

Daniel Kingery  
Approximate word count: 82,457  
Last edited / reviewed August 12, 2023

# **THE TOTALITY**

There is only one

(ALTERNATE TITLE)

# **THERE IS ONLY ONE**

The Totality

By Daniel M. Kingery

"Totality" as used in this book refers to the only body that is inclusive of everything that does now, ever has, and ever will exist; as well as that which does not now exist, never has existed and never will exist, and should not be confused with the political concept of "totalitarianism."

# Table of Contents

Introduction.....	7
Mythology.....	12
Comparing Religions.....	18
Origins of religion.....	21
Embellishments.....	23
Superstition.....	23
Mythical and religious belief.....	24
Astrology.....	29
Astronomy.....	30
Atheism.....	31
Buddhism.....	32
Communing with spirits.....	35
Divination.....	36
Dream Interpretations.....	37
Fortune Telling.....	37
Heresy.....	37
Hinduism.....	38
Garuda Purana.....	38
Judaism.....	39
Magic.....	40
Mediums.....	42
Taoism.....	42
Wicca.....	43
Witchcraft.....	44
The Christian Religion.....	46
Deception in the Garden.....	50
Jesus(s) on Trial.....	58
Lineage - Birth.....	60
From Shepherds into Nazareth or From Wise Men into Egypt.....	63

From a Baptism into the Wilderness or Recruiting Disciples.....	65
Crucifixion-Burial Preparations Begin (prior to the betrayal).....	68
The Betrayal Act.....	73
Jesus Gets Arrested.....	74
Trial of Jesus Before the Chief Priests.....	77
Jesus Found Guilty of Blasphemy.....	80
Questioning by Pilate.....	80
Trial before Herod.....	85
Verdict and Sentencing from Herod and Pilate.....	86
A Scarlet Robe or a Purple Robe.....	87
Attitude of Jesus While on Trial.....	91
Severity of Pre-Crucifixion Abuse and Scourging.....	93
Who Carries the Cross?.....	97
The Place of Crucifixion, Golgotha or Calvary.....	98
Is Golgotha and Calvary the same place?.....	98
Mocking by the Thieves.....	100
Drink at the Cross.....	101
Other Unusually Timed Events at the Cross.....	104
Breaking Legs and/or Piercing Side.....	106
The Rich Man-Disciple Gets the Body of Jesus...	109
Summary of Total Burial Preparation of the Body .....	112
Guard Set at the Tomb/Sepulchre.....	114
Materials Used For Pre and Post Crucifixion Preparation.....	115
(still researching this part).....	115
Other materials familiar to Jesus.....	118
(still researching this part).....	118
Appearances After Burial.....	121
Somebody Different Resurrected.....	124
The Bible.....	128
"God" .....	143

A Political Religion.....	150
Section Summary.....	157
Why We Do the Things We Do.....	174
Revealing Your Lifestyle and Experiences.....	187
Science and Proof.....	193
Sins, Crimes, and Nature.....	193
Morals and Evils.....	197
Truth.....	206
Life After Death.....	211
Faith, Belief, and the Placebo Effect.....	220
Science, Evolution, and Human Existence.....	226
Look at the Totality mathematically.....	239
At some level and form, we exist. Period!.....	240
Cause, Effect, and Miracles.....	241
Spontaneous healing....?.....	243
Humm.... Now that sounds miraculous.....	243
Archaeology, Religion and Prophecy.....	246
Human Life.....	248
The Gamble.....	248
The Value of Gambling.....	252
Destiny.....	255
Perfect Freedom and Your Future.....	268
The Four Agreements.....	288
Be Impeccable With Your Word.....	288
Don't Take Anything Personally.....	288
Don't Make Assumptions.....	288
Always Do Your Best.....	288
Epilogue.....	289
Bibliography.....	290

Copyright 2004, 2022, 2023 by Author, Daniel M. Kingery

[danielmkingery@gmail.com](mailto:danielmkingery@gmail.com) (subject: The Totality)

Two-Zero-Two--Two-Four-Six--Nine-Six-Nine-Eight

# Introduction

Well, since I can't hide the Table of Contents, I'll bet you noticed a sizable amount of material involving the Christian religion. As far back as I can remember my parents believed that Christianity was the "one true religion". Thus, the religion I grew up with, and I had no reason for believing otherwise and was baptized into it, passed out tracts, knocked on doors, and invited people to attend church.

On my mission "to save the world" many of the people I talked to had some interesting comments and comparisons that got me thinking about my beliefs. A high school English class assignment that had me reporting on the Greek and Roman mythology began shaking the foundations of my religious beliefs so that when time came to enlist in the Marines my dog tags read "nothing" on the line the religion was to appear.

Although I would continue reading the bible cover-to-cover one last time, by the third year in the military, Christianity was just another religion.

It wasn't til after four years in the Marines when I started civilian work that I started talking to other co-workers, and reading books about other religions and their teachings. With a little more general studying, inclusive of Aesop's Fables, it became clear that these "god-inspired thoughts and writings" originated in nature, the author's immediate surrounding, and had very little to do with an actual god.

Bible Quotes come from The Holy Bible, published by The World Publishing Company, King James Version (KJV and/or Bible).

The KJV Bible is commonly associated with earlier stages of the Christian push to saturate the world, and is the translation of

which I am most familiar and this quote from 1 Corinthians 14:33 "33. For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as is all churches of the saints." sheds light on my perspective for this writing.

Some defenders of the Christian Bible have rightly claimed that in order to get the correct context the reader should also read at least twenty verses before and twenty verses after to make sure the suggested context is what the writer intended for the reader. However, when one tries to force the writings of different authors from different times to tell parts of the same story, it is as much a mistake as taking one sentence to have one meaning that is clearly not what the paragraph it is part of is trying to convey.

In getting back to 1 Corinthians chapter 14 it begins with the subject of prophesying and speaking in tongues in that the tongues are for the god, and prophesying is for the people. When a person considers the language of lawyers, doctors and scientists, although they may speak in the same national language of the people they work for, the language in each field becomes so specialized that even though they use many of the same words, those words tend to have different meanings.

When the people who speak the same national language do not understand the slang of any group, the users of slang can be said to be speaking in foreign tongues. Verse 26 states, "26. How is it then, brethren? when ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying." Edify basically means to instruct or build up, usually referring to morals and knowledge.

After verse 33, the suggestion that the church is to be subject to the laws of the land when it refers to the women being silent in the church, under obedience as according to the law. Then the remaining twenty verses after verse 33 go into the justification for the resurrection, which will be discussed in later sections



about Jesus in the section "Somebody Different Resurrected."

If that god is not the author or inspiration of confusion, all writers would interpret or describe the same topic or event unquestionably similar, but not necessarily identically. This eliminates any confusion that they have written about the very same event or topic and not just about a similar events or similar topics. Refer to the various sub-sections under "Jesus and the Christ."

"Totality" as used in this book refers to the only body that is inclusive of everything that does now, ever has, and ever will exist; as well as that which does not now exist, never has existed and never will exist, and should not be confused with the political concept of "totalitarianism."

The Glossary, which typically appears at the end of a book, is included in this introduction in hopes to clarify several words up front in hopes of avoiding misunderstandings as you read, as well as providing a glimpse into this book's perspective. Additionally, many terms that generally have multiple meanings are defined where they are used in order to keep the intended meaning fresh in mind.

There are a variety of publications that assist in understanding the meanings of words. In general, the majority of publications are in agreement, at least in the basics. Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary, © 1971 by G. & C. Merriam Co. (Webster's Seventh), happens to be the dictionary used for the basics of word understanding within this book.

Several quotes found at the beginning of the chapters of the book *Welding Essentials Questions and Answers*, © 2001 by Industrial Press Inc., and written by William Galvery and Frank Marlow, are used throughout this book.

*Mankind's Search for God*, © 1990 Watch Tower Bible & Tract Society of Pennsylvania, published by Watchtower Bible &

Tract Society of New York, Inc., along with *When Skeptics Ask*, © 1990 by Norman L. Geisler and Ronald M Rhodes, written by Norman L. Geisler and Ron Brooks, and published by Baker Books, have been the fertilizers that brought this book into the light of day.

The following thirteen definitions clarify the content and perspective of ***The Totality***. Some of the definitions are a bit more restrictive than many other resources including some of Webster's Seventh. The more inclusive a definition becomes the less meaning the word actually retains. In some cases parts of the common definition have been removed, where in others the definitions have been combined with similar words in order to more clearly express the thought desired for that word. Although Webster's Seventh is used as the foundation for the definitions that follow they are not directly quoted.

**Absolute:** Something that is not movable and does not change when compared to everything else.

**Deceptive:** Tending, or having power to cause another to believe an untruth.

**God:** A being or object believed to have more than natural attributes and powers, and requires the worship from others.

**Lineage:** A group of persons tracing decent from a common ancestor regarded as its founder.

**Necessarily:** Of necessity: being necessary: indispensable, that which is logically unavoidable and is absolutely needed or required.

**Messiah:** A self professed or accepted leader of some hope or cause.

**Miracle:** An extraordinary or extremely outstanding or unusual event, thing, or accomplishment that happens within a localized

part of the Totality, known as nature, and is usually duplicated by man after some study.

**Morals:** That which is behaviorally right and wrong: the conduct governing an individual or group.

**Principle:** A rule or code of conduct.

**Religion:** The service and worship of that which is considered to be supernatural. A personal set or institutionalized system of beliefs and practices usually requiring a level of faith or belief in the unproven, or not-provable.

**Supernatural:** The forms of existence beyond the visible and observable forms of existence and is usually something that is unseen and/or misunderstood.

**Truth:** The body of past events.

**Worship:** Reverence tendered that which is considered to be a divine being or supernatural power.

# Mythology

Unproven claims should not be automatically thrown out as total fiction, but should merely be set aside for lack of information until there is evidence that the claim is in fact wrong or proves to be true.

The KJV Bible gives at least three excellent examples as to just how easy it is for a human to measure up and be called a god at any time or in any society.

At the time of John the Baptist's birth, the people credit him, (John the Baptist) for the return of his father's speech after he literally became speechless when he found out that his wife would become pregnant. Luke 1:64-66: "64 And his (John's father) mouth was open immediately, and his tongue loosed, and he spoke, and praised God. 65 And fear came on all that dwelt round about them: and all these sayings were noised abroad throughout all the hill country of Judea. 66 And all they that heard them laid them up in their hearts, saying, What manner of child shall this be!"

In John's later years, the people think this John (the Baptist) is the promised messiah. Luke 3:15: "15. And the people were in expectation, and all men mused in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ, or not;" According to the people of the time, and at the very least, according to the bible records, the "Christ" need not have been named Immanuel.

However, the child in the Isaiah prophecies who was to be born of a virgin, that child must be named Immanuel; otherwise the prophecy remains unfulfilled.

Apparently, the expected "Christ" need only have been someone who taught certain lesson in a particular manner, was present at the time particular types of events happened, or is

one who is believed to have performed certain "miraculous" actions. The key factor of selecting a messiah however, swings on the hinges of the expectations of the people about their anticipated "messiah" and the abilities of any person who is able to present themselves, or to have others present them, as being able to fulfill those expectations.

"The people in expectation" seems to be the primary component of the perfect formula for the people to see, hear, and believe concepts that they might ordinarily reject. The situation with Orson Welles' adaptation of War of the Worlds, not to mention any number of other hoodwinking events and "snake oil" peddlers throughout the history of human existence, demonstrates that people witnessing untrue events believed some or all of the aspects about the events they witnessed were true; only later to be embarrassed when some or all of those supposed true aspects proved false.

In the case of John, he was not doing anything that we, people of modern times, consider miraculous or even noteworthy. He was merely teaching people about what he believed to be a better way of living and a better way to act, dipping them in water as a means of cleansing their sins. Luke 1:76: states the purpose of John's life, "76. And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways".

What is seen from this little bit of information given about John and his teachings is that these teachings were the trial run for the ministry of Jesus which was planned prior to the conception of either one of these men.

Compare Matthew 3:10, which is John's teaching about fruit tree that is cast into the fire; with that of Matthew 7:17-22, which is Jesus' teaching on the same topic. Also in Luke 3:14 is John's teaching about "do violence to no man" where in Luke 6:26-33 is Jesus' version on the same topic a slight twist when he says, "Love your enemies, do good to them which hate you."

It is no wonder that Jesus' teachings were very similar to those of John the Baptist, since John seemed to be one of the early followers of Jesus. Keep in mind, John the Baptist was already thought of as a messiah, simply because of what he was teaching.

When the people tried to turn John into a messiah or god, he refused. But why would John refuse?

If you consider that from before his birth, the parents of John were informed that their child would prepare the path for the "Lord."

Before the births of both John and Jesus, their parents were instructed as to the roles each of their children would play with regard to their religion. Through John's teachings and with his high recommendations to the people as to Jesus being the promised messiah, the people begin to accept Jesus as the promised messiah or Christ, and then later as a god.

Jesus, unlike John, has been taught from birth that he was the promised messiah and therefore does not refuse title messiah or the title of god.

The third example is that of Paul and Barnabas, devoted followers of a Jesus, are recorded as having performed many of the miracles their teacher Jesus had done, including returning life to those who were thought to be dead.

Both Paul and Barnabas refused the title of gods that the locals were willing to bestow upon them, as seen in Acts 14:11-12, they give the glory to Jesus, as they have been taught to do, and then condemn the locals for their practices of worshiping other gods; ultimately angering the locals to the point that they stoned Paul.

The people, assuming Paul to be dead, drag him out of the city. Later, Paul revives and goes into the city and leaves with

Barnabas. The practice of assuming people to be dead who are in fact not dead, but unconscious or in what seem to be comas, appears to be common during that time; as well as in present days. Without intervention, many of those supposed to be dead actually died, and a few revived. However, with proper intervention the impression of a miracle appears to happen in what seems to be a person having been "brought back from the dead."

In getting back to John, and his pre-birth purpose in life "thou shall go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways," raises this question; If the term lord actually refers to a god, why would any god need a mere human to prepare its way?

If this Jesus truly were the supernatural being the Bible records seem to claim and not merely a human who had learned certain skills in magic, law, religion and medicine, this Jesus would have prepared his own ways. Remember, according to the record, Peter walked on the water Matthew 14:26-32; Paul and Barnabas raised the dead. The record bears out that with proper instruction (whatever that instruction actually is) any human can duplicate what were considered to be miracles when performed by Jesus. By definition, Jesus did not perform any miracles, as miracles are generally accepted to be outside the realm of human possibility. So when a mere human, having learned the skill and persons the act successfully; this is evidence no miracle has been done.

Somewhere around the time of the beheading of John the Baptist, Jesus enters into his own ministry, which was actually the continuation of what John the Baptist was teaching, and so much so, that the people began to think this Jesus was the reincarnation of John the Baptist. Matthew 14:1-3: reveals the thinking of King Herod. "1. At the time Herod the tetrarch heard of the fame of Jesus, 2. And said unto his servants, This is John the Baptist; he is risen from the dead; and therefore mighty works do shew forth themselves in him. 3. For Herod

had laid hold on John, and bound him, and put [him] in prison...." eventually Herod has John behead.

It is interesting to keep the thought of "reincarnation" in mind when considering what the Bible says about the appearance of Jesus after his recorded crucifixion. It states in Mark 16:12 that Jesus "appeared in another form," certainly suggesting some form of reincarnation. Remember, that the form was human and physical as Mary, at the tomb confuses this Jesus for the gardener, and Thomas actually touches a physical body.

Myths are generally created with the exaggeration of historical facts, persons, or events. With regard to Christianity, some scholars have compared various key figures with other key figures of different religions. Defenders of the Christian religion tend to consider those who present ideas that place Christianity alongside other religious myths, in the category of atheist. These same claims regarding atheistic attitudes could be made about those of the past who went about proving the mythical attributes of the Egyptian, Greek, Roman and other gods.

Although the Bible may have been the inspired word of the Christian god regarding the history of the Christian religion, it does not necessarily make those writings the true word and record of the powers that actually bought the human race into existence. There is nothing about Christianity that differentiates it from all other religions other than the names and titles of the characters.

If claims were all that is required to make any theory true, then the writers of any work who claim their work is true, those writing would have to be true. Warning: Caveat emptor: Let the buyer beware.

Many religious writings have a number of stories based on provable facts, and many of those stories are excellent for teaching. Likewise, many motion pictures and a great number



of other writings, religious and otherwise, also contain many worthy lessons "based on fact," but those valuable lessons do not turn the entire content of any work into indisputable truths.

"Based on fact," explains the need for an "atheistic type attitude" for anyone wishing to research the various other claims of any work in order to strip away the myth, legend, and embellishment to properly accomplish the task. This attitude generally would have no preconceived notion that the subject's religious, political, or scientific claims are the one and only truth. The attitude also begins the research with the idea that, "All concepts, thoughts, theories, ideas, religions and the like have some form of embellishment."

Everything that is not provable would be stripped away. This "stripping away" is not a forever casting away and never recognizing the information again, but merely setting the claim aside till more information is learned about it, ultimately either proving or disproving the claim.

Although all sides seem to agree on the fact that humans exist, there seems to be great disagreements between the forms, cause, and reason for that existence; with each theory having slightly different story lines, altered character names, and somewhat varied plots.

# Comparing Religions

Religion, worship, and the supernatural all center on whether something is visible and/or observable in our immediate world. That which is not understood is generally considered "unseen;" because it is not viewed in proper perspective. In not being viewed properly, it cannot be properly understood, and as long as the subject is not properly understood it just as well be invisible.

Before achieving a greater understanding of magnetism and electricity, people looked at these natural forces as supernatural. People cannot see these forces, but to some degree they can observe how they work. Once the tools to observe these forces and the proper understandings are developed to see or otherwise witness the effects of something previously named supernatural, the quicker it is removed from the realm of the "super" natural and the minds of man return it to the world of the natural where it has always been.

The positions of natural and supernatural are dependent upon perspective, in that the only reason something is labeled "supernatural" has to do with the point of view and understanding the individual has with regard to that which is observed.

Religious powers are generally discussed in terms of higher or lower powers. Such powers are usually referred to as gods and/or demons that represent either good or evil depending on the particular follower. The "different powers view" is the most appropriate perspective, as literally everything has powers both superior and inferior to some other being.

An example of the different powers view can be seen in the relationship between humans and microscopic beings. There are some microbes, once in contact with the human body may grow

to such a force as to endanger the life of the human. Humans, on the other hand, when discovering the presences of the microbe can reduce and sometimes eliminate the negative effects that the microbe has on the human by killing the microbe, altering it, or adapting the human to better accommodate the effects of the microbe.

In any case, neither the human nor the microbe is more powerful than the other in every respect, in spite of the considerable size difference.

What is supernatural for one tends to be natural or even ordinary and mundane for others. For this reason, everything occurring within the Totality is truly natural and not "super" natural. The only reason for naming activities as supernatural in the first place results from an initial lack of understanding regarding the information concerning the activities --generally happening for the first time in that location.

It is understandable that labeling the unknown should occur, as it is the labeling that is the beginning of understanding. While worship and fear are not warranted in any case regarding the unknown; erring on the side of caution is generally a wise practice.

Please, do not confuse being startled or surprised with that of fear. The ancient sailors marked their maps with dragons to signify uncharted waters, and not so much confirming the existence of sea monsters. Such labeling in the case of the sailor's dragons basically indicates, there is not enough information to proceed safely beyond this point. Dangers are likely beyond this point.

However, keeping such warning labels after the subject matter has been studied to such a degree that the dangers are understood and the public has the knowledge to safely navigate that which was previously uncharted seems to only unnecessarily retard the growth of the human race to be able to

survive the various natural disasters that are sure to be encountered by later generations in other quadrants of the Totality.

The most recent "dragon" is that of the stem cell research, and that dragon is called creator/god. Sure, caution should always be exercised, and just because we "can do," doesn't necessarily mean that we "should do." However, being ready to fix something that may become broken is only good preparation. The possibilities from stem cell research are much like that of guns, which can be used for "evil" purposes or they can be used to benefit society as a whole.

It is ridiculous to have a tool and not know how to fix it when it breaks down, or at least be able to take it to someone who can repair even the most unusual malfunctions.

Religious histories declare that a variety of diseases, and natural disasters are the punishments handed down from some god. Later these diseases were proved the results of practices by those, who at the time were ignorant of certain chain-reaction causes and effects that produced the disease; and were not aware that natural disasters were just that, effects that were caused by previously unstudied causes.

Most knowledge that is routinely destroyed by some political or religious organization and individuals; they call such knowledge and tools evil. The majority of reasons for labeling otherwise valuable information as "evil or immoral" have to do with how it is used or understood.

If healing is understood to be the job of a god and other humans are seen healing the sick with unfamiliar methods, those practices become feared; so much so to the point that the practitioners and/or the tools they use are destroyed.

In the spectrum of human life, there is nothing (dare I use absolutely nothing) that is not harmful to the human.

The fact that water kills some humans could cause humans to not drink water or even get close to it. The investigated truth about that water is that too little water causes dehydration and if prolonged, death. Too much water causes saturation or drowning. The key is in the amount of water and how it is used. The same example can be used for any food product, air, arsenic, other elements, electricity, and so on.

In picturing worship, in whatever form, or to whatever item, it brings up images of those who have given the presently unknown the power of a forever-unknowable entity.

---

## Origins of religion

What about the origins of religion? Well... anything written on the topic of the origins of religion would be as questionable and as speculative as the debates about the origins of humans, as most religions seem to have some theoretical beginnings of the human race. The beginning of the human race, is one of the most common themes among religions, and is usually credited to some being, force, or cause that is later worshiped as a god in that religion.

In its most generic form, religion is the devotion to some principle. As such, literally everybody and everything has some form of religion. Even the most committed atheist would be considered "religious," since the practice of eating and drinking are devotions to the principle of sustaining a human life.

Along similar lines, the rocks would be equally "religious" as any human since the rock must adhere to certain practices in order to maintain their form of existence, and like humans,

external forces may act on them to "kill" them or otherwise change their form.

The difference between religion and myth hinges on whether or not the embellishments have been stripped away. Remember: Many of today's myths were yesterday's religious and political beliefs of the past that were defended to the death as being true. The difference is that the critical supernatural events have been duplicated and/or understood more clearly by later generations who no longer worship or hold to the same beliefs. Unfortunately, as soon as one religion has become a myth, another is already stepping up to take its place.

Each follower of a particular religion tends to claim that the foundations for their belief with regard to their own religion are in fact the truth, while they disregard many similar beliefs; though expressed differently by followers of other religions, as embellishment.

Most beliefs originate in the absence of verifiable evidence to credibly prove or disprove the belief, and are usually based on superstition and coincidence; hence the term "belief." It stops being a faith and belief once there is evidence that supports or disproves the once theoretical reasons for that faith and belief.

Over the millennia, people have believed in and fought long wars over various beliefs that proved silly in later years. These wars were fought mostly because of a fear of offending what some leader has claimed to be the will of the common god.

---

## Embellishments

When all embellishments are stripped away from every belief or theory, religious or otherwise, we find that dirt, amoeba, ape, man, computerized robots, and gods all have the same origins which have nothing to do with the popular misconceptions of evolution or creation. However, the principle of both systems of belief, evolution and creation, are evident in all forms of life to some degree.

Evolution and creation primarily focus on origins, and it is easy to deduce that all origins exist within and part of the Totality. How far back one goes through the ever-changing forms of the Totality depends on what the person wants to prove and what "origins" they are willing to accept

Changing the parameters of the search changes the results and ultimately creates a new religious, political, or scientific belief whether it was what was intended by the cause of that belief or not.

---

## Superstition

Superstition is generally a belief or practice that results from ignorance, fear of the unknown, or trust in magic or chance.

Continuing to practice superstitious acts is evidence of a continued misunderstanding regarding certain causes and effects, specifically about those actions that only seem to produce certain, usually desired results that benefit the practitioners. A person generally continues performing certain acts, believing the act possess or conveys to the practitioner

some form of power. The placebo effect comes to mind and is covered in greater detail in the section "**Faith, Belief, and the Placebo Effect.**"

---

## **Mythical and religious belief**

Each mythical and religious belief not only has something of interest and value, not only for entertainment purposes, but also contain lessons helpful in solving some of life's problems. They possess solutions that are not taught in any other school, church, religion, government, or family practice; and are usually presented in such a manner as to be interesting and memorable.

Most religious thought supports this idea with sayings like, "All scripture is good for teaching..." and "What I have taught is only a small portion of what can be learned..." Unfortunately, many of the followers of each teachers thoughts uses those teachings restrictively to pertain to the specific religion, which may or may not have been the intended purpose of the one who is credited with initiating the teaching.

The biggest hurdle with people about the teaching from different religious and cultural backgrounds is that of the dreaded personality clashes. These clashes produce common mistakes of thinking other people have nothing of value to offer us because their background is different from ours. When we refuse to understand the perspectives of others because of these clashes, **we lose.**

These different perspectives are what make the ideas of others all the more valuable; not that we can use every idea, but that



each idea may help us see our world in a better light, and we never know where or how that next best idea will originate.

The "love your enemy" concept is also common among religions and tends to be the claimed objective of many a government, in one form or another. The foundation of this teaching is observed in most all forms of nature, and once having been observed by an individual, the idea was set out as a philosophy, verbalized and implemented. The primary elements of this teaching are found in the Totality, as it treats everyone and everything the same, and does not play favorites.

Consider the forces within the Totality, which kill the rich with the poor without checking bank accounts. The sun shines on the believers of every type of god, including the atheist, without checking Santa's list as to who's been naughty or nice. The rains save or destroy the lives of those present at the time. The perspective and understanding of those who are present at the time of any event will determine whether such events are to their benefit or to their detriment.

The nature of the Totality has no favorites. Ever.

Although it appears that the forces within the Totality may favor one group over another, this is an illusion. The best way to understand this is with "the survival of the fittest" teaching.

Please, do not confuse this with the popular evolutionary teaching where there is any one species that is the fittest in all situations; because there is none.

This teaching, when observed in the practice of nature proves that a species that is superior in one instance may be the inferior in any number of other conditions and/or times. An illusion comes into play when it appears that some groups benefit more from certain natural actions than others. The truth of this observation can be witnessed in nearly every aspect of the

Totality.

The single cell critters are the masters of their territory. They can devour creatures of considerable size even by human standards. Yet, when they are placed in environments with atomic and molecular components to which they have not yet adapted, they may very well die off. This type of dual capabilities can be seen at all stages of life forms from the simplest to the most complex.

The illusion that the Totality favors one group or an individual over another comes into play when various components of the Totality, for one reason or another, seem treat some components more favorably than others. This "favoritism is generally a better knowledge of a situation than others possess.

The Totality consistently proves that the "fittest" on any given day, time, or situation may not retain that status on some other time, day, or event, not even in the same type of situation.

In discussing the survival of the fittest, a mention of enemies should fit well since an enemy is merely a "person" (actually anything) that does not understand others or is not understood by others, so much so to the point of potentially or actually causing another harm, either deliberately or accidentally.

The process of gaining understanding comes through investigation which can lead two otherwise opposing parties from seemingly hostile positions to slightly friendlier encounters with each other.

Spying, on the other hand, tends to drive the wedge all the deeper between seemingly opposing parties. There is plenty of proof that spying causes more damage than good in the long run. Lack of spying is not the same as ignoring what is happening or what others are doing.

By personally approaching the people that an individual does not understand, and inquiring of them why they act in a certain way, an inquiring person has the opportunity of better understanding others, and slowly removing the wedges that drive them apart.

The art of the inquiry can be fragile.

When the inquiring person comes across as an "expert" (my way is the best way,) others tend to be more defensive of their own methods, no matter how good or bad they may be.

When the person uses a more inquisitive approach from a point of "ignorance" (that is from a position of a lack of knowledge or experience in the matter) it allows the inquisitive person to gain a clearer understanding as to why the person performs in the manner they do. The inquirer may also learn new techniques for those occasions when they find themselves in similar situations thus improving their own bank of skills and experiences to draw from.

The inquisitive approach tends to open the doors more smoothly.

Usually, the simplest inquiry approach is the best. Something like, "I'm curious, I have been wondering why do you do ' that particular task' the way you do?" Although this process is not guaranteed, it seems to work more times than not, especially when the inquiry is approached from a point of trying to learn.

Investigating the unknown is the way to find information about any truth. The individual, who seeks to know the truth, literally is the path to discover the truths they will find. If the individual does not seek out the truths that drive them, that person will eventually settle for whatever others are declaring to be true.

Generally, questions asked in the form of accusations lead to hostility, while questions designed to obtain the same

information, approached from a position of a lack of knowledge on the part of the inquirer generally leads to discovery. Learning why a person retains certain habits generally opens the doors to that person's character. When understood why a person does what they do, many of their actions become less suspicious; and when less suspicious, less feared.

The inventive mind can find the best in the worst, and the worst in the best; the desirable in the undesirable, and the undesirable in the desirable: all it takes is imagination, investigation, and the intent to either build or destroy.

Remember, two people need not be enemies, even if they possess diametrically opposed viewpoints, so long they can agree to disagree on any topic, they can remain friends, and most likely both parties will teach each other more about life than if they would if they parted ways as enemies.

To demonstrate the value of other religions, the following pages in this section compare some of the subject matter Christianity, a fairly aggressive and fast growing religion has in common with the beliefs and practices of other religions, many of which have been declared mythical and/or evil by Christianity.

The reason for using the Christian religion as the point of comparison is that Christianity in some form or another is one of the fastest growing religions worldwide. With that, the following comparisons will serve to demonstrate that throughout the history of the Christian religion, its major leaders practiced many of the acts that were allowed or even commanded by their god at the time, which are now condemned to some degree by the modern Christian religion.

---

## Astrology

Astrology is the use of the supposed influences of the stars and planets to foretell future human and terrestrial events by the positions and aspects of these stars and planets.

Astrology appears as though one is communicating with spirits or using magical forces to discover details about the past and to reveal any number of possible future outcomes. Astrology is a practice condemned in the Christian Bible in Isaiah 47:11-15.

The book of Daniel, especially in chapter 5:7-15, demonstrates how unreliable the astrologers and others have been. Yet, it was the astrologers/wise men/magi/star-gazers, by whatever name, who, after studying the stars, and not receiving any word or guidance from the Christian god, they followed one of those stars (Matthew 2:1-3) to when and where they believed that star revealed the place where they would find the child that was supposed to be born King of the Jews.

This is actually rather odd in that the selection of this future king is left to the chance findings by the "unreliable profession of astrologers." If the Christian god actually knew who these people (Joseph, Mary and Jesus) were, why not just tell the astrologers (also known as wise men or magi) to go the "this address" to find Joseph and Mary who will be giving birth to a child at the location of the specific stables in Bethlehem, or the address of the house in Jerusalem where the child was living? After all, the angels of this god were not so busy as to relay a message to the local shepherds that Luke 2:11-12: about the birth of the "Christ" child, and in Matthew 2:12: the "God" himself, in a dream warns the wise men that they should go home by a different route and not return to Herod.

If the astrologer's profession is considered by the Christian god to be unreliable, why allow such a pivotal element in the religion, the locating of the new king of the Jews, to be left to the chance finding by professionals in a "condemned" practice by following a light that is miles overhead that could be indicating any house for miles around?

The problem with astrology, as well as the belief in any religion, is when people stop using the information obtained as guides and tools and start worshiping the information and/or its source as unalterable facts and gods.

---

## **Astronomy**

Astronomy is the science that studies the celestial bodies and their magnitudes, motions, and constitutions. The difference between this and astrology is a fine line, in that astrology uses the same information and applies it to its supposed influences over human behavior and events.

One should not automatically assume that the actions of stellar bodies do not have some effect on human development or terrestrial events, because there is reason enough to believe that all celestial activity has some effect on all life on earth. Just as the magnet passes in close proximity to an object that can be affected by it, the object is altered to some degree, not always visibly, as sometimes the magnetic power of affected item is changed. Depending on the strength of the magnet, how close the object is to the magnet, the type and amount of the material the object contains that can be directly affected by the magnetic forces, and whether any object is between the two bodies that

may nullify or enhance any of the potential magnetic effects.

It has been demonstrated that the timing of the moon, a celestial body, affects the earth's waters; an effect known as high and low tides. However, not completely ruling out coincidence, the effects of the moon is said to cause on the earthly bodies of water, it must be remembered that the human body is also made of a majority of liquid considered to be water in the form of blood.

If the moon causes these tides, it is only logical to deduce that the fluids in a body may also cause changes in the varied internal pressure points in the brain and other organs of the body. It is fairly commonly accepted that at certain lunar phases, the emotions of humans are altered, causing some strange behavior.

Granted, behavior altering cannot be concretely connected to the moon's cycles, as it may also be connect more strongly to the beliefs of the affected individuals regarding those cycles. Case in point, not all humans are affected in the same way with the same phases of the moon, causing more weight to be placed on the mind set of the individual rather than the actual phases of stellar bodies.

---

## **Atheism**

Atheism is the basic belief for the individual that they have no gods. The atheist does not necessarily believe that other people do not worship gods. The atheist generally believes that anything that is considered to be a god is a myth, or a creation of the believers in order to accomplish specific ends.

Imagine a world without gods. Historically, evidence indicates that there would be far fewer wars; especially the wars that try to prove whose god was better or more powerful. More importantly, technologies would not be lost so readily or as permanently because there would be no religious factions (also politically) that would so easily condemn and destroy such knowledge as "evil," but recognize that the technology was applied in less than desirable ways. An example of this is the medical information that was lost, where the only records kept were in the minds of the people killed because they were accused of witchcraft or sorcery. Don't forget about the information regarding the development of hunches, more commonly known as E.S.P. (extra sensory perception.)

---

## Buddhism

Buddhism, according to the book *Mankind's Search for God*, as soon as Buddha was born he started to walk and began talking, proclaiming he is chief of the world.

If Buddha truly were a god, as many of his followers believe, it would be mere child's play to walk and talk at birth. In comparison, if we are to disregard this story of Buddha as embellishment because we are not supposed to believe it possible or likely, then we must also consider the claims of Jesus walking on water at about the age of thirty or so as an embellishment or the product of magic that was performed during a storm and in the dark. Remember the tricks and magic the Egyptian magicians performed some thousands of years prior to Jesus during the times of Moses.



In one gospel record, the training of Jesus in the arts of magic and medicine is not as far fetched as one might think when considering the fact that he had spent the majority of his earlier life in Egypt. Consider the gifts (gold, frankincense, and myrrh) the wise men gave to a child that they believed to be the new king of the Jews, while an angel informs the shepherds that a savior, Christ the lord was born and lying in a manger.

Do not forget the gospel record that has a Jesus and family spending an unspecified amount of time in Egypt for fear of the child's life.

Buddha teaches that the truth alone is salvation and that it is the individual alone who is responsible for finding that truth. Jesus, on the other hand, makes the teaching a little more personal by saying, "I am the way, the truth and the life" along with, "Seek and ye shall find," "The truth will set you free," and "Narrow is the gate." Once again, both teachers teach that in order for a person to know any truth (as there are many), the individual (I am) must seek that truth, and when they find that truth, they will be a little freer of the bonds that once kept them in ignorance.

Both Buddhism and Christianity started out as single unified practices that eventually divided into a number of different ways of thinking. Each division or off shoot adopted only the teachings fitting and validating a particular lifestyle the followers wanted to practice.

*Mankind's Search for God* suggests the judicial principle of double jeopardy regarding Buddhism's cycle of karma, where one goes from one life to another after each death, paying for the wrongs or rewarded for the rights they have committed in a previous life; and then uses the Christian law of "the wages of sin is death" as the determining factor of double jeopardy in Buddhism. This comparison is the same as that of united States citizens, when committing a crime in foreign country tries to exercise the rights they would have had if they had been caught

for committing the same offense in the united States.

When the double jeopardy claim is studied a bit closer, the Buddhist principle and the Christian teachings are similar. Consider the Christian practice that includes jeopardy to the factor of four for the same "sin/crime/offense."

According to Christianity, the Christian god ordains all powers/authorities, and they have the power and authority to reward the good and to punish the evil. Romans 13:1-4: "1. Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. 2. Whosoever resists the power resists the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. 3. For the rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: 4. For he is a minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."

Here is the first jeopardy, and it does not specify that the god ordain "good" powers or "evil" powers, as much as it does "the powers that be" and the powers that "be," in all known ages of human existence have been both good and evil. Therefore, any power that exists, good or evil, must be ordained by the Christian god, inclusive of Satan, Hitler, Attila, and all other supposedly "evil powers," that is if we are to believe that the Christian god actually ordains the powers that be.

In John 3: and Romans 3: it is taught that Jesus died for the sins of the world in order to redeem and save it from it's sins, past, present, and future. This is the second jeopardy.

Then in Romans 6:23: it says, "23. The wages of sin is death," so once each person dies, dies any form of death, because the type of death is not narrowed down, that individual has supposedly paid the penalty for those sins again. This is the

third jeopardy.

Hebrews 9:27: states, "27. It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." But a judgment to what end? Our governments have already rewarded and punished us for our actions. Jesus supposedly has died for our wrong actions, and when we die we also pay the penalty for those wrong actions. This round of judgment puts the person in jeopardy for the same actions a forth time towards the ends of punishment or possibly some form of reward.

Is there more justice in Christianity than Buddhism?

---

## **Communing with spirits**

Communing with spirits is simply communicating with supernatural beings that need not be human but may also be animals, plants, or places.

Jesus, in talking to his dead relatives, his god, as well as Satan, and other spirits of dead people, certainly qualifies this as an acceptable Christian practice.

Turning to the world of spirits is no puzzle. Spirits have supposedly been through some form of physical life and have experienced death. As such, they should be able and excellent guides when they can be proved trustworthy.

In general, the people who use such spirits believe they must accept the information they have received from a medium, prophet, or directly from the spirit as being an inevitable outcome. When such information is accepted as unavoidable,

the person believing the information actually begins fulfilling the prophecies and predictions, when in fact such information is truly only a tool; a guide as to what seems most likely to happen if the individual does not become more aware of the events around them to change the, the future path that has been seen by them or revealed to them.

As long as predictions remain in the realm as guides and tools for choosing which path to take, the individual is literally the master of their destiny, just short of uncontrolled and unforeseen forces acting on them, either to their benefit or their destruction.

---

## **Divination**

Divination is the art or practice of seeking to foresee future events or discover hidden knowledge, usually by means of omens and signs aided by supernatural powers. This practice in the Christian history uses the supernatural beings called their god, angels, stars, and the like in order to locate and protect a young child that is claimed to be a future king. Christians also use this practice in foretelling the future destruction of the world, including a number of other details about the supposed end of time events.

## **Dream Interpretations**

Dream Interpretations: Another form of psychic activity takes the images of a persons dream, and the interpreter weaves a story about the past, present, and/or future regarding the dreamer's life or the subjects of the dream. This is a fairly common activity among Christian ancestors, recalling the stories of Joseph and his multi-colored coat, and the Daniel of the lion's den, among others who were known to be dream interpreters. This is another act, when introduced to many modern Christians, is condemned as being of the devil.

---

## **Fortune Telling**

Fortune Telling is where one simply claims to foretell future events. This Christian practice uses what they call prophecy, supposedly revealed by their gods through angels and other "supernatural" sources making this witchcraft and communing with spirits as well.

---

## **Heresy**

Heresy is simply the protest against a dominant theory or opinion in any field of thought or belief, and usually is an opinion or doctrine contrary to what is generally accepted as the truth.

Jesus practiced heresy when he went against several predominate opinions and practices of his time in order to initiate a different way life for his followers. As for his teachings being against the truth, would depend on the claim being challenged.

---

## **Hinduism**

Hinduism and Christianity were compiled in part from memory and written documents, (which is common among many religions) while other parts of the scriptures are claimed to be direct communications from the "god" or other being that was worshiped. Their writings contain details about the building of temples, how to perform certain sacrifices, and the purposes for each sacrifice.

---

## **Garuda Purana**

Mankind's Search for God credits Garuda Purana as saying, "A man is the creator of his own fate... a man cannot fly from the effects of his prior deeds..." which reminds me of the Christian teaching, "What so ever a man sows, that shall he also reap."

Both teachings present the same lesson using different words from different cultures to express the same thought.

The Totality, prior to the existence of either of these religions has taught the same concept, "Depending on the seed, the crop desired, the method used to sow the seed, the tender of the garden, among many other factors, may produce a crop in a few weeks, a few months, and perhaps not for decades or centuries later. Some seeds will produce multiple harvests of the same type of crop, as well as a variety of different crops."

One example is a nut tree. Some of the repetitive crops include the fruit of the nut for eating or other uses, and those crops generally occur every year or so. The residue from the pruning and trimming is often used for firewood, or other wood working projects that may also be harvested every few years or so. The fruits themselves will produce future crops of the same type of tree for future generations. Many times, the twigs themselves can be caused to take root and produce clones of the same tree.

We can compare the actions of the human with the seed as well. Tasks done today may produce immediate results or results decades later, whether the person who produced those actions is alive to reap the rewards or retributions of the harvest or not. This seems to be what Garuda Purana says with, "A man is the creator of his own fate."

---

## **Judaism**

Judaism also had its idols or good luck charms with the Ark of the Covenant, which represented the presence and power of the god the people worshiped.

Exodus 17:9-13 "11. And it came to pass, when Moses held up

his hand, that Israel prevailed: and when he let down his hand, Amalek prevailed. 12. But Moses' hands were heavy; and they took a stone, and put it under him, and he sat thereon; and Aaron and Hur stayed up his hands, the one on the one side and the other on the other side; and his hands were steady until the going down of the sun. 13. And Joshua discomfited Amelek and his people with the edge of the sword."

Exodus tells a story of superstitious value not much different than the present day people who cross their fingers for good luck, or practice whatever it is they believe will cause events to go favorably for them.

Judaism is one of earlier predecessor of Christianity and is the primary source of the religions writings and key persons that Jesus used in his ministry as the supposed founder of Christianity.

---

## Magic

Magic is the use of charms and spells, believed to have supernatural powers over natural and supernatural forces.

History repeatedly proves that humans in general will turn to any form of god or device to help them out of, or through some dangerous or otherwise unwanted situations: and why not. When one is in what seems to be, or is believed to be a hopeless situation, human nature tries anything and everything in order to reverse the unwanted situation.

Warning: Good Judgment, common sense, reason, and logic all apply to all who are in such desperate straits, as some



possibilities may cause more harm than good to the practitioner and/or to others.

Incantations or prayers are simply ways of clarifying the thoughts of the individual through the subconscious mental reprogramming processes, which when working in unison with one's actions are more likely than not going to produce the desired result. The stronger one believes the practice to work (sender and recipient) the quicker the results realized.

There are simply thousands of variations of magical systems attempted, from the reading of tea leaves, inkblots, bones, stars, handwriting analysis, body language, ancient writings, sacred writings, and more. They all have one common element: As long as the individual believes that a certain practice works, those practices remain defended by the individual —sometimes to the death.

Most of the examples to illustrate this point involve one religion or another that feels threatened by the practices of other religions; such as the Christians and the witches. The Christians felt threatened enough by witches, who could heal without the aid of a god. The Christians set out to destroy witchcraft by killing people accused of practicing the craft.

Very rarely do we hear about tarot card readers going out to kill the tea-leaf readers or the witches going on a crusade to kill off those who practice voodoo.



## Mediums

Mediums are individuals believed to act as communications channels between the earthly world and the world of spirits.

The use of mediums is a Christian practice that presents Jesus as the medium his followers are to use, allowing them to communicate with their god.

Jesus also delivers messages from Abraham, Lazarus and a certain rich man, all of who were supposed literal humans, and each is residing in either a heaven or a hell after they died. Jesus uses the communications with these "dead people" to warn those living that they are to change their wicked lifestyles or they may suffer the same fate as the rich man.



## Taoism

Taoism teaches; no matter how bad situations get, or agonizing they seem, they will become better: and no matter how pleasant, these situations also will end.

Christianity teaches; to everything there is a season; a time to live, a time to die; a time to laugh, a time to cry, etc., as seen in Ecclesiastes 3:1-8.

To the Tao, it does not matter what you do or do not do.

It makes no difference in the scope of the Totality, as everything is always in a state of change. If one lives long enough, they are undoubtedly going to experience some of the good of life and some of the bad of life to one degree or another.

The Christian Bible, in Matthew 5:44-45,48: teaches that it rains or shines on the righteous and the wicked the same, without favoring either. "44. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you, and persecute you; 45. That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust. 48. Be ye therefore perfect as your father which is in heaven is perfect."

Both religions teach lessons they have clearly observed in the nature of Totality.

Many followers of these two religions, as well as other religions, believe that the stronger the believer's faith is in their god the better their life is supposed to become, either in this life on earth or in some form of afterlife.

Another common aspect is that of ancestor and spirit worship. Although the Bible prohibits such practices, Jesus had been seen talking with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses; all of whom have been recorded in earlier writings as having been dead for many centuries before the birth of Jesus. These acts of talking with the dead would certainly qualify as communing with spirits (spiritism).

---

## **Wicca**

Wicca is similar to Christianity in the belief that the heavens and the earth are connected, not just connected but that similar events and situations occur in both places. Wicca expresses this

thought with, "as above, so below," where Christians use, "on earth as it is in heaven."

Why not? After all, the earth is part of the heavens.

Both practices are known to communicate with their gods and higher powers, although in one practice this communication is referred to as incantations and the other, they call it prayer to define the same act.



## **Witchcraft**

Witchcraft is usually known for its use of sorcery or magic and communications with the devil or a familiar, where familiars are basically the spirits of dead relatives.

This Christian practice is observed with Jesus talking to, and others supposedly seeing him in the presence of some of the spirits of his dead relatives, as well as the record of him communicating with Satan, who is also known as a devil or ruler of the underworld. Matthew chapter four reveals the communications between a devil as Satan and Jesus. Mark 9:4 "4. And there appeared unto them Elias with Moses: and they were talking with Jesus."



Having said all that and pointed out some of the similarities, I

hope you will find these, and other schools of thought interesting enough to do your own research on the topics to help you find whatever truths you seek. Although you may find some of the information so quite unbelievable while you search, do not discard the entire subject. The perspective of truth you seek to understand may be presented in such a way that those odd expressions may clear up some of your thoughts.

The comedians with their sometimes bizarre and outlandish ways, presenting everyday occurrences in ways that open the mind of the audience to situations they ignore, and sometimes stimulating the audience to improve their lives and community by providing a new way to look at "the standard operating practices." Many activities have become so commonplace that they are no longer noticed, even when they are physically experienced, and the quick jolt from the comedians tends to open the eyes.

These comedians (the fools of times gone by) are guaranteed to give you at least a slightly different perspective on life, providing of course you do not object to finding some possible weakness in some aspect of your life. You might even change some of the ways you and your family have done various tasks or understood certain beliefs that are decades or even centuries old.

# The Christian Religion

1 Corinthians 14:33: "33. For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints."

Argument defending the Bible when the topic surfaces that the Bible contradicts itself with regard to several topics. The counterargument, "God has not authored or inspired confusion. Simply because a particular human does not understand what this 'God' is doing and why, does not make it confusion," tends to have one objective; to assume that stories that cannot logically support each other, have the different authors merely covering small segments of an event.

Repeatedly, preachers claim that the Bible was written, or at least inspired by the god, or guided by the Holy Spirit from the same god. The purpose for the Bible has been repeatedly stated, to be that of leading unbelievers to a belief in Christ.

If it is true that the Bible was written for humans, and knowing that all humans did not speak the same language, every translated version would have to be likewise inspired or guided.

Mark 16:17-18: "17. And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; 18. They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover."

Tongues are equivalent to languages; so if a person used to speak negative language about life, they may begin speaking positive language. In recent centuries, serpents are associated with healing (not sure of the earliest connection). Laying hands

on the sick has been associated with actions as simple as a touch, to include rubbing/messaging in of oils, to actually performing surgeries.

John 14:12: "12. Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go to my Father.

Jesus himself declares that the works that he did (whatever those works might be) are not supernatural; but like any other skill, those works can be learned and duplicated.

John 13:35: "35. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another."

Here is where most of the followers stumble, that is if we are to believe that all of the teachings recorded in the Bibles that are attributed to Jesus are in fact from the same person. Many have assumed that this "love" Jesus speaks of to his disciples, is a love from the disciples to the disciples only.

As seen earlier, a Jesus, if the same person, speaks of loving your enemy, which almost most certainly would not be a fellow disciple, not to mention the addendum which instructs people to do good to those who despitely use them.

John 8:51: "51. Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a man keep my sayings he shall not see death at all." This is a puzzle that even Jesus was not able to solve, that is if we are to believe that he actually died on the cross, for he saw death.

Another indication might be that as a result of being able to cure all manner of illness and raise people from the dead, there should be no need for death at all.

It appears that anyone who maintains a proper belief and performs the proper actions is supposed to be able to do the same and even greater works than Jesus did.

One argument from many Christians when asked to perform some of these "miracles" Jesus performed, is that, "One is not supposed to tempt their god."

This excuse is merely a way of avoiding the necessity of proving, as an individual, that they have the correct faith and lifestyle. This sounds like the reverse of the witch trials where the accused, against their will and in spite of their protests were forced to ride the dunking chambers.

The unfortunate aspect of the witch trial tests was a loose, loose proposition. If the accused lost their life in the dunking chamber they were pronounced innocent, and they lost. If the accused managed to stay alive in the dunking chamber, they were then sentenced to burn at the stake, and if they died at the stake they were pronounced innocent and they lost again.

With testing of Christians, the tests only apply to those who claim to be followers of this Christ, and not people who may happen to live according to some of the rules the Jesus taught.

Provided the argument regarding testing is challenged, the usual response is that the individual has not attained the level of experience sufficient to perform those same actions.

The key difference between the witch trials and testing the Christian, or anyone for that matter, is simple. If a person claims to be a follower of Jesus Christ and is not able to perform the required tasks of the tests; that is, any of those actions performed by that Jesus; that person would be pronounced a fraud.

Justifying this claim of testing and trying by referring to the Christian Bible at 1 John 4:1: "1. Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone into the world."

Just to clarify, spirit is not referring to anything other than the



claim of the individual. The reason I say this is because it equates "false prophets" with "spirits," and prophets were merely humans who were either led by the god or not.

The spirit, if it is to maintain a consistent meaning throughout the bible and eliminate confusion, describes the actions and communications of the individual, and not some ghostly type entity. With that, as long as humans have been communicating and performing various actions, (that is, they are living) they have had a "spirit," and the works and teachings they left behind is their spirit still living and inspiring others, long after the body has changed form (that is 'died'). Otherwise the Bible has no consistent definition for the term "spirit".

Regardless of the Christian application and intended use of their scriptures, much of the information is sound advice regardless of an individual's religious or non-religious affiliation. What it says is simple, test the source of the information.

If you neglect, fail, or otherwise do not test or try the source of the information for its accuracy, any mistakes you make while using the information are one hundred percent your responsibility. But before you think of getting off the hook, it is still totally your responsibility for using information that does check out correctly according to your standards and still proves wrong.

Why is the individual still on the hook? Because every decision made by the individual is one hundred percent that individual's discretion, no matter what can be used as an excuse to justify making a bad decision. Even if one is obeying orders, the individual obeys immoral orders by choice, even when facing the threat of death. No one is ever going to have one hundred percent of all the information needed to make the absolute best decision. Usually that information only comes after the decision, in the form of the results of the choice. This source of information is called "hindsight." The only use a person can

make of hindsight is to recalibrate their decision-making ability for use in making better decisions the next time.

If some form of testing or trying is not performed from time to time, how is anyone ever going to know who's who and on what side?

Before I get too far along, I will make the distinction between testing and tempting. Tempting generally refers to the actions of enticing someone to do wrong by promising them some form of pleasure or gain; where testing is more of an examination, observation, or evaluation of the claims someone else has made.

When one is lacking sufficient proof to verify the validity and source of outside claims, it should be considered that the person refusing the test is trying to present ideas that are fully their own. One should not automatically disregard the information presented, as the information can be tested independent of the source.

Even if a source is unreliable, the information may be priceless.

## **Deception in the Garden**

The KJV Bible reminds me of the Readers Digest Condensed Books, where the writings of several authors are combined into one bound book. There is much less confusion in reading the Readers Digest Condensed Books because these manuscripts from the different authors are not combined or manipulated in order to tell a story that none of the authors intended to convey.

The Bible, when read in a similar manner as the Readers Digest Condensed Books, with each component book, whether written by the same author or not, is viewed independently of the other component books and independently of the story that the compilers and later students have claimed to have intended,

there is much less confusion. Then, the stories and the lesson are far simpler to comprehend.

The major difference between the Bible and the Readers Digest Condensed Books is that either the compiler of the Bible or the later students of the Bible began to use the writings of other authors to justify or try to clarify certain statements or claims of previous or later writers in order to force the perspective the student thinks the compiler was trying to accomplish, which may not have anything to do with what the original authors intended, if anything at all.

In the story about the beginning of the earth and the supposed start of the human race that Moses is credited with writing, we can see how different the story written by Moses is when viewed separately than it is when it is compared to the same story viewed from the perspective of the compiled writings where they are supposed to form a three phase story line.

From the compiled standpoint, the readers are supposed to justify the claims of one author with the writings of another even though the writings may have been penned hundreds, even thousands of years apart from each other.

Admittedly, the completed version required considerable skill to blend a genealogy record with that of the teachings identified as that of a messiah, and those of the supposed messiah's followers.

First things first; we understand what Moses intended to be the length of a day in his story called Geneses. "And the evening and the morning were the first day." Although Moses does not specify how many atomic hours there are in his day so that readers some tens of thousands of years later might understand; Moses, none-the-less has defined the length of a day in Genesis 1:5 which is an evening and a morning. This also seems to be historically accurate when compared to other studies of how days were measured before the inventions of the candle clocks,

water clocks, hour glasses, and sun dials with their various configurations.

Essentially there were only two "hours" that divided a "day," the day hour from sunrise to sunset, and the night hour from sunset to sunrise. The light was called day and the darkness was called night. One part of the day, evening/night and one other part of the day, morning/light constituted **one full day**.

Genesis 1:8,13,18,23,31: indicate that the second day, through and including the sixth day, all have the same measure of one evening and one morning to specify the length of each day. With Moses there is no mention of, "a thousand years is as day and a day is as thousand years," as the New Testament part of the same compiled Bible in 2nd Peter 3:8 seems to indicate when a person tries to force the multi-authored Bible into a single story. The only reason for equating one day with one thousand years is to explain away the fact that Moses records Adam and Eve living nearly one thousand years worth of days **after they ate** of the tree that was supposed to result in their death on the day or in the day that they ate of it.

Moses, in Genesis 2:16-17: writes, "16. And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: 17. But of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

The popular thought is that Moses, in Genesis chapter three, paints the serpent as an evil creature, when in truth, depiction of the serpent as evil appears much later when various other names such as, Lucifer, Satan, Beelzebub, and the Devil are attributed to what is supposed to be this Genesis serpent.

In looking at how the KJV translates the words which were supposed to be of Moses in Genesis 3:1: "1. Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field." There is nothing evil about being subtle or subtil, which suggest cunning or

crafty, mentally acute, or highly skillful, and can also mean to operate insidiously. There is no evidence from the record that is translated from Moses that this serpent is operating insidiously or in a sinister fashion.

To know how Moses intended to use the word 'subtil,' the reader must look at how the author uses the words and how the actions of the characters written about fit the words used. In doing this, the reader can accurately make such a determination as to whether the character described is actually demonstrating what are considered good or evil qualities.

In reading the KJV, we are not reading the book Moses wrote, we are in fact reading what another person, many thousands of years later translates what they believe to be the intent and purpose of previous authors, translators, and compilers.

In order to understand the story Moses presents, the readers must first set aside many preconceived notions that have been taught to them (most since childhood from trusted associations) about those stories. Any preconceived notions will not allow the reader to see the story clearly for what it says. It has been proven that the mind tends to interpret situations according to preconceived notions about the situation.

One of those common preconceived notions is that Moses describes a god that cannot sin, lie, or deceive. In other words, the god can do no wrong.

In later chapters, Moses writes that the god is a jealous god: Exodus 20:5. In other parts of Moses' writings, he says that the god **repented** that he made man and set out to correct that "wrong" or mistake by destroying every human until he found Noah: Genesis 6:6-7.

In order to "repent," one must admit that something previously done by that individual was wrong, incorrect, sinful, or an error in some way.

But let's get back to the garden.

In Genesis 3:1: the serpent asks the woman, "1. ...Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" At this point Moses does not present the serpent as making a statement, but merely fishing for information by using the art of inquiry to see what the god had actually told them about the trees in the garden.

Many people assume that the serpent already knew the content of the conversation between the man and the god, but Moses does not state or even hint of any such prior knowledge on the part of the serpent. To suppose that the serpent did know, one must alter the story that the KJV writers translate from Moses. All indications are that the serpent approaches the situation from a point of investigation because of a lack of knowledge to some degree by asking a question, and not by making a statement. We cannot be certain as to how the serpent would have responded had the woman answered differently as that information is not given to us. Nor are we given any information to verify or disprove Eve's claim that the god said what she claims he did; remembering her claim is different than what Moses records as being the conversation between the god and Adam before Eve was on the scene. This proving the unreliability of verbal communications even among members of the same generation.

In the later writings of Moses we can also see that the mind of this god changes from time to time and that he is negotiable, as seen in the story with Abraham, Lot, and Sodom in Genesis 18:16-33. Abraham negotiates with the god to reduce the numbers of righteous people that have to be located in order to spare the cities from destruction. Through this same author, Moses, we have been introduced to another attribute of supposedly the same god, so Eve may be speaking the full truth, but we do not know that for sure either.

Eve replies in Genesis 3:2-3: "2. We may eat of the fruit of the

trees of the garden: 3. But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God had said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die." We do not know for sure from the story whether this god actually said this at some later time or not. The only information given the reader is what the god told Adam before Eve existed, "in the day he eats... he dies."

Finally, the serpent makes three claims when it says to the woman, Genes 3:4-5 "4. ...**Ye shall not surely die**: 5. For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then **your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.**" The serpent does not make the claim that Adam and Eve will be like the gods in all respects, but only in the area of knowing good and evil would they be like the gods. The serpent does not even make the claim that they will be immortal. However, after the incident of eating from the forbidden tree, the "god counsel" does make such a claim as to the possible immortality of Adam and Eve when Moses introduces the existence of the tree of life, which was not mentioned by name prior to Adam and Eve having eaten of the tree of knowledge. Before the introduction of the "Tree of Life" the indication about, "in the day you eat you shall surely die," is that if you never eat of the tree of knowledge, you should never die.

As we read on we begin to find out who knew what "truths" about the tree of knowledge and who passed that information on to Adam and or Eve in the most straightforward manner. We can also see which of those individuals is the least or the most deceptive.

Genesis 3:7: states, "7. And the eyes of them both were opened..." The serpent accurately revealed this as a truth and was not misleading. The god did not reveal this fact either. Moses does hint to the god's knowledge of this aspect when in Genesis 3:10-11: he reveals the god's response to Adam after Adam admits to discovering his nakedness when he hid, then the god responds with, "11. And he (god) said, Who told you

that you were naked? Did you eat of the tree I commanded that you should not eat?"

Although Moses does not specifically state that the god knows this aspect of the tree of knowledge, the indication is clearly there, but some people think this is a sign of an all-knowing god, when Moses shows that the god is merely aware of the cause and effect of having eaten from the knowledge tree.

Then in Genesis 3:8-21: we find the presentation of the various accusations, blaming, and cursing. The story continues in verse 22 stating, "22. And the Lord God said, Behold, the man has become like one of **us**, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever. Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the Garden of Eden..."

The second part that the serpent said would happen, "...and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil," proves the serpent correct in two out of three claims so far. There is no deception yet from the serpent regarding his claims about the tree of knowledge. Moses writes that the god knew of these aspects of eating of the fruit but did not make any attempts to reveal this information to Adam or Eve so they could make a more informed decision regarding the tree of knowledge, and their future in The Garden.

As for the third aspect of the serpent's claim, "Ye shall not surely die..." we have to compare the serpent's rebuttal, to what Eve claims to be what god said about the same tree to Adam, "...thou shalt not eat of it: for in **the day** thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." These are the only two claims stated prior to Adam and Eve eating of the tree of knowledge, and the serpent's claim is clearly a rebuttal to what Eve declares to be the god's claim made to Adam.

The god has first said to Adam that they will surely die in the day they eat of the knowledge tree, which would mean that



before the passing of both one evening and one morning Adam and Eve would be dead. The serpent correctly rebutted to Eve when he said, that they would surely not die in the day they ate. In modern language it seems that the serpent is telling Eve that the tree of knowledge would not be the cause of their death.

According to Genesis 3:22: "22...and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever..." the god knew Adam and Eve did not have an immortal life from the point of their supposed creation, thus the need for a tree of life.

A fascinating thought is what twist the story line would have taken if the tale recorded Adam and Eve eating from the tree of life first. Would they have been removed from the garden before eating from the tree of knowledge? Forever ignorant immortals. There's a scary thought for ya.

In Genesis 5:5: it states, "5. And **all the days** that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty **years**: and he died." Moses states that Adam lived nine hundred thirty years worth of days before he died, which proves the serpent's statement true in the recorded **number of days** that Adam lived after eating of the knowledge tree. Remember, the serpent did not claim that they would live forever.

Immortality is not even part of the equation until the introduction of the tree of life, which only occurs **after the eating of the tree of knowledge**, and just prior to Adam and Eve being evicted from the Garden of Eden.

In the previous presentation that focused on the one author, Moses, and the one story, the Garden of Eden, we see that the god character was a more skilled deceiver and manipulator than that of the serpent; if they were not in fact working together to beta-test their creation.

This story also shows a jealous streak common in many young

children who would sooner destroy a toy than let some unwanted person play with it.

The Bible on the whole demonstrates the aspect of a childlike mentality in its god throughout the remaining parts of the Bible.

This first story of the Bible vilifies what appears to be the good guy and tends to glorify the character that appears to be the actual deceiver and manipulator.

## **Jesus(s) on Trial**

The scope of this section focuses on what are known as the four gospels, where one gospel writer tells a story and at least one other gospel writer tells a story about the same type of event; with enough details to be a similar event with similar timing; with enough different details for the stories to be about different people, different places, and/or different times. Another aspect that is covered in the subsections are the odds of surviving a crucifixion given the information in the Bible, and what modern medicine knows about some of the materials and practices detailed in the Bible about that time.

A defense from Bible supporters who counter the observations that follow is that the person is using the Bible out of context; which admittedly must be true, because the supposed context of the Bible seems to be to prove the existence and supremacy of its god and the miraculous abilities of the god's supposed child, Jesus.

Consequently, any attempt to point out conflicting information within the text of the Bible would alter its contextual intent and therefore be an "incorrect statement" or misuse of the supposed purpose of the compiled Bible.

If one tends to look at this Bible as merely another work of literature, regardless of the compilers intended purpose and

aside from the claims made about it, the following differences become clear.

The objective, when reading any work of literature, one need not throw out the baby with the bath water, as one can utilize many of the valuable lessons and teaching within any work of literature to help build better societies without believing the entire contents are true.

Consider Aesop's Fables, which have all sorts of animals talking with each other. or thinking to themselves, in ways to teach humans how to live better lives and to think in more creative ways.

Another line of reasoning from defenders of the Bible when the thought of contradictions crop up is that the various authors interpreted different aspects of the same event as important at the time and place of their writing, and the writers wrote in different languages that may have been incorrectly translated. Such arguments only prove the authors were inspired by their own concepts of importance based on their own perspectives and observations of life around them at the time; that or the supposed god who is said to have inspired the Bible only inspired some aspects as important to one writer and not to the others. A limited comparison tends to prove that each author was only able to discover certain elements to the stories they thought they were writing about, and the later compilers who thought these stories were about the same person combined them into a single book that is supposed to be an authoritative story about the one person who is supposed to be the savior called Christ, a messiah, Jesus, King of the Jews, and the one who fulfills the Isaiah prophecies among others.

The examples that follow are some of the most contradictory with regard to what is supposed to be the life of only one person called Jesus. Consider that a number authors are pretty much unknown to each other and they begin to investigate the life of a "messiah known as Christ" or a "King of the Jews

know as Jesus," and are led to some of the same witnesses and public records over the course of time when they are compiling the notes for the books they will eventually write.

Some of these authors were certain to overlook or even disregard some of the information that the other authors thought pertinent to their stories, and since these authors got enough parts of their stories close enough, so as to appear to complement each other; later compilers put the most impressive stories together to form one single book referred to as *The Holy Bible*. This type of situation is common where written records are kept on the same types of events by authors with drastically different backgrounds, the purposes for keeping records, and the details contained in the records.

## **Lineage - Birth**

The first indication that there are two people confused for the same person known as the messiah, savior, Christ, Christ the Lord, King of the Jews, and Jesus is recorded in books written by Mathew and Luke. In the second chapter of Matthew, the wise men are led by a star that they believe has informed them that a "King of the Jews" was born, and that star would lead them to where that child would be located.

Luke, on the other hand, in chapter two, writes about shepherds who are informed by an angel that directs them to a manger where "a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord" has been born. Sure, a king of the Jews could be the "saviour," much like Moses was the "royalty" messiah that freed his people from the Egyptians.

Matthew and Luke are the only gospels with lineage records that are supposed to be about the same person, but proves to be the genealogy of two different Joseph's, consequently two different Jesus'; that is if we are to believe that Mary was not impregnated by a human and if we do not alter the words of

either of these two writers to mean anything other than what they wrote.

Both Matthew and Luke are familiar with the meaning of the term "in-law" as seen in Matthew 10:35 "daughter in law against the mother in law." Then in Luke 12:53 "mother in law against her daughter in law." For that reason, if either lineage record is for an in-law of either Jesus or Joseph it is not stated and therefore, one cannot assume either record is for Joseph's father in-law (Mary's father).

Inclusive of Abraham and David, every generation between these two lineage records are identical; after David however, the lines are different enough to be for different people. Although both records end with the same name of Joseph as a father of a Jesus, 2 Samuel 5:14: says, "14. And these be the names of those that were born unto him (David) in Jerusalem; Shammuah, and Shobab, and Nathan, and Solomon," showing the line divides with two of David's sons. This division proves that there are two different Joseph's. The only way to have the same Joseph have two of David's sons in his direct lineage is if one is through his father or father-in-law and the other through his mother or mother-in-law, but this is not recorded in either of the gospels records and rules out the scenario as both the gospel writers have used the term "in-law" in both of there writings.

Matthew 1:1: "1. The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham."

Matthew 1:2-15: In the following lineage record the (...) replaces the word "and" as well as eliminating the repetition of the previous name. "2. Abraham begat Isaac; ...begat Jacob; ...begat Judas; 3. ...begat Phares; ...begat Esrom; ...begat Aram; 4. ...begat Aminadab; ...begat Naasson; ...begat Salmon; 5. ...begat Booz; ...begat Obed; ...begat Jesse; 6. ...begat David

the king; 7. ...begat Solomon; ...begat Roboam; ...begat Abia; ...begat Asa; 8. ...begat Josaphat; ...begat Joram; ...begat Ozias; 9. ...begat Joatham; ...begat Achaz; ...begat Ezekias; 10. ...begat Manasses; ...begat Amon; ...begat Josias; 11. ...begat Jechonias and his brethren, about the time they were carried away to Babylon: 12. And after they were brought to Babylon, Jechonias begat Salathiel; ...begat Zorobabel; 13. ...begat Abiud; ...begat Eliakim; ...begat Azor; 14. ...begat Sadoc; ...begat Achim; ...begat Eliud; 15. ...begat Eleazar; ...begat Matthan; ...begat Jacob."

Matthew 1:16: "16. And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ."

Luke tells a different story in his lineage record, and the (...) replaces the words (which was the). Luke 3:23-38: "23. And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli, 24. ...son of Matthat, ...son of Levi, ...son of Melchi, ...son of Janna, ...son of Joseph, 25. ...son of Mattathias, ...son of Amos, ...son of Naum, ...son of Esli, ...son of Nagge, 26. ...son of Maath, ...son of Mattathias, ...son of Semei, ...son of Joseph, ...son of Juda, 27. ...son of Joanna, ...son of Rhesa, ...son of Zorobabel, ...son of Salathiel, ...son of Neri, 28. ...son of Melchi, ...son of Addi, ...son of Cosam, ...son of Elmodam, ...son of Er, 29. ...son of Jose, ...son of Eliezer, ...son of Jorim, ...son of Matthat, ...son of Levi, 30. ...son of Simeon, ...son of Juda, ...son of Joseph, ...son of Jonan, ...son of Eliakim, 31. ...son of Melea, ...son of Menan, ...son of Mattatha, ...son of Nathan, ...son of David, 32. ...son of Jesse, ...son of Obed, ...son of Booz, ...son of Salmon, ...son of Naasson, 33. ...son of Aminadab, ...son of Aram, ...son of Esrom, ...son of Phares, ...son of Juda, 34. ...son of Jacob, ...son of Isaac, ...son of Abraham, ...son of Thara, ...son of Nachor, 35. ...son of Saruch, ...son of Ragau, ...son of Phalec, ...son of Heber, ...son of Sala, 36. ...son of Cainan, ...son of Arphaxad, ...son of Sem, ...son of Noe, ...son of Lamech, 37. ...son of

Mathusala, ...son of Enoch, ...son of Jared, ...son of Maleleel, ...son of Cainan, 38. ...son of Enos, ...son of Seth, ...son of Adam, which was the son of God."

Without changing the words of the of the KJV translation, Matthew and Luke clearly recorded the genealogies of two different Jesus' through the line of two different Joseph's.

## **From Shepherds into Nazareth or From Wise Men into Egypt**

Luke 2:8-21: is the story of the Shepherds going to see a Christ child who is to be found in a manger in Bethlehem at birth and prior to his being eight days old, circumcised, and given the name of Jesus in verse 21.

Immediately after the circumcising ceremony, which most likely took place in Jerusalem, where an older man and prophetess see the child, this family goes directly into Nazareth without fear of any Herod and without any record of side trips into Egypt. Luke gives all indications that Joseph, Mary, and Jesus make annual treks to Jerusalem from Nazareth, Luke 2:41-52. If what Matthew writes is correct, Joseph and family would be making these annual journeys to Jerusalem from Egypt, but this would not make any sense if they were to be keeping away from the Herod, who was supposed to be out to kill the child, because that Herod seems to have had one of his offices set up in Jerusalem.

Secular history indicates that there were several "Herod's" who ruled in the Jerusalem area before, during and after the supposed life of the Jesus who lived from about 7BCE to about 34CE, (at least somewhere in that timeframe).

These Herod's held the titles governor, king, patriarch, and probably others; one or more of those Herod's may have held more than one of the titles from before and after the Romans

took over.

Matthew 2:1: refers to the birth of a child who was recorded in the writings of Luke, which is about a birth of a child at a manger in Bethlehem, as this Herod sends the wise men to Bethlehem to look for a child identified in the Isaiah prophecy. However, the wise men end up delivering their treasures to a child who is living, or at least staying, with his mother Mary in a house in Jerusalem and not the stables in Bethlehem, or in the city of Nazareth, Matthew, 2:9. From this time in Jerusalem the Mary and Jesus, after receiving the treasures, go into Egypt for fear of a Herod, and not to what is supposed to be their hometown of Nazareth.

The wise men, if they were actually sent by the Hebrew/Jewish god who delivered the prophecy to Isaiah, would have known the child's correct name to have been called Immanuel, not Jesus. Now get this, a star in the skies guide the wise men to the supposed king of the Jews, but the god delivers a message to them in a dream to depart to their home lands by a different way in order to avoid Herod.

The writers lead the reader to believe that Matthew 2:1: is identifying the same child mentioned in Matthew 2:11. Verse one seems to identify the time frame that the wise men appear in Jerusalem, which was when the Jesus was born in Bethlehem, which was in the day when Herod was the king. Another aspect of this story in Matthew is that in verse seven Herod enquires of what time the star appeared, which seems to be two years prior to their arrival in Jerusalem.

Accordingly, it is assumed that the wise men give their gifts to a two-year old child in a house in Jerusalem.

The child Matthew writes about goes directly into Egypt as a young child immediately after receiving the treasures from the wise men, where he remains until one of the Herod's of the time is no longer alive, without giving any indication as to how long



the child remained in Egypt, as a Herod is still in power at the time of one of the crucifixions.

Matthew 2:13-15: "13. And when they were departed, behold, the angel of the lord appeareth to Joseph in a dream, saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and flee into Egypt, and be thou there until I bring thee word: for Herod will seek the young child to destroy him. 14. When he arose, he took the young child and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt: 15. And was there until the death of Herod."

Whatever the case may be, neither Matthew nor Luke recorded the lineage or birth of Isaiah's prophesied child whose name was to be called Immanuel. The prophecy does not indicate that he will be *known as Immanuel* (such as an alias). They do however record the lives of two different Jesus' where one goes directly to Nazareth after his circumcision, where he grows up without fear of any Herod.

The other Jesus, for fear of a Herod, goes into Egypt from Jerusalem and remains there, apparently not sneaking into Jerusalem until the feared Herod has supposedly died, roughly just before this Jesus actually starts his ministry after his baptism.

## **From a Baptism into the Wilderness or Recruiting Disciples**

After the baptism recorded in the gospel of John, a Jesus acquires two of what appear to be disciples of John the Baptist and then continues from there to recruit the remaining disciples. The words, "again the next day," is a good indicator that this is not after the 40 days and nights in the wilderness.

John 1:24-43: "24. And they which were sent were of the Pharisees. 25. And they asked him, and said unto him, Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither

that prophet? 26. John answered them, saying, I baptize with water: but there standeth one among you, whom ye know not; 27. He it is, who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose. 28. These things were done in Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing. 29. The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. 30. This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me: for he was before me. 31. And I knew him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water. 32. And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. 33. And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. 34. And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God. 35.

**Again the next day after John stood, and two of his disciples;** 36. And looking upon Jesus as he walked, he saith, Behold the Lamb of God! 37. **And the two disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus...** 38. Then Jesus turned, and saw them following, and saith unto them, What seek ye? They said unto him, Rabbi, (which is to say, being interpreted, Master,) where dwellest thou? 39. He saith unto them, Come and see. They came and saw where he dwelt, and abode with him that day: for it was about the tenth hour. 40. One of the two which heard John speak, and followed him, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother. 41. He first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, We have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ. 42. And he brought him to Jesus. And when Jesus beheld him, he said, Thou art Simon the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, A stone. 43. **The day following Jesus would go forth into Galilee, and findeth Philip, and saith unto him, Follow me."**

John records Jesus as recruiting disciples immediately after the baptism, while Matthew, Mark, and Luke have Jesus going

directly into the wilderness for 40 days and 40 nights.

Luke 4:1-2: and Matthew 4:1: are similar to Mark 1:9-13: which says, "And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan. 10. And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened, and the spirit like a dove descending upon him: 11. And there came a voice from heaven, saying, Thou art my beloved son in whom I am well pleased. 12. And immediately the spirit driveth him into the wilderness. 13. And he was there in the wilderness forty days, tempted of Satan; and with wild beasts; and the angels ministered unto him."

The forty days and nights cannot be after he begins acquiring his disciples that second and third days, because here, "immediately" the spirit drives him into the wilderness, not the next day or a few days later, but immediately. Likewise, the acquisition of disciples cannot be after the 40 days because of the "again the next day," and "the day following."

Both Matthew and Luke indicate that Jesus begins to acquire his disciples, not only after the forty days in the wilderness, but also after an unspecified time that Jesus spent teaching in the synagogues before his first disciple begins to follow him.

The clearest story appears in Mark when he says in verse twelve "And immediately the spirit driveth him into the wilderness." indicating there was no delay before the Jesus in his stories goes into the wilderness after his baptism. And only after the forty days in the wilderness did Mark's Jesus begin to assemble his disciples.

John indicates that during the first two days after the baptism of his Jesus, almost every one of the disciples has been recruited, including Simon and Andrew (which were recruited after the forty days and nights in the wilderness in Mark) and John fails to mention anything at all about his Jesus not eating or drinking for forty days and forty nights in any wilderness. John is very

specific about the baptism and the next day recruiting disciples.

Once again, the gospels show the lives of different people where one goes immediately into the wilderness and the other immediately begins recruiting his disciples within the first few days after he is baptized.

## **Crucifixion-Burial Preparations Begin (prior to the betrayal)**

The story in Matthew 26:6: regarding an anointing with spikenard is similar to the following details from Mark 14:1-56 "1.After two days was the feast of the passover, and of unleavened bread: and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take him by craft, and put him to death. 2.But they said, Not on the feast day, lest there be an uproar of the people. 3.And being in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper, as he sat at meat, there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of spikenard very precious; and she brake the box, and poured it on his head. 4.And there were some that had indignation within themselves, and said, Why was this waste of the ointment made? 5.For it might have been sold for more than three hundred pence, and have been given to the poor. And they murmured against her. 6.And Jesus said, Let her alone; why trouble ye her? she hath wrought a good work on me. 7.For ye have the poor with you always, and whensoever ye will ye may do them good: but me ye have not always. 8.She hath done what she could: she is **come aforehand to anoint my body to the burying.** 9.Verily I say unto you, Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, this also that she hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her. 10.And Judas Iscariot, one of the twelve, went unto the chief priests, to betray him unto them. 11.And when they heard it, they were glad, and promised to give him money. And he sought how he might conveniently betray him. 12.And the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the passover, his disciples said unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and prepare that thou

mayest eat the passover? 13.And he sendeth forth two of his disciples, and saith unto them, Go ye into the city, and there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water: follow him. 14.And wheresoever he shall go in, say ye to the goodman of the house, The Master saith, Where is the guestchamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples? 15.And he will shew you a large upper room furnished and prepared: there make ready for us. 16.And his disciples went forth, and came into the city, and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the passover. 17.And in the evening he cometh with the twelve. 18.And as they sat and did eat, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, One of you which eateth with me shall betray me. 19.And they began to be sorrowful, and to say unto him one by one, Is it I? and another said, Is it I? 20.And he answered and said unto them, It is one of the twelve, that dippeth with me in the dish. 21.The Son of man indeed goeth, as it is written of him: but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! good were it for that man if he had never been born. 22.And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat: this is my body. 23.And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them: and they all drank of it. 24.And he said unto them, This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many.25.Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God." 26.And when they had sung an hymn, they went out into the mount of Olives. 27.And Jesus saith unto them, All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered. 28.But after that I am risen, I will go before you into Galilee. 29.But Peter said unto him, Although all shall be offended, yet will not I. 30.And Jesus saith unto him, Verily I say unto thee, That this day, even in this night, before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice. 31.But he spake the more vehemently, If I should die with thee, I will not deny thee in any wise. Likewise also said they all. 32.And they came to a place which was named Gethsemane: and he saith to his disciples, Sit ye here, while I shall pray.

33.And he taketh with him Peter and James and John, and began to be sore amazed, and to be very heavy; 34.And saith unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death: tarry ye here, and watch. 35.And he went forward a little, and fell on the ground, and prayed that, if it were possible, the hour might pass from him. 36.And he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; take away this cup from me: nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt.37.And he cometh, and findeth them sleeping, and saith unto Peter, Simon, sleepest thou? couldest not thou watch one hour? 38.Watch ye and pray, lest ye enter into temptation. The spirit truly is ready, but the flesh is weak. 39.And again he went away, and prayed, and spake the same words. 40.And when he returned, he found them asleep again, (for their eyes were heavy,) neither wist they what to answer him. 41.And he cometh the third time, and saith unto them, Sleep on now, and take your rest: it is enough, the hour is come; behold, the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. 42.Rise up, let us go; lo, he that betrayeth me is at hand. 43.And immediately, while he yet spake, cometh Judas, one of the twelve, and with him a great multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders. 44.And he that betrayed him had given them a token, saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he; take him, and lead him away safely. 45.And as soon as he was come, he goeth straightway to him, and saith, Master, master; and kissed him. 46.And they laid their hands on him, and took him. 47.And one of them that stood by drew a sword, and smote a servant of the high priest, and cut off his ear. 48.And Jesus answered and said unto them, Are ye come out, as against a thief, with swords and with staves to take me? 49.I was daily with you in the temple teaching, and ye took me not: but the scriptures must be fulfilled. 50.And they all forsook him, and fled. 51.And there followed him a certain young man, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body; and the young men laid hold on him: 52.And he left the linen cloth, and fled from them naked. 53.And they led Jesus away to the high priest: and with him were assembled all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes. 54.And Peter

followed him afar off, even into the palace of the high priest: and he sat with the servants, and warmed himself at the fire. 55. And the chief priests and all the council sought for witness against Jesus to put him to death; and found none.

The story in John's record as it relates to the spikenard oil is different, John 12:1-5,7: "1. Then Jesus six days before the passover came to Bethany, where Lazarus was which had been dead, whom he raised from the dead. 2. There they made him a supper; and Martha served: but Lazarus was one of them that sat at the table with them. 3. Then took Mary a pound of ointment of spikenard, very costly, and anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped his feet with her hair: and the house was filled with the odor of the ointment. 4. Then said one of his disciples, Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, which should betray him, 5. Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor? 7. Then said Jesus, Let her alone: against the day of my burying hath she kept this."

According to

[http://www.hikoshin.org/Incense/MED\\_HERBS/spikenard1.HTM](http://www.hikoshin.org/Incense/MED_HERBS/spikenard1.HTM) spikenard "...is a very strong sedative useful in treating insomnia and headaches, as well as other stress related illnesses. Although it is a sedative it does not dull the senses; instead, it aids in increasing overall awareness."

If you don't think that Jesus would have been stressed, consider the fact that he knew that he was about to be "betrayed," if it can be called a betrayal, because he set it up. John, when he writes chapter 13, he records Jesus as choosing his betrayer. Jesus knew there had to be a crucifixion in order to fulfill prophecies; at least the way it has been understood up to this point. There are also supposed to be "prophecies" about the thirty pieces of silver, and the betrayal.

Jesus would have done all this willingly, because he had been

taught through the years, even from before his birth that he was the promised messiah. Educating the parents of each Jesus to the idea that their child would be the promised messiah and be raised from the dead. One set of parents were convinced by the messages from an "angel" who declares her child will be called the son of god. The other set of parents were convinced to the idea through the treasures from the wise men declaring their child to be "king of the Jews." Remember, the resurrection is also supposed to be part of those same prophecies. It is easier to convince someone to become a martyr ("die" willingly) if the promise of being returned to life is also part of the package.

Even if Jesus and others had planned every detail thoroughly, why would he not be stressed? After all, he is literally putting his life on the line in hopes of immortality, which by the way is still unproven; at least in the most popular concepts of immortality. If something goes wrong it goes wrong in the biggest way and everything Jesus has lived and worked for (world peace) would suddenly end, that is; if "loving your enemy and doing good to those who spitefully use you," is not a form of world peace, I have no idea what other possible statement could describe it.

The Romans, believe it or not, have a considerable stake in the teachings of this Jesus being successful. What was the objective of the Roman Empire? World domination. The only way to succeed in such an undertaking is through world peace. The Romans were fairly good at maintaining peaceful relations with their conquered people, as they would usually allow them to continue to worship their own gods, and apparently retain their own leaders, so long as those leaders would submit willingly to Roman rule.

With the application of the spikenard as recorded in each of the gospel records, the ointment is only applied once in each of the records, and was only applied to either the head or to the feet. Once again, in order to assume that there was only one Jesus



who was anointed with this ointment, the reader would have to combine the writings of more than one of the gospel writers to arrive at that assumption.

The two authors seem to have written about different events, as neither author has given any mention whatsoever of the ointment being applied to any other parts of the body.

## **The Betrayal Act**

Mark 14:43-44: "43. And immediately, while he (Jesus) yet spake, cometh Judas, one of the twelve, and with him a great multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders. 44. And he that betrayed him had given them a token, saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he; take him. And lead him away safely."

Mark tells the story of Judas getting a multitude of people, armed with swords and staves from the chief priests, and Judas provides them with the signal of a kiss as to the person they are to arrest. Judas also indicates some concern for the safety of this Jesus.

There is different story altogether in John 18:3-8: "3. Judas then, having received a band of men and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees, cometh thither with lanterns and torches and weapons. 4. Jesus therefore, knowing all things that should come upon him, went forth, and said unto them, Whom seek ye? 5. They answered him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus said unto them, I am he. And Judas also, which betrayed him, stood with them. 6. As soon as he had said unto them, I am he, they went backward, and fell to the ground. 7. Then asked he them again, Whom seek ye? And they said, Jesus of Nazareth. 8. Jesus answered, I have told you that I am he: if therefore ye seek me, let these go their way:"

The difference is that John shows no indication of a betrayal

kiss from Judas, but since Judas would have been standing with those who had backed up and fell to the ground it is unlikely he gave the signal of a kiss to identify this person as Jesus for the betrayal.

When John writes, as shown above, "Jesus therefore knowing all things that should come upon him," hints at two possible scenarios. First, there is the obvious belief of the Christian that their god, in the form of Jesus, is all knowing.

The second seems just as clear, indicating that this Jesus was part of the planning process and therefore "knew" what was about to happen.

In both Mark and John, indicate that the band of men and officers, and the great multitude have no idea as to what this Jesus is supposed to look like. It seems that the only person in the multitude who is able to identify this Jesus is Judas.

What if none of the people identified as Jesus, by the gospel writers at the time of the actual betrayal in the garden, was really a Jesus? Various stories in the gospels show the Jesus they write about as being very well known by all the people in the land, from the very poor to the very rich. It seems as though many people were claiming to be the Christ, and each was taken, tried, executed and buried. Such an explanation would clarify the reason for the many differences in the stories. Sure, if a dozen investigators at different times begin to compile the life story of a particular person, and they do not compare notes, it is likely that some of the events may fit the actions of similar people who are known by the same name or title, such as, messiah, Christ, or Jesus.

## **Jesus Gets Arrested**

According to Matthew 26:57 "57. And they that had laid hold on Jesus led him away to Caiaphas the high priest, where the

scribes and the elders were assembled."

Mark's testimony seems to support Matthew's, except for the fact that the chief priests were not present in Mathew's. Mark 14:53 "53 And they led Jesus away to the high priest: and with him were assembled the chief priests and the elders and the scribes." Granted, it could be a minor detail, but it is also significant enough to claim that they are different meetings.

Luke's story significantly differs, in that the chief priests and elders and captains of the temple went out to arrest Jesus, when Mathew and Mark testify that at least the elders or the chief priests as seen above, are in one or the other gospels as already being at the place where the high priest was located. Luke 22:52-54 "52. Then Jesus said unto the chief priests, and captains of the temple, and the elders, which were come to him, Be ye come out, as against a thief, with swords and staves? 53. When I was daily with you in the temple, ye stretched forth no hands against me: but this is your hour, and the power of darkness. 54. Then took they him, and led him, and brought him unto the high priest's house. And Peter followed afar off."

John's testimony is still different enough to be a separate event, especially since all three of the other testimonies lay the path directly to the high priest, while John lays the path directly to the house of the father in law of the high priest, but does not specify where to next, except that the high priest begins to question Jesus. John 18:12-19 "12. Then the band and the captain and officers of the Jews took Jesus, and bound him, 13. And led him away to Annas first; for he was the father in law to Caiaphas, which was the high priest that same year. 14. Now Ciaaphas was he, which gave counsel to the Jews, that **it was expedient that one man should die for the people**. 15. And Simon Peter followed Jesus, and so did another disciple: that disciple was known unto the high priest, and went in with Jesus into the palace of the high priest. 16. But Peter stood at the door without. Then went out the other disciple, which was known

unto the high priest, and spoke unto her that kept the door, and brought in Peter. 17. Then saith the damsel that kept the door unto Peter, Art thou also one of this mans disciples? He saith, I am not. 18. And the servants and officers stood there, who had made a fire of coals; for it was cold: and they warmed themselves: and Peter stood with them, and warmed himself. 19. The high priest then asked Jesus about his disciples, and his doctrine."

When Jesus is asked a series of questions he does not answer the questions, but wonders why they do not ask the people who heard the teachings, after that an officer struck Jesus (John 18:22), Annas sends Jesus bound unto Caiaphas, (John 18:24.) The fact that John shows that as soon as Jesus was arrested, he is taken to Annas, where the other records take Jesus directly to Caiaphas, not only sets the testimony of these people at odds, but puts even more weight behind the theory of there being at least two people arrested and taken down slightly different paths to the crucifixion where the paths cross over from time to time with the accused people making some of the same stops.

John 18:14 "14. Now Ciaaphas was he, which gave counsel to the Jews, that **it was expedient that one man should die for the people.**" This particular statement from John about an authoritative figure for the Jewish people indicates that there may be some deeper religious, political or legal problems between Roman and the Jews with regard to a particular "trouble-maker." There seems to be an indication that the Romans have given the chief priests an ultimatum – Either you deliver to us the person we seek, this elusive trouble-maker, or we will continue to kill Jews until we find that person--.. This wouldn't be the first time in history, a rebellious group refused to submit to the new powers over them, and caused dangerous conditions for other innocent citizens not involved in the insurrection.

## **Trial of Jesus Before the Chief Priests.**

According to the record, the chief priest had deliberately set out to find false witnesses to testify against Jesus. Apparently they found a couple when the high priest question Jesus on the matter as shown in Matthew 26:61-66 "61. And said, This fellow said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days. 62. And the high priest arose, and said unto him, Answerest thou nothing? what is it which these witness against thee? 63. But Jesus held his peace. And the high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. 64. Jesus said unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. 65. Then the high priest rent his cloths, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy. 66. What think ye? They answered and said, He is guilty of death."

It was only after the high priest inquired by the living god did Jesus respond but not answer the question. Jesus only informs the high priest that they have said a question, or that they have made the statement that he was the "Son of God." In any event, Jesus does not admit to being "the Christ, the Son of God," but he continues talking with words that do not actually answer the question he was asked. Jesus states, "Nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." The "son of man" refers to human, not supernatural beings, and Jesus does not say that he is that "Son of man," only that the son of man will sit on the right hand of power, but fails to identify that power. The suggestion seems to be that "power" refers to human government, and "the Son of man" is referring to religious leaders.

Mark's statements of the event are subtly different. The

witnesses recorded in Mark 14:58 state, "58. We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and within three days I will build another made without hands."

We see the subtle difference with the question and response between Jesus and the high priest. Mark 14:60-64 "60. And the high priest stood up in the midst, and asked Jesus, saying, Answerest thou nothing? what is it which these witness against thee? 61. But he held his peace, and answered nothing. Again the high priest asked him and said unto him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? 62. And Jesus said, I am: and ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. 63. Then the high priest rent his cloths, and saith, what need we any further witnesses? 64. Ye have heard the blasphemy: what think ye? And they all commanded him guilty of death."

Both Abraham and Isaac were blessed by their "Lord;" which, if Jesus is the "son of David," Jesus would also be the "son of the blessed" because he would be the son of Abraham and the son of Isaac, and the son of a number of other people in the lineage that have been "blessed by the lord." Notice in this record, Jesus plainly responds, "I am" the Christ, the son of the Blessed.

Luke 22:66-71 "66. As soon as it was day, the elders of the people and the chief priests and the scribes came together, and led him into the their council, saying, 67. Art thou the Christ? tell us. And he said unto them, If I tell you, ye will not believe: 68. And if I also asked you, ye will not answer me, nor let me go. 69. Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God. 70. Then said they all, Art thou then the Son of God? And he said unto them, Ye say that I am. 71. And they said, What need we any further witness? for we ourselves have heard of his own mouth." Luke records an entirely different response than the previous two gospel writers, where one says "thou sayest," to "I am," with "ye will not believe," as a new response; still not answering the question.

Luke indicates that as soon as the sun starts to clear the horizon, or somewhere near that time, Jesus is led to the chief priests for questioning. Basically, if the nights are cold enough to require fire to stay warm, it appears as though the timing is close to winter (beginning or end) and the days are shorter. Even if given the benefit of the doubt of the days being the longest with the assumption that the sun rises at 5:30 in the morning and sets at 9:00 pm in the evening (more or less), if all the records are about the same persons trials, there are nearly fifteen hours of light, which means that at daybreak the first trial occurs before the chief priests. Jesus has to be escorted to the different places of trial before Pilate, Herod, and back to Pilate again before his crucifixion.

Here is the record from John, which is different when compared to the other gospels. John 18:19-24 "19. The high priest then asked Jesus of his disciples, and of his doctrine. 20. Jesus answered him, I spake openly to the world; I ever taught in the synagogue, and in the temple, whither the Jews always resort; and in secret have I said nothing. 21. Why askest thou me? ask them which heard me, what I have said unto them: behold, they know what I said. 22. And when he had thus spoken, one of the officers which stood by struck Jesus with the palm of his hand, saying, Answerest thou the high priest so? 23. Jesus answered him, If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil: but if well, why smitest thou me? 24. Now Annas had sent him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest." This is an entirely different question than the other gospels, and it is a rather simple question. Why doesn't Jesus answer these questions? It seems as though there may have been some misunderstanding, and it is the job of the chief priests to clear up such misunderstandings. If Jesus was as he claimed, and as others claimed him to be, this would be a perfect opportunity to set the records straight, but Jesus refuses to do so.

What would you think of a person that you know to have made a number of claims about themselves, but when you ask them

about those claims they dummy up, and when they do speak after being asked a question, in all their talking they do not answer your questions, but offer excuses for not answering.

## Jesus Found Guilty of Blasphemy

The record on the finding of guilt with regard to Jesus while before the chief priests in Matthew 26:65: is similar to Mark 14:64: which says, "64. Ye have heard the blasphemy: what think ye? And **they all condemned him** to be guilty of death." Matthew and Mark must be writing about different trials than the one Joseph of Arimathaea attended in Luke's story in 23:50-51: "50. And, behold, there was a man named Joseph, a counselor; and he was a good man, and a just: 51. (The same had not consented to the counsel and the deed of them;) he was of Arimathaea, a city of the Jews: who also himself waited for the kingdom of God."

This comparison shows any or all of several scenarios: This Joseph was not present at any of the trials, and therefore could neither consent to the condemning nor speak against it. If he was present he fell into the group of the "all" that condemned a Jesus. If he was present, then he was present at a different trial than the trial where "they all condemned him to be guilty of death."

## Questioning by Pilate.

When Matthew writes out his findings, Pilate questions a Jesus "which is called the Christ" as seen in the next section in verse 17, but first, Matthew 27:11-14 "11. And Jesus stood before the governor: and the governor asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And Jesus said unto him, Thou sayest. 12. And when he was accused of the chief priests and elders, he answered nothing. 13. Then said Pilate unto him, Hearest thou not how many things they witness against thee? 14. And he answered him never a word; in so much that the governor



marveled greatly." Once again, this individual known as Jesus is asked if he is the king of the Jews, not if he is the Christ. Again, the response from this Jesus is at best non-responsive in that this Jesus does not answer the question other than to tell Pilate that Pilate had suggested that Jesus was king of the Jews through his question. This would be an excellent time to go on record and make the claims; if they are actually true.

In any event, in the next section we see that Pilate, according to Matthew sought to release this Jesus. Mark's testimony seems to agree with Matthew so far. Mark 15:1-5 "1. And straightway in the morning the chief priests held a consultation with the elders and scribes, and the whole council, and bound Jesus, and carried him away, and delivered him to Pilate. 2. And Pilate asked him, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answered and said unto him, Thou sayest it. 3. And the chief priests accused him of many things; but he answered nothing. 4. And Pilate asked him again, saying, Answerest thou nothing? behold how many things they witness against thee. 5. But Jesus yet answered nothing; so that Pilate marveled."

It seems that the difference in Luke's discoveries is that he presents some of the accusations made by the chief priests when Jesus was before Pilate. Luke 23:1-5,13-26 "23:1 And the whole multitude of them arose, and led him unto Pilate. 2. And they began to accuse him, saying, We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Ceasar, saying that he himself is Christ a King. 3. And Pilate asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answered him and said, Thou sayest it." Again, Jesus does not answer except with a statement that Pilate had made the claim that Jesus was the King of the Jews, although Pilate made no such statement, as according to the translations, he asked a question for which Jesus was to confirm or deny. Jesus did neither.

As John unfolds his story about the trial before Pilate, Pilate refuses to hear the case because Jesus was a Jew and should be

tried by the chief priests.

John 18:28-36 "28. Then they led Jesus from Caiaphas unto the hall of judgment: and it was early; and they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover. 29. Pilate then went out unto them, and said, What accusations bring ye against this man? 30. They answered and said unto him, If he were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered him unto thee. 31. Then said Pilate unto them, Take ye him, and judge him according to your law. The Jews therefore said unto him, It is not lawful for us to put any man to death: 32. That the saying of Jesus might be fulfilled, which he spake, signifying what death he should die. 33. Then Pilate entered into the judgment hall again, and called Jesus, and said unto him, Art thou the King of the Jews? 34. Jesus answered him, Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or did others tell it thee of me? 35. Pilate answered, Am I a Jew? Thine own nation and the chief priests have delivered thee to me: what hast thou done? 36. Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence."

The Jews are not entirely truthful when speaking to Pilate when they say it is not lawful for them to put a man to death, when they have laws allowing them to stone the guilty to death. However, these statements prove that the chief priests have more to do with the life of Jesus than appearances might otherwise indicate.

John 8:4-8: indicates that stoning is the appropriate penalty for adultery. Consider the fact that it is easier to control the medical events at a crucifixion than it is at a stoning. It should be noted that at the time of Jesus many key religious leaders were also known to be doctors. From birth, it seems certain that the chief priests have been behind the scenes of the life of the story of Jesus, the Christ, the messiah, and king of the Jews that are

recorded in the Bible.

Another memorable aspect is that medicine has a long history in the Jewish religion. One need only give the Old Testament a good reading about how they dealt with many of the illnesses and ailments of their times. Leviticus and Numbers give quite a long list of what is clean and unclean.

As doctors of medicine and law, the chief priests would be knowledgeable surgeons and able to correct most conditions encountered on the cross, so long as the person is considered dead but is merely unconscious or comatose. An unconscious person can certainly be thought of as dead, especially with such shallow breathing as would be expected of one who is hung on a cross, and with the victim having consumed a substance known to have tranquilizing properties.

Joseph of Arimathaea, although not stated, gives all appearances of being a skilled physician, and the questions from Nichodemus when he first met Jesus, would indicate some knowledge of medicine as well, and the fact that they both are preparing his body immediately off the cross with 100 pounds of healing herbs and spices, tends to be suspicious.

In John's testimony, the records vary as to the responses of Jesus, but are similar in that they are cagey or non-responsive.

After these testimonies in the gospels, it clearer that Jesus' kingdom is of this world as his disciples did try to fight to keep Jesus out of the hands of the Jews. Remember the stories of Jesus at the garden where the disciples have swords for fighting, cutting off the ear of one of the servants of the high priests.

Jesus makes statements to his disciples about selling their coats to buy a sword in Luke 22:35-37 "35. And he said unto them, When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye

anything? And they said nothing. 36. Then he said unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one. 37. For I say unto you, that this day it is written must yet be accomplished in me, And he was reckoned among the transgressors: for the things concerning me have an end."

If they were not to fight, why buy swords at all? There is also another critical remark that points to there being more than one Jesus, "for the things concerning me have an end." Jesus is saying that the things that he personally is responsible for accomplishing are about to end, but the things concerning the other Jesus(s) are not yet complete.

John 18:37-40 "37. Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Everyone that is of the truth heareth my voice. 38. Pilate saith unto him, What is truth? And when he had said this, he went out again unto the Jews, and saith unto them, I find no fault at all. 39. But ye have a custom, that I should release unto you one at the passover: will ye therefore that I release unto you the King of the Jews? 40. Then cried they all again, saying, Not this man, but Barabbas. Now Barabbas was a robber."

After some relatively minor scourging, Pilate returns to question Jesus a little more as the Jews want to put the man to death. John 19:7-18 "7. The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God. 8. When Pilate therefore heard that saying, he was the more afraid; 9. And went again into the judgment hall, and saith unto Jesus, Whence art thou? But Jesus gave him no answer. 10. Then said Pilate unto him, Speakest thou not unto me? knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee? 11. Jesus answered, Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given of thee

from above: therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin. 12. And from thenceforth Pirate sought to release him: but the Jews cried out, saying, If thou let this man go, thou art not Caesar's friend: whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Caesar. 13. When Pilot therefore heard that saying, he brought Jesus forth, and sat down in the judgment seat in a place that is called the Pavement, but in the Hebrew, Gabbatha. 14. And it was the preparation of the passover, and about the sixth hour: and he saith unto the Jews, Behold your King! 15. But they cried out, Away with him, away with him, crucify him. Pilate saith unto them, Shall I crucify your King? The chief priests answered, We have no king but Caesar."

Notice that John testifies that the Jesus in his record is still in the judgment hall during the sixth hour (being some time after the sun has risen), where Mark clearly states in 15:25: "25. And it was the third hour and they crucified him." the others have testified that while the Jesus in their record is on the cross during the sixth hour to the ninth hour when it became dark by unusual means.

## **Trial before Herod**

Mathew, Mark, and John have no records of a trial being held before Herod, Making Luke the only gospel writer with any trial before Herod. Luke 23:6-12 "6. When Pilate heard of Galilee, he asked whether the man were a Galilean. 7. And as soon as he knew that he belonged unto Herod's jurisdiction, he sent him to Herod, who himself also was at Jerusalem at that time. 8. And when Herod saw Jesus, he was exceeding glad: for he was desirous to see him a long season, because he had heard many things of him; and he hoped to have seen some miracles done by him. 9. Then he questioned with him in many words; but he answered him nothing. 10. And the chief priests and scribes stood and vehemently accused him.11. And Herod with his men of war set him at naught, and mocked him, and arrayed him in a gorgeous robe, and sent him to Pilate. 12. "And the

same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together: for before they were at enmity between themselves." Once again, testimony shows Jesus as difficult and not incriminating himself one way or the other, as to whether he was the Christ or not.

## **Verdict and Sentencing from Herod and Pilate**

Pilate does not find any guilt in this Jesus and offers to release him.

Matthew 27:15-24: "15. Now at the feast the governor was wont to release unto the people a prisoner, whom they would. 16. And they had then a notable prisoner, called Barabbas. 17. Therefore when they were gathered together, Pilate said unto them, Whom will ye that I release unto you? Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ?... 23. And the governor said, Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried all the more, saying, Let him be crucified. 24. When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made, he took water, and washed his hands before the multitude saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it."

Mark still seems to be consistent with Matthew. Mark 15:6-14 "6. Now at that feast he released unto them one prisoner, whosoever they desired.... 14. Then Pilate said unto them, Why, what evil hath he done? And they cried out the more exceedingly, Crucify him."

Luke, in like manner as the other gospel writers, records a not guilty finding for the Jesus on trial before him. Luke 23: 4-5,13-25 "4. Then said Pilot to the chief priests and to the people, I find no fault in this man. 5. And they were the more fierce, saying, He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Jewry, beginning from Galilee to this place. 13. And Pilate, when he had called together the chief priests and the rulers and

the peoples. 14. Said unto them, Ye have brought this man unto me, as one that perverteth the people: and behold, I, having examined him before you, have found no fault in this man touching those things whereof ye accuse him. 15. No, nor yet Herod: for I sent you to him; and, lo, nothing worthy of death is done in him: 16. I will therefore chastise him and release him. 17. (For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.) 18. And they cried out all at once, saying, Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas: 20. Pilate therefore willing to release Jesus, spake again unto them. 22. And he said unto them a third time, Why, what evil hath he done? I have found no cause of death in him: I will therefore chastise him, and let him go. 24. And Pilate gave sentence that it should be as they required."

As seen above, neither Herod nor Pilate finds any fault in Jesus and they try to release the man. It is clear enough that the Jesus portrayed in the bible is not a criminal against the Roman law, and it is extremely unlikely that he would have been as severely punished as history indicates to be the usual method for those in violation of Roman law.

## **A Scarlet Robe or a Purple Robe**

When it comes to the recorded testimony of the gospel writers, there are discrepancies as to the color robe that Pilate's men placed on the Jesus they describe as being scourged. Matthew 27:27-31: "27. Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the common hall, and gathered unto him the whole band of soldiers. 28. And they stripped him, and put on him a scarlet robe. 29. And when they had platted a crown of thorns, they put it upon his head, and a reed in his right hand: and they bowed the knee before him, and mocked him, saying, Hail, King of the Jews! 30. And they spit upon him, and took the reed, and smote him on the head. 31. And after that they had mocked him, they took the robe off him, and put his own raiment on him, and led him a way to be crucified"

Mark 15:17-20: "17. And they clothed him with purple, and platted a crown of thorns, and put it about his head. 18. And began to salute him, Hail, King of the Jews! 19. And they smote him on the head with the reed, and did spit upon him, and bowing their knees worshipped him. 20. And when they took off the purple from him, and put his own clothes on him, and led him out to crucify him."

John 19:1-6 "1. Then Pilate therefore took Jesus and scourged him. 2. And the soldiers platted a crown of thorns, and put it on his head, and they put on him a purple robe, 3. And said, Hail, King of the Jews! and they smote him with their hands. 4. Pilate therefore went forth again, and said unto them, Behold, I bring him forth to you, that ye may know that I find no fault in him. 5. Then came Jesus forth, wearing the crown of thorns, and the purple robe. And Pilate said unto them, Behold the man! 6. When the chief priest therefore and the officers saw him, they cried out, saying, Crucify him, crucify him. Pilate saith unto them, Take him, and crucify him: for I find no fault in him." Then by verses 16 and 17 they have led this Jesus away without mention of ever having stripped this Jesus of his own clothes, or having ever removed the purple robe from him until he is ready to be crucified in verse 23, when they crucified Jesus they took his clothes and cast lots for them.

Scarlet is among the bright reds: where purple is about midway between red and blue. Purple and scarlet are different colors.

Luke 23:11: Shows the trial of a Jesus before Herod where they put a glorious robe on a Jesus, which may or may not be either scarlet or purple. Regardless of the color robe Herod's men put on their Jesus, both Matthew and Mark have those clothes removed from the Jesus in their records and each have a different color robe put on their Jesus.

Although some arguments have claimed that Jesus had two different robes put on him while before Pilate, there is no biblical record of it in any of the gospels during the time of his



trial just prior to his crucifixion. To get to an understanding that two different colored robes were put on the same person, one must assume that the different writers are in fact talking about the same person and the same trial and somehow managed to fail mentioning the second disrobing of the Jesus where a different color robe was put on him. That, or one of the witnesses was visually impaired, color-blind.

When one takes the sequence of events of the people who go from Pilate, to be scourged, to a hall, to the stripping off his clothes, to the putting on a colored robe (either scarlet or purple, but not both), to the crown of thorns, the reed, the mocking, and the spitting, to the removal of a colored robe and the replacement of his own clothes back on his body, then getting a man called Simon to carry his cross or Jesus carries the cross himself, and then being crucified; none of these gospel writers appear to cover the exact same event at the same time.

The discrepancies between the gospel records is even more apparent when comparing the above stories in Matthew and Mark with the story in John which confirms the purple robe color, but neglects to mention that Jesus was stripped of the purple robe before he was led away to be crucified or that someone else carried his cross, but John clearly states that the purple robe was remove from the Jesus in his record **after his Jesus carries his own cross to the place of crucifixion.**

The different writers certainly cover similar events, that of the accused people with a similar names, similar accusations, similar trial procedures, and similar scourging; but have different color robes, and have different people carrying the cross to a place of crucifixion.

It would certainly be expected that different people would be accused of similar crimes, and even follow nearly identical event paths and procedures, but ultimately, when the differences in the stories are reviewed, the conclusion would have to be that

different people observed or recorded different stories about different accused people or at least events from different times.

None of the stories indicate that there was more than one color robe for their Jesus, nor are there indications of more than one robe in any of the other gospel records, except for the time a Jesus is before Herod, but that is ruled out.

The fact that there are no records within the Bible from the same author who mentions both the scarlet and purple robes, one can logically conclude that each of the writers has covered different trials, and different crucifixions of different people. Other than the supposed names of each accused person and the sequence of events from trial to crucifixion, there is no other indication that these stories are in fact about the same person.

Matthew 26:3-5, "3. Then assembled together the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders of the people, unto the palace of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas, 4. And consulted that they might take Jesus by subtilty, and kill him. 5. But they said, Not on the feast day, lest there be an uproar among the people." If these people really wanted this Jesus dead from crucifixion on the cross, they would have brought him to trial the day after a Sabbath so he would have been on the cross for almost six days and certain to have died. The timing clearly indicates that they do not really want this man dead, but only to appear as though he had died. Why else would they start the process with an arrest the very day before the Sabbath? On that day, not longer than twenty-four hours, Jesus has to be brought from the garden where he was praying, to the house of the high priest, to the religious trial before the chief priests, to the other side of the city for the civil trial before Pilate, back across the city to the local trial before Herod, and back across the city again to another trial before Pilate, walking to the place of crucifixion while carrying a cross, getting three bodies prepped and hung on crosses; and all of this has to be done so Joseph and Nicodemus can get the body off the cross, prepare it in the

custom of the Jews, and get the body buried before the start of the Sabbath day.

## **Attitude of Jesus While on Trial**

What about the attitude of Jesus while he is being questioned? It means nothing for a person to accept all sorts of titles the public wishes to bestow them, even the title of godship, not to mention that of adding a few self-proclaimed titles that others may accept as truth. What about remaining silent, being non-responsive, and even evasive when one is being questioned at trial in regard to the accusations brought against him? If the accused person does not hold to the claims in public that they do in private, the claims are worthless.

Notice how Jesus does not come right out and answer Pilate's questions about being a god, king of the Jews, etc.

When Pilate asks Jesus "Whence art thou?" Jesus, if he were as he claimed, or did not deny being, should have responded with his version of the truth as to whether or not his was from heaven or sent by his god. If Jesus denied being supernatural, another truth is reflected in that he is a man like all others, and therefore not a god in any form, risking the loss of his status and followers.

The Bible presents Jesus as evasive during questioning, especially when it would have been an excellent opportunity to have his claims put on public record for any historian to discover. His lack of responsiveness tends to make him appear guilty as charged. Consider how Jesus tries to "plea bargain" with Pilate when he claims that the people delivering him for trial had committed the greater sin, John 19:11.

When asked, "Art thou the Christ?" Jesus answers, "If I tell you, ye would not believe." The response presents the possibility of two opposing trains of thought. First is that if

Jesus answers that he is not the Christ, his entire ministry becomes a fraud and he possibly faces other civil or criminal charges. It seems likely that the chief priests had a great deal to do with the entire "Jesus/god" situation right from conception.

Modern research proves, rather re-proves the fact that when a person has been convinced that a certain suggestion is true, they alter their life toward fulfilling those suggestions. In summary, if you treat someone like an enemy, and they believe they are your enemy, they are likely to oblige you and act in a manner to prove you correct. On the other hand, if Jesus comes right out and says he is the Christ, according to Greek defining, he does not commit blasphemy, because the term christ simply refers to a messiah, and he would have been an anointed leader who was promising an age of peace. The term christ is different than claiming to be the son of a god, which Jesus refuses to answer.

Mary, the mother of Jesus, seriously wondered whether she was actually going to give birth to a child of her god. But when apparently wealthy men come bearing several fairly valuable gifts to the child that they declare to be the new "King of the Jews" it would tend to reinforce those suggestions in the parents, who would begin to see to it that the child is properly educated into kingship. It should not be forgotten that the parents of another child were prompted to treat their child like the son of a god, "saviour, Christ the Lord" when the shepherds make the announcement.

Some religions select their next leader in the youth after the previous one has died and the one selected usually demonstrates appropriate characteristics that are similar to the previous leader and is then trained to take that position. This is similar in how one Jesus was selected by a small group of people looking for the next "King of the Jews," delivering gifts to a child in Jerusalem they believe to be that king.

## Severity of Pre-Crucifixion Abuse and Scourging

As seen in earlier sections, both Herod and Pilate find not fault worthy of death in any of the Jesus' they are recorded to have tried. In fact, according to the KJV, all of the trials recorded for a Jesus that were held before any Roman trial officer, the accused Jesus was planned to be released by the trial officer. The likelihood that any of the Jesus' received any more severe punishment than that recorded in the bible is slim to none.

However, if the chief priests and associates really wanted Jesus to be put to death, they would have stoned him to death as according to their law as written in Leviticus 24:16: "And he that blasphemeth the name of the Lord, he shall surely be put to death, and all the congregation shall certainly stone him: as well as the stranger, as he that is born in the land, when he blasphemeth the name of the LORD, shall be put to death."

So when the chief priests tell Pilate that they have no law that allows them to put a man to death, they clearly have another agenda. In order for their religion to benefit, their "messiah" cannot have received any broken bones, and stoning is almost guaranteed to break a bone or more. Therefore, the likelihood of there having been more than one Jesus to be tried and crucified and buried would be trial runs in order to get one who has no broken bones.

If Jesus was to receive the flogging with the cat-o-nine tails with bones and metal attached to each of the tails, it is still more than reasonable to expect that the person's bones will be broken.

All the gospel writers have some form of punishment applied to the Jesus of their records while being tried before the chief priests.

Matthew 26:67-68 "67. Then they spit in his face, and buffeted

him; and others smote him with the palms of their hands, 68. Saying, Prophesy unto us, thou Christ, Who is he that smote thee?"

Mark 14:65 "65. And some began to spit on him, and to cover his face, and to buffet him, and to say unto him, Prophesy: and the servants did strike him with the palms of their hands."

Luke 22:63-65 "63. And the men that held Jesus mocked him and smote him. 64. And when they had blindfolded him, they struck him on the face, and asked him, saying, Prophesy, who is it that smote thee? 65. And many other things blasphemously spake they against him.

John 18:22 "22. And when he had thus spoken, one of the officers which stood by struck Jesus with the palm of his hand, saying, Answerest thou the high priest so?"

Up to this point, there is nothing severe about the treatment Jesus has received, not even by modern standards. Certainly unpleasant, but not severe by any means, and it is difficult to determine whether they drew any blood or not.

Even during the time a Jesus is before Herod, Luke is the only writer with a record, and Strong's indicates that naught=nought which is merely mocking and other verbal ridiculing.

Luke 23:12: "Set him at naught and mocked him."

It is during the trials before Pilate that the Jesus' get their most severe treatment, but still not so unbearable that it could not be withstood by most anyone. Sure, the crown of thorns might be the breaking point for many, but remember; at least one Jesus was treated/anointed with spikenard oil on his head. Keep in mind, the medicinal properties of the spikenard oil (numbing to

pain. with enhanced sense of awareness).

The following acknowledgment from Matthew regarding the scourging of this Jesus does not get anywhere close to the use of a cat-o-nine tails. Matthew 27:26-33 "26. Then released he Barnabbas unto them: and when he had scourged Jesus, he delivered him to be crucified. 27. Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus unto the common hall, and gathered unto him the whole band of soldiers, 28. And they stripped him, and put on him a scarlet robe. 29. And when they had platted a crown of thorns, they put it upon his head, and a reed in his right hand: and they bowed the knee before him, and mocked him saying, Hail, king of the Jews! 30. And they spit upon him, and took the reed, and smote him on the head. 31. And after that they had mocked him, they took the robe off from him, and put his own raiment on him, and led him away to crucify him." Matthew has clearly described the extent of the scourging before they led Jesus away to be scourged.

Mark begins differing from Matthew's testimony in that Matthew, the robe color as scarlet and as seen below, Mark gives evidence that robe color as purple. Another possible difference is the hall, unless the common hall is the hall Praetorium. Mark 15:15-22 "15. And so Pilate, willing to content the people, released Barabbas unto them, and delivered Jesus, when he had scourged him, to be crucified. 16. And all the soldiers led him away into the hall, called Praetorium; and they called together the whole band. 17. And they clothed him with purple, and platted a crown of thorns, and put it about his head, 18. And began to salute him, Hail, King of the Jews! 19. And they smote him on the head with a reed, and did spit on him, and bowing their knees worshipped him. 20. And when they had mocked him, they took off the purple from him, and put his own clothes back on him, and led him out to crucify him."

According to Luke, the most severe treatment that Jesus might

have received from Pilate was that of a chastisement, which is considerably lighter in severity than any scourging with a cat-o-nine tails.

The record from John is no more severe than the other records. John 19:1-6 "1. Then Pilate therefore took Jesus, and scourged him. 2. And the Soldiers platted a crown of thorns, and put it on his head, and they put on him a purple robe, 3. And said, Hail, King of the Jews! and they smote him with their hands. 4. Pilate therefore said unto them, Behold, I bring him forth to you, that ye may know that I find no fault in him. 5. Then came Jesus forth, wearing the crown of thorns, and the purple robe. And Pilate saith unto them, Behold the man! 6. When the chief priests therefore and officers saw him, they cried out, saying, Crucify him, crucify him. Pilate saith unto them, Take ye him, and crucify him: For I find no fault in him."

It would be a mistake to assume that the scourging and crucifixion of Jesus was done in the "customary manner," (the use of the cat-o-nine tails) especially when the Bible does not support such a claim, and that the Bible records that both Pilate and Herod find no fault in the man to be worthy of death.

The scourging was not as severe as supposed by many, and especially not as severe as portrayed in the movie *The Passion*, in light of the surprise from Pilate when Joseph of Arimathea asks for the body of Jesus. This is also supported by the story in John where this Jesus carries his own cross all the way to the site of crucifixion. Now with some speculation, suppose that the only reason that the other accounts have someone carrying the cross for their Jesus('s) is because it was part of the mocking. They did give him a crown, such as it was, they did cloth him in "royal" robes, why not have someone carry 'this king's' cross to the point of execution?



## Who Carries the Cross?

There are four gospel writers, and three out of four tell the same story, but the fourth is a story about a similar event. The accused has the same name, receives a similar sentence, but two different people in all four stories carry the cross for the accused person called Jesus.

Matthew 27:32 "32. And as they came out, they found a man of Cyrene, Simon by name: him they compelled to bear the cross. 33. And when they were come to the place called Golgotha, that is to say, a place of a skull," Matthew clearly states that this man from Cyrene carries the cross as soon as they exit the judgment or scourging hall.

Mark 15:21 "21. And they compel Simon a Cyrenian, who passed by, coming out of the country, the father of Alexander and Rufus, to bear his cross. 22. And they bring him unto the place Golgotha, which is, being interpreted, The place of a skull."

Luke 23:25-26 "25. And he released unto them him that for sedition and murder was cast into prison, whom they desired; but he delivered Jesus to their will. 26. And as they led him away, they laid hold upon one Simon, a Cyrenian, coming out of the country, and on him they laid the cross, that he might bear it after Jesus."

John 19:16-17 "16. Then delivered he him therefore unto them to be crucified. And they took Jesus and led him away. 17. And he bearing his cross went forth into the place called the place of the a skull, which is called in the Hebrew Golgotha: "

John could not put it any more clearly; the Jesus in his record bears his own cross to the place of the skull. If someone else carried the cross in the story by John, John failed to introduce the existence of this other person, and with that failure, verse seventeen would read as follows without the pronouns and with

the actual names. – And Jesus bearing his cross went forth into the place called the place of the skull--.

## **The Place of Crucifixion, Golgotha or Calvary**

### ***Is Golgotha and Calvary the same place?***

The different names indicate more than one possibility. Either the writers covered similar events at different times or the names identify different places.

This does not rule out a third option that sometimes people of different cultures refer to the same place by different names. With that said, we have to consider the confusion factor and who is the "true author" of the book called the Bible. Is the author a god or mere humans inspired by the events of the time?

Golgotha and Calvary are different names for sure, and there is no biblical reference that I have found that proves them to be the same place at the same time other than the mention that they are a place of the skull, which would be fairly easy to confuse the two crucifixion site locations, the primary or secondary sites.

According to *The Strongest Strong's*, (21st century edition, published by Zondervan, Grand Rapids, Michigan; Copyright 2001 by Zondervan,) (referred to as Strongs) the maps in the back of the book, the one called "Jerusalem in the time of Jesus," clearly shows that there is the "Traditional Crucifixion Site" to the east of the city, and a "'Garden Tomb' (alternate crucifixion site)" to the north of the city. Unfortunately neither of these crucifixion sites is given the name Golgotha or Calvary. If this map is accurate, it is an indication that there were different possible locations for the crucifixions of criminals and why there are two different names given for the

crucifixion site.

The maps at the back of the KJV designate the location of "Calvary" to be the same as the "Garden Tomb (alternate crucifixion site)" as located in the map at the back of Strong's. The location of Strong's "Traditional Crucifixion Site" seems to be the same location on the map of later times as shown in the KJV where they have placed the "Church of the Holy Sepulchre," which is most likely the traditional location for the crucifixion and burial site called Golgotha.

Matthew 27:33: Mark 15:22: and John 19:17: refer to the place of crucifixion as Golgotha, the place of the skull, where Luke 23:33: says that the particular crucifixion of a Jesus occurred in a place called Calvary, but is not associated with a place of the skull.

The fact there is more than one crucifixion site lends credibility to the theory that there was more than one person that makes up the traditional "son of god" known as Jesus. This seems especially true when we get to the burials with there not being enough time to completely prepare the body before burying it in one record and another record shows the body of one of the Jesus' prepared in the custom of the Jews with nearly one hundred pounds of myrrh and aloes, and buried in the garden tomb because it was close.

While looking into a variety of other topics on the internet it seems that "the hill of frankincense" is also known as Calvary, which according to the Strong's maps, would most likely be the alternate crucifixion site with the garden nearby, however Strong's defines Calvary as skull.

Presently, I have not located any of the possible locations for what was supposed to be the burial location for the person known as Joseph of Arimathaea. Typically, this Joseph's tomb might be in his own home city of Arimathaea, which would be about twenty to thirty miles northeast of Jerusalem.

## Mocking by the Thieves

Once again the gospel records differ as to whether the people crucified with the Jesus of their records actually mocked or defended the crucified Jesus; if in fact there was **only one** Jesus.

The statements by Matthew in 27:38,39,41,44 "38. Then there were two thieves crucified with him, one on the right hand, and the other on the left. 39. And they that passed by reviled him, wagging their heads, 41. Likewise also the chief priests mocking him, with the scribes and the elders.... 44. The thieves also, which were crucified with him, cast the same in his teeth."

Mark is in very close agreement with what Matthew has said, and Mark, in 15:27,29,30,32 claims, "27. And with him they crucify two thieves; one on the right hand, and the other on his left. 29. And they that passed by railed on him, wagging their heads, and saying, Ah, thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, 30. Save thyself, and come down from the cross... 32. ...And they that were crucified with him reviled him."

Luke 23:32,33,35-37,39,40 "32. And there were also two other, malefactors, led with him to be put to death. 33. And when they were come to the place, which is called Calvary, there they crucified him, and the malefactors, one on the right hand, and the other on the left. 35. And the people stood beholding. And the rulers also with them derided him, saying, He saved others; let him save himself, if he be Christ, the chosen of God. 36. And the soldiers also mocked him, and offering him vinegar, 37. And saying, If thou be the king of the Jews, save thyself. 39. And one of the malefactors which were hanged railed on him, saying, If thou be Christ, save thyself and us. 40. But the other answering rebuked him, saying, Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation?"

John, in opposition to the other three gospel writers has no

record as to whether any of the thieves mocking or defending the Jesus they were crucified with while on the cross. In fact, John has no record of anyone mocking this Jesus what so ever, or in any form. It seems likely that the person crucified in John's findings might be the teacher that actually went about healing and feeding the multitudes, where the others crucified in the name of the messiah and king of the Jews would be consistent with some of the secular historians of a person with the name Christos who was accused of various insurrections against Rome, which would account for a "Christ" (in secular records) being scourged with a cat-o-nine tails.

In order to get a much better understanding, a person may have to review the record of every person tried and crucified for being a messiah, Christ, king of the Jews, son of a god, and blasphemy. Find out how many of those were named Jesus, or some form of Christ, Chrestos, Christus, etc. This search can not be restricted to just one particular year, but through at least a period of fifteen generations as identified by the genealogy records in Matthew and Luke; a task that may take on a full time career, if not a lifetime.

## **Drink at the Cross**

There are two distinctly different times in which the person identified as Jesus is either offered a drink or when he actually requests to drink of whatever the concoction is that they have prepared for the crucifixions.

According to Matthew, the first mention of there being a drink either offered or requested is at 27:34-35 "34. They gave him vinegar to drink mingled with gall: and when he had tasted thereof, he would not drink. 35. And they crucified him, and parted his garments." Just as a point of emphasis, it is gall that is mixed with the vinegar in this record.

Mark conflicts with Matthew as to the drink offered to the Jesus

in his record at the cross. Again, as in Matthew, this offer is the first occurrence of a drink either being offered to or requested by the person crucified. This is what Mark has recorded in 15:23 "23. And they gave him to drink wine mingled with myrrh: but he received it not."

Mark's discoveries reveal two different aspects of the drink that was offered. The first difference is that of it being wine and not vinegar as it is listed in Matthew. The second difference is that Mark identifies the add-in as being myrrh and not gall. Though myrrh is a 'gall', in that it is a sap from a tree; gall is a substance that also come from animals.

The substance that is harvested is turned into a juice, which is then converted into a wine, and then into vinegar each with a further progressed fermenting process.

Luke in his testimony at 23:36: has vinegar only being offered with no mention of other substances that were added to it. It is also unclear in the writing in Luke as to when this offer was made, but it is the first offer mentioned. Nor does Luke give any indication as to whether this Jesus received or refused to drink from this vinegar. In what Luke has recorded, the drink, any drink for that matter, was only mentioned once, and that apparent time frame was after he was already on the cross, and just before he was pronounced dead.

John has no record of drink being either offered or requested prior to the crucifixion proceedings, but does have the Jesus in his record requesting it, as shown later, at the end of the crucifixion process.

The following comparison is either the second mention of drink being offered or requested, and/or when that drink is just prior to the declaration of death.

In Matthew, the base drink of vinegar remains the same, but there is not extra mention of it being spiked with any substance. Matthew 27:48,50: "48. And straightway one of them ran, and took a sponge, and filled it with vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave him drink. 50. Jesus, when he cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost." It is not likely, although not impossible, that there was more than one type of drink available at the crucifixion site. The most likely scenario that this second offer was the same mixture as the first drink that was refused that contained the gall.

Mark, in his mention of the second offer of drink, has changed the most. Mark 15:36 "36. And one ran and filled a sponge full of vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave him to drink, saying, Let alone; let us see whether Elias come and take him down." Mark not only changes the drink from wine to vinegar, but also as with Matthew, fails to mention there being a mixture with myrrh. Reed also seems to have medicinal properties

In both Matthew and Mark, there does not seem to be any clarifying as to whether the Jesus' actually got to drink with the second offer, as the remarks of the other soldiers seem to at least try to dissuade the man from giving the crucified Jesus' the drink to ease the pain.

The remarks made by John are the only ones recorded that actually have a Jesus requesting a drink, but also the only record that shows this Jesus actually getting to drink. John 19:28-30 "28. After this, Jesus knowing that all things are now accomplished, that the scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst. 29. Now there was set a vessel full of vinegar: and they filled a sponge with vinegar, and put it upon hyssop, and put it to his mouth. 30. When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished: and he bowed his head and gave up the ghost."

<https://search.yahoo.com/search?fr=mcafee&type=E210US739G0&p=what+is+hyssop> is used

medicinally.

Although John does not have any record of there being anything added to the vinegar, it is likely something was added to kill the pain, especially if either gall or myrrh were a common additive.

With the known properties and benefits of gall and myrrh, and with the way the stories are laid out; it seems unreasonable that they would have a selection of drinks at the execution, although possible, it is unlikely. With the properties of the add-ins (gall/myrrh), it is likely that the reason Jesus refused the drink the first time he was offered and drank the second time was so he would remain conscious up to just prior to the leg breaking when he would take the drink at the time it would be advantageous to appear dead so as to avoid the breaking of the legs, so that another prophecy might appear to be fulfilled in this person. But of course one takes their chances with the piercing of the side, in that the damage could be irreparable.

## **Other Unusually Timed Events at the Cross**

There is a short list of these conveniently timed events at the time of the crucifixion of this person who was supposed to be the child of a god.

Matthew records an earthquake in 27:51 "51...and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent;" and it was during this earth quake that the centurion comes to believe that the crucified man is the son of a god as seen in Matthew 27:54 "54. Now when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was the Son of God."

Matthew does not stop with that, as he goes on to mention that



there is a mass resurrection of dead saints after the temple veil was torn top to bottom in Mathew 27:51-53 "51. And behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from top to bottom; and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent; 52. And the graves were opened; and the bodies of the saints which slept arose, 53. And came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many."

Earthquakes are difficult to predict today, especially a day or two in advance, that is, unless they are man made. Explosives, when set off above ground have nearly the same sensations as those of an earthquake except for the noticeable sound of an explosion. However, the sound of an explosion can be eliminated when the explosion is set off underground in caves and tunnels.

Volcanic earthquakes are slightly easier to predict as they often are preceded by other activities such as increased steam escaping from the ground.

Mark's record is similar to Matthew, except for the fact that Mark does not record any earthquakes when his Jesus dies in 15:38-39 "38. And the temple was rent in twain from top to bottom. 39. And when the centurion, which stood over against him, saw that he cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said, Truly this man was the son of God."

Matthew and Mark, like Luke also mention that there was darkness over the land from the sixth to the ninth hour Luke 23:44-47 "44. And it was about the sixth hour, and there was darkness over all the earth until the ninth hour. 45. And the sun was darkened, and the veil of the temple was rent in the midst. 46. And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus, he gave up the ghost. 47. Now when the centurion saw what was done, he glorified God, saying, Certainly this was a righteous man."

All the recorded eclipses that I have been able to find, the longest eclipse only lasted about nine minutes. Even with three different crucifixions at the different times with one eclipse occurring at the sixth hour, another at the ninth hour, and yet the third at sometime between the two, it could give an impression by later authors that it was dark the entire time.

Earthquakes where the ground tremors, and eclipses where the sun is darkened seems unlikely that either of these types of events were present at the same time; though not impossible. However, volcanic activities can produce both the quaking of the earth and the darkening of the sun for long periods of time, from mere minutes to hours and even days, depending on the severity of the volcanic activity and the proximity of the eruption to the observer.

If the temple is built on an earthquake fault line, it would be no miracle to have the temple or other rocks "torn" in pieces.

Another interesting aspect of the crucifixion is that at least one of the centurions saw what was happening and appears to believe that his Jesus is the son of a god, bringing to mind the question, was this the centurion that declared Jesus dead and then 'pierced' his side?

John has no mention of any other unusual activity at the crucifixion, no earthquakes, no darkness, no resurrections, not even any mocking.

## **Breaking Legs and/or Piercing Side**

The unusual aspect of whether the legs were broken and or the side was pierced, is that there is absolutely no record of either event in the gospels written by Matthew, Mark, or Luke.

The only record of any leg breaking and side piercing occurs in John 19:31-37 "31. The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on

the sabbath day, (for that sabbath day was an high day,) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away. 32. Then came the soldiers, and brake the legs of the first, and the other which was crucified with him. 33. But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs: 34. But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water. **35. And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe.** 36. For these things were done, that the scriptures should be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken. 37. And again another scripture saith, They shall look on him whom they have pierced."

I have to wonder if this person who bares record is Josephus, who was a historian of about that time, and he is said to have had a couple of friends survive the crucifixion process. Could the Joseph of Arimathaea have been Josephus? And could his friends that survived the crucifixion be one of the Jesus that the Bible talks about?

The mere fact that more than one person possessed the name Jesus or Christus, several of them have made it into the public records as having been on trial and crucified. In one case, a Christus was accused of insurrections and setting fires in Rome, and seems to be confused as the person who started Christianity. If this is the case, it is even more evident of there being two people as seen earlier where one person, said to be Jesus, encourages his followers to acquire weapons, and the other teaches to love the enemy and do good to those that hate you.

Can a person, hanging on a cross with one lung pierced low from the side, still breath with shallow breathing? It is likely

that a person as lightly punished as it appears that the Jesus' of the Bible had received, there would have been strength to breath while lying in the tomb after he had been properly doctored.

Forthwith seems to mean immediately when it talks about the blood and water coming out of the wound when the side was pierced. This in another indication that none of the Jesus' recorded in the KJV received very severe torture. If they had, and the Jesus was dead when the side was pierced, there would have been very little if any blood pressure. However, if the Jesus' were to merely appear to be dead, even while hung on the cross, there would have been sufficient pressure in one lung, along with enough fluid to appear as though the heart was pierced.

According to ([www.freerepublic.com](http://www.freerepublic.com)) claims that it was the custom to pierce the body at crucifixion with a sword or lance.

*When Skeptics Ask* claims that it was the custom to break the legs of the crucified. "Be clear on this; they broke everyone's legs..."

There seem to be other discrepancies as to how the bodies were attached to the crosses. ([www.freerepublic.com](http://www.freerepublic.com)) says that the feet were nailed on top of each other; but the photos and diagrams ([www.religiousstudies.uncc](http://www.religiousstudies.uncc)) shows showing foot spikes through each heel into the side or sides of the upright post known as the stripes.

The latter also shows arms draped over and tied to the cross member where the former shows nails only.

Many sources show that there is some form of seat for the victim to rest on. Granted, not enough of a seat to be comfortable, but presumably just enough to prolong the

suffering. ?(www.pbs.org)?

If both (www.freerepublic.com) and *When Skeptics Ask* are correct, then the legs were broken on every Jesus that was crucified, and every person that was crucified had their sides pierced. Otherwise, it would be hit and miss as to whether the legs were broken or sides were pierced, explaining the need for there being more than one person to complete the picture for the person that is supposed to be Jesus.

## **The Rich Man-Disciple Gets the Body of Jesus**

A traditional belief in the Christian religion is that the chief priests have paid the guards at one of the tombs to say that the disciples stole the body of a Jesus, as the conspiracy is detailed in Matthew 28:11-16. As shown below, even Matthew, among other gospel writers, reveal that the person that has had possession of the body of the crucified Jesus('s) is **a secret disciple** of at least one Jesus.

The man known as Joseph of Arimathaea plays several critical roles in obtaining and burying the body that the various gospel writers claim to be a Jesus. This Joseph is very rich, he is considered to be honorable, he is one of the chief priests, he begs Pilate for the body of Jesus, receives the body, buries the body, **and he is a secret disciple of Jesus.**

Here is one of the descriptions of what this Joseph does with this body of a Jesus. Matthew 27:57-61: "57. When the evening was come, there came a rich man of Arimathaea, named Joseph, who also himself was Jesus' disciple: 58. He went to Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded the body to be delivered. 59. And when Joseph had taken the body, he wrapped it in clean linen cloth, 60. And laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out of rock: and he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulcher, and departed. 61. And there

was Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, sitting over against the sepulcher." Pilate does not even question whether this Jesus has died too soon.

Mark tells a slightly different story about the Joseph that got the body of the Jesus he writes about. Unlike Matthew, Mark only says that this Joseph is waiting for the kingdom of God. Mark 15:42-45 "42. And when the even was come, because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath, 43. Joseph of Arimathaea, an honourable counsellor, which also waited for the kingdom of God, came, and went in boldly unto Pilate, and craved the body of Jesus. 44. And Pilate marveled if he were already dead: and calling unto him the centurion, he asked him whether he had been any while dead. 45. And when he knew it of the centurion, he gave the body to Joseph."

Mark has also given another indications of another unusual aspect of the Jesus story when he describes Pilate being surprised to hear that this particular Jesus would have been dead already. Pilate was so surprised that he called in a centurion to verify that the body was dead. Now the suspicious aspect (speculation) is whether the centurion questioned by Pilate was the one that became a believer in the Jesus that was crucified. Perhaps giving a false, or at least a premature declaration of the death of the Jesus that was crucified. This centurion is not recorded as piercing the side of this Jesus.

Magdalene and one other Mary know where this body is in Mark 15:46-47: "46. And he (Joseph of Arimethaea) bought fine linen, and took him down, and wrapped him in linen, and laid him in a sepulcher which was hewn out of rock, and rolled a stone unto the door of the sepulcher. 47. And Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses beheld where he was laid." Like Matthew, Mark only describes very minimal burial preparations.

Luke tells a very similar story to Mark with very little differences. Luke 23:50-55 "50. And, behold, there was a man named Joseph, a counsellor; and he was a good man, and a just: 51. (The same had not consented to the counsel and deed of them;) he was of Arimathaea, a city of the Jews: who also himself waited for the kingdom of God. 52. This man went unto Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus. 53. And he took it down and wrapped it in linen, and laid it in a sepulchre that was hewn in stone, wherein never man before was laid. 54. And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on. 55. And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how the body was laid." These unnamed women seem to see how and where the body lay.

The scenario John reveals in his writings differs considerably from the other three writers. John 19:38-42: "38. And after this Joseph of Arimathaea, besought Pilate that he might take away the body of Jesus: and Pilate gave him leave. He came therefore, and took the body of Jesus. 39. And there came also Nicodemus, which at first came to Jesus by night, and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pounds weight. 40. Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury. 41. Now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden; and in the garden a new sepulcher, wherein was never man yet laid. 42. There laid they Jesus therefore because of the Jews' preparation day; for the sepulcher was nigh at hand."

With all of the other discrepancies in the testimonies of the gospel writers, and especially since Jesus in this case did not even get to the cross till sometime after the sixth hour, the death of this Jesus should by all rights have been the one that Pilate would have questioned, but John bears no record of such suspicions.

When Joseph buries the body in John's story, there are no recorded witnesses other than the one witness that was keeping record at the crucifixion.

The way that John describes the burial preparations, it appears much less rushed and more complete than in Matthew, Mark, and Luke; explaining why the women come later with material to finish the burial preparations.

John also hints that there is not enough time to bury this body in the planned tomb because the preparation day was drawing to an end, so they buried the body near the place of execution, because "it was nigh at hand." The way John's story is written, it seems to indicate that this is not the tomb Joseph of Arimathaea had hewn for himself because they buried this Jesus in the garden near where he was crucified because there was not enough time to get him to the tomb that was planned.

## **Summary of Total Burial Preparation of the Body**

There are three records of pre crucifixion burial preparations where Matthew and Mark's stories are nearly identical, but John is the renegade with a remarkably different description of how the events unfolded.

Matthew 26:6: is similar to Mark 14:3,8: "3. And being in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper, as he (Jesus) sat at meat, there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of spikenard very precious; and she brake the box, and poured it on his head... 8. She hath done what she could: she is come aforehand to anoint my body to the burying."

John 12:1-5,7: "1. Then Jesus six days before the passover came to Bethany, where Lazarus was which had been dead, whom he raised from the dead. 2. There they made him a supper; and Martha served: but Lazarus was one of them that



sat at the table with them. 3. Then took Mary a pound of ointment of spikenard, very costly, and anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped his feet with her hair: and the house was filled with the odor of the ointment. 4. Then said one of his disciples, Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, which should betray him, 5. Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor? 7. Then said Jesus, Let her alone: against the day of my burying hath she kept this."

With the healing properties of spikenard, the doctoring of the body has already begun, and with the preparations during the crucifixion with the vinegar mixed with either gall or myrrh with their properties being similar in aiding the healing processes, then with the one hundred pounds of myrrh and aloes immediately after the crucifixion just before burying, all the materials listed have what are known to be potent healing properties.

Matthew 27:59-60: "59. And when Joseph had taken the body, he wrapped it in clean linen cloth, 60. And laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out of rock: and he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre, and departed." Mark and Luke's descriptions are similar enough to Matthew to not need repeating.

The critical difference that John reveals, other than the amount of materials used for preparing the body is that the extra one hundred pounds of materials it would have taken considerably longer to prepare this body, not to mention it would have given the body much more healing power in order to recover from the crucifixion.

John 19:39: "39. And there came also Nicodemus, which at the first came to Jesus by night, and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound weight. 40. Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury. 41. Now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden; and in the garden a

new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid. 42. There they laid Jesus therefore because of the Jews' preparation day; for the sepulchre was nigh at hand."

Verse 41 and 42, although it is not as clearly stated, it seems apparent that the sepulchre where he was buried was not the one originally planned, and this one was only chosen because it was close.

## **Guard Set at the Tomb/Sepulchre**

The setting of a guard is another unusually recorded aspect that leaves much room for speculation.

The first peculiar aspect of this story is that it is recorded in only one of the gospel records. Mark, Luke, and John have no record, and here is what Matthew reveals.

Matthew 27:62: "62. **Now the next day**, that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate, 63. Saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. 64. Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first. 65. Pilate said unto them, Ye have a watch: go your way, and make it as sure as you can. 66. So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch."

Get this. Joseph and Nicodemus have the body of at least one Jesus for what appears to be nearly twenty-four hours before any guard was set at the tomb. The body of at least one Jesus was prepared as is the custom of the Jews before the burying. The point is that the preparations of at least one, and more likely two, of the bodies known as Jesus began about one day

prior to the declared death of the bodies, while it was still living, eating, talking, etc., and John has recorded one of those preparations.

## **Materials Used For Pre and Post Crucifixion Preparation**

### **(still researching this part)**

There are several interesting materials used on the bodies of the Jesus' in the gospel records. The first is spikenard, which was used just prior to the trials and scourging. The next set of materials is that of the wine or vinegar that was mixed with either gall or myrrh, which was used while one the cross. The remaining materials that were used include myrrh and aloes, which were applied to the body after the crucifixion.

#### Properties of Spikenard

##### 1. Components

- a. Bornyl acetate
- b. Valeranone
- c. Jonan
- d. Tetramenthylloxatricyclodecanol
- e. Menthylthymyl-ether
- f. Cineol-1,8

##### 2. Uses

- a. Tension
- b. Stress
- c. Insomnia
- d. Reguvenative qualities

The physical healing properties of spikenard along with other

ways that it beneficially affects the mind and body in stressful situations, it is known as an essential oil to be absorbed into the skin and the crown of thorns only aids in getting the ointment into the body all the faster, acting like multiple hypodermic needles pushing the spikenard under the skin and into the circulatory system.

While on the topic of spikenard, I have this question: Would an extremely potent formulation or dose of spikenard allow for the appearance of a bloody sweat?

### Properties of Vinegar

- 1) Components
- 2) Cures

### Properties of Wine

- 1) Components
- 2) Cures

### Properties of Gall

1. Components
2. Cures

What about the properties of myrrh and gall mixture with vinegar?

### Properties of Myrrh

1. Components
  - a. Myrrholic

- b. Cuminic
- c. Eugenol
- d. Cadinene
- e. Pinene
- f. Limonene

## 2) Cures

- a. Stops bleeding wounds
- b. Effective against excessive mucus in lungs
- c. Bronchitis
- d. Bedsores
- e. Respiratory
- f. Digestive
- g. Infections
- h. Skin inflammations

What about the properties of myrrh and gall mixture with vinegar?

## Properties of Aloes (lign)

### 1) Components

- a. 19 amino acids
- b. 8 essential amino acids
- c. 11 secondary amino acids
- d. Vitamins A, B1, B6, B12, C, E, and several others
- e. Picric and oxalic acid
- f. nitric acid

### 2) Cures

- a. Skin discomforts
- b. Damaged skins
- c. Consumptions

- d. Burns
- e. reduce inflammation
- f. Speeds healing with gauze bandage
- g. Preserves skin moisture
- h. Cuts and scrapes
- i. Prevents infections
- j. Wound sealant and pulls skin together like bandage or suture
- k. Antiseptic
- l. Immune system deficiencies

## **Other materials familiar to Jesus.**

### ***(still researching this part)***

#### Properties of Frankincense

##### 1) Components

- a. Cardinene
- b. Camphene
- c. Olibanol
- d. Dipentene
- e. Penene
- f. Phellandrene

##### 2) Cures

- a. slows down and deepens breathing
- b. helps to clear the lungs
- c. helps with shortness of breath
- d. effective with wounds scars and skin inflammation
- e. calm and sooth whole body and mind
- f. "According to Dr. Gary Young, clinical research shows that frankincense oils contain very high immune stimulating properties. It also has been found that you can increase the chance of experiencing spontaneous healing by giving your

body appropriate exercise and sufficient rest."

### Properties of Milk

2. Components
3. Cures

### Properties of Honey

1. Components
2. Cures
  - a. antibiotic
  - b. dress wounds
  - c. base for healing unguents (soothing or healing salve or ointment)

Milk and honey combination treatment for respiratory system, and throat irritations

### Properties of Liver

1. Components
2. Cures
  - a. cataracts

### Properties of Imhotep

1. Components
2. Cures
  - a. miraculous healings

Properties of 500 shekels pure myrrh

1. Components
2. Cures

#### Properties of 250 shekels sweet cinnamon

1. Components
2. Cures

#### Properties of 250 shekels sweet calamus

1. Components
2. Cures

#### Properties of 500 shekels cassia

1. Components
2. Cures

#### Properties of one hin olive oil

1. Components
2. Cures

Formula: pure myrrh 500 shekels, sweet cinnamon 250 shekels, sweet calamus 250 shekels, cassia 500 shekels after the shekel of the sanctuary, olive oil in the amount of an hin.

What product is best or calming the heart and relieving hysterical conditions?

Jesus spent several years in Egypt, which has been known for its magicians and healing skills in the world.

Would a good swig of myrrh/gall vinegar mixture cause an appearance of death? Remember Pilate was suspicious if that



Jesus was really dead.

Jesus is considered a "Master." As a master, Jesus most likely is able to control his breathing under the most difficult of situations. He is well known for being a master healer, extensive knowledge of the scriptures and prophecies, his closest friends were money lenders, lawyers, doctors, chief priests, Pharisees, and Romans among others.

Coronary sack with water, if heart is dead, would that release pressure in the sack?

## **Appearances After Burial**

The first person one of the Jesus' is reported to have appeared to after being buried was Mary Magdalene as seen in Mark 16:9: "9. Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene..." If Magdalene was not a romantic concern for the Bible Jesus, why appear first to Magdalene and not his mother?

The other gospel records only seem to confuse the issue of who Jesus appeared to first after being buried. In Matthew, at 28:1-2: "1. In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulcher. 2. And behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door. And sat upon it."

It seems that this area is rather earthquake prone area as just a day or so earlier during the crucifixion there in an earthquake recorded by three of the gospel writers, and now another at the resurrection.

Since Jesus has already appeared to Magdalene early in the day according to Mark, why does Matthew have a Magdalene going to see the body at the place he was buried? These two women,

Magdalene and the other Mary, bring nothing with them, which suggests two possibilities. First they do not expect to see the body because according to Mark, Magdalene already saw the body alive. Second, they already saw the body properly prepared for burial as according to the story in John, but there is no record of anyone witnessing the burial that John writes about.

There is yet another situation recorded in Mark's gospel, as shown below, which has Magdalene and another Mary bringing sweet spices to anoint the body, leading one to assume that they must expect Jesus to still be dead and buried: why else would they be going to the tomb to anoint the body for burial as they did not have time for the anointing prior to the Sabbath? These women must not have seen Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathaea prepare the body in the customary Jewish manner prior to burying it. What is puzzling is that if Jesus has already appeared to Magdalene, why is she named as one of the women who are going to the grave with the spices to anoint a dead body that Matthew has already stated that she supposedly has already seen alive?

Mark 16:1-2,6: "1. And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. 2. And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulcher at the rising of the sun. 6. And he (a young man inside the tomb) said unto them, Be not affrighted: Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, which was crucified: he is risen; he is not here: behold the place where they laid him."

It is unclear as to whether this version of a similar events is actually the same as either of the previous, since Luke does not identify any of the women who go to the tomb. Luke 23:55-56&24:1: "55. And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulchre, and how the body was laid. 56. And they returned, and prepared spices and

ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. 1. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices that they had prepared, and certain others with them." These women apparently did not see the Jesus that was buried in the one hundred pound mixture of myrrh and aloes Joseph of Arimathaea and Nicodemus used in John's writings.

John's description seems to pinpoint the time that Magdalene goes to the tomb when he says in John 20:1: "1. The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulcher, and see the stone taken away from the sepulcher." Here, Magdalene makes what appears to be her earliest trip to the tomb, because in this trip she goes early while it is still dark, which would be before her second trip at the rising of the sun in Mark's account, which indicated that there was more light, because it is no longer "dark" when the sun is rising.

It is interesting that Jesus has already appeared to Magdalene first (according to Mark), when she was alone (according to John). So why would Jesus be appearing to Magdalene again for the first time with the other Mary (according to Matthew)?

Also, with regard to the stone that is rolled away as Magdalene approaches a tomb (according to Mark), when the stone (according to John) has already been removed.

Another confusing aspect is that of when a full day (not just the light portion of the full day) actually begins and ends. The customary measure of a day is that the new day starts with the evening, about sunset. The morning would then be about midday, which is actually when the sun is rising, and the setting of the sun again that evening would be the end of that same day, which also starts the next day. The gospel records for the most part, "very early in the day" is identified with the rising of the sun. This is a point of confusion in that "day" refers to two different measures of time. One measure of a day is that of

measuring the light cycle and the other is the measure of the "day cycle," which includes both the light cycle and the dark cycle.

With day being the light part of the "day cycle," and the night is the dark portion; when someone says it is early in the day, that is early in the "day cycle," not necessarily the early part of the daylight part of the day. With the evening hours the literal start of a new day, then early in the day while it was still dark could mean any of nearly eight hours or more, depending on the time of year. Without the specifics from each gospel writer, one cannot automatically assume the writers are referring to the same hour in relation to sunrise and sunset, especially where they do not state a specific hour, but provide mere references to the amount of lighting. However, during the crucifixion stage it actually gives hour numbers like, the third hour, sixth hour, ninth hour.

## **Somebody Different Resurrected**

When it was considered that Lazarus was resurrected, both family and friends immediately recognize Lazarus after being four days and at least three nights in the grave and stinking, which indicates either decay has started or they buried him alive. If buried alive, when he awoke or when he regained consciousness he may have had to urinate and defecate in his burial wrappings. This, accounting for the stench.

Anyone in the vicinity of a baby's full diaper knows just how strong and how far away the smell can travel. Now, imagine that same diaper having gone unchanged for four days and nights. Whooooo... eeeeeee....

Jesus was supposedly fully recognized at the trial, on the cross, and during the burial preparations, but he is completely

unrecognizable after he was supposed to be resurrected and healed. A man while appearing physically and speaking before some of his closest people, they do not recognize that man as the Jesus whom they saw crucified. The disciples all have to see various "signs" and scars before they came to think of the person they saw as the same person who lived among them before the crucifixion. Thus, strong hints at reincarnation.

Mark 16:12: "12. After that, he (Jesus) appeared in another form unto two of them (disciples verses 7 & 10), as they walked, and went into the country."

"Another form" indicates that the appearance was more of a reincarnation rather than the use of his own post crucifixion body, or this simply is not the same Jesus that was crucified, and is merely confused for the crucified Jesus. Remember, Herod had thought that John the Baptist had reincarnated, or came back to life in the body of Jesus.

The first person this Jesus is said to have appeared to after being buried, Magdalene, she does not recognize this person as the crucified Jesus. John 20:14-16: "14. And when she (Magdalene) had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus. 15. Jesus said unto her, Woman, why do you weep? whom seek ye? She, supposing him to be the gardener, said unto him, Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away. 16. Jesus said unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and said unto him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master."

Shortly after an appearance before Magdalene, a man is reported as walking with two disciples who do not recognize the man as Jesus. Luke 24:13-17,29: "13. And behold, two of them (disciples) went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about three furlongs. 14. And they talked together of all the things that had happened. 15. And it came to pass, that, while they communed together and reasoned, Jesus himself drew near, and went with them. 16.

But their eyes were held that they should not know him. 17. And he said unto them, What manner of communications are these that ye should have one to another, as ye walk, and are sad? 29. But they constrained him, saying, Abide with us: for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent. And he went in to tarry with them."

These men seem to be followers/disciples of Jesus and must have known him well enough for the women to tell them Jesus had supposedly risen. Yet, these followers did not recognize the voice, mannerisms, or teachings of this stranger as the prior crucified Jesus, even when he "opened the scriptures to them."

Once again, even John presents a Jesus before a group of disciples that do not recognize him.

John 20:17-20,24-27: "17. Jesus said unto her (Magdalene), Touch me not; for I have not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God. 18. Mary Magdalene came and told the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and that he had spoken these things unto her. 19. Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and said unto them, Peace be unto you. 20. And when he had so said, he showed unto them his hands and his side. Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord... 24. But Thomas, one of the twelve, called Dydimus, was not with them when Jesus came. 25. The other disciples therefore said unto him, We have seen the Lord. But he said unto them, Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe. 26. And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you. 27. Then said he to Thomas, reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands;

and reach hither they hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing."

Only after showing the scars, did the disciples come to consider that this person might be Jesus, that is all except Thomas (Doubting Thomas), who also had to actually touch the wounds; which, then only after Jesus healed for eight days.

We must take note, that the people closest to this person who is supposed to be Jesus do not recognize this face or voice as the per-crucifixion Jesus when they see and talk with him. If his body and voice has somehow been disfigured and distorted as a result of the scourging or while hanging on the cross, it should be similarly so after the resurrection, which should even make him all the easier to recognize; that is if this Jesus was as mutilated as many people believe him to have been[Mel Gibson's *Passion of the Christ* movie]. Such deformed features should have been very easy to spot, even from some distance.

Jesus was talking while hanging on the cross, right up to the time of his supposed death. If his voice had become distorted in some manner or if his body had become considerably disfigured, the people he supposedly appeared to after what was supposed to be the resurrection should have been able to recognize this person as the same Jesus that was crucified. Several of the people he appeared before were recorded as attending the crucifixion. However, the person, supposed to be the same Jesus that was crucified; after the resurrection he is not recognized as that Jesus until various "code" words or phrases are spoken, or until this person reveals the more noted wounds recorded in the prophecies. Then, if that does not get their attention he has to come right out and identify himself as the risen Jesus.

## The Bible

The books *Mankind's Search for God* and *When Skeptics Ask* both have predetermined that the Christian Bible should be the correct measuring stick for determining what true gods and true religions should be. The same concept holds true with most other religions regarding their beliefs about their gods and their sacred writings and scriptures. In this aspect, the situations have not changed much since the time when Zeus was the father of all gods, or when people defended to the death the supremacy of the sun or moon gods.

All expression contrary to any chosen measuring device must "appear" wrong, even if it is the absolute truth regarding its proper context. When the wrong measuring device is used or the correct device is used improperly, that which is correct often appears incorrect.

At one time Christians were persecuted for their beliefs. Sometime later Christian began persecuting and condemning others, who were not Christian, for their different ways of thinking and believing. The witchcraft trials are one example of this.

There is a claim in *When Skeptics Ask* that tries to disprove the argument stating, "all statements about history are relative," by trying to say that the argument itself is relative because it is supposed to be a statement about history.

The claim, "all statements about history are relative," is an absolute and objective statement regarding particular types of statements, specifically statements about history.

Because history itself is absolute, in that it happened as it



happened, no statements can ever change what happened. Statements about history can only make one event in history look better or worse than it actually was and it all depends on the perspective to the event from which the statement is being made.

In order for any statement about history to not be relative, it has to be that that particular history itself is the statement. Anything other than the particular history itself as the statement, there is something missing. That particular something that is missing makes every statement about history, relative. Therefore, the Bible as a historical statement is only relative text about historical events and people.

Stripping away the supernatural events from stories in the Christian religion in order to get a truer picture of that religion would be like stripping all the money away from the stories about the life of the present day electronics tycoon Bill Gates; all you have left is a pauper, making all the accomplishments he has put his name to seem somewhat miraculous. However, this is exactly what the Bible seems to do with the life of the Jesus it created.

The authors of the KJV has striped away all but four incidents in the life of what is commonly accepted as one Jesus. First is the birth at the manger with the shepherds; then there is the circumcising; and into Nazareth where it is said that he grows up; then at the supposed age of two or three the family receives gifts from what are called the wise men; to an undetermined length of stay in Egypt; and finally the last incident is when he is twelve years old. After the age of twelve there is literally no record until he is baptized at about the age of thirty, making everything he has done after that time seem miraculous.

If we remove every detail, save three or four relatively irrelevant facts from the lives of Harry Houdini and David Copperfield (both famous magicians and illusionist,) a person might get the same impression about their actions as being

somewhat supernatural and miraculous.

One unproven claim the Bible supports, is that one being, a god, is responsible for the beginning of the universe and the existence of the human race which is also the important hinge upon which all other Christian claims swing. Christianity is not the first religion to claim that its god is the creator of the earth and the cause that brought humans into existence.

The only way to conclude that one entity is responsible for the beginning of all existence, including the human race, is if that entity is in fact the Totality, which includes every god and every devil.

The true cause for human existence can care less about what we do, or do not do, especially since there is no evidence that the cause responsible for the original existence of humans even continues to exist today. Every cause and effect has a "timeline," they come and they go. Some causes and/or effects last for many years, others are the proverbial flash in a pan and are gone almost quicker than they came.

Humans are not the "true cause" for the existence of computers and robots, in spite of the fact that that humans were the last cause that manipulated and combined the components that eventually became what we know as the computer and the robot. Logically, when the evolution of the computerized robot advances to a stage that they begin to procreate in some form or another, as there is a variety of options available, humans will become obsolete.

You doubt this?

Ok. Consider the fact that the earth, like everything is locked in to seasonal cycles. This global warming will eventually reach a level to where it will become unbearable for humans to survive, while the robot may not melt down till the temperatures reach

eight hundred degrees or better. Eventually, some number of years later the temperature will cycle back to where it will be suitable for what we know as human life, and it might be some distant creational generation of the robot that causes some other another form of human to exist, while this one is out exploring other sectors of the Totality. If this generation of humans does not learn to control the natural forces that exist around us, we are just as doomed to extinction as the dinosaur and a variety of other now non-existent life forms.

The Bible states, "...that all scripture is inspired of god... and beneficial for teaching..." 2 Timothy 3:16 With the word 'all' meaning inclusive of every, (in this case scripture,) and the word 'scripture' meaning the sacred writings of any religion; which by the way, the Bible does not teach that it is the only source for its god's word. Every religion has sacred writings claimed to be from their god(s); therefore, all religions are valuable for teaching.

The Christian Bible should logically be seen only as a history of the Christian religion and not necessarily the true beginnings of humanity and the universe as we know them. Ultimately, the Bible is its own proof of being the word of a god, and **that** is simply because it says it is.

With many historically accurate points in the Bible, history is not what the Bible is selling or that is followers are promoting. Many of those historical points are not even related to the supposed purpose of the Christian religion, which is supposed to provide some formula for attaining a particular form of eternal life; which by the way, already exists without any religious affiliation what so ever, and this eternal life is provable as having existed long before religion or government.

Many Christians claim that their god controlled or inspired the

writings contained in their Bible through direct revelations that would have to include all translations and copies of translations as well. If such control does not include every translation, then any variation what so ever would be a completely different work, and not the true word of the original writing's god. However, if the god controls the translations and copies, why are there so many errors? The errors exist in accuracy by assuming the numbers have been rounded without prior explanation, errors by misspelling words, and errors by reversing the order of words. All of these errors are supposed to be present in the various translations and copies of the original writings.

If a god is credited with being perfect, any writings declared to be that god's word must be considered perfect; if not perfect, then deliberately deceptive. If there are any incorrect scientific details, the god is not perfect. On the other hand, those writings would not be the true words inspired by that perfect god.

For example: If a master is referring to the smallest seed that yields a crop, and they are considered to be all knowing, than that master must know whether any other smaller seeds ever were, are now, or ever will be used as a crop.

When the writers of *When Skeptics Ask* refer to the teachings of Jesus when he declares that the mustard seed is the smallest seed that yields a crop, they attempt to rationalize the teachings inaccuracy even though they claim the orchid seed is smaller. They try to justify the claim with attempts to convince the reader that there are no crops of orchids. Neither the writers of *When Skeptics Ask*, or Jesus for that matter knew that orchids are grown for crops. To prove this, one need only look in the displays windows of almost any flower shop to find these orchid flowers that were harvested in larger quantities from a crop, thus proving that the teachings are not from an all knowing creature, or the Bible is truly not the word of an all-knowing god. (Mathew 13:31.)

Before someone says, "Yea, but are orchids used for food, as the mustard seed is a food crop?" Look at [http://www.unep.org/bpsp/bioplan\\_archive/BIOPLANS-MAR-2002/BIOPLAN\\_POSTING-2002-3-12.htm](http://www.unep.org/bpsp/bioplan_archive/BIOPLANS-MAR-2002/BIOPLAN_POSTING-2002-3-12.htm) on the internet and you should find; "Tanzanian orchids with large tubers, like this one of the *Eulophia* species, have been dug and exported as food." So yes, according to this web site, people do grow orchid crops, not only for flower shops but also for food. Orchids are also used as medicines; see <https://academic.oup.com/qjmed/article/98/9/625/1547881?login=false> .

If the god is claimed to be all knowing, it must have been aware that the meaning of various parts of the prophecy would be altered, and that some of those writings would be destroyed forever, it would have made certain every translation and every copy ever made would be one hundred percent accurate and one hundred percent what that god intended, one hundred percent of the time, provided that the god still lives. This is a reasonable assertion when one considers the claims that the god is supposed to be able to listen to the prayers of every human that prays, not to mention the claims that the god is supposed to be controlling everything that is going on everywhere in existence.

Prophecies said to be from an all knowing god, who reveals information to an ancient writer, should be so clear as to have only one meaning regardless of the language or point in history it is or was discovered, revealed, or fulfilled. The possibility of multiple interpretations removes the prophecy from the realm of a reliable source.

Jesus taught, (Matthew 6:17) "Every good tree produces fine fruit, but every rotten tree produces worthless fruit; a good tree cannot bear worthless fruit, neither can a rotten tree produce fine fruit. Every tree not producing fine fruit gets cut down and thrown into the fire. Really, then, by their fruits you will

recognize those men." This is another teaching that proves inaccurate with present-day knowledge, although it goes a long way in attempting to portray the existence of a hell, which has been declared mythical in the way it is represented in other religions,;although all depictions are similar. In addition, this teaching is contrary to the Genesis, especially if the tree of knowledge was really evil, as it was not cut down and cast into a fire. Since it was not cut down it must have been producing "desirable fruit."

Tree growers know that a tree producing fine fruit one year may be barren the next or at least any year in the future produce rotten fruit for one reason or another. It is the grower's responsibility to deduce the cause for the rotten fruit and make an effort to correct the situation by removing the pest, providing proper nutrients, moisture, and whatever else may be necessary.

A tree's value does not rest solely in the tree itself. To some extent, the value of a tree has dependence on the soil in which it is planted, the weather and climate that serves the soil, the care it receives, as well as its ability to withstand any number of diseases or pests, to mention only a few of the critical conditions causing an otherwise fine tree to produce rotten fruit. All this does not account for the one who wishes to use the fruit and what use they are going to make of it.

In comparing trees to people, as the biblical example seems to do, one discovers the same results in humans. An otherwise healthy couple (good tree) may bear fruit (birth children) with deformities (bad fruit), and vice versa, and sometimes the same tree will bear both good and bad fruit (good and bad children).

Some people have then said that what a person does is actually the fruit that the Bible is really talking about. Even so, there are people who will witness the same action at the same time and they will call it evil, while others will see it as beneficial, and therefore good. Therefore, even one's works or fruits are subject to the opinions of the receiver or observer.

In Genesis 32:30: Jacob says, "...I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." Yet, in 1 John 4:12: it states, "No man has seen God at any time..." Has Jon just called Jacob a liar?

Which of these is correct? If Jacob was a man, and he sees god face to face, a man has seen a god at that time, and it appears as though both verses are referring to the same "God." Another observation might be that the "God" Jacob sees face to face, is not the same "God" that 1 John 4:12: writes about, but if this is true that would all but destroy the entire religion —or drastically alter it.

Is one day equal to one thousand years? 2 Peter 3:8 seems to present that possibility. This is another interesting, if not misleading concept the Bible presents, but how else can the compilers or later students of the Bible justify Adam and Eve having lived just short of one thousand years after they ate of the tree of knowledge when the god declared, "...in the day you eat, you die..." not that you will begin to die, or that only some part of you will die or begin to die; or that die did not actually have anything to do with death or dying; but merely cutting off communications with the god, which did not happen either,.

The interesting concept here is the comparison where one year is as seven years when we talk about one human year as an equivalent to seven dog years.

The one human year seems to have more value when talking about the lives of considerably smaller creatures. So what about single cell critters? How many minutes or hours do they normally live in comparison to the human years? One human year could literally be hundreds or thousands of generations of single cell creatures. Knowing that the human is made up of millions of single cell creatures that have joined together to

form the organs that make the body. Such a comparison would make the human (body) the 'god' to all the cells that make the body.

The concept of all humanity being from the same stock is valuable, but the same stock as what? Man, computer, and robot are made of the same stock, not to mention everything else on the planet, including the planet.

That stock is the various components found within the Totality.

Supposedly, our emotions are what make the human more special than others of the same stock. The interesting factor about emotions is that they are learned responses that coincide with our needs and desires and how those needs and desires are met or go unsatisfied. Through the process of trial and error we re-program our emotional responses every day, whether we are aware of the reprogramming or not.

Animals express all sorts of emotions; even plants respond better to various incentives and stimuli than when exposed to others. Computers are known to respond more favorably or unfavorably under a variety of conditions depending on how they are "motivated or treated." All these forms of responses are forms of emotion.

The difference between human genetics and computer programming exists only in the language used, the detail and numbers of programming layers. Emotions are a form of communication that can be reprogrammed by the individual, and usually are closely related to societal emotional responses.

What about the reliability of biblical prophecy? Deuteronomy 18:22: says, "22. When a prophet speaks in the name of the Lord, if the thing followed not, nor cometh to pass, that is the thing which the Lord has not spoken, but the prophet has



spoken it presumptuously: thou shall not be afraid of him." This verse gives a rather clear indication that those prophets of the Christian god are to speak precise prophecies in declaring specific timetables and events. Without specifics, how is anyone to know whether the prophecy has or has not come to completion, especially if the prophecy suitably describes any number of events in any number of time frames or places of the past, present or future?

Plainly, there can be no open-ended prophecies; that is, prophecies without definite time lines. Open-ended prophecies are merely goals or a prediction as to what one might wish for, or thinks is most likely to happen given certain circumstances. Why? Because without specifics, it leaves the prophecy open to interpretation from generation to generation as to when, how, or if the prophesy is fulfilled.

The prophecies regarding the wars and rumors of wars, as well as other end time prophecies have existed as a sign for the end of the world and has been believed to be coming true every so often over many millennia.

Per-capita there are no more wars or rumors of wars than there were when supposedly only four people populated the earth. This ratio is about twenty-five percent of the world's supposed population of four. As each decade passed the population grew and communications technology improved. While at one time it took decades for news of any incident to reach most of the world, today a single gunshot or rude remark can be broadcast around the world and even to locations away from the planet in less than one minute. We can flip a switch or punch a button on satellite television and hear of a war or killing in any part of the world as it is happening.

Regarding future events and prophecy, the book *When Skeptics Ask* talks about the Bible prophecy of Ezekiel 26:1-14: which is

said to prophecy the destruction of the city of Tyre. In this supposed prophecy, it talks about the destruction of the city twice in the same way. In both cases there is the spreading of the dust into the water and in one of those cases, Nebuchadnezzar was to perform all parts of the prophecy. However, in *When Skeptics Ask*, archaeologists report the history where Nebuchadnezzar left the dust where it lay and then some two hundred years later another conqueror came and spread the dust in the waters.

In the Bible, Ezekiel refers to "they" as being Nebuchadnezzar's men who would perform all the events in the prophecy. If Nebuchadnezzar's men did not do all that the prophecy required which makes Ezekiel no greater a prophet than Naustradamus or Jean Dixon. The prophecy remains unfulfilled.

Another of the prophecies not yet fulfilled is that of the messiah Immanuel being born of a virgin.

Another prophecy in Isaiah 7:14: "14. Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." The virgin shall call this prophesied child's name Immanuel.

This does not say they, the people, will call the child Immanuel or that the child will be known as Immanuel, but the virgin "shall call his name Immanuel," not Jesus.

When we refer to the circumcision and naming of the virgins child; Mary the supposed virgin and mother of the child, calls the name of her first born child, Jesus. Perhaps the difference between the names, Immanuel and Jesus is what Mary, the mother of Jesus was "keeping and pondering in her heart." The Bible records this about Mary twice; once when the angel appears to present the proposition of impregnating Mary and the second time when Jesus was twelve years old.

Although Jesus was supposedly born of a virgin, the prophecy is unfulfilled, as the child was to be named Immanuel, which from the Hebrew means, "god with us" and Jesus from the Hebrew means, "god will help." The difference in the names Immanuel and Jesus, other than the spelling, is in the definitions. Although the name definitions can be construed to have the same meaning, they are not the same, therefore not identifying the same person. We can see how different the meanings are when we realize that a person can help and not be anywhere near, and a person can be with someone and not help at all.

If the Isaiah prophecy were a true prophecy, the prophet would have presented the exact name of the child to be Jesus, if in fact Jesus was the child that fulfilled Isaiah's prophecy. The angel delivering the news to Mary knew the prophesied name and used it, yet the angel instructed Mary to use another name for the child, proving the source of the prophecy and Mary and Joseph's angels were not the same, or developed a different agenda from the time of the prophecy to the time of the supposed fulfillment.

According to the Bible, Satan can appear as an angel of light, and this is what appears to have happened, either with Isaiah or with Mary and Joseph, which by the way were not approached by the same angel at the same time. 2 Corinthians 11:13-15: "13. For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. 14. And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. 15. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works." Either the Old Testament prophet had not properly tested the source of his prophecy or the angel that appeared to Mary and Joseph was a fraud.

Claims have been made that the Bible has some sort of

transforming power, but it has no more transforming power than a bottle of whiskey or any other drug or substance. The partaker must not only choose, but also must believe that what is chosen has certain power to transform. Otherwise, the object chosen is just as powerless as any other object credited with improving or destroying a person's life.

In any case, the individuals can pre-program themselves to respond accordingly to various situations. Refer to the section, "Faith, Belief, and the Placebo Effect."

Supposedly, the gospel writers of the New Testament wrote parts of their work within forty years of the events they wrote about. Some were supposedly eyewitnesses to some of the events, or they spoke to others who supposedly were eyewitnesses. Even with experts, it is at best difficult to determine what is hearsay and what is author eyewitness. Without specific mention as to the source of the information, the details of the types of events may be accurate and even the people may be real, but none of this rules out the use of "artistic license" by the writer to combine real events and real people with fictional material to present a more interesting and entertaining story.

Have you ever talked to an eyewitness within hours or even minutes of an incident, and then gone back a week or even a few months later to get more information? The same eyewitness will tell a slightly different story each time, adding some details that were absent before and forgetting some details that were included in earlier versions. Even with the assistance of notes, each later version of the incident has some degree of variations.

As far as the betrayal of Jesus, Judas could not actually betray someone who has chosen him to play the role of a betrayer. John 13:2,11,18,21,26,27: "2. And supper being ended, the

devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him... 11. For he (Jesus) knew who should betray him; therefore said he, Ye are not all clean... 18. I speak not of you all: I (Jesus) know whom I have chosen: but that the scripture might be fulfilled, He that eats bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me... 21. When Jesus had thus said, he was troubled in spirit, and testified, and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me... 26. Jesus answered, He it is, to who I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it. And when he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon... 27. And after the sop Satan entered into him. Then said Jesus unto him, That thou doest, do quickly."

That writing from John pretty much names this Jesus as Satan. Satan put it in Judas' heart; but it is Jesus who is doing the speaking?

"I know whom I have chosen," pretty much sums up the fact that Jesus has chosen the one who should be his betrayer, and not Satan: not unless this Jesus is actually that "Satan" appearing as an angel of light. What with the definition of sop referring both to food dipped or steeped in a liquid, and that to a conciliatory bribe, gift or advance. The word "sop," as it appears in John 13:21: Jesus seems to be confessing his action of initiating the betrayal in choosing and paying Judas to betray him.

The verses in John chapter thirteen, when viewed with other incidents, show one Jesus who is deliberately trying to fulfill various prophecies. Notice the words of this Jesus, "I know whom I have chosen; but that the scriptures may be fulfilled, he that eats bread with me..." John unmistakably points out these are the words Jesus is speaking to his disciples.

Although the, "he that eats bread with me..." might be confused with "dipping the sop," "dipping the sop" sounds alot like "dipping the till." We can see from the verse above that sop has

nothing to do with steeping food in a liquid.

Notice the very first part, "And supper being ended..." simply, all the eating is done, and perhaps most of the drinking has ended as well, otherwise the supper lingers on if the snacking still continues. The remaining parts give a clearer picture that Jesus has given Judas some money to be the betrayer, not to mention Judas receiving money from the chief priests for the betrayal as well.

Not convinced yet? Look at John 13: 28-30: "28. Now no man at the table knew for what intent he (Jesus) spake this unto him (Judas). 29. For some of them thought, because Judas had the bag (money), that Jesus had said unto him, Buy those things that we have need of against the feast; or, that he should give something to the poor. 30. He (Judas) then having received the sop went immediately out: and it was night." The topic according to the disciples being present at that time considers the topic to be of a financial nature, giving clear indication that the transaction between Jesus and Judas is pecuniary and not dietary, where sop would be a conciliatory bribe, **gift or advance**.

While on the topic of money, the Bible shows that this Jesus and his disciples are also moneylenders, as the word scrip describes notes for money owed to the holder of the note. Luke 22:36: "36. Then said he (Jesus) unto them (his disciples), But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one." This point is another indication that there are two people the Bible refers to as the same Jesus.

The other Jesus, according to Luke 18:22: "22. Now when Jesus heard these things, he said unto him, Yet lackest thou one thing: sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me."

If this second Jesus requires his followers to give up all that they have in order to follow him, then how did the disciples come to have purses with money, or scrip for money that was owed to them unless they were followers of another Jesus?

Perhaps this is what annoyed Judas at the time of the anointing of the body of a Jesus with the valuable spikenard ointment. If this Jesus was, as he claimed, the son of a god and in essence equal to that god in every way, why would he need to use this expensive ointment with healing powers to anoint his body prior to its supposed death?

Perhaps Judas was student of both Jesus'; one who says, sell all, give to the poor and follow me, and the other Jesus who accumulates wealth with his disciples and their apparently valuable clothing and their scrip.

One Jesus is shown as non-violent, so why would he insist on his disciple buying and bringing swords to the garden to pray? This is an act fitting to one who is called Christus from secular history who was supposed to have lived about the same time as Jesus and was known as a rebel and for his violent acts. This explains the need for the actual betrayal kiss to make sure they got the correct person for the crucifixion and the correct person for the resurrection. *Talk about an early "reality show"*.

There is also a theory that says Judas was murdered and did not kill himself. This would make sense if he actually believed what one Jesus was preaching and teaching, only to find out that another Jesus and the Chief Priests were working together with the Roman Empire to deceive the people.

## "God"

This title "God" is actually somewhat misleading. The term "god" is simply the title for the "top dog" of any religious

organization and usually has some specific name (such as, Buddha, Jehovah, Zeus, and so on). The term god is merely a title, much like the titles lord, queen, or president.

Eventually, all the "Lord(s) or God(s)" of the Bible referred to in the Christian religion have gradually become known as just "God," where for the longest time they were known as "the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, or as Jehovah and various other names and descriptions.

So, whenever you hear a Christian say that they pray to, or believe in, "god," ask them, "which one?" and get a specific name, and not just the title –god-.

There are powers both superior and inferior to every entity within the Totality that is superior and inferior to the Totality itself.

Superior or inferior: what do they mean? Does it mean larger or smaller, stronger or weaker, faster or slower, or more or less intelligent, or perhaps something completely different? If the words conjure up thoughts regarding "the survival of the fittest," you have part of the picture.

Being the "fittest" does not guarantee that the biggest, fastest, strongest or most intelligent in any given situation is the fittest. Survival of the fittest does not even guarantee the one who is "top dog" today will hold that position tomorrow.

The "top dog" today may not even hold that position on any other day in similar situations or in any other situation for that matter.

From another perspective, the laws that govern in some areas of the Totality do not govern in others. One law governing the Christian god is sin. The Christian god cannot sin or it ceases to be that god. This has not said that it is impossible for the god to



sin, only that if it does it is no longer the god of the Christian claims, which is "sinless," among others.

Since the premise for this book is that the Totality is the only all-inclusive entity that exists, this does not say that there are not powers that are greater than the Totality, as the same rule applies to the Totality that apply to everything else.

The powers that are greater than the Totality resides within the Totality (as nothing can reside outside of it). The name of that power is "Change" and every part of the Totality, inclusive of the entire body of the Totality is subject to the power of Change and does use this power to adapt to and manipulate the environment to which they are part of. Sometimes the change is referred to as death, birth, life, improvement, or destruction. Whatever the name, it is all change. If I die, I alter the Totality to some degree. I change the form of the Totality. If I pull a weed, or walk from here to there, I also alter the form and appearance of the Totality. Therefore, the Totality is subject to the actions of its component parts for its shape and structure in any specific moment, but the Totality is not subject to its components for its existence, because without any one of the components, even without all of the components, the Totality will always exist.

The parts of the Totality are not subject to the Totality as a whole, but they are subject to some degree or another to the various components of the Totality.

The Christian Bible demonstrates just how easy it is for a human to become *recognized* as a "god."

When he lived, some people thought John the Baptist was the promised messiah. Later, the people thought Paul and Barnabas, followers of Jesus, were Greek or Roman gods. Acts 14:11-12:

More detail is seen in the "Myth" section.

The act of deification is something that happened in the case of Jesus when the people saw some of the works he had done. How much easier would it be for others living at the time to pass themselves off as angels or agents of a god?

Better yet, look how easy it is in the year 2005-2006 for various food items or rocks to be bought and sold as images of the virgin Mary or as images of a Jesus that they have not seen?

Christians, as do the followers of other religions, claim that their god is the one true god. *Mankind's Search for God* credits Charles Taze Russell as saying... "A god that would use his power to create human beings whom he foreknew and predestined to be eternally tormented could be neither wise, just, nor loving. His standard would be lower than that of many men."

Many Christians consider the wiping out of entire civilizations just and loving when the people wiped out are that person's enemy or what they consider to be their god's enemies. The Christian Bible tells a story of the invented necessity of the killing many children because the god chose to remain hidden while fearing the hand of a man that might harm or kill it. Such actions are more for the appearance of trying to fulfill prophecy than those of a powerful god.

From before his conception, the parents of those recorded as Jesus were taught to believe and make preparations to raise their first child to be the messiah that their scriptures have promised. Evidence that the teachings took hold can be seen as Jesus begins to deliberately fulfill as many prophecies that are considered to be messianic related. To see for yourself, give the four gospels a good thorough read for comparison. For example, in Matthew 13:13-14: "13, Therefore speak I (Jesus) to them in parables: because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand. 14, And in them is

fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive."

Debating for the existence of a god by using the argument of design is futile. There are many designs; there are also many designers. Any design might be imagined by someone who had nothing to do with causes or effect that brought the object into existence. Contrary to the popular belief that design implies some form of superior intelligence in causing the design, it can be proven time after time that superior intelligence is not a prerequisite for the existence of design.

Design does not necessarily imply the existence of intelligence. Design only implies a cause for that item in which a design exists. The cause need not be of supreme intelligence. A cause (such as a scientist) does not have to be deliberately trying to cause a particular item to exist in which a design or use is recognized. Accidents happen, some beneficial, others destructive.

There is a cause for every design. The aspects of any design follow the event that caused the effect in which a later observer notices a design. Furthermore, the noticed design need not have been what was intended by the cause of the design.

Although many people have plans for creating a specific project, the finished project often differs from the original plans to some degree. Perhaps a different material was used than the one that was planned, or a particular component is changed because the one planned did not perform as intended. Even later observers of the project may visualize other designs in and for the project, which were not originally considered or intended by the cause of the originally planned object.

The unchanging aspect of the Christian god proves false when

the god as the father teaches to destroy ones enemies in the Old Testament, and the god as the son in the form of Jesus from the New Testament teaches to love the enemy and do good to those that hate you and despitefully use you. These two concepts are diametrically opposed, requiring a one hundred eighty degree change to get from one to the other. It seems quite unlikely that one can do both at the same time; unless **to kill is to love; or to love is to kill.**

Another interesting claim in the book *When Skeptics Ask* is that the Christian god is infinite within his nature, which actually proves absolutely true.

Consider the fact that **absolutely** everything is infinite within its nature. Even the grasshopper is infinite within its nature, as it is not in the nature of the grasshopper, at least yet anyway, to drive an automobile or build skyscrapers, so the grasshopper does not drive the vehicle or build skyscrapers, and as such it still remains infinite within its nature. Therefore, the claim about the god is just as meaningless as the claim about the grasshopper.

*Mankind's Search for God* claims that we should reach whatever conclusion the god of a pure religion wishes us to reach. It then gives us the verse in James 1:27: which posses the words "...before God and the Father..." indicating they are two different beings which is also emphasized in the creation story when this god says, "Man has become like one of us." So the question is, which conclusion from which god member of the god counsel should we be seeking? Aside from this, not one religion known to man has proven its teachings or its god to be the one and only true and pure religion or god. Every religion that has come has either gone or is on its way out; and before becoming a myth they have changed their positions on a number of issues. The religions here today will also be gone in

some "tomorrow" when it gets here, and it is almost certain a new religion is positioning itself as the next major replacement.

The author's of Mankind's Search for God have already predetermined the measuring stick for determining what qualifies as true gods and true religions and that measuring stick they use is the Christian Bible; therefore, absolutely any position contrary to that measuring device must appear false, whether it is or not.

Christians, as do believers in the other religions, presuppose the god of their religion is the one true god and all others are false gods.

There literally is no proof that the Christian god, or any other god for that matter, is the one and only cause for the existence of the universe or for the existence of humans, let alone that they themselves exist in the forms as the worshiper presents them.

The question of which came first, the chicken or the egg is just as applicable with politics and religion as to which came first. Nearly every religion has become closely connected with a government, and just as many governments have used religion in attempts to rule the citizens by use of afterlife rewards and penalties that correspond to how the citizen has lived their life before they die.

Government are generally created by the people to better secure their rights.

Religions are created among the people to *supposedly* form better societies on Earth.

## A Political Religion

What more could any government desire than a religion that teaches its followers to obey every law of the government and its political leaders, all at the supposed command of the religions god that is said to have put them in place. Not just to obey the laws but also to pay whatever taxes, tributes, or penalties the government wishes to demand of them, all under the potential penalties that they will receive after they die, which will determine their final destination. The Christian religion fills this bill perfectly.

John 19:10-11: "10. Then said Pilate unto him, Speak thou not unto me? knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee? 11. Jesus answered, Thou could have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above."

The author of Romans expands on what Jesus is supposed to have said to Pilate so that it literally includes religious leaders, political leaders, employers, owners of slaves, and heads of households as seen when the words tribute, custom, fear, and honor as seen in Romans 13:1-8: "1. Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. 2. Whosoever resists the power resists the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. 3. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil. Wilt thou then be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and you will have praise of the same: 4. For he is the minister of God to you for good. But if you do that which is evil, be afraid; for he carries not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that does evil. 5. Wherefore you must be subject, not only for wrath, but for conscious sake. 6. For this cause pay you tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. 7. Render therefore all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom

custom; fear to who fear; honor to whom honor. 8. Owe no man any thing, but to love one another; for he that loveth one another hath fulfilled the law."

That Bible work basically tells its followers that whatever the government rewards, is good; whatever the government punishes is bad. So when government **rewards** rapes, robbery, murder, and the such with greatly reduced sentences; but **punishes** most severely, with maximum sentences those who demand trial by impartial jury: The government has declared that regardless of what society calls evil; when the government calls it good by rewarding it—it must be "good".

To reinforce the requirement to pay taxes, here is what three of the gospel writers have to say on the topic. Mathew 22:15-21, Mark 12:15-17, are similar to Luke 20:22-25 "22. Is it not lawful to give tribute to Caesar or no? 23. But he perceived their craftiness, and said unto them, Why tempt ye me? 24. Shew me a penny. Whose image and superscription hath it? They answered and said, Caesar's. 25. And he said unto them, Render therefore unto Caesar the things which be Caesar's, and unto God the things which be God's."

If you have heard something similar to the claim that states that the person who most zealously opposes some action is a person that once enjoyed the benefits they received by practicing of that very same act. The Titus author must have recognized this very fact as well as realizing that the stronger one fights against something, the more defensive the other person defends their own actions. Titus 3:1-3: "1. Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work, 2. To speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers, but gentle, showing all meekness unto all men. 3. For ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lust and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another."

Once again, the author who wrote 1 Peter pretty much agrees

with the previous authors, but this author has included the subjection to the less than desirable masters called forward, which appear to be opposite from those called the good and gentle. 1 Peter 2:13-18: "13. Submit yourselves to **every ordinance of man** for the Lord's sake: whether it be the king, as supreme; 14. Or unto governors, as to them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well. 15. **For this is the will of God** that with well doing you may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men: 16. As free, and not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God. 17. Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the king. 18. **Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and the gentle, but also to the forward.**"

The good thing about the founding of these united States of America is that--it is the government- that is the **servant to the people**. The people are **NOT** the servant to the government.

What more could any government desire than for every citizen to be practicing a religion that requires them to be willing to serve that government, pay its tribute in taxes, and be obedient to every law? This is how the treasonous Pledge of Allegiance" to the **Republic** form of government (Article 4, Section 4 of *The Constitution of the United States of America*) was adopted by Congress.

Presently, citizens of the united States can get involved to change those laws when such laws become undesirable. This power is presented in the form of a right and duty that is outlined in *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* in these words, "Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience has shown, that mankind is more disposed to suffer while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a



long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, **it is their right, it is their duty**, to throw off such government, and provide new guards for their future security."

This right remains just as valid today, at least according to Amendment #9 of *The Constitution of the United States*, which states, "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage other rights retained by the people." The right to alter, abolish, and throw off corrupted government are retained by the people.

This is one of the key examples as to why *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* and *The Constitution of the United States of America* are inseparable documents, the first document is from the viewpoint of the past and plan for the future; it is a contract among the citizens for properly controlling government. The second document is a contract between the citizens and their government officers. It details the **form of government**.

What kinds of laws are on the American books with regard to the government - religious associations?

According to the first amendment of the constitution, the United States government is prohibited from having a state ordained religion, or ordaining or establishing any religion for that matter. "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof..." Meaning, the United States cannot make any laws favoring any religion-business over any other business. It also means that churches, as money handling entities, like any financial concern, really are not exempt from paying taxes on donations, contributions, or other sources of money that pass through their hands.

Any laws that exempt one organization claiming religious status and does not exempt another that also claims religious

status is illegal and unconstitutional. The laws that any government agency have on the books for active enforcement that tend to determine the criteria for determining / establishing what qualifies as a religious entity is unconstitutional and unlawful.

What about the "free" part? If we interpret the "free" exercise to mean tax-exempt, we, as "free" citizens should also be tax exempt, but that does not appear to be what the words mean.

Those words, "free exercise," do not seem to be talking about the handling of money, but seems to regard free of government regulations as far as determining what is and is not a real religion, or an acceptable religion. Such religious freedoms however, do not allow such religions or their practitioners to otherwise violate laws enacted by the people for the public safety and general welfare.

Clarification is in order to determine the difference between public safety and individual consequences. Individual consequences is that which, when a person involves their self in any activity that causes harm to their self would not fall under public safety or general welfare (such as smoking in private or in designated smoking areas, wearing seat belts, wearing orange when hunting, drinking alcohol, to mention only a very few.)

On the other hand, governments are fully within their obligations to assure that individual actions do not harm the general population (such as smoking in designated non-smoking areas, driving while under the influence, shooting other hunters, again only a short list.) Government can discourage these actions, but can only punish when actual harm is caused.

While vaguely on the topic of money, how does this relate to Christianity? What purpose would Jesus have had for collecting money at the time when he pays particular attention to what the

people were giving, at which time he notices a widow woman who put in two mites. Jesus declares this widow woman had put in more than the others had, because this woman is said to have given all she had, where the rich, although they given much greater amounts of money, the widow woman is said to have given a **greater percentage** of her net wealth, which is true.

Perhaps the story was not originally intended to be a tool to shame or extort more money out of the people, but it certainly works to that end.

Mark 12:41-44: "41. And Jesus sat over against the treasury, and beheld how the people cast money into the treasury: and many that were rich cast in much. 42. And there came a certain poor widow, and she threw in two mites, which make a farthing. 43. And he called unto him his disciples, and saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, That this poor widow woman hath cast more in, than all they which have cast into the treasury: 44. For all they did cast in of their abundance; but she of her want did cast in all that she had, even all her living."

A god powerful enough to move the hearts of people, powerful leaders like a Pharaoh, to do his will when he wanted would have no need for collecting money for any reason at any time. That god would simply move the hearts of the people to provide for the needs of others when needed and directly to the one in need, not to mention the ability of producing a fish with coin(s) in its mouth.

Consider Matthew 17:27: as further proof that there is no need for raising money to support the Christian religion, "27. Notwithstanding, lest we should offend him, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money: that take, and give unto them for me and thee."

Why would religious leaders not want a god that would produce such cash regularly? Answer. There would be no need for the

elaborate costumes and the gold plated buildings, and all the jewels and fancy cars that are seen in many religions that used these items to signify how good the god is to the religious leaders when in fact it is the people who are being so good to them.

Every human has the power to move the hearts of others; this is not just a power that has been left to the gods. If you speak accusingly to someone, most likely you will anger them to the point of moving their hearts against you. Speak from a perspective of ignorance or need, when asking for help or understanding and you are more apt to move the hearts of others toward assisting you. This is not a miraculous or otherwise supernatural skill; as everyone uses it, either to benefit or harm them. Some people use the skill deliberately while others are completely unaware of the skill they possess and unknowingly use; many times in self-defeating ways.

Christianity seems to possess all the teachings designed to make running any government much smoother, so long as the majority of citizens possess the same understanding about that religion; a concept that clearly is not the case.

Unfortunately, the majority of people do not realize that if a society can agree as to what is acceptable behavior and what is not, there would be no need for religion of any sort. The citizen invariably drops the ball by allowing the government or religious bodies to assume the roll of properly imparting morals to each of the following generations and we end up in the boat we now find ourselves, where no one wants to be responsible for their actions because that is how the political leaders have been reeducating the population. People blame their parents, siblings, teachers, preachers, government bodies and a variety of other people or events for the problems in their life. When asked what they are doing to correct the situation, the response is usually, "You can't fight city hall," and nothing gets done to

remedy the situation.

If you are complaining and not taking action to correct or contest the situation, you are merely passing the buck to others for them to try to correct the situation, so that you might complain about what they are doing as well.

## Section Summary

In the Appendix of *When Skeptics Ask*, they provide an interesting list of fourteen steps of "Reasoning to Christianity from Ground Zero" which are set in number-letter outline form below. My comments follow each reason listed.

"1. There are self-evident truths (e.g., 'I exist,' 'Logic applies to reality')."

"I exist" and "I am" are self-evident proclamations of all parts of the Totality, from the rocks and air, to the plants, animals, and humans. "I AM," is the declaration, "I exist," and vice versa. The actual language differs from species to species, and from form to form, and just because we may not understand the language of the other forms of existence does not void and does not mean that the declaration has not been made.

"2. Truth corresponds to reality."

Truth is history. History is past events.

Reality, that is the present, is simply truth in the making.

"3. Truth is knowable (all other views are self-defeating)"

All other views, examined objectively, lead to a more complete perspective of a truth. The entire "truth" however is not knowable by any one being or entity. To

know how it feels to commit evil deeds, one has to actually commit those deeds; otherwise, one only has a subjective opinion as to what it might feel like based on the opinions of others who have actually committed those deeds and how they felt before, during, and after. In order for the Christian god to know how it feels to do evil, it has to do evil, and in experiencing these actions it ceases to be the god of its claim, and therefore cannot know everything.

A person does not necessarily have to get shot to determine whether they want to get shot or not. You can look at the results of others who have been shot and you might decide you do not want to experience such outcomes, so you try to avoid getting shot. The observations about how others chose to react in such situations are no guarantee that you will, or even have to react in the same manner; it is not even a guarantee that you will experience the same results.

History is full of the proof. Some people have been shot, receiving relatively minor injuries and die; others are shot, receiving what are generally considered fatal wounds but they live to tell the story.

"4. One can proceed from self-evident truths to the existence of God..."

One can only proceed from self-evident truths to the existence of a prior cause for that truth, whether the prior cause is the wind or what one claims to be a god depends on the self-evident truth and what is claimed to be a god. If self-evident truths lead to a god, than all are gods.

"a. The argument from creation (proceeds from 'I exist')"

The "I exist" declaration is only proof of a prior cause for that claimed existence, with the exception of the Totality, which had no prior cause. The Totality has always existed, and it can never have, not existed. The Totality had no cause for its existence, but every change within the Totality requires a cause. Existence does not reveal a deliberately created design or a deliberate cause for that existence.

"b. The argument from morals (proceeds from 'values are undeniable')"

Morals and values are undeniable. However, the morals and values of one person or civilization may be another's immorality as seen from one person to another and from one government or religion to another.

"c. The argument from design (proceeds from 'design implies a designer')"

Design only implies a cause for the design. Although the cause is responsible for creating that in which a design is recognized; the actual design is subject to the opinions of the observer, which does not require a design to have been deliberate, preconceived, or intended by its cause.

"5. God is a necessary Being (argument from being ---chap. 2---)

In Chapter 2, page 25, of *When Skeptics Ask*, the argument states '1. If God exists, we conceive of Him as a necessary Being. 2. By definition, a necessary Being must exist and cannot not exist. 3. Therefore, if God

exists, then he must exist and cannot not exist' and the argument seems to continue with, "The argument from the idea of a necessary being may not prove that God exists, but it sure does tell a lot about God once we know that He does exist ---by the argument from Creation---)" The argument from creation "...since there is a universe, it must have been caused by something beyond itself." and "The universe needs a cause for its continuing existence" This is a case in point of declaring a specific measuring stick in order to prove ones claim. In this case the "universe," which excludes everything that is not part of that universe, as the measuring stick. Therefore, since the universe is only a small portion of everything that exists, it must have been caused.

First of all, none of the precious arguments even prove that the god exists. They only prove that the idea of a god exists, and that if the god does exist it is a necessary being, which only proves that the god is necessary only for those projects to which it was part of.

The only convincing argument the author's give with regard to the existence of their god goes like this, "God must exist by definition. It says that once an idea of what God is exists, that idea necessarily involves existence."

If an idea constitutes existence of anything other than the idea, the concept is flawed; or, the concept only proves that it is the existence of the idea that creates the god. If the idea constitutes existence of anything other than the idea, every science fiction story, movie, imagined item etc., by this argument already exists beyond the idea stage. The argument that the god exists by definition because the idea of the god exists, only



proves that the idea of the god exists and not that the god itself has any other form of existence other than that of the idea. With it established that there is no proof that the god actually exists, the only proof is that the idea of the god does exist, the remaining argument makes more sense.

If the god actually existed and did as claimed in Genesis, then that god would have been necessary to the existence of the world. However, since it has only been established that the god has not progressed beyond the idea stage, that god is only necessary to the idea that it created the world, the idea actually created nothing.

The arguments according to necessity more logically and more correctly apply to the body of Totality. The Totality did not have a cause for its existence, as it has always existed and cannot have, not existed. Everything that exists and does not exist, as well as all gods and ideas about gods, including their opposing counterparts, exist within and are part of the Totality. In having always existed the Totality can have no beginning and can have no end. Even "non-existence" is a part of the Totality.

How do we know if something does not exist if it has not existed in some previous mind? Existence takes many forms. The physical form, pinch yourself and you know you exist. The nonphysical form, you dream and encounter all sort of situations and beings and you know that your dreams are real, even physical—in the dream world, but not physical in the waking world, but even this thought proves false to some degree. The transitional form; you have goals/dreams that may have started in the form of the typical dream world, and then you began to work on those dreams to turn them into a reality in the physical world. Everything exists within

the Totality, including the realm of nonexistence.

We know that nonexistence is real because we can measure it mathematically with negative numbers. The Totality cannot, not exist. It did not come to be, for it always is in its ever-changing form. The Totality had no beginning, so it can have no past. The Totality can have no end, so it has no future. The Totality only has the present. However, every component within the Totality is constantly changing, each form having a beginning and an ending. Therefore, the Totality is necessary.

"6. My existence is not necessary (evident from the definition of a necessary Being)"

In order for this present form of Totality to exist as it does at this exact moment, I am necessary to that existence, otherwise this existence would be different, if only by that degree to which I either exist in this form or not. Therefore my existence is necessary, but that necessity is restricted to that in which in which any causes or effects I have been involved.

"7. Therefore, theism is true (there is a necessary Being beyond the world who has created the contingent things in the world and intervenes in the world)"

Theism is the belief in the existence of a god or gods. By definition, theism is true and believers are necessary for theism to exist. Truth does not make something necessary. Although it is true that balloons hold air, that truth does not make balloons necessary, as other objects also hold air. On the other hand, in order for balloons to hold air, balloons now, are necessary.

There is truth in the statement; there is a necessary cause beyond the world that caused the contingent things in the world to exist. Contingent is defined as,

likely, but not certain to happen: possible: dependent on, or conditioned by something else. This definition makes every form of existence contingent on a prior cause. I will define "beyond the world," as something that can be either larger or smaller than the world and/or something that may be within the world as part of it or separate from the world. Any cause, original, one-time, or otherwise need not continue to exist after causing an effect, nor is it required to intervene in any future events or causes. The causes that brings an object into a different form of existence need not be beyond the new form, the cause may be within it.

As I am a contingent part of the world called Earth, a bicycle would be another contingent in the world called Earth. I have the power to make a bicycle exist within the world. I also have power to change the form of the earth by leveling mountains or digging holes; does this make me a god? No. It only proves that I have certain powers to manipulate the environment around me to some degree. Likewise, that same environment around me also has power to manipulate me to some degree, as the mountain may fall on me and kill me or I may step into the hole and break a leg; thus the environment has also altered me. Viruses, cancers, diseases, and accidents are only a few examples of items that I can alter, and that can alter me.

"a. The objection from the problem of evil can be solved."

That which is good or evil, like beauty, is in the eye of the beholder and the measuring stick the individual chooses to use. If the measuring stick remains constant for everyone, then everyone should recognize the same conditions and events as good or evil and there would be

no problems. Unfortunately, or fortunately, depending on how you look at it, not everyone uses the same measuring stick.

"b. The objection to miracles can be solved."

There are any number and type of events that people declare as miraculous. Such declarations do not make those events miracles in the eyes of other people. The perspective of the person observing an event determines whether the activity observed is a miracle to them or not. Even Jesus taught the concept that his followers should be able to do all that he did and even greater. Now, if the actions of Jesus were miraculous, and his followers are able to duplicate those actions, by definition the actions become less miraculous and learnable; otherwise everyone is capable of performing miracles. This proves that Jesus did not do anything beyond the powers of any human possessing the willingness to learn the skills. All is learnable. Some skills take longer than others for some people to learn and master.

"8. The Bible is a historical document."

This statement may be true, so long as it follows the criteria for measuring all historical documents. Historical documents describe provable facts of the past, and not the future. The Bible is said to include much more than provable facts of the past, therefore the document called the Bible is not merely a historical record.

"a. History is an objective study of the past."

History is not a study of the past, objective or not; history is the events of the past: Period!  
History is not a study of itself. Any study and/or documenting of an event, is subject to the perspective of its observation and the objective that the observer desires to present or prove. Any research regarding past events tends to reveal those claims the researcher wishes to make known. The Bible is no different.

Ask yourself, "What is the Bible trying to sell or prove; the past, present, or future?"

"b. There is great historical, archaeological, and scientific evidence to confirm the reliability of the Bible."

With regard to the historical and archaeological aspects of the Bible, this may be accurate. However, it does not necessarily make the Bible reliable with regard to scientific and/or future events.

As for scientific evidence, the claims are vague. The Bible loosely states that the earth is round. Such a statement does not disprove a flat earth concept. Look at most any coin, they are round and also flat. Isaiah 40:22: says, "22.It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers." The vision of humans, if that is what the word "inhabitants" refers to, seems to have been taken from a very tall building or low aircraft of some sort, which would actually be closer to the ground than some of our taller building, as many times the humans, even on clear days, either look like ants or cannot be seen at all. So what is it that the god is setting on, and what

inhabitants was that god looking at?

Job 26:7: speaks of "hanging the earth on nothing." As such, the statement is meaningless, except for one point. It only tells us one way that the earth is not suspended. It says nothing of how the earth actually is suspended. In adding that the earth does not rotate between two blocks of ice, nothing of value has been added to the topic of how the earth is actually held in space, except through the process of elimination one of the possibilities has been eliminated.

As for the future, the Bible has yet to be proven any more reliable than our modern day prophets and psychics. The messiah's lineage from David through Joseph is fictional if Jesus was born of a virgin and without the aid of human sperm. The two genealogies provided are each for a different Joseph, not to mention there is no publicly recognized record of the prophesied child (E)Immanuel as having been born of a virgin.

"(Corollary) the Bible gives a reliable record of the teaching of Jesus Christ."

This is misleading since the gospel comparisons indicate the life and teaching that is presented as one person known as Jesus are from at least two different people, where one is known as a Jesus, King of the Jews, and the other as a Jesus who was Christ.

"9. Jesus claimed to be fully human and fully God."

As for what the statement claims, it cannot be denied,

as according to the Bible, Jesus did equate himself with his god, and that his mother was human. But saying Jesus is 100% god and 100% man at the same time is like saying a coin can be 100% gold and 100% lead at the same time.

If we assume the claims about Jesus are true, in that he is said to be the son of a god, Adam is also a son of the same god, at least according to Luke. Since Adam is said to have had no human parents at all, he would be more god than man; therefore, more god than Jesus as Jesus had at least one human parent.

According to the Bible, Adam had **no** human parents making him 100% god. Eve, taken from 100% god (Adam) by 100% god (god) makes her is 100% god (goddess.) So when the offspring of a god and a goddess produces a "human," all the offspring from Adam and Eve are then 100% purebred children of gods called humans. As humans we are also 100% god (creator) and 100% man (human.) We can make the same claim Jesus does, except most of us have not yet learned the skills this Jesus learned.

"10. He gave evidence to support his claim."

The evidence when studied with other resource materials reduces the miracles of healing to the use of holistic medicines such as frankincense, myrrh, spikenard, and other spices and aloes listed in the Bible records that are well known for their 'miraculous' healing powers. To say that people, especially well educated people (doctors etc.), during the time of Jesus would not have had this information, we only have to remember that even today we do not have the technology to build pyramids with the same precision as the ancient Egyptians. "Modern" scientists are only now rediscovering the ancient wisdom of various diets

and how they either helped or harmed their patients.

With the impressive list of magic tricks/miracles performed by Moses, and the magicians during his time that duplicated most of those "miracles," it is not only logical but also likely that the other aspects of Jesus' miracles would be more magic than supernatural. One of the recorded Jesus' started his ministry at about thirty years old, after being in Egypt from shortly after the age of two years until just before his ministry.

David Copperfield is a fairly well know illusionist, a magician who appears to walk through walls and appear and disappear as if by miracle. He did not have these abilities from birth either, but if we wipe out all the records of his education, than his actions appear supernatural.

"a. The fulfillment of prophesy..."

Jesus was not Isaiah's promised messiah Immanuel who was supposed to be born of a virgin, among other points discussed in the section on Jesus.

"b. His miraculous and sinless life"

This aspect is not completely accurate either, as Jesus taught, "in order to love your god you must first obey his commands," of which one commandment is to honor your parents. Doing what is expected, especially while under the authority of the parents, gives a rather clear indication of a prior agreement, which is all part of that honoring. At the age of twelve, Jesus was not where his parents expected him to be, causing them to loose four days travel. Remember, Jesus, as a human on earth;



according to his religion; he was subject to the same laws and rules of the god as everyone else on earth, and he was supposed to be subject to anyone in authority over him.

If the chief priest had authority over the Jewish people at the time, then Jesus was subject to their rules as they are some of those powers "ordained of his god." If Rome had taken control over the Jews at the time, then Jesus would also be subject to Roman rule.

When Jesus claims to be god, he is also deceptive in stating, "I am about my father's business," when he was in fact doing "his own thing," that is, if we are to believe him when he says, "If you have seen me, you have seen my father (god)."

#### "c. His resurrection"

Among other reasons discussed in the sections about Jesus, the people closest to Jesus did not recognize him by sight or by voice after he supposedly had risen from the dead. If he actually possessed the same body he was crucified in, he should have been the easiest person on earth to recognize, what with there not being many people walking around after being crucified, let alone with scarred bodies from scalp and face from the crown of thorns which does not seem to have been a popular crucifixion punishment, to the holes in his hands and feet.

The record of Jesus appearing in another form indicates a doppelganger, stand-in, or impostor who shows only token wound scars in his hands

and side. He should have had scars on his face from the thorns, and in his feet from the nails, as well as other scars from being whipped, especially if the scourging involved the use of a cat-o-nine-tails, as is the popular belief.

"11. Therefore Jesus is fully human and fully God."

See earlier discussion in point nine above.

"12. What so-ever God teaches is true."

The Christian god used information, or rather the lack of it, in the stories about the Garden of Eden to manipulate Adam and Eve to do as he wished. In the story Moses writes, he reveals this god was aware of various bits of information he withheld from Adam and Eve. The kink in the "god plan" at the garden occurred when the serpent (a common symbol long associated with medicine and healing) came along and filled in some of that missing information about the tree of knowledge.

When death on the day was supposed to be justice for eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge, others claim that mercy was granted when Adam and Eve did not die that day. Such granting of mercy makes the death penalty unjust and makes the god unreliable and somewhat untrustworthy; also indicating that the god succumbs to the plea bargainers.

A perfectly just law and perfectly just penal system imposed by a perfectly just being leaves no room for mercy. Mercy, although favorable to the accused, indicates that the law, the penalty, or the being was somewhat unjust.

Regarding the, "kill your enemy," as taught by the god,

as god; later, the god as Jesus amended that law to "love your enemy."

How can one rely on such unreliable practices and opposing teachings to be truthful in all other aspects and claims?

"13. Jesus (God) taught that the Old Testament was the inspired word of God and He promised the New Testament."

This seems to be true, at least for what it claims. It is only a claim and it does not suggest the need for any other evidence than to prove that Jesus did teach as claimed. The statement however does not claim that either testament is in fact the word of any god.

"14. Therefore the Old and New Testaments are the inspired Word of God."

The only proof existing for anyone to believe that the Bible (Old and New Testaments) is the word of a god are the claims written in the book itself.

Regardless of the numerous claims that certain events were caused by some god, all those claims remain unproven, inclusive of the inspiration aspects.

The histories of other religions have credited the moon and sun with the title of god, because of the powers they have. However, we in a more modern time have come to understand the powers of the sun and moon differently. Not one of the claims about a god inspired Bible proves true. The thoughts are simply from the mind of the writer who has simply acquired more knowledge than the others who seem to be living by relatively more primitive standards at the time.

The claim itself leaves a person trying to prove a

negative, what with the absence of any positive evidence to support the positive claims.

How can one ever prove the negative argument? For example: I can state with the utmost confidence, "I carry a Martian on my shoulders." If you say I do not, all I have to do is say, "Prove that it is not there."

For me to prove there is a Martian on my shoulders, according to some standards, all I have to do is tell you that I can feel, see, and hear it. Just because you cannot, does not necessarily make my claim false. Of course, depending on how aggressively I might try to convince others of this Martian, may determine whether I am committed to some institution for psychiatric evaluation or not.

It will be virtually impossible for you to prove the Martian does not exist where I say it does, simply because all I have to do is claim that you are not using the correct equipment to detect it. However, if you can unquestionably prove that Martians cannot be invisible under any circumstances, than I have to either prove your information incorrect or I have to admit that the Martian is not on my shoulder.

Negative arguments can be proven or disproved when there is positive evidence to support it or contest it. The courts do this all the time. For example: A person is accused of killing someone at a particular place at a particular time. In order for the accused person to prove their negative claim, such as, "I did not kill that person," the only proof the accused need present is two-fold and it all hinges on time and place, proving the negative "I did not" with a supporting positives. The accused need only prove that they were not at the specified place at the specified time of the killing. The other aspect, is that the accused would have to prove a

specific someone else did commit the crime. But in order to successfully prove that negative the accused must prove other positives. To do so would require witnesses and/or evidence, both actually being the same, as both can be questioned and/or examined for truthfulness.

Many Christians who try to prove their Bible is the word of a god use the type of request for the non-believer to prove the negative claims that the Christian god does not exist. In this way the Christian does not have to present any evidence or proof that their beliefs are based on provable facts as to whether their god actually exists. However, it is the Christian who has burden of proof as to the existence of their god; otherwise they continue to look very foolish.

# Why We Do the Things We Do

Aside from the obvious pleasure or financial benefits, *Mankind's Search for God* seems to indicate that in the past, people were more inclined to accept as truth whatever traditions and beliefs they were born into because of a limited means of communication and travel. Such an observation is no less true today than five or ten thousand years ago and is evidenced with sayings like, "If it was good enough for my parents it's good enough for me," even though we have instant communications today, along with the ability to literally travel around the world in less than twenty-four hours.

People generally continue to believe a false teaching even when there is evidence to prove the teaching false, simply because they have more trust in the original teacher than they do with the new source of information; or they have become so accustomed to the "the old way" and figure the new way will be too difficult to adjust to.

A quote from *Welding Essentials* credits Aldous Huxley with, "Facts do not cease to exist because they are ignored."

This statement is true and it can be readily witnessed in the present-day human. People tend to see the wrongs committed by another more clearly than their own improper actions. Such blindness is usually voluntarily self-induced. When a person wants some particular desire badly enough the person tends to see only what is wanted and tends to ignore what is actually there, usually right up to the point that an increasing number of people start to point out to us what was put on the dark side of the blinders.

A quote from Laurence J. Peter, from *Welding Essentials*;

"Ignorance once dispelled is difficult to reestablish." This quote has also proved correct in the reverse as well with historical evidence that; Ignorance once established is also difficult to correct.

Education does not always correct ignorance; sometimes allot of time is also required. Take the example of Galileo and his theory with the relationship between the earth and the sun. Most known schools during his time were educating the people that the sun revolved around what was considered to be the center of the universe, Earth. That point of ignorance became very well established.

Galileo could not persuade the educators during his time to accept his ideas and he was eventually executed because of his theory. Only some years after the death of Galileo were his ideas accepted so as to correct an earlier long lasting ignorance of how the solar system operated.

*Mankind's Search for God*, is fairly persuasive when presenting the likelihood that a persons rituals, religions, activities, ethics, and morals have roots with the parents and relatives that they grow up with. Although biological parents create the seed that becomes the child, it is the child that begins adapting to and growing up in whatever soil it finds itself, be it natural, adoptive, government or some private agency. The child is ultimately the one to choose whether it will grow wildly or with some restraint, and that decision is based on what the child interprets as the benefits or penalties that result from their choices. If wild growth is the choice, it is up to society, whether family, friends, or other societal entities to prune, or retrain the wildness so as to produce a valuable member of society.

As the child grows, it takes root in whatever soil is available, or that it can relocate itself into; whether that soil is a person's family, friends, church, neighbors, or the streets. The seed, in

the form of the human, begins to seek out its own environment where it can be most productive, either constructively or destructively. Evidence of this concept can be seen in the plant and the animal worlds as well. The roots of the plant continue to reach out for the soils that will help it grow faster and stronger; while the animals will migrate to lands where the food and water are more plentiful or at least sufficient to sustain life.

Some people who are born into what can only be described as wholesome environments end up wasting their lives and talents. History also demonstrates that those growing up in seemingly hopeless conditions turn out to be some of the greatest benefits to society. The individual is the key, others are merely sources of informational input to either be accepted or rejected, and the individual who is confronting the information is the one who ultimately chooses what they will accept or reject.

Although growing up in a family, whatever its design, this is where the individual begins to develop their personality. Eventually becoming exposed to different environments and information that conflicts with previous teachings, choices have to be made as to which teachings will remain part of our being and which will be rejected.

What we develop into ends up being the result of what we accept as truth and what we eventually reject as hog wash. What we keep or discard has to do with the level of trust we have in those who teach us and how well the information seems to benefit us.

The term, teach, is not restricted to the formal school setting. Our teachers are literally our family, friends, enemies, politicians, and advertisements, to name only a few. These teachers are also our students, as everyone and everything we come into contact with, if even for a brief instant, will learn something from us or about us.

The more trusted the teacher, the more rapidly the teachings are



accepted as truth. It may take a lifetime to develop this sort of relationship with another. Only one wrong or deceptive concept can undo the life work of a teacher. It is important for the student to separate the lessons from the teacher, allowing the student to retain valuable lessons gained from less than desirable teachers and discard less than desirable lessons from an otherwise desirable teacher.

Sometimes a student will hold to a previously taught way of thinking and acting, even when new information proves the old way incorrect or less efficient; often using the excuse, "It has always been done that way."

A practice, when I remember, goes like this: I do not trust anyone or anything at anytime, and the least trusted of all is myself.

Generally this would be considered anti-social behavior, but this keeps all potential teachers in the same boat; all are fallible to some degree but worth studying at some point and in some time. This practice also keeps me in check most of the time. It allows me to remove many preconceived notions I may have and allows me to weigh the situations and people for what they are. It allows me to see them for what I would like them to be, what they may be capable of becoming, and to understand what it is they would like to become and why.

Today, people still use the excuse, "What was good enough for my ancestors is good enough for me," as well as "If it ain't broke, don't fix it," as valid reasons for not changing their current practices. Even if the old way still works, it is "broke" if it is known that a better way of accomplishing the same task exists.

The parents, children, and in-laws pretty much made up a clan. The clan usually made it difficult, if not impossible for a member to rebel against the usual manner and practices of that clan. These practices usually only got changed when one clan

defeated another and the losing clan could either take up the practices of the victor or die. Depending on the victors the defeated may continue some of their own practices so long as those practices did not interfere with the political or religious power in operation at the time.

The practices of the entire clan, tribe, or civilization were not changed just because one person thought those practices should be different in some way.

It was not until some time after Galileo's execution that his ideas were accepted as truth.

How quickly changes took place in a culture depended on how those changes were presented, who presents them, and to whom presented. This is a fact that is just as true today as it was many years ago.

Two methods usually got a variety of practices and beliefs changed. First, convince a large enough majority to the idea, either one person at a time or in groups where they in turn convince others; or you convince the most popular or most powerful of individuals of which the majority of people are most apt to follow.

With the latter option, others tend to jump on the bandwagon for fear of missing out on something, or they are trying to keep up with the "Jones" to try to get what is seen as greener pastures, and others join simply out of fear of ridicule if they do not join in. This process has been just as beneficial in some instances as it has been destructive in others.

So why do people turn to and continue doing certain religious or superstitious practices and the like anyhow? Hypothetically, suppose you are in a particular situation (a habit, relationship, occupation, etc.) that your friends and family think you should get out of, but you actually enjoy this situation for the time being.

What is the best way to remain in the situation and keep the others happy?

You got it. Claim the situation is beyond your power to control and you need help. With such an admission you begin to do as others suggest, while continuing to enjoy both the situation and your friends.

One day you may decide you have had enough and finally decide to quit, or get out of the situation. Now you can't quit, not because you actually cannot, because eventually you will. You do not quit right away because you will have nothing but yourself on which to blame the situation on and for many people, "that just ain't gon'a happen."

In turning to spells, gods, and the like, it gives the impression that other powers are making the changes for you. As long as others believe you are not in full control they can be manipulated to remain in your corner and on your side some degree.

When a person really decides to stop or start some habit, most do so cold turkey. The key factor is that the people doing the stopping or starting must do so for their own reasons and not for someone else's; because just as quickly as the reasons are gone so to is the reason for the changed actions. Sure, other people may benefit from the change but they should not be the reason for the change.

Only when the individual changes for personal reasons can the changes be the longest lasting. Otherwise, when the changes are made for outside reasons the changes usually last only as long as the reason for the change lasts.

Even when starting or stopping some habit when there is pressure from others to do so, the person actually takes up or drops the new habit because of the benefits or penalties the individual believes they will receive or lose by starting or

stopping. Benefits such as gaining a particular set of friends or possessions that are believed to lead to a particular lifestyle are examples of why people make changes in their life.

Quitting works exactly the same way as starting a habit, only in reverse; the person has to do so for personal reasons. What I mean by reverse is that instead of starting the habit one is dropping it, and usually replacing it for something else that is considered by the individual to be of greater benefit than that which is being stopped.

When a person starts a habit cold turkey they do not start smoking three packs of cigarettes a day or drinking two cases of alcohol by breakfast or lunch. The chain smoker goes from non-smoker to smoker with the very first drag. The drunk also goes from non-drinker to drunk with the first drink. Without the first, there will not be a second. But the first is not what completes the task.

Some people do not even try to taste these items, while others will try them only once and never again. Although the first drink or the first puff is not what makes a person a chain smoker or drunk; but one cannot become either without the first attempt and then continuously increasing the volume from there until the habit becomes just like walking where it requires no conscious thought.

Quitting is exactly the same as starting, but in reverse. The chain smoker starts to become a non-smoker again by not taking that next drag, as does the drunk become a non-drinker by not taking that next drink. Not taking that next drag or drink makes a drunk not a drunk, or a chain smoker not a non-smoker. One stops the habit with what their next action or inaction is. A non-smoker or non-drinker refuses each next offer, be the offer from yourself or someone else.

No matter what, when a person considers themselves to be a smoker or alcoholic, or whatever name is placed on the ball and

chain of life, there will always be serious battles because of that title they give themselves regarding the item.

This key has at least two aspects, desire and motivation. How strongly a person wishes to go from one habit to another (either the habit of doing something, or the habit of not doing something) is the desire end, and then whatever the reasons are for changing is the motivation end.

If a person wishes to become a chain smoker and forgets to light the next cigarette before they finish the previous one, that person has not failed to become a chain smoker. The goal, if desired, can be achieved when the next cigarette is lit that much closer to the time the previous one is smoked. So too is quitting.

Success in quitting, if the goal is desired, is achieved when one goes from lighting the next cigarette before finishing the previous one to spending just a little more time before lighting the next. Then increasing the waiting time between cigarettes to one minute, two, three, four, and so on till they become hours, days, weeks, months, and years until the realization finally hits the person that they have already had enough of the unwanted substance for that day, and the total quantity for that day was zero.

Initially, like any other habit such as walking, people must force themselves to consciously think of the action they wish to accomplish, focusing on the positive which is the end result of the desired goal. For example, focus on saving the money normally spent on the undesired habit and not focusing on – not smoking. Like trying to walk for infants, one is apt to stumble or fall, but if one focuses on stumbling and falling and not on walking, stumbling and falling is apt to be accomplished more often than walking. Also consider this, if it were human nature to give up at the first problem or fall the human race may have never got off their bellies and onto their hands and knees and up on their feet.

Falling does not make one an unsuccessful walker. Quitting makes one unsuccessful. Failing to obtain ones objective does not make one a failure. Giving up on that objective creates the failure; so long as the result is still desired. Continuing to try only serves to increase the odds of success with each next attempt. Just remember Edison's 10,000 attempts to "perfect" the light bulb?

When responding to peer pressure, the simple response, regardless of the time of day or place, might go something like this when offered whatever it is one is trying to cut down on... simply say, "No thank you, I've already had enough for today." and leave it at that. No explanation required.

Some people may think the comment is deceptive but it is not. It appears to be lying and deceptive but it is not. Some may think this might cause others to take up the habit because they have the mistaken assumption that the person making the statement consumes or continues to consume the item, but the person considering taking up the habit will do so because they want to, regardless of what they use for the excuse of starting.

Zero is a quantity! And it really feels good to know that as soon as you wake up you have already had your maximum quantity for the day; a quantity of zero. You have already reached your predetermined limit that was set only by yourself. You have already started your day from the point you want to be. Now that is success at its finest. The only concern when the topic comes up is whether you alter your objective of refusing to partake to stay within self-determined limits; or partake in attempts of trying to please others by ignoring your own objective.

Maintaining momentum always uses less energy than starting over. The trick is to use the momentum acquired while going in one direction to move closer to the desired direction without

loosing much momentum. The appearance this action gives is that the person is actually taking responsibility for their life. What novel idea.

The practice actually works for any habit one may wish to change or stop.

The above response is good for stopping but in order to change to a different habit the response may go like this, "No thank you, I have had enough," or "No thank you, but I would like (you fill in the blank with something you would like in it place)." When requesting an alternate option to the offer, try to request something that is likely to be readily available or simply ask for what the other options are.

Try it... I dare ya.

It is important to remember to refrain from kicking yourself when you are feeling down. There are certain to be enough other people to do that for you. You only have to decide each time whether to take that next drag or drink (or what ever habit) or not to, right up to the point it becomes a habit of refusing and at that time the decision is essentially made automatically without conscious thought; just like walking.

The longer you stick to your decisions, without wavering, others will eventually accept your choices so long as you do not begin to condemn them for the very same acts you once enjoyed. Perhaps the saying that goes something like, there is none more self-righteous on than the one who once enjoyed the very act they now condemn. Ring a bell?

While on this topic, why not look into crime as it pertains to this section as to why people do the things they do.

Imagine the government enacting laws that treat the

brandishing and the discharge of a deadly weapon in public with the same penalties. For example, the better part of sixty years of record keeping have proven that a drunk behind the wheel of any vehicle is much the equivalent of discharging a firearm in a public place even if there is no intent to do harm. Though "intent" is still there, as the individual is well aware that while under the influences and still driving, real harm and real damage is probable; thus the intent. They **intended** to get drunk, by not stopping before that point. They **intended** to drive while having drunk by taking their vehicle to the bar in the first place.

So why are the laws less restrictive for intoxicated drivers than shooters?

Consider the fact that the lawmakers are more inclined to participate in driving hazards than shooting hazards.

Unfortunately, the politicians have not recognized that the current American judicial system has become one of the largest lotteries on the planet. If people knew that they would get five years mandatory hard labor jail time for a first offense of driving while under the influence; especially where there was property or personal damage; whether using drugs, alcohol, medications, or other substances; or whether the offender is the president, legislator, or homeless it will force the person to weigh the act against the known definite consequences with a bit more caution. But the justice system has become such a crap-shoot that it is almost worth the risk of committing major crimes for the chance of making a favorable deal for reduced sentences or even immunity to prosecution if one can deliver a "bigger fish" who may be, but probably isn't guilty of what they are accused of by the smaller fish that is already on the line with enough evidence to convict them.

Is hard labor in jail any more inhumane for the inmate, who is receiving more meals per day, better medical services, and



remedial vocational education than many of the people who are paying the taxes for that service; where the taxpayer works in coal mines, sludge plants, and other hazardous forms of employment?

No! There is a large enough jail population receiving a free ride, who can produce services and products that will be beneficial to the society they have offended so that they can finance one-hundred percent of the system they have chosen to become part of by committing the crime. Even those who may not have committed the crime but have been found guilty can be compensated for their time and labor during wrongful incarceration.

A good measure of inhumane treatment is: Do people outside of jail and outside of prison do this same type of work for pay or even for free? If they do, it is not inhumane so long as the labor is legal outside of jail. For example, if a person has been convicted for growing drugs, they would be well-suited for growing food products that will feed the entire prison population. But —whether you like it or not, *The Constitution of the United State of America*, Amendment 9 actually protects the right of the people to grow their own drugs.

I will guarantee that the individual will give the topic of committing the crime considerably more thought when certain punishment is guaranteed and the plea bargain lottery system of today becomes extinct.

Sure, initially there will be a few people to test the system.

There will always the risk takers who will challenge the new system for flaws, and those flaws can only exist in the lawmakers, law enforcers, along with the judges and jury system. As long as any discovered flaws are repaired as soon as they are detected there will be fewer offenders.

With fewer offenders there will be less trials, less trials mean

lower numbers of people incarcerated, with fewer incarcerations there will be less money required for prisons and staff to run them.

The less money needed through taxation the lower the taxes. The lower the taxes the happier the people, the happier the people the less drugs and crime required get them to a point they think they will be happy. The less drugs required the fewer crimes committed, the fewer crimes committed the less personnel required to police the population, the less policing required the less cost to the people.

OK, see where I am going with this snowballing chain reaction? We got to where we are today because of what was done on one hand and what was not done on the other hand; ignoring the roadside billboards that have been erected by previous civilizations to warn the future generations of what worked or did not work.

It seems to have started with greedy politicians who were up for re-election, and in order to make their track record look good, they would bargain with a hundred relatively smaller criminals in order to get one bigger fish. The little guy would get a near zero sentence to get an even bigger fish till the only criminal left is the politician that has been making the deals.

# Revealing Your Lifestyle and Experiences

Who really cares about your lifestyle, or mine for that matter?

Honestly, nobody really cares about the lifestyle of anybody else.

There is proof galore to make that theory a fact, and there is more than enough proof to claim that the theory is flawed.

The first presentation is the proof in support of the theory. There are literally thousands of specific examples, but they all tend to fit one category. How many so called "eco-terrorist" do you know, or have you heard about that burn down housing projects because the project has damaged the homes of a particular wildlife creature? Did you know that almost every one of those people live in some form of house that has done exactly the same thing in some earlier year. The actions speak louder than words. I got mine and I'm not going to let you get yours, now that I learned the evils of the practice.

Another interesting example along a similar line is that of people who oppose landfills, waste-to-energy plants, and other types of facilities. What you are likely to discover, is that these people in opposition tend to generate the largest volumes of trash and of those generating the largest volumes of trash tend to do the least amount of recycling.

In general, people do not care where a product comes from, especially if that product is something that is thought to make the life of the buyer just a little more pleasurable.

When we flip the coin to see what is on the other side, we tend to find one person who has been offended or harmed in some way, legal, psychologically, physically, financially, or in some

other way. This person begins to condemn the person or business that has offended them. Generally the person will have to shame other friends and family into jumping on the bandwagon. Unfortunately, many of these friends and families do not have enough guts to tell the person they do not have to do business with that person, so they begin to condemn the offender as well. Eventually the condemnation becomes a movement. Several such movements come to mind that have had drastic results. One is witchcraft, the herbal/holistic healers; another other is prostitution; then prohibition.

Prohibition was the extreme control of the production of alcohol. Instead of controlling the crime, hundred of free enterprise businesses were destroyed. Instead of encouraging and enforcing self-control and ingenuity, the rapid development of clean automotive fuels has been severely delayed.

Prostitution has had its ups and downs. Initially, prostitution had its benefits in the spread of Americanism. The women would travel to the various seedling settlements and gold rush towns where mostly men have gathered. The prostitutes generally worked out of one of the local bars, they might eventually find a man who struck it rich in either land or gold and might settle down and raise kids. Communities would then form. With the sudden influx of people, the predatory element was certain to follow. Those who would rather take, by any means available, from those who would sweat for what they got, much like a predatory infection; if not properly dealt with, will fester, growing to cause great damage to the body when drastic measures may have to be taken to repair the problem.

Problems with prostitution generally crept in when prostitutes new to the area would be approached by a man who may have married a prostitute and through jealousy or improper cleaning accompanied by disease prompted the former prostitute to condemn the new arrival.

Witchcraft had several obstacles to overcome. The "good"

Christian folk seemed to be the major accusers and opponents to the craft, mostly because of the Christian scriptures that condemn the craft, but still use it when necessary for their own ends.

For the most part, witches were generally identified by a lifestyle, use of non traditional healing practices; and then there were the sector of those accused that apparently offended some political or religious person who would simply make the accusation in order to acquire the land and possessions of the accused person or family after they were murdered by "legal" means.

This has just been a small sampling of the damage that religions, politics, and fanatics can cause when the blinded followers participate in condemning practices that they do not know enough about.

Time to get a bit deeper into the topic at hand where there are generally very few reasons why people randomly tell others about their lifestyle and practices, or the reasons why other people refuse to tell others who ask about your lifestyle and practices.

Generally, the principal reason people approach strangers to tell them about their beliefs, lifestyle and practices is to convert the stranger to their way of thinking. Not quite as common, another reason is to try help the person accomplish some goal in their life, but this is generally not done randomly and most frequently it involves people who are not stranger to each other.

The primary reasons for refusing to respond to others who ask them about their lifestyle, beliefs and practices, is because the person has no desire to have others interfere in their life. Less common however, is that the person being asked has something about themselves they wish to keep to themselves.

For those people who feel the urge to convert others to their way of living and believing, the KJV has a pretty good approach to the situation.

The KJV in 1 Peter 3:15: gives sound advice, "...be always ready to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear:"

"Be ready always..." does not mean one is to stand up and force people to listen to them, and does not even indicate initiating the conversation about their lifestyle. It only means that one is to be ready. Ready signifies a clear knowing of a topic. If one is ready to run a race, it does not mean that they are actually running that race, but that they have sufficiently prepared themselves for the task when it happens.

Ok, but ready for what? "...to give an answer..." One is supposed to be ready to answer. What does it mean to give an answer? In order to answer, the indication is clear that a question must have been asked first. Bluntly, if others do not see in your life what they would like to have in their own, they most likely will not ask. It is not an answer if there is no question.

But to whom is one to respond to? Does this mean that if one person asks, that you tell everyone? Not unless the person is asking for a group, and then it is safe to figure "everyone in the group may be interested in the response." Otherwise, it is clear and certainly is logical, you answer "...to every man that ask you..." Answer only those who ask, otherwise you are volunteering a load of unwanted information to a bunch of people who could care less and probably see nothing about your life that is of interest to them.

The final two aspects are really one as they clarify how to respond. That method is, "...with meekness and fear." Webster's Seventh defines meekness with meek: which is defined as enduring injury with patience and without

resentment: mild: deficient in spirit and courage: submissive: not violent or strong: moderate. Fear is an anticipation of danger, apprehensive. Basically, know your stuff.

If one looks to the writer, supposed to be the wisest man of all times, Solomon, and the book of Proverbs at 26:4-5: there is some additional information about talking with "foolish people." "4. Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest you also be like unto him. 5. Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit."

These three sources, Peter, Proverbs, and Webster's should make this situation considerably clearer. The prerequisites are: to respond to those who ask; know the subject; have proof (that is, be able to back up the claims with evidence;) and have the good sense to drop the topic when asked, and especially when the interest level has turned to annoyance. When responding, respond with the understanding that not all people have the benefit of the same experiences as you and they are most likely viewing the situation, if at all, from different perspectives. Be patient and without resentment, remember; it may take more time than expected to get others to the same understanding you have, and that is only if that is where they want to be. Otherwise you are beating your head against a brick wall, possibly driving the other person even further from where you would like them to be.

Respond quietly. This does not necessarily mean whisper; although it seems human nature to listen in to whispering for fear of missing something and to tune out unwanted loud communications because of its lack of interest to the individual.

Quietly, might mean, without a lot of boasting. Like Dragnet's ole Joe Friday, would say, "Just the facts." Leave out all the unnecessary information. Also from Proverbs at 15:1-2: "1. A soft answer turneth away wrath: but grievous words stir up anger. 2. The tongue of the wise useth knowledge aright: but the mouth of fools poureth out foolishness."

Other religions, philosophies, scientists, and just the regular person on the street all have valuable lessons, and such lessons are like diamonds and gold in the rough. Sometimes one has to move tons of s-crap, dirt, and other obstacles and impurities before finding only grams of anything of value.



# Science and Proof

## Sins, Crimes, and Nature

Sins are generally accepted as offenses against the laws of a god or against religion. Crimes, although similar, are generally accepted as offenses against the laws of mankind or against a government.

Nature is simply any localized part of the Totality. Natural here may not be natural there.

Without laws of any sort, there can be no offenses of any sort; no sins, no crimes.

What about the "laws" of nature? Does nature actually have any laws that can be violated?

Humans, through the ages have observed, identified, defined, and even formulated ways to duplicate several of the forces they have observed in nature. Formulating these observations only help humans to better understand these natural forces, to duplicate them if that is the desire, or to stop them if they have to. Humans call these formulations, 'laws of nature' because these forces become somewhat predictable under certain circumstances.

We must remember that the formulations are not 'nature's' laws, but man made formulations to help man understand, alter, and utilize the forces, energies, and materials that exist in the world he inhabits. Unfortunately, many people refuse to understand that those so-called " laws of nature" that are predictable on Earth, may not hold true or be as predictable in other parts of the galaxy, universe or within other places of the Totality; given the fact that not every force of nature, on Earth, reacts equally to every other force in nature on Earth.

It would not be unreasonable to calculate that one sector of the Totality is not subject to magnetism or another sector not subject to light as we know them on Earth. The rationale behind this reasoning can be witnessed within the human body. The eye reacts to in a specific manner to light, but does not seem to react at all to the vibrations of sound. The ear on the other hand, responds in a variety of ways to the vibrations of sound, but does not seem to be at all affected by the presence of light. Clearly, the intensity of either the light or the sound may produce quite noticeable changes. An intensely hot light may dry and crack the ear to the point of altering the hearing. A sudden close-range sonic boom may pop the eyeball or at least cause vibrations that affect the sight.

There appears to be only one law or rule that describes the nature of and within the Totality as a whole, "No matter what happens, the nature of the Totality is that it treats everything in its path equally." That which is in the path of these forces and acts of nature determine whether they are rewarded or punished by that particular aspect of the Totality based upon how effectively those individuals have been able to understand, predict and utilize those forces. As a result, the word 'change' is the most appropriate term to define those supposed laws.

For proof that nature has no favorites, observe some localized actions of natural events. Do the floods avoid "holy" places to destroy only the "wicked" ones? Does the hurricane bypass the well-kept property to destroy only the abandoned, run-down buildings? Does the disease harm only the guilty and leave the innocent untouched? All of these are forces that are considered natural.

What about other natural forces that include animals and humans where many of the actions are not nearly as random as the wind or the placement of a lightning strike. Many of the actions of animals and humans are deliberately performed, at least in the minds of the human and animal.

Observation and perspective are interesting tools to work with. The animal that is hunting and happens upon a group of potential prey, may have deliberately selected the individual that it intended to feast on. It goes in for the kill, unfortunately the group of prey scatters in what appears to be random patterns, but they soon regain their composure and regain patternistic behavior.

A closer observation of the wind reveals similar results as that of animals and humans. Very specific actions cause a breeze to form, others cause it to continue, maintaining, increasing, or diminishing its force.

With such observations, it becomes clear that all actions, regardless of the cause, are both random and deliberate. The deliberate act of dropping a stone in a pond will cause the pond to ripple. Any random items on the surface of that pond will alter the design that the ripples take as they spread across the water.

Individual perspective regarding any cause or effect is the only tool that determines whether the natural changes are good or evil; rewards or punishments. Such personal determination may depend on whether these events are happening to them or someone else.

The natural human tendency is to utilize or harness nature's forces, (causes and effects), and such utilization can be a crime when doing so interferes with another person's rights as determined by some societal group or governmental organization, or it can be a sin when an act violates the laws of a religion or the religions declared powers or gods. Ultimately there is no sin or crime but that which the societies create; whether that society be one person and nature, or many people who are in agreement or disagreement on various topics.

The Totality knows no good and it knows no evil. Everything... just is. Cause and effects produce events. The actual

determination of whether any of those causes, effects, or events are good or evil depends upon the one observing, experiencing, or otherwise responsible for the cause, effect or resulting even; and none of them have to agree, and all of them can be correct—based solely on their unique perspective. Outside of their perspective, they may be completely wrong..

# Morals and Evils

Scientific is simply the attainment of knowledge through study or practice.

Morals and evils are definable and measurable and therefore scientific. It is difficult to discuss either morality or evil without also considering their opposites, if in fact immorality and good are the opposites, especially when one person interprets an event as good or moral, while someone else says the very same event is evil or immoral.

Good and morals will be used interchangeably, as are evil and immorality. Although all exist, there are no absolute morals or absolute evils.

In order to understand that morals are not absolutes, all we have to do is look into the topic of killing. Many people agree that indiscriminate killing is immoral; especially when others are killing one of the deciding person's loved ones. Although any law prohibiting this type of killing can be considered a moral law, such laws are relative none-the-less.

Kill, simply means to deprive another of life; so, it is the definition of killing that becomes the absolute, while it is the laws about killing that remain relative as to what forms of killing are actually acceptable, or unacceptable.

The number of people who object to one human taking the life of another human, whenever the fancy strikes, is nearly unanimously against the idea. When asked if killing is acceptable during wartime, the number of people opposing killing decreases. With regard to killing for self-defense, there are still fewer opponents. Killing animals for food brings even fewer challengers. Killing plants, whether for food or in the name of landscaping, brings the near unanimous swing back to

where there are nearly zero people in opposition to this form of killing. Therefore, killing is not absolutely immoral or everyone would reject all forms of killing. The only difference as to whether killing is moral or not lies in the purpose of the killing and who is setting in as the judge.

The measuring stick for rewarding good and punishing evil is reflected in a law of the land that changes from ruler to ruler; be that ruler human, animal, plant, or whatever else there is in existence. Those laws also change from country to country; and even within the same country, acts forbidden in one district may very well be permitted in another.

The concept of the impossibility of denying absolutes in their chapter on morals, the authors of *When Skeptic's Ask* argue that there must be an absolute if everything else is relative.

Since relativity is the state of a relationship that is dependent upon something else for determining existence, value, or quality, one must be able to compare it with other objects of known existence, value, or quality. To determine the value, quality, or existence of an item, it must be compared to something other than itself, whether the comparison is to a set of rules or to other items of similar properties.

Many times the supposed absolute that is used as the constant is a formula or a definition that defines the units of measure or it defines the parameters for measuring similar items. In altering the formula, definition, or whatever the measuring devices a person uses, the positions of everything else will change in relation to the alteration. Although definitions and formulas tend to seem fixed, one need only look through dictionaries covering a variety of decades to discover that many words either gain or lose parts of their definitions; and like the word "hot" which once referred only to temperature in relation to

cold, the slang meaning of desirable was applied to the term. Now get this. "Cool," once was a term used to define temperatures on the opposite side of hot, but another definition of "cool" also has a slang meaning that something is desirable. Hot has also meant "stolen".

Literally everything is measured against something else that is constantly moving and changing. The only so-called absolute has to be any predetermined reference point, and that reference point depends entirely on what the person determining the point of reference wishes to achieve or prove. Basically, in order to understand anything at all, it must be compared to, with, or against something else that is known to some degree. For example: imagine that we are standing on a flat, one-mile stretch of ground on the planet earth. A car at point 'a' arrives at point 'b' in one minute, which is exactly one mile away. If the car can travel eight feet per revolution of the tires, how many revolutions did the cars tires make to travel that one-mile?

If your response is, "660 revolutions" you have presupposed certain parameters, such as the vehicle was self-propelled along the ground traveling one mile. On the other hand, if your response was, "2640 revolutions" you have assumed similar parameters as before, but have multiplied the number of revolutions by the number of tires. Although these responses are logical and correct given the assumptions taken, another equally correct responses may have included "0 to far more than 2640 revolutions" for any of several reasons. The vehicle was dragged with all wheels locked, the earth's rotation on its axis, the earth's travel around the sun, or tornadoes, hurricanes, floods, etc. carried it away.

In order to correctly comprehend just how fast the vehicle is moving, it has to be compared to, with, or against something else that others are most likely to understand. Something cannot be compared to itself under the same parameters of time and space. But it can be compared to itself in different times and

different place; such as its condition or position at 10:05:03.000 hours today as apposed to its condition or position today at 10:05:09.103 hours.

Although all the above answers would be correct in the contexts assumed, they prove absolutely incorrect in nearly all other possible contexts. In order for others to properly understand the subject matter, all parties concerned must understand the concept of the measuring device and how it relates to the topic.

In order for one to correctly calculate the speed of the vehicle, the person calculating must predetermine what measuring devise will serve as the point of reference. At that point, the context created for the vehicle speed becomes the absolute in that particular instance, creating what are known as "temporary absolutes" (or not an absolute at all).

Any predetermined marker is always some movable and changing indicator when compared to some other predetermined marker. The only exception is history. The **reports** about the history are not the actual history, but merely a subjective perspective of it. History is truth. History is absolute. History can never change. An individuals understanding about historical events are likely to change as new information is discovered about those past events, but the actual history remains unchanged. The products involved in that history, such as weapons, household items, landscapes, etc., almost always change form as they decay and others take over.

When time-travel is common, history (that is the past events) will remain absolute. Any change in the outcome of a situation only creates a new event path, a new history, and does not change any other historical event paths having already occurred. To understand this more clearly, imagine that you are standing at a crosswalk of a very busy, high-speed intersection. You see a vehicle approaching and you have to decide whether



you can make the crossing safely or not. Many factors are going through your mind whether you are conscious of them or not. A few of those factors might be: How fast is the vehicle traveling? How far away is it? How quickly can I cross the street? Go now, or wait till the vehicle passes?

If you calculate incorrectly and proceed across the street, your death may be the result of this event path. On the other hand, if you calculate correctly and successfully cross the street, this would be an optional event path that differs from the previous unsuccessful attempt. If you decide that you cannot safely make the crossing and wait, this is still a different path.

After having chosen the first path which resulted in your death and someone from the future travels back in time to that exact moment you are deciding whether or not to cross the street and they persuade you to wait for the traffic to pass, and you live, history is not changed. What has changed is the choice of possible event paths. One of the elements of the previous event path is no longer present, therefore causing different results and the history of a different event path is being traveled. Whether or not the event path where you die ends at that point where you continue to live, I do not know. I see no reason why it could not continue on some form of a parallel or diverted existence without you in it (or maybe with you in it, visiting from another event-path as a *ghost*).

In order for history to actually have changed, all events in a given event path must remain exactly the same and then produce different results, which means that you would have to cross the street without the added information of your failure to successfully cross and of your certain death, and you still live after you have been hit. None of the treatment can change; nothing at all can be different, only the result can change in order for history to change. There can be no second attempts, because all other attempts are different event paths; therefore, **different** 'histories' of a similar event.

Even if every aspect remains one hundred percent identical and there are one hundred later attempts to the same end, each attempt is a new event path and can never be one hundred percent identical, if only to the degree that one has learned something with each attempt, a new path has been taken. Sometimes the results also change unnoticeably. Bending metal or plastic, for example. When using the same piece of metal or plastic, with each bend, the material weakens at that point. The more times bent, the more likely it is to break at that bent point.

Basically, with the one-hundredth attempt, it does not make the previous ninety-nine attempts to have not happened.

Confusing absolutes with the universality of concepts is a common misconception that generally uses statements like, "love is an absolute value that is universally recognized."

Just because a concept is "universally" accepted or recognized as existing does not necessarily make that concept absolute, in that it is defined the same everywhere.

Although there may be universally accepted definitions as to "what love is," there are nearly infinite varieties of descriptions as to, "what is love."

One person may act in ways that they declare to be love toward another person, and that other person receives those declarations as love. Later, the same initiating person may express the same love in the same way to a yet another person who receives only hatred. Although all three people may use the same *definition* of "what love is," each will describe that love they define differently, if only by minor degrees.

If love actually were an absolute, what is love to one person must be love to all people, all plants, all animals, rocks, etc.;; This however, is not the case. For instance, a common statement made between two people where one says, "If you

love me, you would (blank)." The blank has been filled in with, 'want to spend more time with me,' 'have sex with me,' 'show me that you care,' 'tell your family to not interfere with our relationship.' etc.

As for morals being absolute or not, morals are absolutely relative. Since this proves true, what is the likelihood that the claims of ridding the heavens and the earth from everything evil can actually happen?

So long as there is more than one object that exists, one will be considered better or worse than the other. No matter what the perspective, they both will never be equal in every respect; not even if they are part of the same body; not even if they are considered to be identical twins. The right hand is not the same as the left hand. They do not occupy the same space. Identical twins cannot occupy the same space at the same time, therefore, not equal in all respects.

They will always have a slightly different perspective. One hand will almost always be favored more than the other in some aspect or another by the body to which they are part. What may benefit the one may cause the other harm, good for the one, evil for the other.

The idea that good will eventually destroy all evil ultimately results in the destruction of all that is good as well. This type of destruction is something that happens in nearly every war when conquerors succeed in defeating an enemy, and is demonstrated historically and scientifically below.

In the battle between Great Britain and their territory of the colonies (presently the united States of America), at about the year 1775, those colonies that became the united States of America are becoming more like the Great Britain they fought so fiercely to separate themselves from. If you doubt these words, look up a copy of *The unanimous Declaration of the*

*thirteen united States of America, 1776*, and see if you notice any of the grievances listed that have become commonly practiced by the United States government today.

From a scientific point of view we can break a magnet anywhere in order to try to remove one of the poles. What remains are two versions of the original magnet, only smaller. The same opposing poles are present on both pieces. The only difference each piece has from the original is the distance between the outer edges of the poles. The same type of example can be made with the coin.

Take a coin. Most of them have two distinct sides known as heads and tails. If we call one side the good side and we call the other side the evil side, and try to totally scrape the evil side away; the more removed from the side called evil the closer we get to completely removing the other side called good as well. In eliminating each worst evil, another "evil" is always next in line as the worst. In continuing this elimination process, one is eventually left with just one remaining evil that was once called the greatest good, thus eliminating both sides of the coin.

If we will never totally destroy evil, can evil have a good purpose?

It is easier to see the beneficial purposes for the supposed evils after one removes all the labels. Without the labels, all that remains are the events. No matter the event, if it has some beneficial use, no matter how small that use, it must be good. Just how good an event is, depends on how much use can be made of it, and from whose perspective the determination of good or evil is made.

The concept of choosing between the lesser of two evils, versus the idea of choosing between the greater of two goods under the guise of what happens when two absolutes conflict, a funny game of semantics takes place. No matter what, if both are

absolutes, neither will conflict.

Black is the extreme opposite of white in the context of color. Depending on whether solid or transparent, one color is said to absorb every color while the other is said to reflect every color. There is no conflict. They don't even overlap and they are both absolutes. If either black or white begins to reflect or absorb more of one color than another, there still is no conflict, because it is no longer either black or white but a different color or shade of gray.

Absolutes do not conflict, although they can and often do co-exist. Gravity and lift, though they seem to oppose each other they merely co-exist. The more gravity you have the less lift you are able to obtain with the same amount of thrust or force. In an exact balance between lift and gravity with zero thrust or force there can be no movement toward or away from anything.

As with colors, the absolutes do exist, but they do not necessarily exist everywhere all the time.

# Truth

Truth is an event or a body of events. Essentially truth is history. Truth is not changeable.

Truth, contrary to popular opinion, does not include objects (living or dead) or facts as part of its definition. Objects are the results of events and these objects can cause other events. Objects are relative, as they are dependent upon all other events or situations to remain the same in order for them to remain unchanged.

Facts are statements about real items or about real events, but facts are neither the event nor the item they describe. Facts although they may be true, can be used out of context to prove an untruth, true, making facts relative, as they are dependent on context.

Relativity is the comparative relationship between differences.

Events, once they happen, cannot change. The context or use of the information about an event cannot change the event. Any attempt to change the outcome of an event creates a new event; therefore, events are absolutes. Events, though maybe not desirable, are perfect. The results of an event may not have been those intended by the cause or the effect that created the event, but intention is not necessarily a prerequisite for perfection.

Real objects are always changing form. A toaster today may become a car-part tomorrow. The event that made it a toaster yesterday can never change, as a new event is required to make it a car-part today.

The fact the car is blue today, may not be true tomorrow if it gets painted red. Each event of painting the car will never

change, because painting the car each time is a new event. The "result" of the first painting will be changed with each subsequent painting event but the original event remains unchanged.

Therefore, truth is the past events only; that is if truth is to be considered absolute.

Both the causes and the effects of an event are relative, each dependent upon context, time, and other aspects of existence.

Once an event is completed, it does not matter what changes, because those changes are new and different events. Even if the causes and effects no longer exist, the event occurred; whether it has been discovered or not, and any future events will never change any previous events. Basically, something done cannot be undone, but the adverse affects can be minimized or reversed by taking other steps or actions to create different results.

No matter what the context or perspective, the events remain constant, past, present, and future. The way we interpret or come to understand an event may be different from person to person and from time to time, even for the same person.

What about events that haven't happened yet, how can they be absolute?

Any event that has not happened yet is not yet an event; it is a prediction, prophecy, or idea that is still being worked on. The action that creates the prediction, prophecy, or idea about any future event is a separate event in itself, but the events they claim to describe have not yet occurred.

Immediately after an event or any part of an event happens, it goes into the past to remain forever unchangeable and therefore absolute.

The only absolute truth is the event itself. Any reporting of an

event becomes the perspective of the reporter. The report is not absolute and can never be absolute regarding any event the report is about. The report does not alter the absoluteness of the event and it never will represent it one hundred percent; making every report relative to the context in which it is presented. However, the report event, that is the event that caused the report, is absolute in and of itself but it is not an absolute about the event the report is about.

Yes and no would be the correct response as to whether truth is knowable.

Yes, in that one person can know something about any truth or event. No, in that once an event is finished, even if that person was part of the event, the person will never know the entire event or entire truth regarding the event.

The only way to know more about any truth is to seek more information about it, and then test the information to see if it checks out, true or not; keeping in mind that even liars, fools, and imbeciles speak volumes of truth when the information they provide is understood in the proper context and from the correct perspective of source.

Is part of a truth, the truth or a lie? The determining factors would depend on how the information is being used and who is deciding the case.

If I know four major parts to a truth and I know with some certainty you will react differently if given any one or some combination of these four parts, and the only way to get you to do **as I wish** is to give you only two of them; what would you call that? If not a lie, it would be deceptive and manipulative. The key factor is whether I know the other aspects or not, then it is only a matter of deliberate or unintentional deception for misleading another.



The only way to know more about any truth is through the art of questioning, which is a method of finding out the purpose and intent of the particular perspective of a given claim.

Any given event does not change simply because new information is learned about it. The only change that occurs is the perspective regarding that event. The information gained may cause the event to appear more or less desirable in the minds of the observer.

The saying, "Walk a mile in my shoes," or some other version of it may sound familiar. Spending time with someone in some aspect of their life and experiences is a good way to understand life through their eyes, to understand their perspective. A win-win situation can be created in trying to understand another's experiences in life, as well as why they may perform certain tasks the way they do. The other win is that the other person will experience life from your perspective as well.

What is easy for one person may be difficult for others; and that which others find easy may be difficult for another to perform, if not declaring its impossibility for them. Until the time is invested to learn the little tricks or secrets that make doing such tasks appear easy; performance of those tasks may remain difficult and out of reach.

The more specific the details regarding the claims about any truth, the better those claims can be judged as true or not as they pertain to a specific topic.

General statements tend to be "truer" in more cases than are specific statements.

The more specifics added to a statement, the less true the statement is for that which the more general statement once

included before adding the specifics.

If you give me the keys to your car and only tell me the car is blue, I may never find it. However, if you then add the specifics of a particular parking lot, that new information narrows down the search area, as the statement now excludes all the other blue cars that the previous statement included that are not in that parking lot. If you then continue to tell me the section designation of that parking lot, the addition of this new detail once again narrows the area to be searched to just that section, once again excluding other vehicles. Adding information such as the year, make, model, and license plate number can narrow the search to only one possible vehicle. These added details are no longer true with respect to all the other blue vehicles.

# Life After Death

Seems as though there is a need to clarify what life is and what death is.

Death is simply that point in time when one form of life ceases to retain its form and takes on a different form.

A still living body, with mind that murdered many people may have change of perspective; though remembering all things of past actions will stop (or if you will, kill the prior self) and become an entirely different 'mind' if you will. Thus, the previous lifestyle is dead as the next is born. Some religions call this 'repenting'.

Life has taken on many forms of existence; plants, animals, humans, single cell, the simple, complex, and mineral, etc.

What about the transformation process between life and death, is it gradual or immediate? Once again, perspective alone can answer this question, as sometimes the change appears to take place before our very eyes, while other times the appearance of immortality seems more likely.

The bodies of the dead still exist but they have taken on a different physical form, the form of ashes and or dust, but an existence nonetheless. The energies that once bound these cells and animated their bodies also still exist; and like the body, the existence is also in different forms. Call that existence spirit, soul, breath of life, or what have you, the energy that animated their bodies still exists.

Many people have experienced those energies, mostly in dream form, when they wake up they know that a certain person has died, only to have the dream confirmed a few days later. Sometimes the communications continue long after the *death*

has occurred, and these communications tend to take the form of memories when ever coming into contact with people, places, or things that the dead person had been in contact.

I cannot personally speak of the gaseous ghost-like appearances we think of when talking of seeing dead people who can communicate in real time about past, present, and future events with accuracy. Some claim they are real. I am not one to automatically discredit for lack of personal experience. I have never been to Hawaii, but that does not mean that Hawaii does not exist.

This sort of life after death existence for those still in possession of the physical body who are in communications with those without their physical bodies is reached by the minds of the living and not necessarily by only the people and places that have known and experienced the spirit in the past. Those who have never met the ones who died can also get to know them through the records, places, and people who remain behind. The dead also continue to live in how they reacted to various situations they encountered and by what they taught others.

The spirits of not only the dead but the living as well, can be heard, touched, seen, and otherwise experienced; usually not in the waking physical sense but in the "sub" physical form within the mind, and usually when it is in a very relaxed state, either in the sleeping dreams, or in waking dreams. Benefiting from what was taught while the dead were living is just a reminder that the energy that is **mind** that once animated their body still lives.

The more of the person that you make part of your life while these people are living, the better you are able to recognize the energies of the person after they lay their bodies down (so long as the mind does not drastically alter itself, such as the cocoon to butterfly or moth). Unfortunately, most people are taught to ignore such communications with those 'dead souls' as either

evil or fictitious. This communication skill is generally natural in humans and is actually trained out of most people in their youth, say before the age of five or six for religious and/or social reasons.

Physical bodies have nothing to do with who the person is. Just as the car has nothing to do with whom the driver is. The body is only the vehicle that transports the "whom" or the mind, which is the person, and only vaguely relays information about that person. When studied properly, one can get a pretty good idea about who a person is by studying how and why the person does what they do.

The harm with afterlife beliefs is the tendency toward procrastination in the present life, which tends to keep people from getting to know each other better today. After all, there will always be another tomorrow; either in this life or in some life after death. Conceptually, this is true, however, the form possessed in an afterlife does not seem to be guaranteed, or easily recognized.

How often have the survivors of the dead family member, friend, and co-workers said, "I wish I got to know them better," or, "I'll get to spend more time with them in heaven," or, "If I had only one more day with them I could do this or tell them that."

Remember; today, this very moment, is the very last moment you will ever have to experience and finish those undertakings you might enjoy. Get to know a friend a little better or try to understand why the other person may be your enemy.

If you are twenty years old the odds are good that you may see another five years. After all, many people live to see their sixtieth birthday and even older, but this does not guarantee that you will. The odds get even better for just another month of life

and better yet for another week or day. However, the odds are one hundred percent against you ever seeing tomorrow, because today is always your last day, not only your last day but also the only day in which you will ever have to accomplish any of your goals and desires.

What are you doing today to move you a little closer to accomplishing the goals you made in some yesterday? If you are reading this book right now, chances are pretty good that you are still alive, although your form may be uncertain. This is proof you have not died in any yesterday, or even ten seconds ago, so most likely you will never die in any past moment. Furthermore, you have not died in any future moment, nor will you, and that is guaranteed. Not tomorrow: Not next week: Not next year.

If you go to a fortune teller, and they tell you that you will die tomorrow Tuesday, August 1st 2034, you may expire (die) on that Tuesday; and if you do, that expiration will not be on a tomorrow; but the 'today' of Tuesday, August 1st 2034. If you die before or after that specific date; you will have altered your life and path, lengthening or shortening it (if in fact the specified date would otherwise have been accurate, had you not been given it.

Does that mean that you are immortal? Not unless forever is in the moment.

Will your body retain the same form? All evidence points to the negative. Understand that the form your body had ten years ago is different than it is today, and eventually that form will see some type of change known as death.

It is said that Jesus appeared in a different form after his crucifixion and burial. That other form was so much different from the pre-crucifixion body that even closest family and friends were not able to recognize the "resurrected" body as the

crucified Jesus. All this is quite similar to a number of other religions that have people reincarnated into other human forms, or into animals, plants, or other forms.

How about another time travel experience. If today you were able to travel into the future or into the past, and you die during that time, you will always die in some present moment, whenever it is. Although you may have skipped over the time of the travel **you are always in a present moment.**

The most common aspects found with believers of reincarnation and other after death life beliefs is that they have some preconceived notions and desires as to how one will look, act, or even what form they will possess after death. The expectations tend to give a person the gift of some form of peace of mind, whether backed by fact or not.

"What happens when we die?" is probably one of the oldest questions in human existence, at least from the time humans started planning future events and started dying before completing those plans.

Aside from the many concepts of reincarnation, resurrection, and nothing as being the most popular after death experiences: Not one of these concepts has proven their theories true. Of course trying to prove something where little to nothing is known on the topic is similar to the Martian on the shoulder situation mentioned earlier. There is no guarantee that the one who is supposed to be reincarnated will actually be able to recall any past lives.

So what's the big deal anyhow? Well.... The question is, "To procrastinate or not to procrastinate?" which is simply putting off doing today something that should be done.

If you are not doing something you will wish you had done when you will no longer have the time to do it, you should be getting it done right now, otherwise live with the regret of not

having done so.

The best way to know what that particular something is, ask yourself, "If some particular event or situation occurred, or such a person died, would I want to have known them better or done something differently?" If your answer is yes, get it done now.

How do you make these actions automatic habits? Well, this requires another trip back in time. Let's go back a few years. You may presently know how it feels, or felt at some time, to just get up and walk. For the most part you do not have to think about it, you simply place one foot in front of the other and you are on your way. Okay. Lets go back a little further, to infancy, before you were walking.

Before you were walking, you saw how quickly others got around that way. You literally had to focus on trying to maintain balance (just as a child learning to ride a bike). Once balanced upright, you had to focus on the placement of your feet and legs in order to get them to do what you wanted them to do. After a good deal of patience, practice, falling, getting up, and perfecting the process. Then, walking became so much a part of your life, that when you decide to get up and walk today you no longer have to think about it. Your body automatically responds.

When initiating any new habit, initially you will have to give the new action constant and serious thought until you become so used to doing it that it becomes so natural that it is as automatic as breathing and blinking.

When a friend or family member dies; you should not be saying, "I wish I had more time to spend with them," or, "I never told them this or that," "I didn't know them as well as I should have." You certainly know others who are just as likely to die, so get those uncompleted tasks done with them, as soon as you can and leave the regrets behind.



Some people look forward to some life after death in order to complete what they have not done in this life; but what makes people think that they will get another chance to finish the job in some next go-around?

The nature of a person does not necessarily change simply because the situations change around them. A smoker does not stop smoking simply because they find themselves in a room of nonsmokers or where there is a "no smoking" sign. The habit may be temporarily suspended under these circumstances but the person is still a smoker, right up to the moment when they decide to quit and they beginning acting like a nonsmoker regardless of the conditions and circumstances around them.

Simply, if you procrastinate in this life, what makes you think that you won't in any other life? Who knows, if you move too slowly in this life you may be more suited as a rock, turtle or some other life form that moves slower.

Your body is not the **who** of you. Your body is only the present vehicle you use to get around and to **express the who** that is you. Your **mind is you**. The brain of your body is merely the CPU that organizes functions for your body.

What about keeping up with the Jones'?

Have you ever heard someone say, "If only I had this or that, I would be happy?"

Perhaps they just saw someone with something that appeared to make them happy. Maybe they simply think that object will solve some of their present problems. In that expected solution there is an expected happiness.

You may see the person later, with the very object of their desire that they swore would make them happy, only to see that the person is just as miserable, if not more so than they were

before they got it.

In cases like this, I often remember something my dad told me. If a man is unhappy, and all he has is one hundred dollars, he will appear to be ten times as unhappy with a one thousand dollars.

Basically; a person needs to **already be** what they want before they get what they think will give them what they want be. If not the person will continue to look for what they seek in everything else, everywhere else and never find it; never realizing the very objective of the search was theirs all the time.

So what does all this have to do with afterlives? Dissatisfaction!

An increasing number of people are becoming so dissatisfied with their lives today that they begin hoping there is something better on the 'other side' of death. The tendency is to put more effort into something presently unproven, such as a specific form or type of life after death they fail to make the required improvements in their present life that would make it more enjoyable.

Every time we come into contact with anything or anyone, at anytime or anyplace, we leave a little bit of that which is us at that exact moment. That is how others remember us and how we remember them. What information or part of you are you leaving behind for others to improve themselves, and what are you taking with you from others that you are incorporating into yourself?

Everything that exists contains information. Existence reveals some information about us, while ability reveals the rest.

Have you observed similar projects that have been completed by different people (or even similar projects completed by the same person at different times of their life), and somehow you can tell which projects possess a more desirable level of quality

and which do not, without you ever having met the creator of the project?

What you are seeing is the "spirit or soul" of the cause for the project, from the materials used to the workmanship that put the materials together. This may not be quite as glamorous as some unproved concepts and maybe not as desirable; but it definitely puts the ball back into the hands of the individual.

What are you doing today to make your present home, your life on earth, more of the heaven or nirvana you hope for in some afterlife? You may realize that very 'heaven' in this lifetime, and not have to die to get it.

# Faith, Belief, and the Placebo Effect

If the placebo effect is an unfamiliar topic to you, find some information about it. The more you find, the more interesting you will find the topic. The more you come to understand the placebo effect, life will take on a whole new meaning as you begin to discover the real power that you, your mind, alone possess. Although I do not include much technical research but only a few summarizations and notes from personal observations, I hope to have baited the line sufficiently for you to check out a book or two on the topic. Suggestion: try to find two books, one pro and one con on the topic, then make up your own mind on the topic; even after some serious personal experiments.

According to the writings of various religions claiming to date as far back as the first known man, the placebo effect has been around at least as long as humans. The major groups that benefiting most from this effect are religions, governments, various fields of medicine, teachers, snake-oil peddlers, and a variety of other swindlers.

Swindlers are not the only people who have used the placebo effect; but they seem to be the ones who financially benefited the most from it. Many of the more honorable people who used the Placebo effect, generally on others, have shown them how much they would benefit from a certain practice or product, and when the person is finally sold on the benefits, the honorable person will then make all efforts to show the person that the practice and product have no effect, but it was the beliefs and practices of the individual that brought about the changes. If the individual willing accepts personal responsibility, this individual will be their own healer from that moment on. Otherwise, just the reverse may happen. The individual's health

may suffer to the point of death.

The placebo effect is a very simple tool, and yes, it can be and often is referred to as faith and it is certainly "belief-based" because it works off of what the individual believes. But the placebo effect goes a step further. It also incorporates the individuals' actions.

When the individual acts in such a way as to distrust a medicine they believe to be either harmful or useless, often the results produced in their body after taking the medicine, prove their reasons for distrust are sound. Basically, no matter what you believe about anything, you will be able to prove that belief to be true; at least for you.

Another quote used in *Welding Essentials*. Henry Ford put it this way, "**Whether you think you can or you can't, you are right.**"

The drug and psychological fields of medicine are some of the best proofs of how the placebo effect works. Either knowingly or not (but almost always willingly), the patients have already pre-programmed themselves to believe a particular medication or practice will produce certain results; either favorably, unfavorably, or having no effect at all. The stronger the patients belief, the more rapid and lasting the results, either favorably or unfavorably depending on what is tried and what the patient believes about it.

No matter how many people a particular medicine or practice is known to have helped or cured; if the patient does not have enough confidence in the doctor, the medicine, or the practice, the method will not work or at best work very poorly for a very short time. What this proves is that our bodies, right down to the individual cells and even smaller are programmable and re-programmable by the individual who can override any previous programming received from any source; right up to the present.

This re-programmability seems to include all genetic programming which is alterable by the individual mind who will master the technique.

Group reprogramming does not negate the will of each individual cell or the parts of each cell, which is readily observable in religious and political organizations where the group in the majority decides that certain activities are not allowed. But occasionally an individual will refuse to go along with the majority and can cause harm to the majority, or keep harm from happening to it.

If the body does not gain full cooperation from each of its parts and cannot rid itself of those parts that are not cooperating, the whole body may suffer. In the case of the human race, groups of people will also suffer when the disruptive people are not properly dealt with or removed. For clarity, "removed" does not necessarily mean exterminated, and disruptive people are sometimes required to carry out changes that end up benefiting the body as a whole. Sometimes, it is the body that would benefit most, by adjusting to the "disruptor."

When we look at the human body, we can take any cell or group of cells from the body and they will live independent of the body. They will live independent of the organ. After the removal, their lifespan depends on the environment in which they are placed and their ability to manipulate themselves or their environment.

The human body consists of many organs, each performing specific functions in contributing to the life and survival of the body as a whole. Each organ also consists of many different cells performing specific functions within the organ, contributing not only to the life of the organ but ultimately benefiting the body as a whole.

In continuing this process to the cellular levels and smaller;

each part contributes to the whole of each larger part. They will either benefit or harm each other.

In most cases it is difficult for each organ within the body to provide its own food and other supplies required to sustain the life of that organ. Each organ becomes dependent upon other parts of the larger body as a whole. The larger body, which is all the other organs of the body is then dependent upon each organ for its continued life and ability to perform properly.

Every level or stage of existence is dependent and interdependent on stages both larger and smaller than itself for its life and survival. The clearer the communications between the levels and within each level increases the chances of survival from the largest to the smallest of its components. In government or society, this could be communications between the rich and the poor; the black and the white; the male and the female; the young and the old; etc.

In looking at the human body, there is tremendous faith, better yet, trust and communication between every cell and every organ that holds the body together.

One of the functions that make the body so interesting is the manner in which one organ tends to make use of the refined products and waste products of other organs and cells, re-configuring those items into new raw materials for its internal use, or for the use to another cell or organ. When each organ or cell has finished with its raw materials and has disposed of its "waste," another organ or cell may continue the cycle of converting each reconfiguration of the materials brought into the body.

The actual programming and re-programming of the cells occurs in a variety of ways, which can be deliberate or accidental, with chemicals, electricity, mechanically, or some variety of these and other means. The programming may occur

instantly or over long periods of time.

No one cell can successfully reprogram another in the long or short term without the cooperation of the individual being reprogrammed. Sure, some can be forced to perform in a variety of ways against their wishes, but rarely against their wills, especially for any extended period of time. Examples of this would include holding for ransom a family member or bank account; until the individual does as instructed.

Although others make suggestions, the individual determines whether those suggestions will become part of their personal programming or not. The individual predetermines within the self just how easily the suggestions of others will be accepted and made part of their own programming. The ease of acceptance is usually based on the level of trust that the individual developed with the source of the information.

The term programming is probably less accurate than communicating, as some people have been able to shut down various bodily functions and restart them without harm to the body or any of its components. That takes a lot of trust between the parts so as to ensure every part will perform as planned in order to revive the entire body without harm to any of the parts.

In summary: Whatever an individual uses as or declares to be the object of their faith or belief, if it is anything other than the individual's mind, the declared object is a placebo.

Ultimately, it is the individual that brings about the various changes within their lives. Sure, the remaining components of the Totality do have some effect on us, whether we want them to or not; but as the individual, we determine how those effects will alter our person. We may not have much to say about how those effects may ultimately alter our bodies, but this 'chapter' of human development is still being rewritten.



In comparing the human body with a government body, both are quite literally fictional, in that there would not be either body without its component parts. It is the body that can find a productive use for "socially unacceptable" components (such as the tumor and cancer is to the human body, or the criminal to the government body) that will eventually survive the elements that will more easily harm or kill others of the same type of body.

# Science, Evolution, and Human Existence

The human, as we know it today, has the same origins as the modern robots; although the cause is slightly different in that it was one stage further along the overall "eternal" process of creation/invention and adaptation. These origins occur through the manipulation and combination of atomic, molecular, and "non"-biologic life as the foundations for what we now call biologic life. Then, through trial and error humans finally hit the scene, and now robots have made their *début*.

Notice the similarities between humans and robots. Humans do not think of robots as living beings or as their equals. Many religious stories regarding the beginning of the humans; humans were merely the servants of their gods and considered substantially inferior to the gods. Both humans and robots are supposed to have originated from a mixture of dirt and liquids, and they are able to do many of the same tasks. Where humans were once primitive in their technologies, practices and lifestyles, now it is the time of the robots with actions that are more primitive than they are imagined to be capable of performing. But remember, robots have only been around and on the scene for only a few decades, where humans have existed for some tens of thousands of years.

In most religions, especially where gods are credited with the invention of humans; humans were never considered equals to the gods, especially by the gods. However, there seems to have always been a defender of the human race that went about improving the human, and that defender almost always becomes the "enemy" of the gods. Similarly, humans do not consider the robot as their equal, and there are the defenders of the robot race that continually seeks to improve the robot to

make it equal to or better than humans.

Humans, again according to many religions that deal with the human origins topic, have the human beginning as a single prototype, and when the prototype performs up to specks, then it goes into limited edition production.

Regardless of the origins, humans are on the scene. The exact form of this existence is completely speculative, as some say that we are no more than a dream and therefore not real. Others say that we are real but our dreams are not.

Can you imagine what the robots of the year 12004: yes, ten thousand years from now will be capable of performing? Imagine what their archaeologist will dig up when they find some of the remains of their ancestors, the shapes they had and the evolutionary process they went through to become what they will have evolved and adapted into. And what in the world were those bipeds that look so much like the apes?

Humans may have once had close communications and other relationships with their original manufacturers, just as the present day robots are enjoying a thorough hands on experience with their creators. But these times too will be long passed.

Regardless of the claims by some people that they are in direct communication with the original manufacturer of the human race and that they are given special messages or missions, it is unlikely that those original creators still exist.

Consider the tendency of the "global warming" event, which by the way has been an ongoing process of the planet earth since the ice age; long before humans have developed any ozone depleting technologies beyond the fart. By the time robots are developed into what humans consider "true life forms," to be able to logically weigh out the potential consequences of their decisions, and to reproduce on their own, the global warming will have nearly eliminated the existence of all human life on

earth, except perhaps in cryogenic containers, if they last that long.

Despite the claims of receiving these special messages from supernatural beings, there is little to no proof that these communications actually came from some divine being or creator of the human race. Most evidence tends to point to the mind of the individual who is claiming to receive the messages as the true origin of the message.

In any event, the original manufacturers of humans do not seem able to communicate clearly to the masses and the masses seem to be unable to clearly communicate with the original manufacturers. This situation reminds me of the human manufacturing of specifically preprogrammed robots and sending them to other planets and even into the human body to collect certain details or perform a particular task. Sort of like the Star Trek movie with the robot "V ger" which was actually the ancient earth satellite Voyager that traveled the universes and was modified by the various civilizations it came into contact with through it's travels until it actually became a self-aware, S living being.

Life, that is, the self-proclamation, "I exist," or "I am," is purely information based, but not just any information. As humans, we can say that the computer "exists," but as far as we know, the computer does not recognize its own existence with regard to being able to communicate such self-awareness so that humans are able to comprehend it. Our lack of understanding concerning another being's self-awareness does not void the actual existence of another being having awareness of their own existence. They may not recognize the existence of humans.

The sex of the child, among other physical traits can become predictable given specific astrological, chemical, electrical, magnetic, as well as a great number of other conditions.

Likewise, when either parent ingests certain chemicals at a time during of the manufacturing of, and/or joining of the egg and sperm it will change the programming of the union, and depending on the programming affected it may alter the form of the child at birth.

Each sperm and egg carry specific programming, each without the other is not yet able to produce the human, let alone survive very long outside its host without considerable outside assistance.

When united, the combined genetic programming activates the manufacturing aspects of the new program in order to produce a human, provided of course the union is between human sperm and human egg.

The arguments from science, evolution, and creation all dance around the ball of intelligent design. Everything (if it exists in any form at all) possesses some level of intelligence and some form of design. Even nothing says plenty about itself once one achieves an understanding of the language. If absolutely nothing else, nothing tells us about everything that it is not.

The grain of sand seems less likely to be able to manipulate its environment than a plant, plants less than animals, and other animals less than the human animals.

However, intelligence and design are just as provable in the sand as it is in the human. The information they both provide is the same, in that it conveys the same two types of information, experience and ability. The information is different in what they say about themselves and their abilities.

Humans, in their pride, declare themselves superior in intelligence to the dirt, when in fact the dirt is where humans got their intelligence and most of their life.

The thought that everything in the Totality has some form of intelligence is provable, while the theory that everything existing had to have a more powerful or more intelligent source or cause for its existence proves incorrect.

Robots seem to be smarter than their human creators as they are able to calculate much faster. The robot can be built stronger, faster, and more accurate than most humans, all depending on the programming instructions and materials used. Humans are just as dependent on their programming instructions and the materials that are used to construct the body, as are the robot and computer. The ability to manipulate the environment and ultimately change their own programming depends immensely on the programming instructions given from birth, and the materials used to construct the individual, be it a robot or human.

Before you start thinking that robots cannot be smarter than their programmer; which programmer are you thinking about? Modern computers and robots almost always have more than one programmer or engineer, usually more than one programmer for each program loaded/taught to the computer, and almost always more than one creator that is responsible for the final form and appearance. The combined efforts of all the programmers and engineers can cause a computer/robot to appear smarter than any one of its programmers when compared to one programmer at a time. We can easily see the comparison between robots and humans when we look at the developing human who is loaded with a basic operating program right from the point of conception.

That initial programming essentially contains the form or structure of the human which includes the initial "BOI" (Basic Operating Instructions), which are the natural instincts toward survival that appears common to all beings, appearing obvious when one sees animals raising different species, (such as, a dog raising a cat; and the human that raises cats, dogs, etc.).

The programming of the human actually begins much earlier than conception, just like the programming of the modern computerized robot whose programming actually began as early as the abacus and perhaps even earlier than that. The electronics were not added till much later but all the programming, or at least the parts of that programming can be seen in various parts of the modern programming language.

When more closely comparing the formation of the human with that of the formation of the robot, various aspects have developed over long periods of time perfecting each component before it is added to the unit that becomes the body housing all of the components. Once the house/body for all the components has been completed, perfecting that house for optimum operation comes into play where additional modifications to the components become necessary.

The human, born from a pair of parents, has been known to exceed the education they received from their parents. Thomas Edison and Albert Einstein are both know for exceeding the training from any of their teachers by a long shot. If they had not, the items they have been credited with inventing would have been completed long before either of these two men produced their results.

All smart is, is the ability to learn one skill and apply it in the fields for which it was taught, but genius however is the ability to apply what has been learned in one field of study and being able to apply it in other unrelated fields of interest. We see this practice in action in the study of magnetism, electricity, construction, chemistry, and almost every known area of technology.

Simply because computers have not been publicly introduced as having the ability to "reason" independent of human intervention, they actually already possess the elementary education for such reasoning. Various robot design and programming have them able upright themselves after having

fallen or being knocked over. To do so, the robot not only must have the basic education on how to get upright, but must also have some form of reasoning ability in order to make use of the objects in its immediate environment, which will vary from location to location.

Imagine one human having as many teachers/programmers in their lifetime as computers have total programmers; teachers who take the time to work with the student until almost all the bugs are worked out of the lessons, and the student fully understands the subject matter. Now imagine other teachers that teach the same student how to retain all that is learned and keeping it ready for instant recall while still other instructors teach how to use information intended for one concept and apply it to other areas of thinking.

Evolution proves to be more along the lines of creation with adaptations. Such thinking is not so far off when you look at the present path humans have taken as the creators of the computers and robots (a set of new species has been formed in the creative processes of adaptation and evolution within the Totality).

With thousands of different robotic designs created, each new design comes about by using the successful design parts from previous attempts. The design evolves. Each new successful creation and evolution is then adapted to other uses. Eventually enough alterations occur and the new creation becomes an independent living creature that begins to adapt itself to its environment, and is able to live relatively free of all other supervision.

We've had a species called computer for longer than fifty years; sub species called mainframes, laptops, and others for a few less years. Even longer than that, we have had mechanized devices utilizing simple levers and wheels that were used to



merely perform a few repetitive tasks. From this, the creation of another new species called computerized robots.

Robots have existed long before the electronic computer, but with the union of the computer and robot we have a new species, where once there was a mindless mechanism that could perform only one action; that for which it was made.

Now we have robots that have joined with computers. That joining required the aid of external parties. Although robots and computers utilize much of the same materials and programming, the computerized robot is a different species nonetheless. If not, the insect and the human must be the same species, as at the atomic levels; as they use similar materials for construction, and there is plenty of similar (DNA) programming elements found in both. With the robot, humans are witnessing "creational evolution" in progress.

A few stages smaller into the DNA, there is atomic and subatomic proof that DNA is made up of mineral and dirt in the form of non biological life, just like the beginning stages of computers and robots. When we look at the layered computer programming of today, there are parts of the original programs still used, an idea also true of DNA programming in the human.

Eventually, robots will have a circulatory system for internally rebuilding itself and for cooling over heated parts. You know; sorta like what humans have?

Perhaps science has been looking at the formation of living beings somewhat backwards. Human life did not necessarily have to start as an acid gel of DNA, nor did it have to begin in what we call the final form that we now possess. The most logical stages would be that man, at least the basic form that exists today, was created as fully formed to be the servant of its creator and most likely programmed with minimally independent thought in order to act independently of its creators in order to complete orders or commands given to it. This does not

eliminate the likelihood of there being an evolutionary process that started out with very little resemblance to the human form of today.

Independent thinking includes the ability to recognize some sort of commands or objectives, and develop ways of carrying out those commands.

Others in the line of development have decided that the creatures would be more valuable if allowed a greater level of independent thought so they could be sent out and used in situations much too dangerous for the "creator." With this, we see humans sending out robots to investigate other planets, and volcanoes on Earth.

With all the mineral and electrical components required to produce DNA, perhaps an internal chemical imbalance provided the perfect opportunity for humans to "live" and procreate.

Anyhow, in less than fifty years, by the end of the year 2055, robots will have acquired what humans call a consciousness and a set of morals. These morals will be written into their programming which in part will reflect the morals of their human programmers; but in many cases, this could be a mistake. Perhaps by 2055 robots will rewrite a set of morals for themselves.

If you look at the mythological and religious stories where all creatures once had the same language, the computers of today all speak pretty much the same language, and they can communicate in all other known human languages as well. The computer can be taught new languages fairly easily (human or not).

Computers can quite accurately duplicate the sounds required in

nearly all animal communications, not to mention the ability to synthesize chemical traces and reproduce them, thus allowing potential communication with insects and with species of all sort of life forms, as well as the ability to learn or cipher unknown languages.

The problem of our present day communication system is that each group of citizens develops their own terminology that is no longer familiar to the majority of people. Examples of this form of specialized terminology occurs with doctors, lawyers, bricklayers, religions, and even some small clubs and gangs; each tending to use the same words and even the same pronunciations to have drastically different meanings. The words "hot" and "cool" have taken on a number of opposing meanings. The difficulty begins when one of these group members intends to communicate a specific idea to the member of a different group, where the other group understand the same words to have entirely different meanings. You suppose this is how social wars get started between countries?

The smaller the particles of matter get, the more they begin to look like particles of energy. The smaller the particles of energy, the more they begin to look like nothing. Even though they look like nothing, do they exist? We can perform an infinite dissection into the composition of matter and energy and always have something to examine.

Centuries ago, humans were lucky if they could see cellular activity, but today we do so quite easily. Then we realized that the cells were made up of even smaller components called molecules and atoms. Now we know atoms are made up of many other progressively smaller parts called neutrons, protons, electrons, etc., and it has already been discovered that these parts are also made up of even smaller items that differ considerably from the body they make up, and this dissecting is virtually infinite.

As long as there is something to examine, there will always be the components that have combined in order to make the item being presently observed.

Most people would agree that intelligence is the ability to comprehend and understand what one experiences, as well as the ability to act independently of external orders or commands, along with some degree, the ability to manipulate ones environment and adapt to it to some degree.

It takes intelligence to produce a plant, but is the plant itself intelligent?

Well.... Doesn't it take intelligence to process dirt, water, air, and light to form a solid structure with consistent and recognizable design?

Some religions believe that their gods created themselves. But from what?

Something cannot create itself, for the simple reason that the one had to already exist before they existed.

To have an existence in any form means there is an origin or cause for that existence from some prior existence. This sounds like the previous claims that the Totality has always existed and has no cause for its existence has just been defeated, but the claim does not contradict itself. In short, the Totality has always existed; within it exists all manner and form of causes and effects along with the potential for all other causes and effects at one time or another. Therefore, the Totality has never had a cause for it's being the Totality, although the ever-changing forms of the parts within the Totality do require causes and effects for their changes. The Totality itself, is quite simply made up of all the parts.

In support of the theory that the god could have made itself, the only way this could have been accomplished is that if the god as a god first existed in "spirit" form, and that god creates a physical body to house that spirit, then the spirit god has created its own new form, but it could not have created its original spirit form.

Like the rule that says, "There is an exception to every rule except this rule," the Totality excludes itself from the need of a prior cause because it includes all causes and effects before they became cause or effects.

The term self-made man appears to mean that the man made himself, which is as false an assumption as it is with the god. The concept can easily be understood.

Although other forces caused the physical aspects of the human to exist, inclusive of parents and grandparents among others, but what the man becomes after that point, the non-physical aspects, depends on the man and how he acts and reacts.

Although the man did not make his physical body, he does make himself into a killer, a thief, a father, a millionaire, a carpenter, or what have you; simply by the way he lives his life. To a limited extent, others can make the man into a god by declaring him to be such a god and worshiping him as such, or they accept the self-proclamations of others who claim to be a god.

The authors of *When Skeptics Ask* use a circular argument to prove the existence of their god, when such an argument can be used to prove that there is nothing able to survive the argument. In the particular instance, they try to prove the universe needed some god in order for it to exist, but that the god did not need some cause in order for it to exist by using the principle of causality: cause and effect.

You will get a sense of the argument when I use it by changing its references to the universe, to refer to gods, any god, or group of gods.

If any god had a beginning, it was either caused or uncaused. If caused, what kind of cause could be responsible for bringing it into being? On the other hand, if a god is uncaused, why should we believe it had or could have caused any of the events credited to it? If the gods supposed actions are all caused, what evidence exists to prove the god is uncaused? The principle of causality does not support such a claim that a god can be uncaused.

An argument used to prove or disprove one theory must be used as a test for all other theories making the same claims; in this case, the claims are uncaused existences.

Let's try the argument on the Totality. The ending requires some changes because the theory earlier is circular and can be used to disprove all theories except the Totality. When the same argument is used with the Totality the ending makes no sense. It also appears the principle of causality is somewhat misunderstood or incomplete in the previous arguments.

If the Totality had a beginning, it was either caused or uncaused.

If the Totality was caused, what kind of cause could be responsible for bringing the Totality into being?

However, if the Totality was uncaused, how can we believe a cause existed for the parts?

If there is a cause for the parts, what evidence could suggest the Totality is uncaused?

The principle of causality actually supports the Totality because every cause and every effect exists, regardless of its form; or it

does not exist. Non-existence also has its own form of existing. In existing, every cause and effect is part of the Totality. Therefore the Totality, being the whole, is necessary and uncaused but the ever-changing forms of the parts within it have a cause for those changes. What's more, since every universe and all gods exist in some form or another, they exist within the Totality, in that the Totality will exist without any gods, universes, or humans, but the parts cannot exist without the Totality.

Taking the scientifically proven teaching, "For everything there is a time and a purpose..." or a season if you will, the Totality is a continuous cycle of changing seasons; never ending because it had no beginning. With no beginning because it always existed in its ever changing form, but not necessarily changing predictably.

## **Look at the Totality mathematically.**

If positive one (which could just as well be any number, positive, negative or neutral) represents everything that exists, and negative one (which could be any number, positive, negative or neutral) represents everything that does not exist, and zero (which also could be any number, positive, negative or neutral) is the potential representing change. In order to go from one side of the Totality called non-existence (negative one) to the other side called existence (positive one), it must pass through the potential called change (at zero).

In order to move from total non-existence to any form of existence, such as moving from negative one thousand to negative nine hundred ninety eight, a change must take place, which first went through negative nine hundred ninety nine.

Once a thought enters a mind it becomes potential, it is on its way to becoming a member of the realm of existence.

By bringing the materials through the gates of change, the automobile eventually went from the nonexistence side of the Totality and into the existence side. Through re-manipulation of the building blocks; an abstract thought finally became solid form.

The process of re-manipulation also works in reverse for that which once existed in some yesterday that no longer exists today, not even an existence in the minds of man, beast, or mineral.

## **At some level and form, we exist. Period!**

How or why we got here is no longer relevant in the scope of Totality.

What we do in, and with this portion of Totality where we are located is relevant only in the present, and to some degree our actions in the present will have some consequence upon some aspect of the future.



# Cause, Effect, and Miracles

There are no laws regarding cause and effect that states any particular cause, or effect for that matter need occur more than once or last for any specified amount of time.

In order to discover how an original cause or effect may have worked, we may be required to produce our own causes and effects in order to more closely reproduce and understand the effects of the original cause. Since there is an almost infinite number of possible causes and effects, we have our work cut out for us. Then, that is if we don't kill ourselves in the process, we too will produce "miracles".

Miracles, by definition are extremely outstanding or unusual events, things, or accomplishments. History has proven that they are natural occurrences that humans may learn. Anything that happens within the Totality is natural. When studied, ultimately understood, and eventually with repeated duplication; these unusual occurrences become ordinary.

Events that are ordinary in one part of the Totality may be new or unusual, even appearing miraculous in another part of the Totality when it appears for the first few times. Any event continues to retain a miraculous or supernatural appearance until it is better understood and utilized to a point the event becomes ordinary.

Looking at the various events called miracles in the Bible we see that others have learned those practices and duplicated them. The Egyptian magicians duplicated most of the so-called miracles of Moses. Jesus said his followers would be able to do the same types of "miracles" (healing and the like) that he did, and even greater, a clear indication that "miracles" are learnable (Peter also walked on water, Another Disciple is said to have raised some from the dead).

Miracles are simply those activities not yet learned by others, which makes miracles subjective and dependent upon the perspective. Humans see what is done within nature and duplicate it, either to their benefit or detriment depending on the one using the technology at the time.

Nature is simply a localized portion of the Totality.

What we call nature is simply those events we are familiar with. What we call supernatural is merely the events that are unfamiliar to us; which is evidence that the natural and supernatural are relative as to where one is in their level of understanding and knowledge at the time of observing certain events.

Every event leaves behind telltale signs, evidence of its existence. The clearer the evidence, the better another will be able to reproduce it. The more frequently studied and duplicated the clearer the understanding become and less mysterious; and therefore the less miraculous they seem.

From an internet search at,  
<http://tryoils.com/drsblakethepetwhisperer/> "According to Dr. Gary Young, clinical research shows that frankincense oils contain very high immune stimulating properties. It also has been found that you can increase the chance of experiencing spontaneous healing by giving your body appropriate exercise and sufficient rest."

# Spontaneous healing....?

## **Humm.... Now that sounds miraculous.**

Frankincense is one of the treasures given to the family of a Jesus. This knowledge existed for centuries before Jesus. There should be no reason to neglect the likelihood of Jesus having learned how to use these products and more, including the learning of those supposed miracles known to Moses; what with Jesus living in Egypt (the land where Moses and Pharaoh's magicians learned and practiced their miraculous/magic) before Jesus started his ministry.

If you recall the magicians of Egypt in Moses' time and how they performed much of the magic that was considered miraculous when performed by Moses; what do you think a few thousand years of practice and advances had done in the field of magic by the time of Jesus, not to mention combining the fields of magic and medicine?

I know it is guesswork to conclude that Jesus was primarily educated in Egypt, but without records on the life of Jesus as to where he attended school in his early years, the testimony in at least one of the gospel records indicates one Jesus would have attended school in Egypt where he and his family waited for the death of one of the King Herod's.

As to the question of whether nature's forces are precise, random, deliberate, accidental or otherwise, one must answer, "yes," as there is a cause for every natural force. Any cause need not be of supreme intelligence, nor does any cause have to be deliberately trying to produce a specific effect. Some causes are nothing more than the results of others caused events.

Every action causes certain effects or reactions. Repeating those actions will reproduce very similar effects. Any variation whatsoever in the actions, such as changes in the ingredients, place of the occurrence, and sometimes the time of the attempted reproduction will cause a variation in the effect, some variations being desirable, others undesirable.

If ignored, causes and effects remain unmeasured until someone finds a use for, or a reason for studying either the causes or the effects. Measuring the attributes of the causes and the effects become more predictable and in some cases more useful. Once identified, measured, and predictable a person can begin to build other causes and effects around them.

Precision is that which possess characteristics of exactness. The study of a cause or effect tends to produce purposes that the cause of the action may not have intended. The more detail in the description the more precise a cause seems and the more deliberate the actions appear; when neither precision or deliberateness were present.

Intelligence always comes after the fact, in proving a theory, studying repetitive events, or in trying to recreate "one-time" or original causes. Basically, the intelligence gained is, "How does it work?" or "Why doesn't it work?"

Although humans consider themselves intelligent beings, many of humanity's most useful inventions occurred while trying to accomplish something entirely different (Supposedly, this is the story of the Post-It Notes).

Thomas Edison, although deliberately trying to produce an adequate light bulb, used a form of chaos called trial and error to find the best result. Although he had an idea of the effect he wanted to cause, he had no idea as to what combination of components were required to cause that desired effect. Edison

used a process of recording previous attempts so as to eliminate or reduce the chances of duplicating previous attempts during what would be nearly ten thousand trial runs. Only after Edison produced an acceptable result did it appear to be an intelligent or deliberate design by later observers.

# Archaeology, Religion and Prophecy

In theory, archaeology can prove every past event to have occurred in the time and place of its occurrence and even what people and technologies were associated with the event; provided of course they are given enough time and money to do so.

With religions, one of the unproved claims is the existence of some form of life after death (immortality in some form or another) as it is claimed by the particular religion. Millions of people have died and not one has been able to prove they have lived other lives or that they are immortal (living the same life from before the existence of Totality without experiencing death in any form); which, is not necessarily proof that life after death does not exist, because there are no claims that the after death life has to be on this earth, in the present time, in a recognizable form, or even that the after death life has memory of any previous life. Understand this, incarnation is not immortality, nor is reincarnation.

Suppose a person makes exactly one thousand one claims about any topic in their lifetime of writings. Of those claims nine hundred ninety eight prove scientifically and archaeologically true. An impressive record by most standards. But what of the other three claims? Should there be an automatic assumption that these other three items are equally true with no reason to investigate or question them (mostly because of the difficulty in proving them)?

The remaining items are usually the key factors for what the person making the claims is trying to sell, con or convince others to be true. "After all, I have been 100% accurate in the

other nine hundred ninety eight items, why don't you trust me on these three?"

Embellishment, like lying can go either way, one can add details that did not happen or one can leave out details that did.

Repeating an earlier statement about prophecy; if a prophecy is vague enough to cover more than one period of time, more than one person or set of people, or more than one event, it is not a prophecy, it is barely a prediction. Moreover, the source would neither be all knowing nor fully trustworthy.

# Human Life...

## The Gamble

The very fact that you specifically are reading this book represents astronomical odds.

With a world population at some 6,000,000,000 plus, as of the end of the year 2004, a person has a better chance of winning a major lottery than having ever been born with the specific set of genetics they possess. Of that six billion plus, there are some 50% plus or minus males and of course some 50% plus or minus females.

The web site, <http://www.alkalizeforhealth.net/Lspermdamage2.htm> refersto a 1992 study in the British Medical Journal that claims the sperm count of men contain an average of sixty-six million sperm per milliliter, with about four and one half milliliters in a teaspoon.

If the average ejaculation once every thirty days is approximately one teaspoon in volume, without being a statistician, the simple odds are about 297,000,000:1 from the male side of "you-genetically" actually having been born with just the one sperm chance, with only one sexual experience between your biological parents. This assumes every egg produces one human, however some eggs have been known to produce more than one human, but many do not produce anything at all.

According to <http://www.emc.maricopa.edu/faculty/farabee/BIOBK/BioBookREPROD.html> the female human from birth is provided a total of four hundred to five hundred eggs in her lifetime. If we use the lower number of four hundred we can see the



tremendous increase in the odds of you specifically genetically being born from your biological parents. Staying with the simplified version of one-man and one-woman, the odds are somewhat closer to 400:1 from the female side of you actually being born with the one egg chance between your biological parents.

With one sexual encounter for each egg, 118,800,000,000:1, which also assumes that neither parent has any other sexual relations, including masturbation, multiple sex partners, birth control, and the population of the world, you can imagine what those aspects do to the odds of any specific being's birth.

After the successful union of one egg and one sperm the University of Hard Knocks has just received applications for a new student and one more teacher. Now a whole new set of odds comes into play. What are the odds of surviving the nine months (more or less) of the testing processes that are preparing you for the indoctrination known as your birthday?

Your nine-month survival rate at this point has its greatest dependence on your host, the biological mother and the choices she makes. Essentially the task of the biological father is complete, at least for the biological contributions, although some of those contributions may not kick in for many years down the road.

What your mother consumes and where and how she lives may increase or decrease your odds of arriving and surviving that first day of life outside of, and separated from your host mother.

There are hundreds of chemical elements, some discovered; and others, not yet. Then there are the molecules and compounds these elements combine into, not to mention all the viruses and other diseases known and still unknown to the human. The wrong combination of any of these, either too much or too little of any of these elements may terminate, deform, or otherwise alter the physical or mental appearance on that first day, or they

may even alter when that first day will actually happen. Even if the host mother does absolutely everything known to be correct, the father's initial contribution of sperm still plays a role as to what the genetic programming is, and the suitability of the offspring to encounter various aspects of its environment.

Your pre-birth activities of kicking about and somersaults in the womb may tangle the supply line around your neck, thus shortening your days, canceling your enrollment, or even altering your form to some degree.

By now you will have spent your time in the waiting room (womb), and it is time for your first class to start. The skill of the people introducing you into the University of Hard Knocks also will increase or decrease the odds of survival.

At this point in time, your classes continue. How long was your enrollment? In which courses did you enroll? Did you have an exit plan? Do you remember any of the details?

It is now time for a whole new set of programming to be installed by parents, relatives, community, environment, disease, and injuries (a super short list,) and these contributors will have some impact on what you will become along the path to your termination, transformation, final graduation, or death.

Initially you do not have much to say about what you will be exposed to or what others will expose to you. Sometimes you cannot even determine how you will react without being corrected. Eventually the reins to your own life are handed fully over to you and a completely new set of rules and odds enter the picture. Now it is your turn to correct some of that previous programming to try to set yourself right. Are you going to seek some form of revenge, or are you going to get on with your life?

With every decision you make, you alter your path and course of study in the University, you also alter your chance of

surviving that day, either by increasing the odds or by decreasing them.

# The Value of Gambling

Other than the possibilities of earning a living or going bankrupt, the most important aspect of gambling, chance taking, is the development and fine-tuning of the Sixth Sense Communicator.

Even if you have never been to a gaming establishment, bought a lottery ticket, raffle ticket, or entered any sort of contest, you most likely will know what I refer to as the Sixth Sense Communicator, especially if I use the term, hunch.

If you have ever thought to yourself or spoken it out loud to others, "I knew I should have done (or not done), some particular action." That was your Sixth Sense Communicator. Have you heard the saying, "Quit should'n on yourself"? Stop kicking yourself about what you should or should not have done. Learn from it, and do better next time.

Everything you have ever done in your life, everyone you have ever met, everyplace you have ever gone, and everything you have ever been in contact with, they all have taught you a lesson of some sort or another. Whether that lesson was the one intended by the source or some other lesson you managed out of the experience, a lesson was taught and a lesson was learned.

The greatest tool that is used to calibrate this Communicator is best known as hindsight, at least for those who wish to do some deliberate recalculations.

Although everyone posses the tool called hindsight, few people actually use it to improve their future lives. Calibration of the Communicator with hindsight is as simple as analyzing what triggers the response, "I knew that would happen," by tracking back to just before that hunch occurred. Was it a thought, an upset stomach, a calming sensation, or an uneasy feeling about

the situation? This communicator tends to be slightly different from person to person but a few common words or phrases are used to describe it. Words such as, a still small voice, a hunch, a knowing, *deja-vu* (already been there), and conscious are only a few of the names given to this Communicator.

The most recognizable indicators of the presence of this tool, in others and yourself, are simply the statements made that give an indication that there was a prior thought or indication that the action should have been different than the one taken.

Some of the examples of the Communicator indicators include, achy joints prior to impending cold or damp weather; hair standing up on the arms before the winds blow; nervousness (butterflies in the stomach) before winning or loosing in a game of chance. The list is nearly as limitless in degree as the number of people, plants, and animals, etc. that are know to possess this skill. Everyone's body is slightly different, chemically, moisture content, height, weight, etc.; and like metals some conduct or insulate electricity or magnetism better than others; so too is the human body with variations.

One cannot destroy this communicator as long as one has some form of life. However, one can opt to not use or fine-tune this tool, letting it haphazardly operate. The Sixth Sense Communicator will continue to operate and exist. From time to time the communicator will remind the individual of its presence through those hunches and thoughts like, "I knew better than that." Some people have called this devise a conscious, others a spirit.

The name is not at all as important as understanding how the devise works. Like a hammer or screwdriver, it doesn't matter what you actually call the tool, but the hammer is unlikely going to drive the screw very efficiently, nor is the screwdriver going to very effective in pounding the nail into the board.

At any time one can begin to sharpen, fine-tune, feed or

strengthen this Communicator. The more one tests, fine-tunes and listens to the "hunches," and the more one studies those hindsight lessons and tests their reliability, the better and faster one can begin to successfully use them to keep themselves on the path they choose.

Caution is to be exercised. Like any tool, if improperly managed, this communicator can be disastrous, causing great harm. On the other hand, if properly used it can be of great benefit not only to the individual who possesses the tool, but to many others as well.

# Destiny

While finishing one of the many rewrites, someone handed me an article published in the January 15, 2005 issue of *The Watchtower* called "What controls your Future." The article appears to present two views on the topic of who controls future events. One view demonstrates that man is no more in control of his destiny than other plants or animals; while the other claims that man is in total control of his destiny. Both views are one hundred percent correct, but not necessarily at the same time in the same situation.

The aspects of being in total control of ones destiny provides us with a nearly infinite variety of choices we make, either knowing the outcome, thinking we know the outcome, or having absolutely no clue as to what the outcome may be. With the ability to choose, we are in as much of what can be called total control as can be expected. However, the results of these choices can be, and often are outside the realm of our control. As a result, we can constantly make new decisions that may partially alter the results of any previous decision.

Excuses such as nature, politics, and supernatural forces (such as gods, goddesses, spirits and ghosts) are frequently used as reasons for giving up.

Fate and predestination are merely words used to describe the same non-individual controlled events in a person's life. If the individual cannot control those events, the belief exists that these events must be their fate and destiny.

The belief that some god has given man a free will is total myth, as all religions I can think of that make the same claim reveals those gods punishing the human for using that "free will gift" when the human seems to go against the wishes of the particular god.

Humans who think that humans are the only creatures with free will are very mistaken. Consider the domesticated dog. Anyone who has tried to train any dog will notice the dog has a definite will of its own. A free will is the only way to define the difficulty in training any animal, or plant.

The longer a person works at training the same dog, the dog is allowed less and less exercise of its own will as it begins to exercise the will of the trainer or master based on what it interprets as rewards or punishments. The actual process is that the free will of the dog is being calibrated to coincide with the trainer. The dog begins to associate the various rewards or punishments for its actions with the commands given by the trainer. The more frequently either the rewards or punishments are given to the dog for the same reactions to the commands from the trainer, the clearer the dog is able to predict how it should act in order to obtain certain rewards, or to at least avoid certain punishments.

Don't be mistaken. Even a very well trained dog still exercises its own free will, which now also includes the training it has received. In conjunction with its own desires and depending on how the dog interprets the balance and the consistency of rewards and punishments. These factors will determine the dog's level of obedience. This same idea is true with raising children. Like the child, the dog can choose to disobey the "master" or parent whenever it wishes, usually when the sense is consistent that they can accept the anticipated punishments for their actions that are contrary to the commands they have been given.

When a trained dog is away from its trainer or master, any master for that matter, and becomes "wild" again, the dog must set aside some of what it has been taught in order to survive on its own or in a wild pack.

Enough about dogs, what about insects? The ants have established a somewhat perfected form of government where



breeding and selective abortions produce the correct number of builders, guards, scouts, workers, and queens, where each occupation has specific tasks to perform to insure the survival of that particular colony. Ants seem to be miniature masters of chemical genetics with the reprogramming, destruction, or exile of a defective or unwanted unit occurring from time to time.

Plants also exercise free will to some extent as seen in their ability to adapt to different environments over time, making themselves more attractive to some creatures that either help them reproduce and spread their seed, or to become their food; while others make themselves less desirable and even poisonous to other critters in order to protect themselves from being eaten.

All parts of the Totality have the ability to learn. Even the dirt and sands when properly manipulated and trained can respond more quickly than humans, and is often more powerful than humans. Consider the silicon chips manipulated from certain sands that are trained to be the brain functions of the computer, which in turn becomes the control center for the robot.

As for free will, everything that exists has some level of free will.

Likewise, as with everything else, all is subject to the free will actions from those beings both larger and smaller than themselves.

Everything that exists, not only has some level of free will but also has some level of subjection to others exercising their free will. Each entity need not be some unknown or unknowable god, but a very well known or unknown virus.

A virus is simply anything that the body reacts to in a negative way, and by size is generally microscopic, and usually has the capacity to destroy the body that it attaches itself to. Remember, even the virus has virus' that can harm them as well; the same

goes for those of the larger creatures as well that destroy the smaller, there is always something larger or smaller that can destroy them as well.

Often the one exercising their free will to not do something they would like to do usually declines because the person is trying to avoid one of the possible repercussions from doing so.

The plant eats the dirt and the insect eats the plant. The bird eats the insect and the animals eat the bird. The human eats the animals and the microscopic life consumes the human (whether they are still living, buried in the ground, or cremated.)

The more rapidly one can adjust to the changes in their environment, the more apt they to survive another day in order to get up and do it all over again.

Humans are no more predestined to survival than the rat or the eagle.

Some humans, born into families living in the slums and squalor have risen to positions of great wealth, power and prestige; while others born to such positions of wealth, power and prestige found their way into the gutters and squalor of skid row in equal time, or faster than it took their counterparts to get out.

Even the child that is born to drug addicted and alcoholic parents are not predestined to drug or alcohol use or abuse, nor are they any more likely to become addicts or drunks than anyone else. Everyone has the same 50/50 chances to decide to use or not use any substance. The decision is made, usually, because of the perceived rewards or penalties.

Hold on now! I know this goes against much of the popular statistics that say children of drinkers and children of smokers are more likely to drink and smoke, so let me break it down a

little more.

Children who are born into families that drink Pepsi are generally more predisposed to drink Pepsi than Coke, generally with the understanding that there is no Coke-a-Cola in the house of Pepsi. The same concept can be said about sauerkraut, kielbasa, pepperoni, anchovies, sulfured water, carrots, broccoli, cigarettes, alcohol, and literally anything else a person can think of, none of which has anything to do with genetics. The likelihood of such uses being passed on from generation to generation is more learned than genetics, and more learned because the substance is more readily availability while its counterparts are not available.

The family that does not like the taste of Coke-a-Cola is less likely to have the product in the house. Do not be fooled, even before the child is born it is learning through what the mother consumes, and how her body reacts chemically and physically to its environment, which is evident and becomes more apparent after the child is born, simply because we can now visually observe the results of learning process in action.

If a person is taught to do something one way and they are never taught that it may be "wrong," that person willingly does what they have been taught as correct and proper, right up to the point they discover or learn otherwise. Even when the person learns that their actions are not acceptable by the larger sections of human society, the individual still has the ability to choose which way to go. The direction chosen most often is what the person wants or likes to do anyway.

If from birth, a child is taught that they are less able to resist a particular substance or activity than everyone else, and if the child grows up believing what they have been taught is true, they will begin to act in accordance with their belief so as to

appear susceptible. However, when others teach the individual that it's actions are not correct, and why, the person now has opposing paths from which to choose. The responsibility of the family, society, religions and the government is to assure that all citizens are being taught as closely the same lessons and responsibilities as all other citizens. The ultimate responsibility for the results of ones choice remains solely with the individual who causes the results.

Anytime someone does something wrong, they do so willingly, whether it is known to them to be wrong according to some society or not. The reason these actions are done willingly is because each of us can choose to do or to not do each action in our life, but we cannot necessarily control the way others act in their lives that will affect us. Basically, the difference between "right" and "wrong" is information and social acceptance or rejection.

If a god or some other form of government that rules the individual asks or tells the individual to do something they declare to be correct, and someone else has a different god or government that tells them to do something they also declare to be correct, and at the same time they say the actions of the first person are incorrect, there are liable to be some sort of disagreement over whose god or government is more powerful or more correct. These types of disagreements have led to some of the bloodiest wars in history.

Freedom of choice is no more a god-given gift to the human than it is to the insect or other animals. All creatures and all other forms of existence possess freedom of choice to some degree. Choices can be trained and manipulated based on the perceived rewards and penalties in the mind of the person making the decision and the person offering the choices.

Overall, each critter reacts, responds, and otherwise lives life

according to how it has adapted to other aspects of its environment that it encounters in its life that it feels have rewarded or punished it, whether the critter has understood or was able to manipulate those environmental aspects or not.

Mankind is no more or less instinct driven than any other critter on earth that chooses to attack, retreat, or investigate any given situation.

Whether free will or instinct, the same process happens. The one making a decision does so based on how the situation is judged to benefit or harm them, and sometimes how it will affect someone else.

The major difference between humans and most other forms within the Totality is that humans created gods and devils out of various forces and bodies within the Totality that are believed to be unaccountable to any other entity than themselves, if even then. Eternal lessons indicate that everything in the Totality is accountable for their own actions and reactions, both to themselves and/or to other beings. Even the computer that fails to respond properly to its operator is accountable to the operator, who may trade it in, toss it out the window, or change some of its components. None of this requires a god of any sort. No heavens. No hells.

Accountability is certain to be as old as the Totality itself, as every time one part of Totality takes a new form, a new set of rules applies that did not necessarily apply to the old form, creating changes regarding accountability, with who is accountable what others and to what extent.

Animals, whether wild or domesticated, are also held accountable for their actions as is seen when one animal tries to steal the offspring from another and the would-be thief is attacked. Sometimes the counterattack is successful and other times it is not. The initiator takes its chances. Whether the initiator is actually punished or deterred or not is irrelevant, and

this is where the heaven and hell come into play for the human governments. As long as the mythical heavens (other than the skies) and hells (other than the grave) cannot be proven to exist or more importantly cannot be proven to not exist, people can be convinced of the existence of either place to some extent. The human who submits to those beliefs can be controlled to the degree they believe in the existences of either place.

Historically, religions seem to have been initiated and/or backed by some form of government, or the government by the religion where use of the life after death rewards and punishments system helped to control the citizens in their social interactions. If the citizens can be brought to believe there would be some sort of retributions or rewards to them for their individual actions during the present life that would carry over into a life after they died, then it would be a little easier to control their actions in the present life. Also, historians have proven that many religious beliefs were founded on improper understandings of the people's environment.

What better way is there to get the people to obey the government powers that be than to have them obey the leaders of the government at the command of the god the people have chosen to worship. In cases where a person may not be caught or punished for the crimes of this world, or not recognized and rewarded for the good deeds they have committed in this life; a supposed impartial party then warns the people of some afterlife penal or reward system for the deeds that were not properly recognized in the present life.

The appearance that some governments want the religions to be separate entities is just that, an appearance. They almost always have to exist and work together in order for either of them to work the way they appear to be designed to work; aside from the appearances that they present of being at odds with each other.

Regarding the thought that a god of some sort predestines us is provable in the affirmative if we are to believe first that the god does in fact exist, and that the god is also all knowing. If the god were all knowing, it would know whether we would do as was planned or not. If you and I are to believe that this same god had a specific hand in our being on earth as we are, at the time we are, the only way to describe that is through predestination.

If the god knew what our outcomes would be, regardless of what we experienced and then caused us to exist in the first place, our destiny would have been predetermined, or at the very least foreknown, which pretty much describes the same activity of predestination anyway.

If the god, knowing what our outcome is to be regardless of our experiences continues to cause us to exist; then we do not choose the heaven or hell as supposed, but the god of that religion does the choosing and all the promised punishments and rewards from that god are pretty much futile as they would have no effect on our eventual outcome. Now that sounds like the actions of one who repeatedly acts in the same manner each time while hoping to obtain different results.

To predestine basically means to decree, determine, appoint, or settle beforehand. Prior knowledge is to know beforehand what the outcome is going to be under any of the possible circumstances. Although predestine seems to indicate an active participation, where prior knowledge is more of an inactive participation. With semantics aside predestined and pre-knowledge are about the same.

If the god knew that allowing specific situations would cause a person to believe in and serve that god, the god would apparently have no need for the human existence at all, unless it is to calibrate some aspect not yet known to the human, and

because everyone would eventually end up in the supposed heaven, there would be no need for any hell except for its being used as an alignment tool, as this god would simply do what was necessary of it to convert every individual and be done with it.

The oddest aspect about predestination and free will is that if the god did give humans free will, that god cannot punish or reward the human for their desired use of the gift, otherwise there is far less free will than there is predestination.

It is not free will, nor a gift, when the giver simply orders, "You can do anything you want to with the gift I have given you, so long as you do what I want you to do, and if you do not do what I want you to do I will see to it that you die, or are punished in some manner." This sort of reasoning makes the relationship between the god and human the same type of relationship most humans expect from their robots, "The robots may do anything they want to do, so long as the robot produces the results that the human desires, otherwise that robot will be dealt with in whatever manner produces the desired results." Robots must have the same kind of free will that many humans experience through their beliefs in the god scenario.

The Totality, to which all gods are part of, punishes and/or rewards all who are present at the time an event happens. Those present at the time either utilize or get run over by what the other parts of the Totality are doing, whether they recognize or do not recognize that those other parts are present. Ultimately, the receiver determines whether the other parts of the Totality have rewarded or punished them, which explains the presence of so many gods and supposed supernatural powers.

Like the moldy bread or rotting meat, it depends on the situation of the individual at the time they find such items as to whether they are desirable to eat or not. Some will turn up their



noses at such a feast, even when they have been without food and have been hungry for many weeks, only to die of starvation. On the other hand, some will look at these same items as less than desirable nourishment that if consumed will allow them the live another day to try again in hopes of a better tomorrow, provided they can only make it through this day alive.

When predestination and pre-knowledge are compared, the definitions are indistinguishable one from the other, as discussed earlier. If an inventor knows the outcome of an invention to be undesirable and invents it anyway, he is foolish and wasting his time, that or merely creating job security for himself by having something to continuously clean up after.

However, if the inventor knows the invention will not perform as planned, and the invention is never created, the inventor predestines the invention to non-existence.

Either the god does not know what our end will be and therefore is not all knowing, or that god has actually predestined us. Many thoughts on the issue claim that our choices will alter our destiny. Such ideas have origins within the Totality and have nothing to do with supposed existence of the mythical and imagined heavens or hells of any sort save the ones we create for ourselves to live in at any given time.

Whenever we get to a point in our life where we make a decision we alter our possible future outcomes, which are also called by the name destiny, to some degree. No matter how small the decision seems in that present time, we can alter our path so much so that in twenty or fifty years we may wonder how in the world we arrived at the point in our lives that we eventually find ourselves.

Sometimes forces beyond our control temporarily alter our desired path, but our ultimate reactions to those forces can, but

not always do, return us to that previously once-desired path, keep us on the diverted path, or allow us to create or choose a different path that may become desired in light of the new circumstances and information.

Every destiny remains within the individual. If you choose to go left instead of right, certain events are set in motion that would not have been initiated if you had gone right. The same situation happens with every subsequent decision made. With every decision made, the opportunity is present for other decisions to be made that would not have been available had any other path been taken. Yet, every path always presents the same type of decisions, "Which way from here?" or "What do I do now?"

The individual is truly the master of their own destiny in that what one does today will determine where they will be when tomorrow becomes today, and ultimately what will happen to them because of where they in some future moment.

Although we cannot guarantee ourselves a specific destiny or outcome, we can improve the likelihood of a desired outcome by acting consistently with our desired destiny. This is to say, "If you want to stop knocking your head against brick walls, you must keep your head away from those walls, or at least decide, and act upon that decision, to not knock it against them and act accordingly."

None of this involves the actions of any god or supernatural being. Although your destiny has a great reliance on all else that occurs within the Totality that is acting upon everything else in the Totality, you are where you are because of the prior decisions you made. What happens to you because you are where you are may be entirely out of your control at that moment, but the reason you are there is essentially because of your prior decisions; many of which were made without full

and accurate knowledge of exactly what would happen.

We make our decisions, at the time they are made, based upon the information that we have available at that time and on what we expect or hope the possible outcome will be. We then test our theory which should help us make even better decisions the next time, provided we learn the lessons from the last decision.

# Perfect Freedom and Your Future

As freedom pertains to religions, it seems to be referring to attaining some form of peace of mind in this world about how one expects to be spending what is supposed to be an eternity when they leave this form of life existence, whether that eternity is called nirvana, heaven, or obtaining some supernatural or otherwise divine body or power; the general descriptions seem to be much the same.

When freedom is associated with governments, this freedom usually means the ability to live one's life without having to look over a shoulder wondering what new law a person might be breaking or whether someone is offended who has no business being involved in certain areas of your life when and where they are not invited.

Aside from government and religion, some have said that the most perfect freedom is the ability to do what one wants to do without regard to how it affects others.

No matter what, as with love, there are just about as many descriptions as to what is the most perfect freedom as there are people to define it.

Ideally the citizens of the united States of America should already have the most perfect freedom or at least the greatest advantage of attaining it. The following quote from *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* should demonstrate this point. "Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind is more disposed to suffer while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to

which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security."

I want to emphasize the part at the end where it states "it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security" because this right/duty cannot be canceled by the American Constitution or any of its amendments as it is a right retained by the people at the time the new country was established, and is as much an "unalienable rights" as the others mentioned early in the *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America*, and has not been, nor can be delegated to any government agency.

This right is still valid to all united States American citizens, at least according to "Amendment IX" of *The Constitution of the United States*, which states, "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage other rights retained by the people."

In the united States, at least as of today, the citizens have the authority to be involved with the government to change, alter, abolish, or to throw off (out) any law, governing agency, form of government, or political figure that is no longer suitable to the PEOPLE as a MAJORITY, regardless of what the politicians have to say about it.

For now, that should take care of the government aspects of a perfect freedom, at least for the united States.

Almost every group, religious, political or otherwise in the united States have claimed that *The unanimous Declaration of*

*the thirteen united States of America* and/or *The Constitution of the United States of America* have granted them the right to act in the manner they have, even when their actions violate other laws enacted to protect those harmed by those actions.

Governments are generally established by a group of people in order to better protect themselves from other governments or dangers as a whole, not just the protection of the financial welfare of a select few that have eventually positioned themselves in power over the people.

Without laws or rules that are generally accepted by the people who form a community, whether the community is a family, town, state, nation, etc., we simply step back in time to the feudal system of "the one with the might is right," which is actually still practiced to some extent by the person who attains a position in some political office, then presumes they have greater powers than they actually do. However, if the people perceive this person to have such power, they may submit to it, which only tends to reinforce a power that is not supposed to be. In addition, it is unfortunate today that other governing bodies are still practicing a version of the golden rule that reads, "those with the gold, make the rules."

When a government (i.e., the people elected, appointed, or inheriting any government office) ceases to obey the laws they are subject to, and a large enough majority of citizens desire to change or enforce these laws, the exercise of all legal options should be made use of in order to accomplish the changes. When all the legal options fail, the people must consider the options of the united States American founding generation that exercised the power of eviction of the powers that failed to uphold the best interest of the majority. If those powers refuse to vacate (step down) of their own accord, their physical removal may be required.

Removing public officials from office is a very difficult task, in that situations almost always have to get so bad that some show

of physical force may be required. This is merely an observation also made by a number of "patriots" who set their citizens free from some form of government or ruler that was considered unbearable by a set of new "patriots."

Only when enough people get together to change the way a government operates, can the situations really change. The changes will only last as long as the people are willing to maintain them. As soon as the maintenance stops, like any other structure where maintenance is lacking, deterioration begins until the structure needs to be rebuilt and sometimes requiring demolition prior to rebuilding. Once maintenance stops the government tends to resort back to an unfavorable formation. The sooner the people are organized and the larger the body of people, usually the more quickly and more peacefully the changes can take place but this is not a guarantee.

The secret to finding a supreme entity is simple, and the primary key is just how "supreme" the seeker wishes to go.

The Totality is the most inclusive entity there can ever be, for the simple reason that within the Totality exists all gods, devils, and all manner of other things. Whatever it is you have found to date that you figure is the answer to all your questions and needs, it is still only a part of the Totality, unless of course it is the Totality.

For now, that should take care of everyone else, at least politically and most forms of religion.

In the book *The Miracle of Psycho-Command Power* © 1972 by Parker Publishing Co., Inc., written by Scott Reed, contains this information throughout the book.

--- "Every object in existence first existed in someone's mind... all existed first only as an idea in someone's mind, you,

yourself, are the result of this... law of creation... Thoughts are real -thoughts are things- to the thinker.

"Each of us, therefore, lives in a vast invisible universe – silent and invisible to others, but clear as life and plain as day to us. To each of us, our minds are a kingdom, alive and filled with the splendor of our dreams, desires, and goals. We can see these things clearly... Likewise, the human mind can materialize thoughts as well as any duplicating machine." ---

"Our minds are a kingdom..." Could this have been the kingdom that Jesus spoke of preparing? Preparing the minds? He was preparing the minds of his followers. Within our mind we can make any situation in which we find ourselves a place of joy or a place of misery. We often discover that the situations we experience are similar to the types of situations others also experience, where some of those people seem happy and as content as can be; others are just as miserable as ever. The difference? It is the attitude of the individual about the situation. Attitudes can only be found in the mind of the individual.

Questions like, "Why are we here? How should we live? What does the future hold for mankind?" all require free will and interaction with others in order to answer in the best way possible as they deal with the present, while questions like, "Why was man manufactured? Who were our manufacturers?" takes more guesswork than fact, at least for now, and become irrelevant in that what we do with our lives from this point forward.

We cannot do anything to change the past as far as what happened or why. The only aspect about the past that we can change is our present understanding regarding it. We may learn new lessons today that make the events of yesterday more or



less pleasant to deal with and remember.

As to the first set of questions, each of us has to answer them as individuals. What is your purpose? What are your goals?

If you recognize that your body has many parts, as it does; and each of these parts has a unique purpose, which they do; then you will know some of these purposes are fixed, while others change from time to time, as they will; then you can investigate how you might be beneficial to a larger body that you are part of, such as a family, group of friends, club, community, etc.

The goals of the larger organizations will have some effect on the goals of the individual. If you presently have no goal(s) for yourself, you can develop them by reversing the process by looking into organizations to which you belong or would like to belong. Find their purpose(s) and if you can live with those purposes, make them your own and then find out what part you can play to fill those purposes. You now have some individual purpose(s) and goal(s).

Regardless of what your answers are today, you may alter them as your life changes, and your life will change, sometimes in little stages and other times in huge catastrophic or delightful leaps.

It doesn't matter where you are today as much as it matters with what you do with what you have. That which you have has little to do with money or material possessions, as they come and go. The most important possessions you have are your experiences, your knowledge and skills. Those experiences are lessons that you have learned and take with you everywhere regardless of the situations of your life. You keep them even when you are left with "nothing else" after a disaster; no money, no house, no vehicle, little or no food, and perhaps your friends have abandoned you for one reason or another. The experiences you have acquired are there to be used to regain anything that was

lost that you might wish to regain.

What you do with all those previous experiences makes all the difference as to whether you stay where you are or whether you get closer to the objectives you discover to be most important in your life.

In making the best out of whatever situation you are in, you will have answered the question "Why am I here?" which can, and often does change with the changing circumstances in your life. Whether you complete any or all of those "whys" you have planned for your life, it has a great deal to do with how they contrast or assist other social rules, laws, and beings.

As for, "how you should live you life?" When you discover or create the answer as to why you are here, you simply live according to those answers. In doing so, you will always be true to yourself. Remember, that which makes you who you are will most likely change with the seasons and times of your life.

Remember, for every action there is a reaction, equal or not, and nothing is a reaction. If you are not prepared for, or do not want to receive the eventual, most probable reactions for your action, do not perform the initial actions. Otherwise, have at it; and do not complain about the results.

If you slap someone's face do not expect to receive a turned cheek, although they might. You should be prepared for and expect them to return in kind, and perhaps a bit more severely as situations tend to accelerate as they go down hill. You are ultimately the judge as to whether it is a good idea to slap that cheek in the first place or not.

Even if your initial intent or purpose is beneficial to all involved, the receiver or other observers may not know your intent at the time they respond in ways that may be unfavorable

to all involved.

The other aspect to remember here is that you, and no one else, are responsible for your own actions regardless of whether they were initiated because of faulty information or not. Just buck up and admit you made a mistake. After all, it ain't the end of the world even if it may prove embarrassing at the time.

Telling others how the mistake was made, or why a particular decision was made does not have to appear as though a person is ducking their responsibility for making the decision, and it should not. Such reasons should only be provided in a way as to serve as guides to help steer others clear of making the same types of mistakes.

In *Welding Essentials*, Philip Dormer Stanhope is credited with saying, "The chapter of knowledge is a very short one, but the chapter of accidents is a very long one." The only way to gain knowledge about any topic is to either experience the subject and/or talk to others who already have the experience. Ultimately you will either have to test the information, accept it as the truth, or rejecting it for whatever reasons you consider justifiable.

Another good quote comes from *Welding Essentials* by Nikki Giovanni, being credited with, "Mistakes are a fact of life. It is the response to the error that counts." You have to choose to go either left or right, forward or backwards, up or down, do this or that with every decision. You choose to go left only to discover it is taking you further away from your goals. Now, do you choose stay to the left or try to correct more toward the right in order to realign yourself with your goals?

A way to avoid repeating the same mistakes is by not assuming that the entire subject matter is true simply because it contains some truths. Also, do not ignore an entire subject because some of it seems too far-fetched to be true. Aesop's Fables have a great many far-fetched presentations of talking animals, but

they present many extremely valuable human lessons.

Treat life like a huge picture puzzle. Everything you experience is a piece of that puzzle called life, specifically, your life which is interconnected with the pieces of puzzles of the lives of others. Throwing away pieces that look out of place will result in an unfinished puzzle with holes in it.

Pick up a piece of the puzzle, examine it, and if it does not fit in any of the areas you are working on at the moment, put it with others that look like they may go together. You may end up with a dozen or so groups from which you will eventually work. When you get to a section that begins to use one of those groups the puzzle assembly progresses a bit faster and you may find yourself dividing the group you are working on into even smaller piles. Eventually you will have a finished picture with no extra pieces and without any holes. At the end, step back and look at it, and only then might it really make sense, and if you have time... start another one.

A word of caution. It never works to force a piece to fit where you think it should go, if the fit is not smooth; near the end you will have pieces that look out of place and when you finally figure out where they are supposed to be and exchange them, neither piece will fit as snugly or look as good as they should where they should.

The blind refuse to see that nature, the major parts of the Totality, treats everyone and everything the same.

Value in any relationship between creation and creator exists only as long as the creation is of some use or value to the creator, whether planned or accidental.

Remember, the aspects about you that make you valuable will differ by degrees from those aspects that make another person valuable. We can turn to the workings of our own bodies for

proof.

We look at only two components of the body, such as the veins and the intestines as they perform similar functions, in that both of them are pathways for moving materials through and or from the body. If they remain in the same place and exchange the materials they move the entire body would cease to function. Eventually the veins would fill with solids and pack with waste products, while the entire volume of blood would soon exit the body through the intestines.

Now, if the body parts change places and take over the functions of the ones they replaced, by definition they are no longer what they were before. The one that used to transport waste material is now transporting blood, so it is no longer an intestine but a vein, and vice versa.

When parties pool their resources, such as the parts of the body do, the possibilities for greater accomplishments become possible and even likely, so long as the parties pooling their resources can agree as to who will use what resources and how those resources will be used, and then each party holding to the agreements through the tough times as well as the good times. When one party destroys the resources and knowledge of another out of ignorance, fear, superstition, or otherwise — everyone loses.

Humans are like chemical reactions, where some combinations of two or more inert substances make the union more powerful than either of them were when kept apart; while combining two or more otherwise powerful components when separated may turn the union into an inert compound.

In taking full responsibility for our lives and how we act and react, we begin to experience freedom in as perfect a form and

condition as it can be. Such responsibility truly frees a person in many aspects of living. When one feels the need to lie about one's actions and reasons for the way they conduct themselves, the person becomes a slave to the reason they feel the need to lie or deceive.

In many cases, the bonds become so layered and complex that it may seem impossible to actually free one's self. Freedom is more easily achieved, especially when we realize there are very few, if any records of anyone dying from embarrassment, but there are many deaths recorded because people have reacted to that embarrassment in less than desirable or less than legal ways.

Be careful. In trying to change the actions and habits of someone else, you may find yourself starting to do that which you are trying to get the other person to stop. One of the best examples I can demonstrate is that of the newly forming united States of America in 1776. Trying to change the British Government, the united States goes to war with Great Britain, listing some 27 or forbidden political powers. Winning the war, the new government simply continues those same powers but under different titles; President vs King, Congress vs Parliament. But as any person will recognize while reading those 1776 grievances, the present united States government is exercising nearly all of them and to a greater degree.

You can only change yourself and the way you look at life in the environment around you. What you focus on eventually becomes part of you.

I have always wondered which was more, "est," or "er." Because every time someone declares they are the very "est" of anything (the biggest or the fastest, etc.), another comes along to declare they are an even "er" of the very

same thing (bigger or faster, etc.). No matter where you are, someone else wants to be, have, or is more than you. When someone is fast, another challenges the fast person and one of them becomes faster than the other. One of the two can claim to be the fastest; but the claim is only valid between the two people at that particular time.

Someone else races the winner and wins. In short, the same person can be all three at the same time, they are fast, they are faster than someone else, and they are the fastest of a particular group.

Praying, meditating, or incantations, by whatever name, proves to be more of an individual expressing their concerns and desires in a form of a seeking that is designed to activate themselves in producing the object of the search. The name of the god, object, or idol prayed to or meditated on does not matter; history proves this as fact. Key figures in many religions have been credited with healing people of all manner of illness and injuries. The key factor has to do with the **level of belief** the sick one has in the practice and practitioner.

The most important ingredient is that the person seeking must believe that they already possess it and that the world will eventually see the objective of the search. It is in that belief that the seeker alters their life in living the results of the search.

When the person does not expect to get what they claim they are looking for, they go about their lives as usual, rarely putting any effort into obtaining their claimed desires, all the while complaining about not having what they claim they desire.

If you do not like the situation you are in, do something about it. Preferably legal, otherwise be prepared for the political repercussions.

Staying in an occupation, relationship, or anything one dislikes

or even hates, the person is demonstrating actions contrary to their desires and they do a disservice not only to themselves but to all others involved as well. When the person gets out of the unpleasant or unwanted situation, or changes their attitude about it, by choice or from necessity, and they get into something else more enjoyable, they give the greatest service to all. The person brings with them a set of skills and knowledge that can be used anywhere and the skill can be adapted to anything, anywhere, anytime. When a person is happier, so are their family and friends, and they become more productive. Remember, the wheel is not just an item on the car. It is seen in gears, pulleys, marbles, hula-hoops, etc.

Everything has three lives. The first is always the present, which must be viewed from the perspective of the Totality, as the Totality can have no past or future, though the parts of the Totality do have a past, present, and future. The present life is lived today, this very moment. The present is somewhat fixed and somewhat flexible. Fixed, in that we are where we are at any given moment and we cannot change that fact. Flexible, in that we cannot remain in exactly the same spot from moment to moment, and to some degree we have control as to what direction we choose from one moment to the next.

The second life must always be the past. As the present life ends, it instantly becomes past; a past that can never be changed, though our memories and thoughts about it can change. Only when a moment becomes history can it obtain any concrete form that is forever unchangeable.

The third life can only be the future, which can never be lived, because as soon as the present is becoming the past, that which was to be the future is now the present. The future has only a fluid and gaseous type of form, in that nothing about the future is solid, definite, absolute, or certain.



Both, the past and the present exist within the fluid and gaseous future. But how can that be?

The past, present and future are all components within the Totality, but the Totality itself cannot experience anything other than the present.

The past, forever fixed; and the present constantly changing the features and shape of what form the future may take when it become the present. The past, to one degree or another guides the actions performed in the present, while the present actions alter the forms of the possible future outcomes.

The actions we have performed in some present life that is now past, produces results in some future life that is not yet present. The results will always be realized in a present life, either our life or some future generation's life. Whether we collect the harvest ourselves or someone else does, someone will receive the rewards or retributions of our past actions. The trick, magic, or miracle is that all three lives are lived at the same time; that time exists between birth (which is the start of one changing form) and death (which is the end of the previous form and the start of a new form.)

Essentially, the past and the future are non-existent, in that there is no action occurring in them, as life is only happening in the present where all the action is taking place. In the present, everything is changing form by degrees that are mostly unnoticed by the casual observer. As the old form ceases to exist a new form or forms are beginning to exist out of it.

The past is forever unchangeable; the future forever uncertain, uncertain because of the numerous possibilities that unfold with each action taken in the present.

Following, are a few lessons I learned the following from my parents.

"Beware of those who tell you to do one thing, while they are doing just the opposite."

"Just because we tell you a certain thing is true, it is your responsibility to make sure it is true before accepting it as truth."

"When you are old enough to know we did not teach you correctly, you are old enough to begin correcting the situations for yourself and no longer have anyone to blame but yourself."

The lesson about the importance of the meaning of words at the time used came in the form of one of Dad's riddles: "What is a four-letter word that ends in 'k' that means intercourse?" And No. That is not it. Think *verbal* intercourse. T\*A\*L\*K

Mom, also taught me **how to learn** every time I asked her how to spell a word. She handed me a big dictionary and told me to look it up. But how am I supposed to look up a word I do not know How to spell? She says, "Sound it out. You will know it when you find it. When you get tired of looking it up, you will remember how to spell it correctly."

Some years later, a comrade taught me, "If we can agree to disagree on any topic, we can remain friends." And, "Don't get so bogged down in trying to understand the 'big picture' that you overlook all the little pictures that make the big picture what it is."

Why an idea comes to exist is irrelevant. What is most important is how one chooses to use those ideas. Excellent ideas often begin for the wrong reasons and usually are stopped for equally wrong reasons.

How are you using the tools you have been acquiring over the years? Information is as much a tool as any hammer, screwdriver, or light switch, but information is far more powerful and useful.

Just because a person has all the physical tools it takes to be an excellent plumber, electrician, or mechanic, it does not make the person skilled in the trade. Not even the knowledge of how to use those tools properly can make a person an accomplished craftsman.

The only way to become a competent master in any endeavor is through **the proper application** of the tools in the field the tools are designed for and by producing a progressively improved quality work with those tools each time they are used.

When I was investigating the likelihood of how easy it is to convince large numbers of people in any of the most modern times to believe as true, certain events that were not true the Orson Wells version of "War of the World" came to mind. Later, during this editing in 2023, recalling the "2000 end of the world" scare and others at [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_dates\\_predicted\\_for\\_apocalyptic\\_events](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_dates_predicted_for_apocalyptic_events).

From the internet this site at <http://www.transparencynow.com/welles.htm> on the War of the Worlds, Orson Welles, with the Invasion From Mars, states, "The ability to confuse audiences en masse may have first become obvious as a result of one of the most infamous mistakes in history. It happened the day before Halloween, on Oct. 30, 1938, when millions of Americans tuned in to a popular radio program that featured plays directed by, and often starring, Orson Welles. The performance that evening was an adaptation of the science fiction novel The War of the Worlds, about a Martian invasion

of the earth. But in adapting the book for a radio play, Welles made an important change: under his direction the play was written and performed so it would sound like a news broadcast about an invasion from Mars, a technique that, presumably, was intended to heighten the dramatic effect."

Well it worked quite well didn't it?

It continues with, "In a prescient column, in the New York Tribune, Dorothy Thompson foresaw that the broadcast revealed the way politicians could use the power of mass communications to create theatrical illusions, to manipulate the public.

"All unwittingly, Mr. Orson Welles and the Mercury Theater of the Air have made one of the most fascinating and important demonstrations of all time,' she wrote, 'They have proved that a few effective voices, accompanied by sound effects, can convince masses of people of a totally unreasonable, completely fantastic proposition as to create a nation-wide panic.

"They have demonstrated more potently than any argument, demonstrated beyond a question of a doubt, the appalling dangers and enormous effectiveness of popular and theatrical demagoguery...

"Hitler managed to scare all of Europe to its knees a month ago, but he at least had an army and an air force to back up his shrieking words.

"But Mr. Welles scared thousands into demoralization with nothing at all."

The site then talks about fake game shows, lip-syncing, and politics.

The words, "nothing at all" is misleading. There are a few

minor interesting points in the similarities common to the Orson Welles events and the times of the Jesus events:

1. With Orson Welles, "it was the day before Halloween" gives an indication as to what the expectations of the people are, and that those expectations are already heightened toward certain types of strange events that are likely to occur during the seasonal Halloween events. With Jesus, it was the expectations of a messiah, god, or king appearing in the form of a human who would at least appear to fulfill certain prophetic scriptures that were considered holy.

2. The book, in being adapted to radio to appear as though it was a live news broadcast included a number of sound effects to make it sound real. The scriptures talk of a messiah back at the time of Moses who would free the Hebrew people from their bondage to Egypt. Later the bondage was that of the Jews under Roman rule. John was setting the scene for Jesus, "preparing his way," which proved to be more that John was **preparing the people** of the land to accept his "chosen" person as the messiah, The interesting aspect is that John refused the title of divinity, where Jesus did not. If John had not refuse; people may be saying 'John Christ' and not Jesus.

The power of suggestion toward unusually susceptible minds in any give time will allow people to see and hear that which did not actually happen, and in like manner to not see or to not hear, that which did happen.

3. To say Orson Welles had nothing at all, where Hitler had his armies and an air force is also misleading. History has proved over and over again that words are one of the most powerful of weapons a person can use, and the more believable the props when presenting those words, the more impressive the results, and Jesus proved himself a master of the spoken word, as well as the use of props, along with ancient writings. Consider how many friends have become enemies after having been verbally insulted in public. How many wars have been initiated when a

political leader from one country has verbally offended the beliefs and practices of another country?

Words themselves are powerless. It is the meaning and power attributed to them by the listener that gives the words meanings that may not have been intended by the speaker. Thus, the "power" of words.

Look at all the eyewitnesses of the present day sightings of the person Santa Clause, sightings all around the world on roughly the same 24-hour day. What do you suppose the history will show a few thousand years from now about the existences of this Santa Clause? Will he also become a god?

It is also interesting when the article states, "The victims were also subjected to ridicule, a reaction that can commonly be found, today, when people are taken in by simulations." Although written decades ago, it still holds true today.

Throughout most religious writings, the authors indicate that the people are in expectations that the gods would appear in human in human form. But just how were these people to know exactly what human forms were truly gods, angels and the like, and which were impostors? How else, but by the preconceived notions as to how these gods were supposed to act and look, and by what miraculous activities they were supposed to be capable of performing that the local people could not do.

We think that the twenty-first century people are less gullible than they were some two thousand years ago (as of 2023). Then an incident of Orson Welles: less than one hundred years ago comes to mind. For additional reading

- <https://historycollection.com/12-historys-baffling-mass-hysteria-outbreaks/>
- <https://www.cnn.com/2022/01/20/world/doomsday-clock-2022-climate-scen/index.html>

- <https://abcnews.go.com/US/2023-doomsday-clock-announcement-expect/story?id=96495463>

Far too many people view this "Dooms Day Clock" as if it is accurate. Human history is filled with end of the world predictions. Christianity is another of those examples.

There also are end of the world mass hysteria that have large numbers of people selling all they have; later to realize, they still are alive and on Earth.

When the expectations of the people en mass have been heightened toward a specific event. People will either claim to have seen and heard events that did not actually happen; or in some instances, deny that they saw or heard events that did happen. This happens especially if they believe they may be ridiculed one way or the other for making such claims; or that harm may come to them if they do not make the claim (be it true or false).

Orson Welles did not even have the benefit of any sacred writings or prophecy to convince a nation that Martians were invading the earth.

# The Four Agreements

## **Be Impeccable With Your Word**

Speak with integrity. Say only what you mean. Avoid using the word to speak against yourself or to gossip about others. Use the power of your word in the direction of truth and love.

## **Don't Take Anything Personally**

Nothing others do is because of you. What others say and do is a projection of their own reality, their own dream. When you are immune to the opinions and actions of others, you won't be the victim of needless suffering.

## **Don't Make Assumptions**

Find the courage to ask questions and to express what you really want. Communicate with others as clearly as you can to avoid misunderstandings, sadness, and drama. With just this one agreement, you can completely transform your life.

## **Always Do Your Best**

Your best is going to change from moment to moment; it will be different when you are healthy as opposed to sick. Under any circumstances, simply do your best, and you will avoid self-judgment, self-abuse, and regret.

(Author Unknown)



# Epilogue

When your life is not going the way you would like and you are not getting the results you desire, do something different. But keep this in mind; anything you do that involves anybody or anything else, you cannot be in complete control of the outcome and almost certainly you will have to make a number of alterations to your plans as you proceed; or give up.

Oh... Everything we do involves something (air, water, soil) or someone else.

This book is merely a guide, that is designed to take you up or down any path you wish, as well as how to get off of an undesirable path and on to any other path you may find more interesting.

The results of our choices produce other causes and effects. Choose wisely (either deliberately or by accident) and live. Choose foolishly (either deliberately or by accident) and reduce the number of your days.

This book should merely be considered a tool, and like all tools, hopefully beneficial. The hands and mind that use it will decide how it is applied.

# Bibliography

G. & C. Merriam Co. Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary, G. & C. Merriam Co. © 1971

William Galverly and Frank Marlow. Welding Essentials Questions and Answers, Industrial Press Inc. © 2001

King James Version, The Holy Bible, The World Publishing Company.

Watch Tower Bible & Tract Society of Pennsylvania, Mankind's Search for God, Watchtower Bible & Tract Society of New York, Inc. © 1990.

Norman L. Geisler and Ronald M. Brooks, When Skeptics Ask, Baker Books © 1990 by Norman L. Geisler and Ronald M Rhodes.

"Spikenard"

[http://www.hikoshin.org/Incense/MED\\_HERBS/spikenard1.HTM](http://www.hikoshin.org/Incense/MED_HERBS/spikenard1.HTM)  
©Hikoshin Ryu 2002

"Orchid"

[http://www.unep.org/bpsp/bioplan\\_archive/BIOPLANS-MAR-2002/BIOPLAN\\_POSTING-2002-3-12.htm](http://www.unep.org/bpsp/bioplan_archive/BIOPLANS-MAR-2002/BIOPLAN_POSTING-2002-3-12.htm)

"Frankincense" <http://tryoils.com/drsblakethepetwhisperer/> Dr. Gary Young

The Strongest Strong's, 21st century edition, published by Zondervan, Grand Rapids, Michigan; Copyright 2001 by Zondervan

"Human Male Sperm Count"

<http://www.alkalizeforhealth.net/Lspermdamage2.htm> British Medical Journal.

"Human Female Egg Count"

<http://www.emc.maricopa.edu/faculty/farabee/BIOBK/BioBookREPROD.html>

"What controls your Future" The Watchtower January 15, 2005

Scott Reed, The Miracle of Psycho-Command Power © 1972  
by Parker Publishing Co., Inc.

"War of the Worlds," <http://www.transparencynow.com/welles.htm> War of the Worlds, Orson Welles, and the Invasion From Mars.

[www.freerepublic.com](http://www.freerepublic.com)

[www.religiousstudies.uncc](http://www.religiousstudies.uncc)

[www.pbs.org](http://www.pbs.org)