of Petrine succession
26
Holy Logos:
—presetting all values 91
Holy Perfection:
—impossible without the potentiality
of evil 44
"Holy Scriptures" and God's Logos
72 F/note
Holy Trinity 3-4
—and the "mystery" that is not of the
One Complete-Perfect God collect-
ing into one the three distinct facul-
ties of Logos: the Reasoning, the
Expression, and the Inspiration,
seeking incessantly only Good and
Holiness 349
Homer: paraphrased 352
Hoyle, F. 54
—making false representations of the
heliocentric and geocentric systems
in a textbook 196-7 F/note
Hubble, E. P. 174-5, 181, 308, 348
—his findings and the cosmological
conservation of momentum estab-
lish an immobile absolute center
where expansion began, at which
all momentum vectors always sum
up to zero. This point is the center
of a preferred system of reference
in which all events are spatially
and temporally ordered. This re-

turns relativity 184-5
Human activity:
—its seamless spectrum intoned
by the presence of God and Man
46
Human freedom:
—requires the presence of choice
between sanctity and evil 44
Human languages:
—one by itself capable of describing
God 35 et seq.
Human reason:
—inately superior to the sensory
equipment 256
—the duty arising therefrom 25
—must delimit the certainty
inside the bounds of our limited
sensory equipment 257
Human "scientific" knowledge, for
insisting, by selective subjectivism,
on including in "science" only what
the atheist physicists deem proper,
is basically incomplete and even
outright false 274
"Humanism" facing cruelty and the
stubborn refusal to learn 343
—and the duty to jerk the Spirit back
into Action 343
—do we reject the Spirit of Action?
—if not from God, where is it from?
343
—only indifference as to the conse-
quences of a definitely coming
Future, on the belief that nothing is
coming, comes not from God 343-4
—since still exist people that truly care
for Meaning ultimately leading to
Holiness, about which by definition
only God truly cares, can anybody
deny that it is exactly because they
stand against God that some stand
against Meaning? 344
—unquestionably, even the meaning-
lessness some choose is a meaning,
meant to deny the Meaning 344
Humility:
—by whom it ought to be taught 41
Hulse-Taylor pulsar, 57
Hylleraas, E. A. 233
Ideas:
—how the most dangerous ones are
presented 11-12
—"objects" in a mind, even if not ours;
—of the first and second kind 67
those out there, in the Mind of
God 68
Image and likeness:
—the Asiatic confusion 290
Irrationality and Rationality foolishly
equated! 52
Jesus Christ (see also Holiness):
—if only a God, why do we reject His
Way? 272
—if only a man, why do the Jews not
honor Him more than all others? 272
—which raises the question of
whether a Good Man can rise to
Holiness in the absence of God
272
—that Holiness came out of
nothing is by definition far far
more demanding than that the material universe came out of nothing 272
— the entrance into Jerusalem:
— the expectation of it vs. the fact 302
Jews and the Crucified:
— the crimes of “Christians” may not be charged to Him! 268
— why do they want even His name erased? 268
— unless they show Him evil, they attack Holiness, in Him made visible 268
Jews[and we all in their position] vs. Jesus Christ 302-3
— another gift did they expect:
— instead, the example of Holiness was offered! 303
— unsuitable for the lazy, the soft-handed, the weak-minded, the narrow-hearted 303
Judaism:
— the only recognized source of monotheism 203
— Israel: Jacob’s contention with God 203
— so too, the source of world atheism 203
Kaesuk Yoon, Carol 312
King David:
— orientally passing on the blame of his own sinfulness to his parents, and from them on up to the Creator he addresses! 319
— the blasphemy of Holy God is never greater than when it is purposefully spread to affect the holy procreative act, so that it make us all children of sin 319
— which is why the “higher” Orthodox and the entire Catholic Christian clergy remain unmarried and persuade even the nuns to avoid committing the “sin”! 319
— but aren’t all the “religious” useful? but isn’t even more useful to have more Christian citizens spread among the general population and by their constant exemplar presence in all decent walks of life inform the entire society how the Christians ought to fulfill their duties, including that of producing even more Christian the following generation? isn’t it obvious that by acting as they traditionally do, they are in effect thinning by this sort of unconscious selective breeding the percentage of true Christians in the general population as the generations pass? 319-20
Kingdom of God:
— the reality of its having come the Churches refuse to consider 292
— having as a Logical consequence that we since live the Day of Judgment, and misbehave as we are being judged 292
Knowledge and Faith:
— on the narrow ledge over the abyss and the duty of professors and Churchmen 23-4
Kronecker, L.
— “integers were created by God, all else is man-made” 284
Laplacian determinism 140
Law:
— its presence central in the proof of the existence of God 89
— and the silence of the brokers of power over us 89
— Natural and man-made:
— different 92 et seq.
— not identical 97
— where to look for the former 97
— of separations 165 F/note
Law and chance:
— mutually exclusive 131
Law and the Universe:
— former additional to the physical properties of the latter 222
Law on the constitution of matter:
— asking and settling all the crucial detailed questions 140
Law supporting the universe:
— may not come into self-contained antinomy 296
— thus introducing the question of its absolute Logical origin 296
— unquestionably both physical and mathematical 296
Laws:
— are never products of chance 203
— System of:
— disdained due to incomprehension of the fact that it is not haphazard 204
Laws of Gravitation and Separation of bodies 212
Laws of Nature: underlying:
—are not nature's properties 221
—what truly is their source? 222-3
—the question can be decided, and thus also the question of God! 223
—compels us to search for their source, absent in the physical universe, yet not mysterious, being the Logos, the perfect A and Ω 251-2

Laymen:
—the ordinary ones:
—simply “believe”, coming to new ideas by hearsay alone 83
—the pious ones:
—coming to new ideas mixed fourth hand 83
Le Verrier, U. 161
Least action unit
—and the Democritean atom 211
—and the “uncertainty principle” 211
Leibnitz, G. W. 211
Length:
—not a fundamental but a derived dimension 222
—the question of its constancy 96
Lenski, Richard E. 312
Life:
—and the deep-seated order of the physical world the professors ignore 109
—characterizes not just only the flesh, but principally the Spirit 35-6
—under local conditions 41
Life evinces as its source not chance, but a Grand Design conceived in a Mind guided by Logos 41
Light:
—emission from a continuously moving source forms a series of fronts, each having its own center 192-3
—expression of its velocity 217
—and the so-called “Hubble time” 217
—its character and properties are hard facts of nature 189
—its correct treatment under Newtonian gravitation matches the observed facts! 179
—its dual nature resolved:
—at every point in space, there is mass corresponding to the total energy in it, but it requires time to react, decided by the unit of action 221
—its front and the state of motion of its origin 189

—its front cannot be observed 216
—its true center of emission and the light front 188
—limits our observations 216-7
—still regarded as Newton’s corpuscles and Young’s waves 71
—the constancy of its velocity an arbitrary human supposition intrinsically contrary to Newton’s Law and the physical and cosmological evidence 219
—the first broadcast of the expanding universe 216
—transparency and opaqueness 231
Light and energy:
—problems of 99
Light and matter:
—their ultimate constitution 219
Lindley, D. 20, 57
Logic:
—if it is only a figment, there is no right and wrong, but only the power and the pleasure of the most heinous villain! 280
—unless you are him, it is natural that you take an immediate interest! 280
Logic, philosophy, science & theology in ancient and present Athens 83
F/note
today not interacting 83
Logical and Mathematical Simplicity Principle 146
—present in the Ultimate Mental Process 168
Logos:
—a general presentation of its meaning 13-4 F/note
—absurd to deny its independent of us existence and operation 297
—alone closes the Gates to the Abyss 86
—and experimental facts 17
—and its balanced physical support 17
—and the oriental Faith of Church in God 18
—are not produces a “science ” that rejects Him 16
—Heraclitus and St. John 13-4 F/note
—in the mouths of the blasphemers, He becomes empty words 303
—ought to be obeyed even in the axiomatic establishment of Religion 296
—possessing neither antinomies nor based on them is necessarily other-worldly, yet not imprisoned in its own world nor self-imprisoned 297
—the kind and limits of His power:
—all remaining power is unquestionably raw! 298
—today denied 15
—unknowingly we all trust Him, or else, both belief and unbelief in God would be hopeless 297
—without Him, Religion becomes irReligion 303

Logos and God:
—are the same and precede the creation of heaven and earth 326
—the “scientists” cannot propose a resolution superior to that offered here 298
—the “theologians” must thus tell us whether they prefer in ilLogical, or a perfectly Logical God 298

Logos and Theology:
—examined as befits our anthropic, no longer “human” nature 289
—its various aspects, forms, byproducts 295
—consider the order in which they are set, in order to make sense of the whole 341
—his idea of the electron as a hollow sphere 242

Lorentz transformations:
—and the relativity of space and time 193-4
—the true and so-called ones 187, 190 et seq., 202

Lynch, A. 164
Lyttleton, R. A. 16, 60

Man:
—revealed by the perfection he assigns to his God! 126
—the only known natural, living, physico-mathematical quantum-mechanical solution endowed with sufficient self-and-environment-awareness as to ask the ultimate questions about the exact Nature of Being 350
—and the ossified dogmas about the nature of man of Churches and atheists 350

Man and ape:
—mostly of similar matter, yet only he former asks the questions! 108

Man’s duality
—as of distinct flesh and Spirit rejected by religions seeing the two as one, and by “science” rejecting the Spirit 37-8

Masoretic text 290

Mass:
—its natural unit: the Democritean atom 95
—mass-energy conservation:
—a weapon against the Personal God - Logos also sitting as Judge 141

Material universe:
—by the fact that it shows its Design and center, it ipso facto proves its Creator 351

Materialists:
—self-exposed by the company they keep 108
—though only man-, not ape-like, yet betray their spirituality! 108

Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity 213, 222-3, 241, 347-8
—compelling and by far the most beautiful mistress ever 348
—while the Judaic theology dealt solely in the transactions of man with his God on a quid pro quo Covenant that alas still informs all monotheistic religions, she alone seeks to make the Man-God relationship understood as a union of consenting intimate spiritual friendship 348
—and the “idolatrous” Theology of the Greeks 348
—does not mince words, numbers, significance 251
—is given only lip service 219
—is integral, not differential 66
—sweeps clear the floor of twentieth century “science” 216
—the Most Elegant Design under it makes perfect the order of Nature, completely demolishing the “philosophy” under the current “scientific” beliefs 247
—the true and the lame 226
—unites in a single scheme the micro- and the macro-world 244 (see also under Atom, Chemical Atom and Electron)

Mathematics
—and their proper place in reasoning 275 et seq.
—how the Greeks respected it as an inseparable part of Logic and attributed it directly to God 275
—its “theological” neglect is part of Jewish-oriental tradition 275
—part of the perfect and complete
intellectual attributes of the Personal Deity 275
—when neglected as a part of our Logical Faith and delivered to the enemy, God is profaned 276
—without it, Christianity has become Jewish and oriental 276

Matter:
—and none other than even the rocks themselves, created self-and-environment-awareness, finally advancing to the level of Man becoming finally able to consider and judge even the purely spiritual fundamentals of Being, ask the Great Questions, and home in to the Creator Spirit that made it 350-1
—receiving the Answer, the only Unforgettable Truth, that God alone, the Ultimate Pure Spirit alone, truly ontologically is, by His own right: while all the rest exist solely by His Grace 350

Matter and energy:
—believed to be the same, are not, 93

Matter and energy problems:
—their solution 146 et seq.

Matter, micro-structure and universal quantities 250
Maupertuis, P. L. M. de 211
Men:
—come here so that each manly present, argue and, if he can, protect and defend his explanation of all that exists, along with the propriety of his doings in the presence of all else that is 351
Michelson, A.A and Morley, E. W. 100
Michelson-Morley experiment 71, 191, 219, 220
—a two-dimensional analogue of a three-dimensional instrument 151-2
—and its “resolution” by relativity 204 et seq.

problems with 151 et seq.
—three major ones were the mistakes committed 151-2

Mind:
—and the spiritual necessity of the possibility of evil 27
—and the unfathomable God 27
—uncontrolled by Logos: is controlled by leaf 27

Missing mass quandary resolved 218

Monotheistic religions:
—and their continued studied profanities passing for virtue as human blood translates to profits in the markets of the world 339
—their believers must take due note of the Essence of Perfect God and immediately cease all warring 300
—or else, they expose their malicious and evil intent! 300

Moral entities and responsibility:
—the latter is intrinsic to their nature and it cannot be shed off! 336

Moral Law and human acts:
—the former is determined, or else, it would not be a Law, in order only to guide and to impel,
—so, the latter are not predetermined neither at all are we compelled 355-6

Moral standards:
—how they owe to be kept under Logos 30

Mortality and mortality:
—belief in God must include Logical standards for the former and a compelling reason for the latter 295
Morris H. M. & Parker 72
(Inst. for Creation Research)
—and creation science 43, 72, 74, 79, 81
—erroneous their creationist view of thermodynamics 92-3
—erroneous their creationism an aprioristic alternative model of origin 82
Morris, Simon Conway 313

Mortality:
—does not bestow an obligation to attempt extending this life beyond the limit to which it is useful to the purpose for which it was given us 295
—suggests that the “good life” is not the very highest good
—only the honest pursuit of Holiness is! 293

Most Elegant Design Principle:
—equivalent to absolute Determinism 240-1

Motion in elliptical grooves 178
Motion in the universe and the three-body problem 165 F/note
Music of the Celestial Spheres:
—calls for other ears! 126

Mutation rate:
—least or optimum? arguments for 118-9

Mutations:
—and the confusion of specie development and new specie generation 135
—are they true microscopic physical
states or only an elaborate mental construct? 120
—as viewed by outsiders and insiders 119
—Nature’s still unknown method of eliminating the harmful ones drastically affects our conclusions 120-1
—of perfect organisms: are they possible, and where are the in-between links? 122
—the vast majority of them admitted as harmful 118

Natural Fact and human invention 97
—only the former by Nature or by God, 97

Natural Law:
—contrary to all claims of chance, uncertainty, indeterminacy, doubt, and every kind of muddled thinking 97
—determination of its source results in removal of doubt 70
—how the “authorities” today receive it 21-2

Natural World:
—as God’s creation is subject to a fully deterministic, non-redundant, non self-conflicting Least Set of Laws not permitting uncertainty 98

Nature:
—allows a clear classical picture to be had of the micro-world: 246
—this suffices to overthrow the current form of quantum theory 246
—is most certainly of only one kind for all, and united under certainty! 236-7
—shown to obey objective physical-natural Laws cognizant of the sequence of the cardinal numbers! 245

Nature’s main details:
—whether set pantheistically or by God are fully knowable 97
—atheists deny both options 97

Needs:
—intellectual and spiritual;
—by whom they are not met 13-4

Negative and imaginary numbers: in mathematics and physics, 55
New York Public Library 196
Newton, I. 100, 204, 222, 240, 348
Newton and Einstein:
The latter adapted to the former, yet claimed the former subject to his findings! 101
Newton by Einstein replaced?
—an idiotic gross lie! 311
—when on falling, fragile goods break, no relativity can restore them to wholesomeness! 311
—given an immovable Natural Law, no other Natural Law contradicts it:
—Nature is not confused for the fact that she never is asked to choose among contradictory Laws:
—whose inner strictly rational structure remains invisible solely for the fact that our professors refuse to recognized the basic rationality of her systems of Laws 312

Newton’s Law of gravitation:
—and the parallel of Mona Lisa 207-8
—having no limit of applicability, only reliable candidate for letting us see through all human conventions 313-4
—its proper consideration and the parallel of protecting society from its guards 208
—operates completely favor-free by containing hidden in itself the totally separate law of separations 314
—significance of 207 et seq.
—ties best with the Law of conservation of universal mass, not just of some select bodies and accounts for phenomena supposedly described by relativity, without recourse to it and its weaknesses 314-5
Newtonian gravitation:
—a natural hard fact 199 et F/Note
—and the separation of bodies:
—problems with 157 et seq. (see also: Separation of bodies)
—has no distance limit! 180
—its correct formulation 160
—the failure to determine the source of its purported inaccuracy 157-8
—sets new demands on our understanding of the world, which the “experts” refuse to admit! 206

Nihilist “Scientists”:
—challenged to show rational both their reasoning that man is the next step up from the ape, and the leap from the ape to thinking of from photon to God and all things/ideas in between 36 F/Note
—disdain the distance from the ape to Aristarchus’ heliocentrivity,
Beethoven’s Ninth,
Byzantine Vespers’ Φως Ἑλπίδων,
da Vinci’s Gioconda,
Dante’s Divine Comedy,
El Greco’s The Grand Inquisitor,
Handel’s Messiah,
Hindus’ Upanishads,
Homer’s epics,
Kepler’s Laws,
Newton’s Laws,
Plato’s Republic,
Pythagoras’s Theorem,
Shakespeare’s Sonnets,
Schubert’s Winterreise,
Sophocles’ Antigone,
V. Williams’s Lark Ascending.

Nobel laureates:
—confused about religion 199
—do they deserve the “God” they worship? 201
Nobel prize award:
—accepted by atheist-nihilists defines the worst unrecognized schizophrenia 254
Nordstrom D.
—[Editor, PHYSICAL REVIEW, D] 195
Nothing is truly meaningless:
[both meanings meant]:
—when we learn nothing even from our pain, we truly deserve punishment, as anything less would be un-Just 343
Nuclear particles and the problem of mass and energy 103-5
Nucleus and electron internal structure still unresolved 242
—charges on a rotating spherical shell produce an electromagnetic moment half as great as that by an equal size total charge revolving in an orbit of equal diameter, thus classically accounting for the half-spin quantum numbers 242
—electron: a never collapsing spherical elastic harmonically vibrating spring balances the electrostatic Coulomb force, and all other internal and external forces 242-3
—a concept of operations bridging the superatomic and subatomic structure of matter is needed for ensuring the unity of the two and of the whole physical world, yet has so far been ignored 243
Numbers in themselves:
—purely mental constructs, needed to understand the rest of the world 277

Oakes, Ed. T., S. J, 269
Objective hard facts vs. man-made theories 201
Objective Natural Law and moral responsibility 304 et seq.
Objective Reality:
—being One, has no sides! 311
—“religion” refuses to tackle the issue of God’s self-respecting obligation to install in His own Creation the solid proof of its being His thoroughly cared for product! 311
—“science” evades the fundamental question of how Nature (made of things needing causes, and of laws regulating its components and themselves needing a consistent lawgiver) came about 311
—compels us never to buy prepackaged opinions, but only those that alone make true sense of the Whole 311
Opinions and persons:
—silly persons respect more the former! 84
Original sin
— and the differential treatment of men and the serpent 27
Particles of matter:
—and the problem of action at a distance and “bonding particles” 230-1
—the question of their mass and size is not discussed 230
—there is an inverse universal relationship relationship of particle mass and geometrical size 230-1
—[AT&T Bell Labs] 195
Penzias and Hohenberg
People of soft “faith”:
— belonging to both camps, dispense broad smiles to all 255
Persons are not physical and the faces are only masks 304
Philosophers:
—ancient and present:
—at their different method of thinking 225-6
Philosophy:
—always seeks a rational purpose 225
Philosophy and Science:
—can only advance after we dispel the fear of true Freedom, that is the
other side of Moral Determinism:
—of which coin the world is made complete! 336
—learn of each other second hand 83
—theology is informed third hand 83
Physical science:
—has flatly failed to show the universe possessing of its own the needed mathematical and Logical characters 296
Physical scientists:
—do not examine all possibilities about the world’s source, but attempt to straight-jacket both the world and its source by their theories 203
—how the wise examine the evidence 203
Physical world:
—Hubble’s findings stirred the murky waters 257
—its definite beginning irritates the atheists 257
—why Einstein chose to pretend to have learned nothing by the black backdrop of the sky at night! 257
“Physical world”:
—the fiction had in the skewed minds of “physicists” 258
—ghastly Picassoesque pictures of sick souls, pretending to be living! 258
Physics:
—its proper meaning is very badly confused 255–6
Physics and Theology:
—highly intertwined 304
Planck, M. 211, 227
Planck anarchy 139
Planck constant: 236
—a variable, not a true constant? 227–9
—problems at the beginning 227
Planck length and time, 261–5
—in the context of the expanding unit-verse 137
Plato:
—forewarned us to preconsider all consequences, obvious and hidden of every statement 91, 278
—his always standing challenge 213
—in the Timaeus tells how the wreath is won 62
—knew that even time too had been created 80
Plonski, (Mrs.)
—Employee? PHYSICAL REVIEW 194
Politics and War:
—each is its opposite by other means 321
—on them both, both the blood and the spirit of people is no object! 321
—the profits fan ever hotter the flames 321
—the Lord and His Justice shall not much longer be mocked 321
Pontius Pilate and the Temple priests 302
Pope John Paul II 28
Popper, K. 170
Popper, K. R. 226
Positronium:
—failure to detect its expected characteristic double emission spectral lines 250
Power:
—how it is being enforced 29
—if all belongs in a single Being, would you rather prefer Him Reasonable or unReasonable, loving, truthful and just, or according to their opposites? 298
—the struggle for it divided even the churches 28–9
Pre-Copernicanism:
—set one man at the center of the universe, and its far worse modern metastasis 258
Pre-Copernicanism and relativity compared 166
—and Einstein’s invention of psychological satisfaction of all observers to regard themselves central 166
Present theories:
—suspicious their purpose, ground and origin 47
Pride and arrogance of practitioners:
—divided faith and science 87
Principle of Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity:
—applied to the theory of evolution 126
Professorial teachings and the question of keeping (standard) time 306–9
Professors:
—first insult themselves and then their audiences 305
—undeterred proffer falsehoods 257–8
—why do they keep secret that no Law comes without Lawgiver? Do they intend to make forget that laws need to be responsive to needs; that no responsible self-respecting Lawgiver ever forgets, but that they colluding with irresponsible present-day law-
makers want hidden, in order that
undisciplined minds, by them willfully
in that state kept, miss the responsi-
bility of the irresponsible? But isn’t
that blasphemy? 313
—will they at long last find the courage
to say that there is no sensible effect
without a strict underlying Law, and
no such a Law without Lawgiver?
313
—and that all effects and only effects
have causes, and that “accidental”
effects are so called for our igno-
rance or neglect of the causes? 313
Professors and Nobel laureates:
—branding “tradition”, now that of
atheistic evolution, on soft brains
317
—carefully neglecting to explain the
chemical and physical prerequisites
of biological structures 317-8
—the story of themselves as natural
“successes” or “failures” shall never
be told by throwing their deck of
cards to eternity 318
—their struggle to pass the “message”
of nothingness to the world
includes, alas, their personal agony to
reduce to nothing even themselves!; what a misconceived purpose for
laureates!; exposing the extent of the
gratitude they feel towards the
Law that keeps them alive, and the Law-
giver Who respects their freedom to
choose and blaspheme! 318
Professors and speakers:
—they split words, and cut and kill
consciences and only then also
bodies 305-6
Ptolemy, Claudius 163
Ptolemy, Copernicus, Newton, Einstein
and the relativists:
—reviewing and abusing to review old
theories 195
Punishment and retribution:
—the ancient Greek and the modern
element 295
—no accident that the Greeks did not
allow lashing a citizen, and never
established an executioner 295
—see how Socrates was punished 295
Purpose:
—through the Pythagorean imperative
of “know thyself” [brought up to the
context of the entire Uni-verse (since
we alone, for all we know, are its sole
living and thus sensing it conscience)]
becoming a universal demand for
Holiness of the entire Creation, the
atheists consciously choose to reject
316-7
Purposelessness and nihilism:
—“scientifically” introduced 15
Quantum mechanics:
—and the variables hidden beneath
51
—the step beyond relativity to total
irrationality 50-1
Quantum theory:
—founded on:
—Planck’s work on the black body
radiation 231
—Einstein’s work on the
photoelectric phenomenon 231
—Rutherford’s conception of the
atom, contrary to the facts 231
—Bohr’s early quantum theory of
the hydrogen atom, contrary to the
facts 231
Quantum theory, “new”:
—objections to it 233 et seq.
—the electron ionizes from an
infinite radius of revolution of
around the nucleus 233
—the motion of electrons in the
atom becomes an exactly
unsolvable many-body problem
that implies a defect of Nature
233-4
—electron cloud “seen” in
“probability space” 234
—“orbitals” (probability density
lobes) mostly limitedly spaced 234
—electrons and trajectory analogies
234-5
—quantum mechanicians refuse
to tell how the electron jumps from
place to place [suggesting the Star
Trek superior!] 235
—supporting it, Heisenberg
suggested treating the electron as
a mere mathematical concept and
introduced the “uncertainty
principle”, thus misconstruing the
least action law! 235-6
Quintessence:
—its double ancient meaning is now
disdained! 128
Rationalist cynic:
—judging “scientific” theories
and developments 47, 49, 52-8, 59
Reality:
—being rational never deceives
—and admits definitive answers
—and includes human freedom
—and its essential duality

Reality and the mathematicians:
—is the former intrinsically resolvable
—or rather, the latter, be they even
-of the first class, subject to error?
—the logical consequences of facing
-the dilemma

Reason vs. Biblical Cosmogony

Reasoning
—and its ultimate consequences
—and the either/or choice
—and the objective evidence of the
-Laws out there

Relativity
—and determinism
—and release from responsibility
—and introducing absolute license of force
-against Reason and Logos

Relativity principles:
—inseparable the “scientific” and the philosophical (see also under
-Eddington, A. S., Einstein, A.)

Relativity theory:
—and the question of approximation
-but to what?
—as a weapon of atheism
—effort to present it a principle of
-invariance

-General:
—convenient, for all who fear the
-Absolute
—faulty logic of 162 et seq.
—from its inception fails the test of
-global generality
—how it becomes natural law has not
-been explained?
—never addressed the issue of the real
effect of the entire universe on every
-single photon in it?
—never explained how the velocity of
-light is kept generally constant!
—never produced a general Law for the
-motion of light far or near heavy
-bodies, all the way to the limits of the
-Universe!

-Special:
—blunders and conspiracies
—human failure typically passed on
-to Nature and to God
—its conclusions desired before it
-was invented
—some faults of classical determinism
-gradually realized

Religion:
—has not held high the Light,
-nor illuminated every aspect of our
-lives, stating solid the Faith in
-Logos
—yet sets the most important example

Religion and Science:
—facing the questions of the world,
-the former closer to the ground
-point of Logic
—separate yet forming a unity,
-choose to stand opposing each
-other

Religious leaders and the Word of
-God:
—which hand wrote it best

Responsibility moral and intellectual:
—may not be separated, as it is either
-altogether complete, or else it simply
does not exist
—this truly universal vision of the
-world, for offending mortally the
-“establishment”, is deliberately
-being ignored and kept hidden by both
-Churches” and “universities”!

Resurrection of Christ:
—had to involve the change of the
-body, but only in order to be seen by
-our material eyes; this does not mean
-that the body became Spirit, nor in-
deed the reverse; when matter is
-nothing other than Democritean
-atoms [and Creation is the simplest
-only if it involves them, or in other
-words, the finest by definition form of
-physical light]. His body did not
-experience a fundamental transformation
-of its true nature, but only of its ap-
-parent to us form; the freedom of the
-Lord to do what He must, namely,
-the best and noblest, was still thus fully
-preserved; after Judgment, the Spirit
-goes its way, and matter its own!
-but as Judgment inevitably means
-the end of things as we know them
now, what then becomes superfluous cannot be considered survivable!

Richard J.,
—provided the numerical dress to the ancient Epimenidean paradox, on which dress Gödel fashioned the “proof” of his theorems 279

Riesenberg, Loren H. 312
Russell, B. 188, 204
—and the question of “who created the Creator” 70
—attempted to prove (by general agreement unsuccessfully!) that $1 + 1 = 2$, forgetting the definition $2 = 1 + 1$

Russell, B. (logistic school) 277
Rutherford-Bohr conception of the atom 241
Sagan, C. 286, 316
“Saints”, “scientists”, “citizens”:
—consciously choosing to separate God from Logos, by canceling His Holy Objective, turning it into “business”!
—their one half keeps on “worshiping” Him, as the other keeps on profaning Him
—both at the expense of every foolish obedient buyer 341
—for naked power, the strongest all-controlling empire, the empty applause of worshiping ignoramuses believing mere glow-worms to be the “illuminati”; and last but certainly first, as it today buys the rest, for no other than money 341
—auch is today the “education” the “masses” receive, demanded by some to be had for free; forgetting the eternal “quid pro quo” 341-2
—consciously disdaining the Intellect-Logos, calling Him nothing 342
—just look at the “social upheaval” respect of Logos would cause 342
—churches and their coffers: not for offering Glory and Thanks, but for favors and fear alone do they get packed 342
—haughtily ignore Heraclitus’, Socrates’ and Plato’s teaching regarding the Logos, calling Him the “Word”
—do please tell: what do the many today make of it? 342-3
—Justice (the system of)
—in utter need of the petty criminal,
as for the great transgressors we have the independent commissions protecting their personal data 342

Schiller, H. C. F. von 350
Schwarzschild radius:
—here found applicable to the entire expanding Universe 218
Schrödinger wave-function: 233
—deals not in real things but in probabilities, the verification of which is impossible 234
Sciama, D. W. 183, 219
—on Eddington’s 1919 measurements 164
—on the uselessness of “soft” theories 165
Science:
—a deadly “game” involving the good name and honor of scientists, the integrity of Nature, but also the integrity and honor of the Holy God Logos Himself 251
—does not look deep in the world, confines itself to producing theories 21
—done correctly only together with correct Philosophy and Theology 90
—its current unconfessed practical method of “advancing” knowledge 196
—means absolutely nothing, if not Complete Knowledge 347
Science and theology:
—atheistically separated 44
—mishandled by creationists and the pious 44
Science and Theology:
—answering whether their mixing is proper 288
—demand committing one’s very soul 22
—impose only apparent 22
—spiritual essence: common and inalienably personal; such that all may offer the best they can 289
“Science” and “Theology”:
—fight over man’s misconceived nature 36-7
Science-related News Media:
—Press Release to, dated April 21, 1987, and how the world is not being informed 197-8

Scientific Community:
—its reaction since 1985 to the inescapable hard facts under the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity 251
Scientific examination stops at the physical universe 70
Scientist:
—cannot be serious while refusing to consider the cardinal fundamentals 348
Scientist: creationist, or atheist?:
—only the former if truly objective is capable of completing his duty 253
—the latter, scared of objectivity, does not see that the human body is most-likely a perfect solution of the most complex known quantum-mechanical problem, that cannot be a constant product of chance 253
Scientists:
—their responsibilities while thinking through the consequences of existence and their actions 226
Scientists and God 59
"Scientists":
—deliberately keep on "confusing" mind and brain 260
Scriptures:
—of men said "inspired", and words not pegged on Logos 21
—questioned by such as Adam's age, and the story of Babel 33-4
—their fulfillment 326
—given the imperfection of the human word, not even the Bible is capable of a TheoLogy superior to that directly written by God Himself in the heavens 326
—God cannot have given us two contradictory TheoLogies 326
—written as best it was possible still contain hidden blasphemies 33-4
Separation of physical bodies:
—along which path are they to be considered? 159
—neglected by general relativity 161
Sin:
—enters Reality solely by our choice of action 44
Sirens:
—those who lure to the abyss, 286
Socrates:
—obedient to Apollo only sought to cast God's Light to the souls of men, to the point of teaching them even how to give up their lives as free, erect/correct, standing up citizens believing in righteousness 270
Socrates and Plato:
—not mystics but Logicians 62
—show the point from which the search can continue 21
Sophomore pride and the unseemly determination of proud old men to take to their graves the Truth they cannot shake 345
Spacetime 100
Spinoza, B. 260, 330
—and the depersonification of God 141
Spirit and matter:
—ontologically distinct stay separate 292
—the Lord's Resurrection settled the matter for ever 292
—the wonders following His Resurrection explained 292
Spirit in the world:
—only in reference to the Spirit are we in God's image and likeness! 331
—that we cannot fail to recognize it in both humans and the speaking eyes, "voices" and behavior of the trainable animals: was also created, in addition to matter, not of or from it 331
—thus, the part of it we see hidden in Nature's Laws is indeed solely God's own 331
St. Andrew 28
St. Augustine's theory of "just war" now advanced to the stage of "preventive" war 42
St. Luke 28
St. Paul 28, 33
St. Peter 26, 27, 28
Statistics of order and the Planck time interval 110
Tact, tactlessness, curiosity and Faith in Rationality and Meaningfulness on the ledge above the abyss 24-5
Tarski, A. 276 et seq., 286, 288
Tarski's theorem discussed:
—searching for Truth is hard, but not hopeless
—the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity of the world based on the Most Elegant Design is not shaken 286
Teaching and "conferencing" more coldly examined 308
Teaching of "Science" and "Religion" in the current practical real way and
—profiting from it 308-10—
—and “believing” in God told to serve Us! 310
—how the debate is staged up 310-1
Telescopes and microscopes:
—the former tell of the seeming disorganized yet needed brute power of heavenly Fire
—the latter tell of the far greater glory of that same Firepower by Law brought under total control in the meticulously organized universe within us!
—those observing through them:
—globally uncultivated peasants failing to see themselves as such universes,
—ignoring cavalierly the hard physical fact that they themselves are celestial bodies of otherwise untold beauty and thus necessarily also of primordially set purpose 316

“Theologians”, ignorant of their ignorance of the true state of matter, speak of the resurrection of physical bodies (though only somehow “transformed”) in a way that smacks of delayed transmigration, a varied but still old Asiatic belief! this cannot be a Christian doctrine of afterlife! 334
—transmigration and Transfiguration:—
—the latter, a uniquely Christian term, still not understood fully, is passing into another state, unknown to humans, described in human words uncertain of their suitability for use in the description! 334 et seq.
—the resurrected, being transfigured, shed their previous physical nature and are altered into a new, no longer physical nature!: the Lord spoke only of the Kingdom of God being at hand, immediate, no longer to be awaited! His Suffering and Resurrection, His body turning to light and His Spirit separating from its temporary fleshly home, truly were the ultimate Transfiguration! 334

“Theologians” and “creationists”
—despite claims of respect for the biblical text, still do not take in its full weight that “in the beginning was the Logos”, not what they misunder-stand as the “Word” 325
Theological Dualism:
—ancient Western Asian, only later manifested as Manichaism 291
—temptation in the light of Logos 291
Theological reasoning:
—and the religious authorities’ reliance on external thinkers interested in other matters 82-3
—its state today 82
“Theology”:
—at best a collection of men’s opinions 88
—commercial, and where it leads 84
Theology:
—of the Greeks:
—false called “idolatrous” 348
tells of the Lord as HE IS! 88
Theoretical arithmetic 276 et seq.
—and the unsuccessful formal twentieth century study of its foundations 277
—due to our still incomplete understanding of the quantitative mental nature of numbers and our faulty appraisal of them within the far wider qualitative universe of the mind, and of how qualities and quantities relate rationally 277
—human axioms cannot in themselves examine their own veracity 278
—but this does not assert that Truth and falsehood cannot be told apart 278
—the faultless proof comes from the entire universe of facts, in which no instance can be cited as contradicting it, that relates to Plato’s warning about consequences of statements made 278
—precise formal language means no other than a human axiomatic formalism 278
—necessarily uses clearly non-arithmetical connective particles 277
Theories:
—and their acceptance 97
—invited, not discovered 163
—not better than their assumptions and our wasted efforts 65 et seq.
Theories of science:
—how they get started and are being manhandled 111
—ignore the true meaning of universe 111
Theories, principles and hypotheses:
—“science” today rejects their proper consideration 199
Theorists and claims of “proof” 52-3
Theory of evolution:
— (see also under Evolution)
— and the cultural milieu 123
— and the real world 111 et seq.
— Divine Economy and the Purpose of Creation 106 et seq.
— if correct, the fossil record is the record mostly of failures! 121
— looks more like a façade of licensed viciously operating immorality! 122
— stigmatized by materialist atheism 106 et seq.
— understood as it only can stand, yet taught and practiced as a lever of social demolition 124

Theory of quantum mechanics:
— a most peculiar collection of fundamentally illogical ideas 227
— and the deeper issues of existence and Logic 224
— and the particles of matter:
— the question of their mass and size is not discussed 230
— does not connect the Planck Law of Least Action to the “principle of uncertainty” 227
— no link to the ancient Democritean atomic theory, the first quantum theory 224
— problems of and their resolution 224 et seq.

Thermal death 93

Thermodynamics:
— axiomatic, not necessarily true 94
— not yet united 93

Time:
— its quantization logically unacceptable 227
— its reversal and current theories of past states of the universe 102-3
— physical and psychological 95 f/n.

Tomlin, E. W. F.:
— scathingly criticizes evolution 125-6
— touches on “thematism” and its source 126

Total Love:
— without Total Logos in Total Control is the Most Dangerous Total Passion, exactly for the fact that it dresses as the Highest Virtue! 298
— Traditionalist refusing to deliver his valued old ideas to the fresh air is no good! 345

Truth:
— commitment to it of the “scientific” and “religious” authorities:
— the Reader is asked to judge 221
— fearing nothing contains no mystery! 351
— has not here been either invented nor even “discover”, only uncovered 352
— is that the Spirit is Master and shall resolve all matters according to Logos that is one with Justice and Love; since it is just to love only the lovable and worth loving only the just, that are solely spiritual matters 292-3
— and we blaspheme ignoring the now hard evidence 292-3

Truth and falsehood:
— and the state of ethics and morality 85
— by way of “unfalsifiability”, are in effect declared co-equal! 91
— the Churches, now (im)properly scared of the consequences, attempt further to distance themselves from Science proper, in order to salvage what faith in God still remains in prelates and faithful, and do not in humility face the problem squarely, for its being a direct attack against God (secretly the more so in the form of the Gödel and Tarski theorems, that, by undermining arithmetic, the foundation of all exact sciences, cast doubt on Logos, that is both the very nature of God and the intellectual tool by which He created the world) 279
— their conscious blurring prevents the world from keeping Faith and Knowledge intact and together, and from clearing them both from all that in each of them is untrue 279
— their distinction blurred by the modern pseudoscientific findings, which are solely due to the separation of Science from Religion 279
— their ultimate stages 85

Turing, A. M. 278

Ultimate blasphemy:
— every effort suggesting that God is illogical, unjust and unLoving 293
— some current forms of it 293
— Ultimate Holiness is the Ultimate Objectivity 273
— and the shame of all three monotheistic religions and all who pour acid and poison rather than balsam to
our common wounds 273-4

Uncertainty:
due to the oscillatory nature of the electron, relates only to prediction of direction and velocity of particles flying off after an atomic or subatomic collision 247-8

Uncertainty principle
—and associated real practical concerns 236
—and the refusal to explain how uncertainty, if it be true, brought about the certainty of the believed uncertainty principle! 237-8
—and to forbid hidden variables and all laws controlling them 51
—the ancient reason for rejecting the existence of certainty 238

Unfalsifiability:
—and the absence of “faith” 86
—and the pride of its practitioners 87
—notion and origin of 82 et seq.
of all faiths: atheistically inculcated and the damage done 87

“Unfalsifiable” beliefs:
—stuck to for their being believed safe from disproof 83

Universal expansion:
—and the law of conservation of (instantaneous) momentum 215-6
—establishes a natural preferred frame of reference 216
—is no longer mysterious 215
—its deceleration is no other than the deceleration of the velocity of the first light 217
—mandated by Newton’s law and verified by Hubble 215
—refers solely to the volume of the universe, not to space! 215
—requires the existence of a static center 216
—too fundamental not to be treated as fundamental in any theory claiming universality 183

Universal gravitational constant:
—its true nature 212 et seq.
—relates to universal mass density and to time (the age of the universe) 212 et seq.

Universe:
—a “thematic” composition of Democritean atoms 126
—its expansion per Hubble due to its structure 206
—under Law, and the constrained way

the professors examine it 125
—able to deliver its exact reaction to/at an exact address 229
—different the ways of looking at it 209-10
—the engineer’s view of it and its Laws 210
—expands in agreement with the law of gravitation under constant G and M 214-5
—expressions of its properties and current values 217
—expression of its radius 217
—how the Newton and Hubble laws coming together 211, 219
—so says the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity 219
—ignores no fact and no “detail” 111
—its laws allow testing the hypothesis of a young earth 220
—its size and our obligations as thinkers 263-4
—are we to act as citizens of the universe or just as peasants ensconced in a yet smaller and narrower valley? 263-4
—only peasants, moles and ants think narrowly of themselves 264
—its statical and dynamical features 210
—its total mass found to be constant 214
—of one and of many kinds of fundamental particles 224-7
—of one and of many kinds of fundamental particles 224-7
—Simplicity, Economy, Logic demand that it be the least that can serve its objective 264
—the power of the findings cannot be refuted 220-1
—where the least and the most come together under Law 212
—with the sufficient command given, it proceeded according to Plan 220

Value of Person and belief in God 84

Voltaire, (F. M. Arouet) 211

Wars and their succession:
—all in pursuit of profit
—the victor’s final bluff and how he,
too, was caught in it 339
We and the universe:
— we still need to comprehend our position: none than us more intelligent; from none in it do we expect any help; yet masters of it are we not! 337
— we must still learn our lessons;
— even from our animals 337-8
— cats being proud animals do turn their backs, but surely we can reason better than they! yet, we all still have not learned the lesson! 338
— caught up between Fluffy and God, are forced to consider how seriously He cannot but have taken it upon Himself not to prove lesser than we would think of Him seeing Him standing on the uppermost rung of Perfection! 338

Weinberg, S. 15, 20, 198, 286
— admits an irreducible mystery that science will not eliminate as it cannot answer the "why?" 264
— does not see that even Nature’s Laws do have a purpose relating to that “why?” 264
— does not see that the only answer that surpasses all subjectivity is: “but for the sake of Holiness, both God’s and ours”, being the extreme opposite of the nihilism he prefers but is ever so careful as never to mention, hiding behind the innocent-looking general atheistic assertion that “God does not exist; therefore, life is utterly meaningless.” 269
— and the atheists gambling manically on the very next Planck chronide 263
— and the relations of Christians and Jews during the centuries 267-8
— asking “what other standards can we use?” 267
— but certainly not ours! 268
— how little children teach 268-9
— attacks God for the desire of men who by blasphemous misconceptions said to be Holy Writ attempt to maintain their grip on society, rather than solely advance the Cause of the Holy God; and fails to see that even vicious men think of God as of themselves 266-7
— chooses to mention playwrights (Aeschylus and Euripides) and forgets the attack of Meletus against. Socrates 270
— calls upon dubious past witnesses such as ancient playwrights in support of his thesis, but forgets the attack of Meletus against. Socrates 270
— cannot bring just one citation from Socrates, Plato or Aristotle stating the nonexistence of God 270
— and forgets how Jesus Christ filled Palestine with benevolent miracles (not the malevolent miracles he concedes would be persuasive!), continuing to state that “there are no signs of benevolence that might have shown the hand of a designer” 270
— does not attempt to define life quantum-mechanically but takes refuge behind “evolution” 265
— does not examine the common quantum-mechanical significance of low-grade “inorganic” and high-grade “organic” matter, but attributes the former to a craftsman and the latter to “evolution”! 264-5
— does not discuss how Law obtains in Nature 198 et seq.
— does not state whether he regards life beneficial 271
— guesses that the hand of a designer should be in the fundamental principles, yet does not see that the Ultimate Simplicity of the Most Elegant Design demands one only force, operating under the Perfect Quantum Law on a one only kind of fundamental Democritean particles combining to bring about all “solutions”, including the human body! 265
— his supposedly “reasoned” atheistic views examined 258 et seq.
— in discussing a Designer Universe, he calls “impersonal” laws that are clearly products of mental processes 261
— rather than arguing from the data and the beginning, he just supposes 259, 261
— and most tellingly, he does not undertake a very much sounder calculation of probabilities 261-3
— is asked to state:
—whether Holiness, including that
of Christ, is nothing; while the
million coming with the reward is
something!; and
whether Holiness could
sprout
better than in Hitler's
concentration camps? 273
—if it did not, was Hitler truly
responsible, whom Weinberg
correctly attacks for his crimes,
though conveniently forgetting
that he does so on God-pegged
morality, without which, there
can be neither immorality nor
any crime? 273
—and if the concentration camps
produced just one only Saint,
will Weinberg, the nihilist,
dismiss him on grounds of too
much waste in the midst of
"meaninglessness"? 273
—is obviously incapable of the
honesty and objectivity we need
—and offers himself as example of
subjectivity:
—dismiss ing belief in a God he
supposes to demand blood,
yet is willing to believe in Him
were He to strike him down in
retaliation for his unbelief! 266
—not realizing that he thus offers
obeisance to a God publicly
proving Himself evil, even as he
despises Him for being such,
thus in context confessing that
he does not really reject a cruel
God, but thinks he produces a
reasoned argument for refusing
belief in a Kind God [the one
self-offered in Person], Who
would not be Kind unless He
also dispensed Perfect Justice!
266
—sees nothing more about the human
mind than about the weather 260-1
—thus forfeiting the right of all
Nobel laureates to the prize, that
must be awarded to the "weather"
for feeding the billions, that all
Nobel laureates put together have
not done! 260-1
—could be satisfied to find the "book
of rules"; doubtless the more so the
thinner the book, but does not say
Who could have written it! 265
—Weinberg, Hawking and Co.:
—attempt to devise a scheme of
eliminating God, without first
proving eternal the universe! 226
Weyl, H. 283
—discusses dubiously Gödelization”
by means of 1 + x ≠ y 283
Wisdom:
—questioned when based on axioms
96-7
World History:
—common possession of us all
—we do not treat it with the utmost
respect! 303
World state and its connection to
Ideas 11
Young, T. 100
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THE FALL OF FALSEHOODS
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The double Chinese wish (or is it a curse?) “may you live in interesting times!” and “don’t wish it too much, or it may befall you!” seems to be particularly apt in this “era of globalization”, that we still treat as incorrigible peasants rather than as upstanding Citizens of the World! Otherwise, we would not have set aflame the globe in our mad pursuit of constant “development”. Nietzsche’s message of the supposed Death of God has not been well learned, or else we would have assumed the full responsibilities of the master! As nothing truly is farther from our minds, the accusation of incorrigible peasantry cannot be shaken! Rather than assuming them, even some Nobel Laureates, purporting to guide us all, have undertaken to make us believe that all is for nothing, as all, though only to them, seems meaningless—except that is, the hit check that accompanies the reward; by spending which, they only fan even hotter the flames!!!

To them, as indeed to the most of us all, it means nothing that the Greeks called the World Κόσμος [meaning an “orderly and thus totally pleasing arrangement”] and Συμπαν [meaning “all-inclusive”] while the Romans called it Universe, “a single poem-story”, that uncouth peasants, used only to counting bushels and heads of cattle, think they can ignore!

It has all been the result of rude farmers who thought they could make the farm their own, if they put away the Heir! So much so that they proclaimed themselves, rather than The One, “fathers” and “shepherds”, that is to say sole owners of sheep and souls! Faced with that blasphemous and faithless, not just unseemly expropriation, those opposed to that sort of “cut to one’s own measure theology” cut their own, which they called “Science”! Fools fully equal to those others, they never understood that mathematics is a pure product of mind, not just of matter! Nor did they understand that ultimately, differential calculus is useless unless it integrates correctly the Συμπαν and makes a Κόσμος and a Uni-verse of all that is.

This book exposes that double-faced blasphemy! What the Greeks and the Romans united, and the foundations they set, upon which later comers may add their well shaped bricks, may not, shall not be forgotten! The lesson of meaninglessness shall not pass! The usurpers shall seek their holes to hide from light! But from the heat coming up from beneath, ah, from that, escape they shall not!

As this is a book like no other ever written before, the Reader will find its General Index a particularly useful tool to help him obtain an introductory grasp of the many faces of the problem we call the “World”. How it all ties together, and how the falsehoods evaporate can only be gotten by a careful study of the body of the work, that during its writing never allowed forgetting, as Plato has amply warned us, the consequences of every single statement, almost of every word. Not! The claim of infallibility is not here made! All are welcome to do their best! The Truth is not afraid of every and all imaginable bisections! As long as they are guided not just by “Reason”, but by Logos Himself! Indeed, one can invent “reasons” aplenty! Only Logos cannot be invented! For HE alone IS! With Him, what here is set down can only become better still, all the more devastating of the falsehoods that for so long have been taught as “truths”!

The Reader is forewarned: He must be willing to re-examine his roots! His beliefs! His reasons! His hopes! To bisect all his set ideas, to reweave his mind, his heart, the very depths of his soul! The reading will not be easy! But it shall be rewarding! Because, despite all that so far has been thought as true but is not, despite all the teachings of falsehoods coming to us even, especially, from the highest chairs, there IS a tomorrow! And today, each of us has his last opportunity [not just his last chance, as this is no longer gambling!], to seed and reap the everlasting fruit of eternity!

Reader! Use your time well! You sought to become master! By the standards fitting the masters shall you be judged! By the Master! None other!

ISBN: 978-960-85044-4-8

Price: