

Message: Faith & Science - Part 1

This message is not for people who believe that God exists. Most people on the earth believe that some God exists, for that is a reasonable deduction, as we shall see.

For the people who do believe God exists, the important question is what is he/she/it is like and what does he/she/it want of humans? Why does it matter if you understand what God is like and what God wants? Because if you believe it matters to God how you live your life, or that you will be held accountable for how you lived your life; or your existence after physical death is dependent upon how you live your life or what you did with God, then it makes a big difference.

I would argue that to know the God you say you have faith in is crucial to both the quality of your life in this life, as well as to the destiny of your soul and to the quality of existence of that destiny.

Perhaps the main purpose of my work is to help people come to know and understand what the God revealed by the one who called himself the Light of the world is like, based on this saying of the Light:

“This is eternal life, that they may know You, the only true God, and Joshua of Nazareth whom You have sent.”

So, the main purpose of my work is to repeat the teachings of the Light and to help people come to and understand the Light and the Father he points to - For those who come to properly know the Light and his Father will enter into a state of eternal life as he says. Why do I believe him? Because he defeated physical death to prove all he said and did was true.

So, to the heart of this message – Faith & Science, Part 1. There are two kinds of people who can potentially receive those truths regarding eternal life:

1. Those who already claim to have faith but merely have religious beliefs;
2. Those who reject faith in any “God” type being or concept.

Who are those who claim to have faith but merely have religious beliefs? [Explain...]

This message is intended for the latter – for those who have believed the educational system and the western scientific culture who tries very hard to get people to believe that no God exists. The teachers in the classrooms and the professors in the universities don't need to say, "no god exists", although an increasing number boldly make that claim. The more popular method to communicate that God does not exist – or more subtly that if he does exist, his existence is irrelevant to me - is to just provide naturalist explanations for everything in the human experience and ignore any or all god concepts.

Let's understand a bit more about a particular group of people, or type of person, who seeks to prove that god does not exist. Many or perhaps most people who label themselves as scientists are also physicalists. What is a scientist? A fair definition might be a person who relies on observation of the physical realm in order to draw conclusions on how that physical realm works. Not all scientists reject that a metaphysical realm does or might exist. Those that do are physicalists – that is those who believe that all things encountered in the human experience can be best explained by physical means only, meaning no metaphysical or spiritual explanations provide a better explanation for the reality they observe in their work or experience in their life.

Let's take a look at the soundness of the physicalist's belief as just stated.

Physicalist Belief 1 – A proper deduction from living and observing the human experience is that Human beings do not have a metaphysical component.

Physicalists contend that everything about the human experience and human nature can be explained by physics – atoms, molecules, proteins and energy. The primary question to this belief is – is this view reasonable?

The counter belief is that physical things cannot reasonably account for some aspects of human nature or the human experience.

Let us ask a few questions and explore the reasonableness of the physicalist belief. Let us use an illustration as the center of our exploration. Most people are now familiar with a computer. There are two basic things that a computer needs to work. First is the hardware, and the second is the software. Without the software, the hardware is essentially or metaphorically 'dead' – it cannot

fulfill its intended purpose – it cannot operate. The hardware is made up of the components that are made out of matter or material things. The software consists of commands created by sentient beings and stored in a physical media and enabled by energy, namely electricity. The software is ‘invisible’ to the human eye whereas the hardware is what the human senses can experience. This illustration or analogy – while imperfect – does a good job at conveying the main unreasonableness of the physicist view.

In like manner, the human body in and of itself – just the chemicals (proteins, etc.) that make it up - the hardware, so to speak – cannot account for certain aspects or characteristics of a human being.

At the most fundamental level, can atoms, molecules, proteins and finally cells account for your personality – for who you are? Not only a particular aspect of your personality, but having a personality to begin with. Ask the physicist to explain how molecules and complex protein strings account for your having a personality? In like manner, can a computer’s hardware alone account for the content you see projected on it’s screen? The reasonable answer is no.

The contention that physical matter can account for non-physical realities - like thought, an aspect of your personality - is as reasonable as believing that a computer made up of only it’s hardware, would be able to function without the operating system or software.

Can atoms, molecules, proteins and finally cells (the equivalent of a computer’s hardware) account for your ability to reason (the equivalent of software)?

Can atoms, molecules, proteins and finally cells account for your ability to love –not selfish sexual junk, but to behave in a selfless manner with compassion for the other person, which behavior can often work against your survival or material success in the world? If so, how? Not **why** people choose to love, or how ‘love’ might be explained as somehow beneficial to ‘survival, but how the material building blocks of your body cause humans to be able to love? What exactly is the physical property of ‘love’ and how does it’s physical characteristics work to cause a human to behave in a way consistent with its physical characteristics? This is the physicalist’s contention, that everything in the human experience has a material cause. Is that reasonable?

Can atoms, molecules, proteins and finally cells account for your sentience – meaning your ability to be self-aware of your own existence and to be able to comprehend your being and your place in the life of the planet? If so, how? Again, not the why as to human’s desire to exercise those

abilities and thoughts, or why they might have them, but HOW does the physical accounts for the existence of the sentience? How do the bricks and mortar (cells and proteins) cause the building to be self-aware and have thoughts? Please, physicalist, explain how?

Can atoms, molecules, proteins and finally cells account for the fact that humans have the ability to make judgments as to what is right and wrong regarding human behavior? Can the physical building blocks of your body account for the fact that you have a conscience that is affected – through emotions - by the metaphysical concepts of right and wrong, good and bad? Again, do not make the mistake of answering the question from the why perspective and speculating why human's might have those abilities or how human's might be helped by having those abilities. Rather, answer the question HOW humans have those abilities given the belief that humans are merely a bunch of well-organized atoms - electrons and protons and neutrons. How exactly can a human know what is right versus what is wrong? How exactly do the physical body components cause such ability?

Is it reasonable to suggest that a computer can perform operations without the software, which software was created by sentient minds? In a like manner, is it appropriate to believe that chemicals, proteins, cells and energy can account for human's ability to reason or to know right from wrong or to love?

The answers are obvious to those who try and be governed by truth – including deductive reasoning - without undo bias. The simple truth is that physics and matter and energy do NOT provide a complete picture of human nature, nor do they provide a reasonable explanation for the human experience. Nor will they ever, dear listener, for the simple truth that matter itself has no mind or soul, nor will it ever. Nor does energy have sentience.

The brightest scientists alive cannot provide you with reasonable explanations of how physical matter can account for the things just mentioned. And the reason is not because they are not yet intelligent enough – that they have not evolved far enough. No, and rather, it is because observation of the physical realm using reason can never make the jump from physics and the physical realm to the realm of human sentience and consciousness, reason and love, conscience and a moral knowing. They are two different realms, the physical and the non-physical, or metaphysical or spiritual. They are as far apart as a computer's hardware components, and it's software, which software required intelligence to create and program the operating system.

Unfortunately, the physicalist is biased against the metaphysical realm – they have committed themselves to a belief –physicalism – and they attempt to make everything fit into that belief.

As another example of the unbridgeable gap between the physical and the metaphysical, if a team of the brightest nobel prize winning brain surgeons had all their technology aimed at your brain on the surgery table, could they ever be able to know that you were thinking about your new dog fido? No, they could not, because our thoughts are metaphysical, and they cannot be known through material technology. Technology and physics cannot explain human thought adequately, any more than technologists who denied software existed could explain how a computer performed operations. The scientists who deny a metaphysical element to the human person are as blind as the technologist who denies a computer's operating system is part of what makes the machine operate.

If a physical model cannot account for certain aspects of human nature, then it is only reasonable to conclude that the physical model is inadequate to explain those aspects of human nature, and an alternative or better explanation ought to be sought out and accepted. Those who accept that a metaphysical realm exists have no problem accepting a better model than physicalism posits, for the 'metaphysical realm exists' model can account for the metaphysical concepts touched on in this message.

What can we conclude based on what we have briefly examined in this message? A reasonable and plausible conclusion is that matter and energy do not provide an adequate explanation of the human being. Matter and energy cannot reasonably account for sentience, a moral conscience, the ability to reason using metaphysical concepts like logic, or perhaps most importantly love. The best observation of reality and the best use of deduction based upon the analysis of human beings leads one to conclude that humans do indeed have a metaphysical component. Just because physicalists cannot sense the metaphysical realm does not mean it does not exist, nor does it mean it does not provide the most reasonable and plausible explanation for human nature and the human experience.

For those listening who have been moved away from the physicalist belief based upon this message or other evidence they have experienced or looked into recently – I congratulate you! The physicalist view is a sad and empty belief that seeks to reduce the beautiful metaphysical aspects of the human experience to random physics. Those who seek to hold to this belief are truly checking

their minds in at the door as they use metaphysical realities – reasoned thought for example – to support their contention that a metaphysical reality doesn't exist!

Knowing or acknowledging a metaphysical reality exists is very different from believing that there is a creator or governor or designer of that metaphysical realm. I would encourage the listener to explore that distinct possibility. Our next message will look at why it is reasonable to conclude that complex systems with interdependent parts or subsystems require a designer.

Please, dear listener, understand that your physical life will end – it is called death. However, unlike a computer, your soul will continue to exist and does have a destiny beyond the physical realm. When a computer's hardware ceases to function, the software resides in the storage medium and is no longer able to operate – it has no way to express itself, so to speak. Not so with your soul. Look at your soul as water and your body as a sponge. When your body dies, the water is set free, and so it is with your soul. Please consider believing the one who said:

“I am the resurrection and the life; he who believes in me will live even if he dies, and everyone who lives and believes in me will never die.”

This is the surest hope I am aware of, and it is beautiful and real. The Light gives hope to men. Why don't you place your trust and hope in the one who said that.

Till next time...may we be the light this world so desperately needs.