

QUANTUM-SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY CANNOT MATURE WITHOUT COMPASSIONATE LOVE

Sid Galloway BS, M.DIV. - SidGalloway.com - * Revision SEPTEMBER 6, 2024 *

Chapter 1 - SCIENCE IS WONDERFUL, YET LIMITED

Much of science is more *subjective* than most people realize and often involves *trust* in unseen, unproven, unfalsifiable *causes* for phenomena we observe in the *physical* cosmos. Science is *self-limiting* due to an overly *quantitative* focus on the *material*, while neglecting *non-material* realities like the *qualia* of the mind, especially empathetic *compassionate* love. Fully investigating this dimension of life requires knowledge (Latin = *scientia*) from epistemological sources outside of *science*.

“This has important **implications** for actions such as **empathy**. ... described as an **action rather than merely a feeling** alone”

Curt Thompson MD, Christian Psychiatrist Neurologist. *ANATOMY OF THE SOUL: Surprising Connections Between Neuroscience and Spiritual Practices that can Transform Your Life and Relationships*

“**Consciousness cannot** be accounted for in **physical** terms. For **consciousness** is absolutely **fundamental**.” **[bold added]**

Theoretical physicist Erwin Schrodinger PhD,
WHAT IS LIFE: With Mind and Matter?

Chapter 2 - LOVE MUST GUIDE SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY

Strong mature love (*humble, self-sacrificing, compassionate*) is the universally accepted highest human virtue and value. *Agape* is the ancient Greek term for this kind of strong love. It’s the elegantly simple Way, the profound principle, that can and must *unify* and *mature* all fields of knowledge towards a “Theory of Everything” (TOE). And, it’s the *compass* needed to *guide* technology so it *serves* the genuine *needs* of *all* people, and *sentient* animals (not just the selfish *desires* of a few people in power).

“**Now** I know in part; **then** I shall **know fully**, even as I have been fully known. So **now** faith, hope, and **love** maintain, these three; but the **greatest** of these is **love**.” **[bold added]**

1 Corinthians 13:12-13

Chapter 3 - LOGOS IS THE SOURCE OF AGAPE-LOVE

The *ultimate* source is *not* our *self*-righteous egos. Ancient Greek philosophers used the term “Logos” for the ultimate transcendent, logical consciousness that generates the logically ordered and digitally encoded Cosmos. All fields of knowledge and discovery, from physical quantum cosmology to *non*-physical psychology to metaphysical teleology to philosophical theology and intuitive spirituality, are converging toward the same logical, evidence-based conclusion. That the Source of the Cosmos is a *personal* Mind-behind the Universe, Who exists as pure compassionate agape-love.

- A - **COSMOLOGY** (Mind Beneath Quantum)
- B - **AGAPE** (Love Beyond the Natural)
- C - **THEODICY** (Good God yet Suffering World)
- D - **TELEOLOGY** (Metamorphosis not Technology)

“The **atoms** or elementary particles themselves are **not real**; they form a world of **potentialities** or **possibilities** rather than one of things or facts.”
[bold added]

Theoretical physicist, Werner Heisenberg Phd

“Logic is not a theory but a **reflexion** of the **world**. Logic is **transcendental**.” **[bold added]**

Renowned Philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein. Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus. (p. 82).

Chapter 4 - LIVING LOVE TOGETHER FOR EVERYONE

How’s your love-life? No, not your sex life. How well is compassionate love flowing through your life into the lives of others and also flowing back to you? If not so great, how come? Are there simple, practical ways to enhance the flow of strong *mature* love in your life and relationships? We’re all in need of guidance toward the goal of mature agape-love.

- A - Is the World Spinning *Out* of Control?
- B - Imagine if We Lived Agape Love *Perfectly*?
- C - Why is it so Hard to Live It *Consistently*?
- D - How Can We *Grow* in the Way of Agape?

Hopefully, others with *better* minds than mine will expand on these ideas toward a deeper knowledge of reality. Especially toward *cooperative* understanding to make this world a better place for *everyone*.

INTRODUCTION

OUR QUEST FOR ANSWERS TO THE BIG QUESTIONS

“Perhaps the three-dimensional **world** we experience is **just a shadow** of the **real world**,” **[bold added]**

Michio Kaku PhD. (Agnostic), Co-Creator String Theory. Prof. of theoretical physics at City College NY. *THE GOD EQUATION: THE QUEST FOR A THEORY OF EVERYTHING*. (p. 158).

- Where did we come from?
- Why are we here? What's *real*?
- Why is there so much suffering?
- Is *pure* unselfish love even possible?
- Where is everything heading?
- What happens after we die?

MY STORY - JUST A STRUGGLING KID, SAVED BY ANIMALS

Everybody is a story - past, present, and future. In fact, all of history is a story, that includes each individual person, the entire universe, and whatever might be beyond the Cosmos

“Many people perceive the struggle to understand our Universe as a battle between science and God. But this is a false dichotomy.”

Marcello Gleiser PhD. (Agnostic) Professor of Theoretical Physics and Astronomy at Dartmouth College *Science vs. God: Understanding reality is not a battle between reason and faith*. <https://bigthink.com/13-8/science-god-false-choice/>

“Physical **matter** is **music** solidified” **[bold added]**

Pythagoras

“the **universe** is a **symphony** of strings, and the '**Mind of God**' is cosmic **music** resonating in 11-dimensional hyperspace”

Michio Kaku PhD. (Agnostic) <https://physicscommunication.ie/the-cosmic-symphony-a-brief-exploration-of-string-theory/>

As a young boy, with my dog Missy laying next to me, I'd often awake in the middle of the night, silently, *anxiously* wondering, worrying about life, love, and reality. Missy, however, laid there *peacefully* oblivious to any concerns at all - gazing at me with eyes of unconditional love. I couldn't stop thinking about all the *suffering* endured by so many people and animals across the world, and *why* so many people didn't seem to care. I didn't see it, not even among Christians, who *talked* a lot about love. I wondered whether caring and love were actually real, or just a selfish *survival of the fittest* mechanism of evolution.

"I can't speak for **other religious traditions, but** the further **Christianity** has **strayed** from its roots in **Jesus** of Nazareth—his **teachings**, his **example**, and the reality of his risen life—the more we have **betrayed the one** we claim to follow." **[bold added]**

Michael Curry, the first "black" head of the Episcopal Church in America. *LOVE IS THE WAY: Holding on to Hope in Troubling Times*. (p. 229).

I'm definitely not talking about the confused uses of the term *love* in English, such as "I love cookies", "I love hiking". All these are really just forms of *like*, and merely mean I *want* to get *from* things and others to benefit *me*, to pleasure *self*. No, I'm referring to the kind of love that everyone at least *talks* about as the highest virtue - a love that *chooses* to give *to others* for their benefit.

"We tend to think love is a **feeling, but it is not. Love is an action**; love is something we **do for others**." **[bold added]**

Desmond Tutu, black South African, Anglican theologian and activist.

My boyhood and youthful struggle centered around the *inconsistent* way people *lived* love, and that it might mean everyone was just superficially *pretending*? All of this led up to me wrestling with a bit of childhood depression, which I often expressed through angry rebellion.

However it was my animal friends, my dogs and the orphaned wildlife I rescued on my hikes, that kept me going - and *hoping*. As someone once said, "Animals are better people than most of the humans I've known". This true yet sad fact is probably why I *initially* pursued a career in animal psychology (ethology). My first job out of college was at the Audubon Zoological Institute as a care-giver for

the elephants, lions, tigers, bears, leopards, hyenas, and wolves. They were not just animals to me. They were my friends, my daily companions. They were Panya, Jean, Banu, Byomi, Mandy, Bala, Pandita, Akela, Rakshi and others. Much later when I became an individual, marriage, and family counselor, once again, my dogs often helped counselees through animal-assisted therapy.

“Animal therapy is making strides in the treatment of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (**PTSD**). For years, animals have been used with great benefit in the treatment of the aged and the terminally ill. **Now** Animal Assisted Therapy is **benefitting sufferers of PTSD**. The results of Animal Assisted Therapy in the treatment of PTSD patients have seen **significant results**. In one **study of the effect** of dogs with patients, **psychologists** noted an **82% reduction in symptoms**. One particular case noted that interacting with the dog for **as little as one week**, enabled a patient to **decrease** the amount of **anxiety and sleep medications by half.**” *[bold added]*

<https://www.actascientific.com/ASNE/pdf/ASNE-02-0026.pdf> ßß

Back to My Teen Years....

As I struggled with the lack of genuine consistent compassionate love among so many people, my mind would turn toward the *universe*, wondering: “Is there *anything* at all that I can *trust* as truly real?”. I couldn’t shake off the possibility that a greater reality was hidden from our limited perception. Could something or Someone (maybe a super Mind) exist *beyond* the Universe, the Cosmos, as the famous atheist Dr. Carl Sagan loved to call it on his popular science TV show.

My teenage search led to books on theoretical physics like, *THE TAO OF PHYSICS: An Exploration of the Parallels Between Modern Physics and Eastern Mysticism*, by Dr. Fritjof Capra (PhD from the Univ. of Vienna). That book and many others fueled the fire of my desire to find answers to the big questions. It led to me becoming a scientific-Buddhist for many years (teens into my 20’s). Dr. Capra’s personal life journey resonated with and therefore influenced my own back then.

“I had gone through a long training in **theoretical physics** and had done several years of research. At the **same time**, I had become very interested in **Eastern** mysticism and had begun to see the **parallels** to modern physics. *[bold added]*

Capra, Fritjof. *THE TAO OF PHYSICS: An Exploration of the Parallels Between Modern Physics and Eastern Mysticism*, by Dr. Fritjof Capra (PhD from the Univ. of Vienna) (p. 11).

Even though my worldview as a youth and young adult matched Dr. Capra's views on science and spirituality, my later ongoing journey mirrored in many ways that of Dr. John Polkinghorne. However, my intellect definitely did *not* mirror or match either one of those theoretical physicists, not by a long shot. Like Dr. Polkinghorne explains, I too went through a later phase of myopic conservative religion. But as I grew and matured, my perspective "became more independent" and so "I moved away from that".

"When I was an **undergraduate at Cambridge**, studying mathematics, was much **influenced** for a while by the **Christian Union group** there, who are rather **conservative, evangelical** people, and I **learned some important things** from them, about treating scripture seriously and making a commitment to Christ. **But** there was also a **certain narrowness to their point of view**, both **intellectually and culturally**. As I **grew a bit older and a bit more independent** perhaps, I **moved away from that.**"
[bold added]

Theoretical physicist John Polkinghorne, interviewed by acclaimed science writer Kitty Ferguson. August 1997 <https://www.kitty-ferguson.com/articles1/Polkinghorne1.pdf>

Now, I'm just a *simple* follower of the "Way" of compassionate love taught by Jesus. No, not the grossly *un-Christ-like* politicized, commercialized, organization that most folks think of as Christianity. I'll explain more about that later in the book. By the *way*, pun intended, the first followers of Jesus's teachings and life about love simply called themselves "people of the Way. They did not call themselves Christians. That was a negative derogatory term made up by the Roman rulers who demeaned and persecuted them. Also, remember that the term "Christ" is not a name but a description like the terms "Messiah", "Buddha" or "Bodhisattva". Each of those terms convey the meaning of unique, anointed, or enlightened.

So, my hope and my efforts *now* are merely to help other people and maybe the collective culture increasingly *mature* toward greater humble, unselfish, compassionate love — the highest human value and virtue. For that to happen, we each must bear our *responsibility* to do all we can *individually* and *cooperatively* to change ourselves and then civilization toward that goal.

"What, therefore, should our **attitude** be towards **others who do not agree** with us, whatever view

we hold? Surely the old adage has got it more or less right: ‘**In essentials, unity; in nonessentials, liberty; and in all things, charity.**’ (p. 156).

[bold added]

[charity was the old English term for agape-love]

John Lennox Ph.D., DPhil., DSc. (*speaks five languages English, Russian, French, German, Spanish*). Oxford Prof. Math, Philosophy, Science., *Seven Days that Divide the World*.

I’m convinced, by the evidence, that this requires looking beyond mere “physical” *matter* to the greater non-physical dimension of *mind* and the ultimate *meaning* of all.

“I regard **consciousness as fundamental**. I regard **matter as derivative from consciousness**. We cannot get behind consciousness. Everything that we talk about, **everything we regard as existing, postulates consciousness.**” **[bold added]**

Theoretical physicist Max Planck, speaking to a reporter from the Observer in 1931. <https://bigthink.com/words-of-wisdom/max-planck-i-regard-consciousness-as-fundamental/#:~:text=“I regard consciousness as fundamental.,as existing, postulates consciousness.”>

Keep in mind as this book unfolds, the *information* laws of mathematics and science that precede “matter” do not *generate* the physical cosmos. They merely *mediate* it into our experience. Likewise, the *quantum* realm does not *generate* “life” from non-living matter. The quantum realm merely *mediates* life from matter. Similarly, the *brain* does not *generate* consciousness, it merely *mediates* the mind’s expression into the material world. And above all, the *mind* cannot *generate* pure “love”, it’s merely a mediating conduit to the ultimate Source of love

WHAT IN THE WORLD IS GOING ON?

Amazing advancements in knowledge and technology have occurred over the past seven decades of my old life. And now with the advent of supercomputers with artificial intelligence (AI), the advancements are increasing faster than ever before. Many leading scientists predict *quantum* computers will be created soon. If and when that happens, the increases in knowledge and technology will become exponential. Michio Kaku, *agnostic* co-founder of String Theory and professor of theoretical physics at City College NY has written a new book

proclaiming the phenomenal *transformation* of human civilization that could happen through a *quantum* “leap” in computing.

“...the **quantum computer**, which harnesses the **power** and complexity of the **atomic realm**, already **promises** to be every bit as revolutionary as the transistor and microchip once were. Its unprecedented gains in computing power **herald advancements** that **could change every aspect** of our daily **lives.**” *[bold added]*

Kaku, Michio PhD. (Agnostic), Co-Creator of String Theory. Prof. of theoretical physics at City College NY. <https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/697040/quantum-supremacy-by-michio-kaku/>

Past advancements have produced *positive* benefits in many fields: life saving medicines, nuclear energy, etc.. Yes, most peoples’ lives have improved from generation to generation. Yet, along side the good, many *dangerous* “negatives” (*both intentional and unintentional*) have also arisen.

For example, chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons which if unleashed could erase all life on earth. Sadly, much of the good knowledge and technology that’s been produced has been *selfishly* misused and abused for the benefit of those in positions of power, privilege, and profit at the expense (the *suffering*) of others (both humans and animals). Instead of being *mature*, peaceful, Serving-Protectors, we humans in so many ways have been *immature* violent *Selfish-Predators* (*Survival of the Fittest*), serving ourselves and only *selectively* serving a few others.

Examples are too numerous to catalogue, like toxic pollution, industrialized human factories where oppressed and enslaved people (*often children*) make some of the clothes sold in our stores. Also, the *industrialized* factory “farms” (animal factories) where *sentient* animals live in emotional *fear* and physical *misery* until they meet a very inhumane, often terrifyingly *cruel* death.

Why do we humans so often do these kinds of things? Individually we all do it. When we buy products produced by the suffering of others, we are indirectly supporting it with our personal life styles. And at times throughout history, we collectively, as cultures and subcultures, have tolerated, supported, or even participated in much worse. Over time, attitudes, actions, and patterns become the norms, and become ingrained, programmed into our brains, psyches, and societies.

Psychiatrist, Dr. Curt Thompson MD, refers to this process as “interpersonal neurobiology”. It can be good or bad depending on what shapes it.

“... **interpersonal neurobiology**. This term expresses the **reality that the mind** is ultimately a **dynamic**, mysterious confluence of the **brain and experience**, with many aspects of it deeply connected (or potentially so) in ways that often go unnoticed. The **interactions** within **interpersonal relationships** deeply **shape** and influence the development of the **brain**; likewise, the **brain** and its development **shape** and influence those **very same relationships**.” p. 6. **[bold added]**

Curt Thompson MD, Christian Psychiatrist Neurologist,
ANATOMY OF THE SOUL: Surprising Connections Between Neuroscience and Spiritual Practices that can Transform Your Life and Relationships.

Cooperative Survival of the Compassionate

Dr. Thompson also points out that in order for us to begin *overcoming* the human tendency toward individual selfish competitive survival of the fittest - and instead *live* the “way of love” (*cooperative survival of the compassionate*) — we must *each* choose to “pay attention” to what’s happening in our own mind. In other words to self-examine and reflect on why we think, feel, and do.

“**Thinking** of ourselves **as individuals** is common in the West, but such thinking is much more **limited** to a left-hemisphere way of the mind rather than a more integrated way. **To live in the way of love requires** that **I pay attention** to the fact that **my mind**, through the process of emotion, **longs to be connected to others**.” **[bold added]** p. 99.

Even in such situations **the vision of obtaining** God’s political agenda of **justice and mercy** can be **realized**.

In these macro settings, **paying attention to the mind** leads us ultimately to the **way of love that is shared**, not only between **individuals**, but between **groups torn asunder** as well. **[bold added]** p. 254.

Curt Thompson MD, Christian Psychiatrist Neurologist. *ANATOMY OF THE SOUL: Surprising Connections Between Neuroscience and Spiritual Practices that can Transform Your Life and Relationships*

We must consciously *be aware* of (and at times *beware* of) the power of our desire to be connected, to fit in together with others. Because it can lead toward

a healing community of humble compassionate love, or toward the kind of mass mob collective we saw in Hitler's Nazi culture.

Not even *atheistic* scientists are immune from the human tendency toward *irrational* "group-think". Sociologist Dr. Lois Lee, who is herself an atheist, has demonstrated this through her sociological studies. She is the Principal Investigator on the Understanding Unbelief program in the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Kent. This program is a pivotal research effort examining atheism, agnosticism and other forms of unbelief around world.

"The **problem** that any rational thinker needs to tackle, though, is that the science increasingly shows that **atheists are no more rational than theists**. Indeed, **atheists are just as susceptible** as the next person to **"group-think"** and other **non-rational** forms of cognition." **[bold added]**

Lois Lee PhD, Sociologist. WHY ATHEIST ARE NOT AS RATIONAL AS SOME MIGHT LIKE TO THINK.

<https://phys.org/news/2018-09-atheists-rational.html>

"If **reason** is the tool we use in **science**, it is **not** its **motivation**. **[bold added]** (p. 279).

Marcello Gleiser PhD. (Agnostic) Professor of Theoretical Physics and Astronomy at Dartmouth College and was the 2019 recipient of the Templeton Prize. *THE ISLAND OF KNOWLEDGE: The Limits of Science and the Search for Meaning*.

Worse, to me, is that so many Christians, who claim to follow the teachings and life of Christ, reflect the group-think of the culture, not the love lived and taught by Jesus. We've failed to self-examine. So, like the socially contagious yawning effect that spreads to others, we've become conformed to the prideful, self-righteous, self-serving "survival of the fittest" way of the world. In contrast, true Christianity is the progressive process of becoming increasingly transformed into the humble, other-serving, enemy-forgiving image and character lived and taught by Jesus of Nazareth.

In order to become the reflection of humble compassionate love that each of us and the world needs, we must, as Dr. Thompson said, envision the agenda of living "justice and mercy". And we must consciously, continually maintain the

“paying attention” to our mind’s attitudes, motives, and decisions. That is what can lead to “the way of love that is shared, not only between individuals, but between groups torn asunder as well”.

For those of you who are Christians, Dr. George Ellis, theoretical physicist, cosmologist, and himself a Christian, describes the self-examining mindset of a truly Christ-like group characterized by a humble, loving, other-serving, enemy-forgiving character.

This view rejects the religious **traditions** and **churches** that are **militaristic**, monarchical, or tyrannical, and **accepts** at least provisionally **those that are genuinely loving, freedom-based**, and with a strong element of **self-sacrifice** as an essential ingredient.

This group includes, but is not restricted to, a major strand of the Christian tradition; it probably occurs as a strand in almost all religious traditions. **This view is compatible** with those religious strands capable of seeing the **search for truth in other religions**, and **rejects** those that **dogmatically** claim a sole access to truth (representing the **idolatry of infallibility**, as against the **kenotic virtue of giving up certainty**).

[bold added]

George Ellis PhD. (Christian) Theoretical physicist. *The Work of Love: Creation as Kenosis* (Kindle Locations 1384-1387)

Michael Curry, the first black head of the Episcopal Church in America, points to this same *humble*, compassionate, self-confronting, teachable attitude that each of us, America, the World, and yes, especially the politicized “Christian” church, so desperately needs to embrace and practice.

“**Love makes it possible to disagree** on bedrock convictions and **yet stay in a relationship**. There is a valid concern that doing so forces you to **compromise** on principles. But sometimes you have to run the risk because of a **greater danger**: chaos and **social self-destruction**. I think we have to run that risk, **especially in the church**. We have to know that **love can survive** meaningful disagreements. The **union** can endure, and must endure. Likewise, in our nation, **if we can’t** make room for people with

differing viewpoints, we aren't living in a democracy anymore. **We're in a dictatorship.** *[bold added]*

Michael Curry, the first "black" head of the Episcopal Church in America. *LOVE IS THE WAY: Holding on to Hope in Troubling Times.* (p. 200).

Chapter 1 - **"SCIENCE" IS WONDERFUL, YET SELF-LIMITING**

BALANCE IS HARD, WHEN *PULLED FROM ALL SIDES*

As the many decades have progressed, my own ideas and views have changed significantly. A number of those views have changed so significantly, I'm *grieved* that some of my "old" articles are still floating around on the internet. Especially my *past* short-sighted, ultra-conservative view that only *my* group had *complete* and *certain* answers about when and how the universe came to be, etc. So,

please if you run across any *old* writings, audios, or videos, don't assume that I still believe *all* that's in them. Some of those old beliefs and writings were absorbed by the socially *contagious* "yawning effect" (psychosocial osmosis).

Back then, I should have seen it coming, but sadly the conditioning effect of sub-cultural consensus (group-think) often has a subtle, *negative* effect on our perception of the world. The good news is that personal *growth* and *change* is the *positive* process that leads toward increasing human *maturity*. Similar to Dr. Michael Guillen (*Triple PhD physics Harvard, math, astronomy/cosmology*) my heart was humbled by convicting evidence. So, my eyes were opened to a larger reality than I had imagined.

As a pious scientific monk—a liberated, free-thinking **Atheist**—I lived by the trusty adage that **seeing is believing**. I **refused to believe** in anything I **couldn't** actually **see** and that couldn't be **proved**. But that worldview was now out the window because **science** had **discovered** that what we are **able to "see"**—what we're able to prove the existence of—is only a small **fraction of what's out there**. *[bold added]* (p. 9).

Michael Guillen (Christian) (Harvard Triple PhD physics, math, astronomy). *Believing Is Seeing: A Physicist Explains How Science Shattered His Atheism and Revealed the Necessity of Faith*.

THE "AGE" OF EARTH & THE COSMOS DOES NOT IMPACT THE *TRUTH* OF LOVE

"**God loves an enquiring mind**, a fact that has been a great encouragement to me in my study of mathematics and the history and **philosophy of science** – and everything else. We can surely also agree that the Bible is **not written** in contemporary **scientific language**. This circumstance should not cause us any surprise or difficulty, but rather **gratitude and relief**. (p. 26)

[bold added]

John Lennox Ph.D., DPhil., DSc. (*speaks five languages English, Russian, French, German, Spanish*). Oxford Prof. Math, Philosophy,

Science. *SEVEN DAY THAT DIVIDE THE WORLD*, 10th Anniversary Edition.

In many spheres of Christianity, *non-essential* issues like, how old the Earth and the Universe might be, have become heated and sadly unloving motivations for division. Though most admit these are *non-essential* issues, they speak and act as if they are the *necessary* foundation of Christianity. Back in my past, I did it too. But, they are, and I was, wrong. Compassionate *agape-love* is the only foundation, the way, and the goal of true Christianity.

So, to my old friends and former students, I'm now convinced that the *truth* regarding the kind of compassionate love Jesus taught is *not* impacted by *any* particular view of the Universe's or Earth's *age*.

Over the past decade, I've come to see evidence both scientifically and biblically that there are other *valid* models of the cosmic timeline. The main take away is that Jesus's message of compassionate *love* by *humble* dependence on love's Source (instead of *self-righteousness*) is *not* contradicted by any of the various cosmological or geological theories.

Therefore, I also do *not* think it is *necessary*, nor even *important*, for Christians to try to demonstrate how Einstein's time dilation might confirm a particular *young* earth/cosmos theory. For those of you unfamiliar with this view, it postulates that the different *relativistic* time observational frames of reference (earth vs. distant space), along with the expansion of the universe (*with its changes in mass/gravity concentration & velocity*), might support a *relatively* (pun intended) recent cosmic age as perceived from an *earth* reference point.

That interpretation *might* shed some *light* on the time discrepancy between Genesis vs. consensus science (*a Cosmos that is 13.7 billion years old*), but it might *not*. A wooden *literal* view is *not* the *only* possible interpretation of the Hebrew text in Genesis ch. 1.

What's *certain*, is that the agape-love moral-meaning of the Genesis Garden of Eden story is its main point! [*It is, however, interesting that over ten times in the OT it refers to the universe being "stretched out" as time progresses. Sounds a bit like the scientific discovery of an accelerating expansion of the Cosmos. Also consider the statement "God is Light" as a statement of eternity, since anything at the speed of light experiences no passage of time. Later I'll discuss more on time dilation & the origin of the Cosmos.*]

**NOT ME - AND MAYBE
NO ONE ELSE EITHER**

I'm definitely *no* expert, despite having *read* countless books and essays on philosophy, epistemology, relativity, quantum theory, biology, psychology, theology, spirituality - and have had the privilege to *dialogue* with many scholars on the subjects. But, it's fun and it exercises my limited, now aging brain. As the Southern Rock singer, Lynyrd Skynyrd, sang, "I know a little - about love".

My *current* ideas and conclusions were developed over the recent decades from ongoing *research* involving the works of internationally respected scholars from the major fields of *knowledge* (Latin = "scientia"). Yet the most helpful of all have been the writings and talks from people whose focus was not on empirical info-data-research knowledge, but on knowledge about human *relationships* involving the hearts and souls of *persons*.

Knowledge can be thought of in two types or realms. One is the type of knowledge that seeks to know *informationally*, ranging from scientific to philosophical to theological "things". The other type of knowledge seeks to know *intimately* persons and the interpersonal relations among people, cultures, societies, and the world. I'll discuss more about this farther on in the book.

As I've tried to read widely in both of these knowledge realms, the various authors' worldviews ranged from atheists to agnostics to theists to pantheists. So, in this book I've included 100's of *contextual* quotes from scholars as support for the ideas I'll discuss. In a way, this book is simply my attempt to restate, collate, and synthesize into a reasonably coherent form, the thoughts and findings gained from these respected experts.

We can all take solace in the fact that *humble* honest scholars in all fields admit that there is far more to reality - that we do *not* know - than what we *do* know. Plus, many of them acknowledge that some *scientific* theories and conclusions cannot yet - and might *never* be proven.

But, if the history of science tells us anything about the **big why questions**, there can't be much doubt that future centuries will see discoveries beyond what we can imagine today. I suggest that **there will always be a relativistic 'beyond' – beyond what we can know. [bold added]** p. 264

Denis Noble PhD (Agnostic) an evolutionary Prof. of Cardiovascular & Computational Physiology at Oxford University, *DANCE TO THE TUNE OF LIFE: Biological Relativity*.

DEEP MYSTERIES THAT CONFOUND THE MIND

Kitty Ferguson, the highly acclaimed science writer, and biographer friend of famous physicist Dr. Stephen Hawking, has sought to build bridges of mutual agreement among scholar across diverse fields. Dr. Hawking described her book, *THE FIRE IN THE EQUATIONS: Science, Religion, & the Search for God*, as a “clear account of the ultimate question”.

In it, she concisely points out that, even with so many amazing discoveries, science *alone* has not resolved the “deep mystery” of reality.

The **way** the **quantum** world translates **into** the **world** we normally **perceive**, at that juncture where the **quantum blur** of alternatives reduces to one of the alternatives, **is still a deep mystery**. p. 200 **[bold added]**

Ferguson, Kitty (Anglican Christian). *THE FIRE IN THE EQUATIONS: Science, Religion & the Search for God*. Kitty’s friend **Dr. Stephen Hawking** called her book - “A clear account of the ultimate question”.

She adds a *further* thought, directly related to the central subject of my book, which is the *value* and *need* of compassionate love. She *warns* us about *assuming* we humans are the *ultimate* source or standard for determining the values that will guide our emerging global civilization into the future.

“... The **intellectual** spirit of the **times** also places **humans above any** system of **values**. Is this carrying Enlightenment **thinking** to an **absurd extreme?**”

[bold added] p. 239

Ferguson, Kitty (Anglican Christian). *THE FIRE IN THE EQUATIONS: Science, Religion & the Search for God*. Kitty’s friend **Dr. Stephen Hawking** called her book - “A clear account of the ultimate question”.

IS THE UNIVERSE TRYING TO TELL ME SOMETHING?

“Perhaps the **biggest ‘why?’** questions of all are **why we** are here and **why** the **universe** is as it is.

p. 248. **[bold added]**

Denis Noble PhD (Agnostic) an evolutionary Prof. of Cardiovascular & Computational Physiology at Oxford University, *DANCE TO THE TUNE OF LIFE: Biological Relativity*.

In our modern world, it's common to hear people saying things like, "It seems like the 'Universe' is trying to tell me something?". As a psychological counselor, it's fascinating to me that it's become culturally OK to *personalize* the Universe, but *not* OK to talk about a *personal* God? We humans, like sheep, tend to unconsciously follow the crowd into and out of "fads". We seem to be driven by survival of the coolest. The prevailing "cool" fads of the day, especially among the young, are atheism and Buddhism, both of which characterized my worldview in my own youth. And, I still sincerely respect both views.

For many today, there seems to be a psychosocial, culturally conditioned *fear*, and for some even a paranoid terror, of the *possibility* that a *Personal* Intelligence exists as the first-cause, the Source of the Cosmos. This fear even keeps many from understanding and acknowledging that *agnosticism*, not atheism, is the most *scientific* and logical alternative position if someone has not yet embraced theism.

Could it be that the common "fear of death" is also connected to these current fads? Numerous researchers have concluded this is, in fact, the case. For example, cultural anthropologist Ernst Becker, in his classic book, *THE DENIAL OF DEATH*, said that the fear, the terror of death, is a deeply rooted all consuming drive beneath most human endeavors.

".... in fact, this whole book is a network of arguments based on the **universality** of the **fear of death**, or "**terror**" as I prefer to call it, in order to convey how **all-consuming** it is when we **look it full in the face.**" **[bold added]** (p. 15).

"**Science**, after all, is a credo that has **attempted** to ... **deny the fear....**" **[bold added]** (p. 284).

Becker, Ernest. The Denial of Death

Could it be that this desire to *deny* even the *possibility* of a *personal compassionate* Consciousness behind the Universe involves a fear of what lies beyond death. That is, the possibility of a Cosmic *authority* who might hold us each *accountable* for our life attitudes and actions regarding love? This was a big

part of my own youthful atheism *before* my mind and heart were changed by the cosmological explanatory power of “love”.

It’s theoretically possible that this fear of death, and *accountability* to a personal Cosmic Creator, is one of the reasons that Buddhism has become so popular in the West. As I’ve said, it was for me when I was an atheistic scientific-Buddhist. Buddhism, Mahayana more than Theravada, acknowledges a universal consciousness, but *not* a *Personal* Cosmic Mind who exists *as love, personally* loves us, and whose *law* for the Cosmos is therefore love.

Yes, I understand the common question that asks, how could there be a loving Creator yet a world full of suffering? That question involves a subject called “Theodicy”. I’ll discuss more about theodicy and its worldview implications later.

IN THE SOURCE - NOT THE FORCE “WE LIVE, MOVE, & DERIVE OUR EXISTENCE”

Recently, some respected scientists and philosophers have postulated a theory called “Panpsychism”. It’s a view that some kind of *impersonal* consciousness is the fundamental basis (*Prime Reality*) behind the Cosmos. Yet *some* of those same scientists wouldn’t dare mention God *positively*, for fear of public *persecution* and academic *cancellation*.

“As we amply documented at the time, the **real reasons** Gonzalez did not get tenure at ISU were simple: **discrimination** and **intolerance**. Despite an **exemplary** record as a **scientist**, Gonzalez was **rejected** by ISU **because** of **his support for intelligent design.**” **[bold added]**

https://evolutionnews.org/2013/07/setting_the_rec/

Given the current culturally conditioned *consensus* (group-think) science that *avoids* the *possibility* of a *conscious* Creator, it’s ironic that there’s no shortage of scientific theories regarding a *non-personal* creative “consciousness” as the source and substance of reality.

“ **Panpsychism** is the idea that **consciousness** did **not** evolve to meet some survival need, **nor** did it emerge when brains became sufficiently complex. Instead it is **inherent in matter — all matter.**

[bold added]

<https://www.discovermagazine.com/mind/panpsychism-the-trippy-theory-that-everything-from-bananas-to-bicycles-are>

In this view, the entire **universe** is inhabited by **consciousness**. A handful of **scientists** are starting to warm to this theory, but it's still a matter of great debate. Truth be told, **panpsychism** sounds very much like what the Hindus and **Buddhists** call the Brahman, the tremendous universal Godhead of which we are all a part. In **Buddhism** for instance, **consciousness** is the **only thing that exists**. *[bold added]*

<https://bigthink.com/mind-brain/the-universe-may-be-conscious-prominent-scientists-state/>

The above quotes about *panpsychism* remind me of an ancient *Greek*, stoic philosopher, Epimenides, whose statement was *positively* affirmed by the first century Hebrew *Christian* teacher, Paul of Tarsus. Paul addressed a gathering of Greek philosophers at the Areopagus in Athens (Acts 17). He agreed with one of Epimenides's *pantheistic* principles which parallels the modern scientific theory of *panpsychism*. Yet, Paul, while agreeing with the principle *in part*, used it to point their thinking beyond impersonal pantheism, to the *personal* character of the ultimate Source. Here's Paul's quote of Epimenides's principle, along with a second related phrase, which Paul also affirmed, from another Greek philosopher.

“So Paul, standing in the midst of the **Areopagus**, said: “Men of **Athens**, I perceive that in every way **you are very religious**. For as I passed along and **observed the objects of your worship**, I found also an altar with this inscription:

‘**To the unknown god**.’ What therefore you worship as **unknown**, this I proclaim to you. ... For **in** [God] we **live** and **move** and have our **existence**. ... For we are also [God's] **offspring**”.

Acts 17:28

All people, everywhere in all of history, have sought answers to the BIG questions. *Psychologically* those questions are the *driving* force at the *root* of every academic field of knowledge and research. In fact, scientists and philosophers are investing a great deal of effort to ask the *physical* material Cosmos for *all* answers. They dream of discovering a unifying principle, a complete world-view (Greek = cosmic-perspective), hoping for an elegantly *simple* solution that will *explain* and tie it all together. But, is it *possible* they are looking in the wrong “place” and at the wrong “things” for the most fundamental answer?

“The **natural** sciences **cannot answer** the “**why**” question of purpose. **Science has its limitations**.

(p. 20). **[bold added]**

John Lennox Ph.D., DPhil., DSc. (*speaks five languages English, Russian, French, German, Spanish*). Oxford Prof. Math, Philosophy, Science. *CAN SCIENCE EXPLAIN EVERYTHING?*

Is it *possible* that the unifying answer *transcends* the limits of science? Is it possible that the scientific *hyper* focus on the *physical* material realm, instead of the *non-physical*, personal, mental phenomenon of humble compassionate love is the problem. Have they and we who look to them as the *gurus* of truth become lost in the weeds of info-data? Are our science-driven cultures *unable* to see the *beauty* of the “forest”, which is *non-physical love*, because we’re too focused on the individual “trees” of *physical matter, atoms, quantum strings ...?*

“**Science** gets things **right**, it converges on the truth, **but** it will **never** give us **absolute truth**. Sooner or later **science** must **bump** up against **limits**.”
[bold added] p. 327

John Horgan. Agnostic, Long-time writer for the prestigious journal SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN. Quote from 2015 edition of *The End Of Science: Facing The Limits Of Knowledge In The Twilight Of The Scientific Age*.

In fact, a growing movement, called “Transhumanism”, popular among many elite power-players across the world, seeks to combine computer technology and bio-genetic alteration to “materially” produce super-humans. Sounds fascinating, yet also unnervingly close to the old racist eugenics movement. The transhumanists’ goal is to increase human IQ, physical strength, and longevity. But, they have no viable plan to increase human capacity for compassionate love. **Why?** Because increasing real love in the human population requires something beyond the *limits* of *material* science and technology. I’ll discuss more on this later, but for now, consider Wesley Smith’s comment below, contrasting materialistic transhumanism’s *self-enhancing* IQ goal, versus the beauty of *other-centered* “love” in the *heart* of Down-Syndrome souls.

“The **purer** the **love**, the **less** the **regard for self**. And **lack** of self-regard **conflicts** with **materialistic transhumanism**, which is steeped in solipsism and **hyper-individuality**.

Here’s the tragically **ironic** thing: The people among us who are **most** innately **capable of love**—at least, in the full sense described by St. Paul—**are those with Down syndrome**. Every person I have ever met with that

genetic condition is **better than I am** because of his or her **greater capacity to love.** *[bold added]*

Wesley J. Smith. <https://www.firstthings.com/web-exclusives/2017/06/whats-love-got-to-do-with-transhumanism>.

LOVE — WHY WE TALK IT, BUT DON'T WALK IT

Many varied fields of human knowledge (*science, philosophy, etc.*) have *failed* to arrive at a unified understanding of the Cosmos, our place in it, and especially our subsequent *moral* (love) responsibility. One significant reason for this is the human *psychological* propensity to pridefully *defend* pet presuppositions. We tend to inaccurately *assume* and judge the heart motives of others, then to argue and even to attack others in different fields. This problem is not only rampant in society, politics, media, and academia, but even among many Christians and churches. People who claim to follow the *humble* way of compassionate agape love.

“It is a **sad spectacle** that brings **discredit** on the **Christian** message when we see those who profess that message ... **fighting** among themselves or **caricaturing** others **rather than engaging in respectful discussion**, through which all sides just might **learn** something.” (p. 31).

[bold added]

PhD, DSc. Oxford Prof. Math, Philosophy, Science., John C.. Seven Days that Divide the World, 10th Anniversary Edition

In contrast, there are some with *humble* hearts who work hard to build bridges of mutual *understanding* instead of the natural barriers that come from the pride of *egos*. Sadly, the humble quiet voices of those who seek to build *bridges* are often censored into silence, because what *sells* are *loud*, arrogant, provocative *egos* (*on all sides*)! One of the quiet, compassionate voices who has helped me learn and grow in a similar way is Steve Meyer:

“[Dr. Stephen C. Meyer’s book] represents an **opportunity** for **bridge-building** rather than dismissive **polarization**—**bridges** across cultural divides in **great need** of professional, **respectful dialogue**....”

[bold added]

Dr. George Church. Professor of Genetics, Harvard Medical School
<https://www.discovery.org/b/comprehensive-guide-to-science-and-faith/>

The *simple* yet *not easy* solution to the divisiveness and *destructive* reactions that permeate society is to *humbly* listen, dialogue, and seek areas of agreement with the goal of understanding heart to heart. But that will only happen among those (*from all sides*) who choose humble *trust*, and steadfast *hope*, in the "power of *love*".

Dr. Martin Luther-King Jr. was one who, like all of us, was not perfect, yet he stood *strong* in self-sacrificing love even for his enemies, and *eloquently* proclaimed, warned, about this desperate need of every human heart - and the world.

"Love is the greatest *force* in the universe. It is the *heartbeat* of the *moral cosmos*. He who loves is a *participant* in the being of God." [bold added]

Dr. Martin Luther-King Jr. <https://www.cnn.com/2020/02/09/us/martin-luther-king-jr-handwritten-note-for-sale-trnd/index.html>

"Yet, in spite of these **spectacular** strides in **science** and technology, and still unlimited ones to come, **something basic is missing**. There is a sort of **poverty** of the **spirit** which stands in **glaring contrast** to our scientific and technological abundance. The **richer** we have become **materially**, the **poorer** we have become **morally and spiritually**. We have learned to fly the air like birds and swim the sea like fish, but **not learned the simple art of living together** as brothers."

[bold added]

Dr. Martin Luther-King Jr., quoted in the journal, SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN, by John Horgan. <https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/cross-check/martin-luther-king-jr-s-haunting-reflections-on-science-and-progress/>

SCIENCE IS A CONTINUUM (FROM VERY *DIRECT* TO VERY *INDIRECT*)

Today, many people assume from popular media that "science" produces absolute truths and that it has *all* the answers to *all* the questions about the cosmos, including life, love, and reality. But few realize that science and scientific inquiry are founded upon and function through what's called the "*philosophy* of science". This *philosophical*, foundational field of knowledge functionally determines what is and what is not science, as well as which scientific *endeavors* are reliable vs. unreliable, and which *conclusions* are certain vs. uncertain, direct vs. indirect.

“Even today **most** of our advanced **science** is **done indirectly**. We know the composition of the sun, the detailed structure of DNA, and the age of the universe, all due to measurements of this kind. We know all this, even though we have **never visited** the stars or entered a DNA molecule **or witnessed** the Big Bang. This **distinction** between **direct** and **indirect** evidence will become essential when we discuss **attempts** to prove a unified field theory. **[bold added]**

Kaku, Michio PhD. (Agnostic), Co-Creator String Theory. Prof. of theoretical physics at City College NY. *THE GOD EQUATION: THE QUEST FOR A THEORY OF EVERYTHING*. (p. 8).

“As we have established, **most science** is done **indirectly**, by examining echoes from the sun, the Big Bang, etc. **[bold added]**

Kaku, Michio PhD. (Agnostic), Co-Creator String Theory. Prof. of theoretical physics at City College NY. *THE GOD EQUATION: THE QUEST FOR A THEORY OF EVERYTHING*. (p. 163).

In the book cited earlier by agnostic Oxford Professor Dr. Dennis Noble, he also emphasizes the need for *humility* in science, because science *cannot* directly answer all questions with certainty:

“We have no idea what, if anything, could lie beyond what we see and observe. That should inspire **humility** That is why all **science requires a metaphysics....**

not ... derivable from purely empirical observations. To use the terminology of Karl Popper, we can make **conjectures** that we may be able to refute, but we can **never** be absolutely **certain** that they are true, nor that there will not be a better conjecture.

...There may or may not be an **ultimate purpose**, whatever that may mean. I **doubt** whether empirical **science** can **answer** that question. **[bold added]** pp. 262-263.

Denis Noble PhD, (Agnostic) Evolutionist, Prof. of Cardiovascular & Computational Physiology at Oxford University. Ch. 9 -The Relativity of Epistemology The Meaning of it All. Book - DANCE TO THE TUNE OF LIFE: BIOLOGICAL RELATIVITY.

Science is actually a *continuum* of attempts to answer questions about the physical world. It's a continuum because the evidence *available* to provide a confident answer ranges from very *direct* evidence to very *indirect*. The result is that many *indirect* science questions and conclusions are actually philosophical and *metaphysical*. Evidence needed to confidently answer them is *not* directly available.

At this point, **physics stops**, and **metaphysics begins**. Physics says **nothing** about where the laws of physics themselves **come from**. So the cosmological proof of Saint Thomas Aquinas concerning the **First Mover** or **First Cause** is left **relevant** even **today**. (p. 187)

[bold added]

Kaku, Michio PhD. (Agnostic), Co-Creator String Theory. Prof. of theoretical physics at City College NY. *THE GOD EQUATION: THE QUEST FOR A THEORY OF EVERYTHING*.

The fact that the question of God's existence involves, among other things, **metaphysics**, makes it a **philosophical question**. The only way to deny philosophical questions would be to deny the reality of areas of study like **metaphysics** (which asks, "What is real?"); epistemology (which asks, "How do we know what is real?"); ethics (which asks, "What is right action?"); logic (which asks, "What is right reason?"); and more. **[bold added]**

Richard Howe PhD Emeritus professor of philosophy and apologetics, Southern Evangelical Seminary. This quote is from Ch. 3 pp. 49-50 of the book, THE COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE TO SCIENCE AND FAITH: Exploring the Ultimate Questions About Life and the Cosmos, which features over 40 entries authored by over 30 qualified experts. <https://www.discovery.org/b/comprehensive-guide-to-science-and-faith/>

"Direct Science" examples include things like determining *how* fast light travels through a particular piece of glass (physics experiment). Or, determining *what* kind of animal an old bone came from (DNA test). For both of these inquiries, *all* the evidence needed to answer the questions is *directly* available in the *present*, controllable, and measurable. Therefore, experiments can be repeated many times and conclusions will be very *confident*.

"Indirect Science" results in *less* confident, *less* certain conclusions. It involves for example seeking to determine *WHY* light behaves as both wave and particle.

Another indirect question involves, *WHY* light in a vacuum has a mathematically constant speed. We know *what* light does, but cannot answer many of the *why* questions about light. An *indirect* science inquiry about the bone in the example a paragraph above would be asking, *WHY* did the animal die?

To answer these kinds of questions with a high degree of confidence would require evidence that is *not directly* available in the present, therefore *not* controllable, not measurable, nor repeatable. Regarding “string theory”, (Christian) Dr. Steve Meyer, whose PhD from Cambridge is in the Philosophy of Science, points out the very *indirect* nature of cosmological theories.

“That is, it does so by **positing** an extraordinary number of **purely hypothetical** and abstract entities for which **we have no direct evidence.**”

Meyer, Stephen C.. PhD in Philosophy of Science from Cambridge.
*RETURN OF THE GOD HYPOTHESIS: THREE SCIENTIFIC
 DISCOVERIES THAT REVEAL THE MIND BEHIND THE UNIVERSE.*

Therefore, the more *indirect* a science inquiry is, the *less* confident or certain are its conclusions. One of the reasons is that *indirect* science requires *abductive* reasoning to arrive at an “Inferred Best Explanation” (IBE). Such conclusions cannot give us absolute truth or *facts*. The best they can do is point either strongly or weakly toward what is possible, plausible, or probable.

“Historical scientists use **abduction** to **infer** past conditions or causes from present clues or evidence. Philosophers of science and logicians have shown that not only historical scientists, but forensic scientists, detectives, theoretical physicists, astronomers, medical diagnosticians, philosophers of religion and science, and **anyone** making **inferences** about **unobserved** (or unobservable) causes will typically use this form of reasoning. Since questions about the **origin** of life and the universe and the **possible existence of God** involve questions of **ultimate causal origins**, investigations of these questions make ample use of **abductive** reasoning.” P. 347 **[bold added]**

The logic of **abduction**, however, does **not** produce **certainty**, but instead plausibility or possibility. **[bold added]** p. 349

Meyer, Stephen C.. PhD in Philosophy of Science from Cambridge.
*RETURN OF THE GOD HYPOTHESIS: THREE SCIENTIFIC
 DISCOVERIES THAT REVEAL THE MIND BEHIND THE UNIVERSE.*

Abductive reasoning leads to an IBE, which is merely the best *probable*, yet *unprovable*, logical conclusion (*inference*) based on *indirect* evidence. Inherently these types of science inquiries and investigations leave open the possibility, (*often high probability*) of transcendent, “spiritual” *supra*-natural realms beyond science’s reach.

However, culturally conditioned *consensus*, driven by leading *anti*-theists, cause many people and some scholars to avoid following the evidence to wherever or “*whomever*” it points. That fear of “cancellation” should never be a part of true science.

“... we should be prepared to **follow** the **evidence** where it **leads**, even if that involves a **supernatural** dimension. **Science cannot** answer **all** questions. **[bold added]** (p. 48).

John Lennox Ph.D., DPhil., DSc. (*speaks five languages English, Russian, French, German, Spanish*). Oxford Prof. Math, Philosophy, Science. *CAN SCIENCE EXPLAIN EVERYTHING?*.

“SCIENCE” THRU EVIDENTIAL-BELIEF NOT BLIND-FAITH

Much of media and academia has pushed the idea that science has *nothing* to do with *faith* (belief), and that all faith is *blind*-faith. But this popular pervasive *belief* (*pun intended*) is false. The examples below from theoretical physicists Michio Kaku (agnostic) and Brian Greene (atheist) demonstrate that belief/faith is a normal, natural part of scientific theories.

“Many astronomers **believe** that **black holes** lie in the center of every galaxy.” **[bold added]** (p. 111).

Kaku, Michio PhD. (Agnostic), Co-Creator String Theory. Prof. of theoretical physics at City College NY. *THE GOD EQUATION: THE QUEST FOR A THEORY OF EVERYTHING*.

“**Hawking** was so fascinated by time travel that he issued a challenge to other physicists. He **believed** there must be a **hidden law** of physics, ...” (p. 123). **[bold added]**

Kaku, Michio PhD. (Agnostic), Co-Creator String Theory. Prof. of theoretical physics at City College NY. *THE GOD EQUATION: THE QUEST FOR A THEORY OF EVERYTHING*.

“.., the fact is I have personally **verified** the results from but a **tiny fraction** of the discipline’s essential **experiments**. You could say **I’ve taken most results on faith.**” p. 179 **[bold added]**

(Evolutionary Atheist) Brian Greene PhD Prof. physics and mathematics at Columbia University. He is world-renowned for his groundbreaking discoveries in the field of superstring theory. *Until the End of Time: Mind, Matter, and Our Search for Meaning in an Evolving Universe*. Ch. 7. Brains and Belief: From Imagination to the Sacred.

In his quote above, atheistic Professor Greene’s honest *admission* of his use of *faith* in science is *rare* among atheistic scientists. More commonly, most atheists present a *false* distinction between faith and science. Christian theoretical physicist Dr. Michael Guillen explains why.

It seems that many scientists are **unwilling** or **unable** (or simply **refuse**) to see the enormous **difference** between **blind** faith and **evidence**-based faith. Or that the entire edifice of **science itself** is built on a **foundation** of both blind and evidence-based **faith**. **[bold emphasis added]**

Michael Guillen (Christian) (Harvard Triple PhD physics, math, astronomy). *Believing Is Seeing: A Physicist Explains How Science Shattered His Atheism and Revealed the Necessity of Faith*. (pp. 71-72).

Not only do people *mistakenly* think that all of science produces confident, reliable conclusions, but most folks *mistakenly* think *faith/belief* has nothing to do with science. Yet, as the quotes above and below show, many internationally respected scientists and philosophers of science have demonstrated that much of science is actually *founded* upon and *relies* on faith. No, *not* usually *blind* faith, but *rational* (evidence-based) faith leading to logical belief that a conclusion or theory is likely true. Keep in mind that throughout the history of *science* itself,

many theories and laws that were once strongly *believed* were eventually proven to be wrong (*falsified*).

Agnostic theoretical physicist Paul Davies, quoting Einstein, also shows that all of science is founded upon a faith which is in essence “theological” in character. It’s the belief that the apparent logical order we perceive in the natural cosmos is *real* and therefore we *trust* that using our *reason* to examine it will arrive at real and genuinely accurate conclusions about *reality*.

Physicist Paul Davies says that the right **scientific attitude** is essentially **theological**: “Science can **proceed** only if the scientist adopts an essentially **theological** worldview”. He points out that “**even the most atheistic scientist accepts as an act of faith** ... a law-like order in nature that is at least in part comprehensible to us”.

Albert Einstein famously said:

... **science** can only be **created** by those who are thoroughly imbued with the aspiration towards truth and understanding. This **source of feeling**, however, **springs from** the sphere of **religion**. To this there also belongs the **faith** in the possibility that the regulations valid for the **world** of existence are **rational**, that is, **comprehensible to reason**. I cannot conceive a genuine man of science without that **profound faith**. The situation may be expressed by an image: **science without religion is lame, religion without science is blind.**” (p. 36).

[bold added]

Albert Einstein, quoted by John Lennox Ph.D., DPhil., DSc.
Oxford Prof. Math, Philosophy, Science.
CAN SCIENCE EXPLAIN EVERYTHING.

A SIMPLE EXAMPLE OF SCIENTIFIC EVIDENTIAL-FAITH

One day years ago, I stood teaching my honors college-prep biology class, when a student in the back of the class raised her hand and said, “Mr. Galloway, I think I smell *smoke*”. But, I was at the front of the class and didn’t smell anything, and none of the students near me did. Keep in mind that my classroom had over 30 animals in it that I’d rescued and was rehabilitating for the Dept. of Wildlife. So, I nearly panicked because there were *many* terrariums, cages, lots of lights, heaters, and electrical wires.

I walked back to that student in the rear of the class, and suddenly I too “smelled” smoke. The *smell* of smoke was *evidence* that led us to *hypothesize* there was an *unseen* fire burning or starting somewhere. But, none of us *saw* smoke. Then, I realized a closet door was near where we smelled smoke, so I opened it. The closet was *full* of *visible* smoke. Now we had even *more* evidence *leading* to the *theory* that there was an “unseen” fire burning or starting somewhere. But, there was no fire in the closet, not even any wires or outlets. Yet our *belief* that there must be an *unseen* fire somewhere was even *stronger* because we had more *evidence* leading to that *logical* inference.

As we all tried to brainstorm, suddenly I remembered that the class on the other side of the wall was Chemistry. I checked and each chem student was *burning* substances for an experiment. Their smoke was going up to the ceiling, through the ceiling tiles, and over the wall into my closet! Our *evidential* rational faith/belief in an *unseen* fire was finally verified. By the way, this method of *logical* inference toward an *evidence-based* faith is repeatedly taught and encouraged throughout the *Bible*.

“Now **faith** is [based upon] the [physical] **substance** of things hoped for, the **evidence** of **things not seen.**” **Hebrews 11:1**

“**Test all things**, hold fast to what is good”
1 Thessalonians 5:21

“One of the things that **science** has made us very familiar with is the **controlled trial**, This is a very clear ancient example of **decision-making** on the basis of a **controlled experiment** and is of the very essence of science. For someone **to suggest** that the **Bible knows nothing of the kind** of thinking involved in science tells us more about that person than it does about the Christian Scriptures. **The scientific test** suggested by **Daniel** was geared to **distinguishing** between different kinds of natural **food**—the meat from the king’s table and vegetables. (p. 46).

[bold added]

John Lennox Ph.D., DPhil., DSc. (*speaks five languages English, Russian, French, German, Spanish*). Oxford Prof. Math, Philosophy, Science. *CAN SCIENCE EXPLAIN EVERYTHING?*

As many respected scholars have demonstrated, belief in an *unseen* Creator of the Cosmos as the Source of Love can be founded upon rational, *evidence-based*, and *logically* concluded *faith*. Yes, of course I know there are *some* people who have an irrational, *blind-faith* in specific images or ideas (idols) of a Creator God. But the fact *some* folks have blind belief, does not prove that the *object* of their belief does not exist. In fact, no one can *prove* either the existence or the non-existence of a Consciousness behind the Cosmos.

“You **can't** absolutely **prove** - or **disprove** - the existence of **God.**” **[bold added]**

Stephen C. Meyer. PhD p. 6. Science and God.

“**My** own point of **view** is that you can **neither prove** nor **disprove** the **existence of God.**” **[bold added]**

Michio Kaku PhD.

<https://innotechtoday.com/michio-kaku-clears-god-discovery/>

THE CULTURAL MYTH OF “SEEING IS BELIEVING”

Former Harvard Prof, Dr. Michael Guillen’s book, *Believing Is Seeing: A Physicist Explains How Science Shattered His Atheism and Revealed the Necessity of Faith*, shows that the old sayings “*Seeing* is believing” and “I’ll believe it when I see it”, are *not* accurate in real life, nor in science. Instead, the statement, “Believing is seeing”, is far more accurate, from a *psychological* perspective. All worldviews involve trusted assumptions that *cannot* be proven directly. And our worldviews, including those of scientists, become lenses (*perceptual filters*) through which we *see* and *interpret* the world. Our worldview *lenses* can either *blind* our eyes to the ultimate reality or they can *open* our eyes to see and know what is *truly* real.

“You might pride yourself on being a smart, sophisticated, modern-day person with a smart, sophisticated, modern-day worldview, but don’t kid yourself. Your **worldview** is **not** based on **logic**. It is **based on faith**. That’s right: faith. Like everyone else’s worldview—including mine—yours is ultimately based on what you believe to be true, on ideas and feelings **that cannot ever be proved**. That is why faith, far from being a weakness, is far stronger than logic, stronger than empirical evidence, and certainly stronger than feelings.

Faith is the mysterious, widely **misunderstood** agent that powers every one of your worldview’s **unprovable** beliefs. It’s the granite foundation that supports the entire weight of your worldview. **Faith dictates how you see, think about, and relate to everything** within and beyond the universe. Everything. In other words, **believing is seeing**. **Atheists** boast about being “free thinkers,” but they **rely on faith** every bit **as much** as a fundamentalist **Christian** does. Every one of an **Atheist’s** so-called free thoughts is based on **assumptions** that **cannot be proved**.

p. xv **[bold added]**

Michael Guillen (Christian) (Harvard Triple PhD physics, math, astronomy). *Believing Is Seeing: A Physicist Explains How Science Shattered His Atheism and Revealed the Necessity of Faith*.

This is another reason many atheistic and agnostic scientists struggle to *see* the *evidential* abductive probability that an Intelligent Loving Creator does exist. It’s their biased perceptual filter. Yes we all have biases, yet many scientists seem to deny that they do too. This denial prevents some scientists from consciously confronting their biases in order to examine evidence more fairly and open-mindedly.

An interesting and relevant article by sociologist Lilliana Arroyo PhD. Dr. Arroyo explains why and how our cognitive-biases, especially “confirmation bias, makes us believe in that which reinforces our convictions and doubt whatever contradicts them.” *Failure* to consciously fight against this mind-blinding survival instinct not only leads to false conclusions (theories), but perpetuates them despite new evidence that points to newer better theories. These cognitive biases create a short-sighted perceptual filter, mental myopia.

“Our minds work on the basis of biases. This helps us to prioritize information and make decisions more quickly. **But it also means our judgements are not as rational as they may seem**. ... Long before the

explosion of digital media, **we already had a problem of scale**: while our **senses** are capable of **perceiving 11 million** bits per second, **our mind can only process 50**. Let's imagine a funnel for **filtering** all these bits, dedicated exclusively to **reducing** complexity, **ignoring** stimuli and **prioritizing** certain **pieces of information** over others.

In the early 1970s, psychologists Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman published an article in which they **questioned the assumptions of rational choice theories and indicated that in situations of uncertainty, it is cognitive biases that predominate**.

.... The best known is the **confirmation bias**, which **makes us believe** in that which **reinforces** our **convictions** and **doubt whatever contradicts them.**" [bold added]

<https://lab.cccb.org/en/cognitive-short-sightedness-biases-and-survival/>

Chapter 2 - **LOVE MUST GUIDE** **SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY**

"However, it is worth pointing out that it is **not only theists** who **recognize the biblical source of many of the ethical principles and values** that we expect to be embodied in civilized society. Indeed, leading **German atheist intellectual Jürgen Habermas** has given clear **warning** of the **dangers** of a **shift in our moral base** from a **Judeo-Christian** moral base **to the postmodern**:

Universalistic egalitarianism, from which sprang the ideals of **freedom** and a collective life in **solidarity**, the autonomous conduct of life and **emancipation**, the individual **morality of conscience, human rights and democracy**, is the **direct legacy of the Judaic ethic of justice and the Christian ethic of love**.
 **To this day, there is no alternative to it**. And in light of the current **challenges** of a post-national constellation, we **continue to draw on the substance of this heritage**. Everything else is **just idle postmodern talk.**" (pp. 141-142).

[bold added]

John Lennox Ph.D., DPhil., DSc. (*speaks five languages English, Russian, French, German, Spanish*). Oxford Prof. Math, Philosophy, Science. *2084: ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND THE FUTURE OF HUMANITY*.

"Science is a response to our urge to understand, to make sense of the world we live in and of our place in it. It addresses the same **age-old questions** that have **haunted and inspired** humanity throughout the ages, questions of **origins and endings**, of place and **meaning**. We need to know **who** we are; we need to know **where** we are and **how** we got here. Science speaks directly to **our humanity**, to our **quest for light, ever more light.**" **[bold added]** (p. 279).

Marcello Gleiser PhD. Professor of Physics and Astronomy at Dartmouth College and was the 2019 recipient of the Templeton Prize. *THE ISLAND OF KNOWLEDGE: The Limits of Science and the Search for Meaning*.

EVIDENTIAL BELIEF IN PURE LOVE - OPENS EYES TO REALITY

Compassionate *unselfish* self-sacrificing love is *rare*, but I evidentially believe it is *real*. It's not just an illusion caused by the brain's neurobiological chemicals. And, it's not merely an evolutionary *self*-survival mechanism used as a better way to pass on *my* genes in the struggle for survival of the fittest. That would be *selfishness*, not unselfish love. Philosopher and Oxford University professor, C. S. Lewis, centered his writings on the conceptual reality of agape love, as taught by Jesus, which therefore is the *heart* of true Christianity.

“I **believe in Christianity** as I believe that the sun has risen: not only because I see it, **but because by it I see everything else.**” [*bold added*]
 C. S. Lewis (Oxford professor of English, Philosophy, and Theology)

The term “agape” is well known as the ancient Greek term for a *selfless*, self-giving, other-centered type of love and was seen as the highest human virtue. Agape-love is compassionate, altruistic, and self-sacrificing for family and friends. However, Jesus and the NT (New Testament) writers used and then *pushed* the concept of agape beyond the Greek meaning, to include a self-sacrificing love *even* for enemies. Remember that Jesus not only taught his followers to love and actively do good to their enemies, but after being tortured by flogging, and while hanging on the intentionally cruel cross of crucifixion, he compassionately *forgave* those who had done all of that to him. “Father, forgive them, for they do not comprehend what they are doing” (Luke 23:34).

In light of this, it helps me to picture this kind of pinnacle love as a “cross-type” of compassion. Arms open wide to *embrace* even our enemies. No, I did not say trust enemies, nor “like” what they do. Strong love is not stupid, it’s brilliantly loving and powerful enough to potentially transform an enemy into a friend. It’s an attitude and character that’s tragically *missing*, and desperately *needed* in the world today. Sadly, it’s even missing in much of cultural Christianity, and missing from the lives of so many politicized, commercialized, selfie-centered “Christians”. Christ’s self-giving, other-forgiving, enemy-loving *cross-type* of love should be the *soul* of Christianity and of those who follow the “Way”.

So, for any of you who doubt the *central*, *overarching* role that agape-love *should* have in Christianity, and the lives of Christians, please take a look at the following brief sample of key NT passages. You’ll see how important it was to Jesus and to his disciples.

You have **heard** that it was said, ‘**Love your neighbor**’ and ‘**Hate your enemy.**’ But **I tell you, love your enemies** and pray for those who persecute you, Therefore, **you must be perfect** as [God the **Source** of Love] is perfect.

JESUS in Matthew 5:43-48

“Teacher, which commandment is the **greatest** in the Law?” **Jesus** declared, “ ‘**Love the Lord your God** with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind.’ This is the **first and greatest** commandment. And the **second** is like it: ‘**Love your neighbor as yourself.**’ All the **Law** and

the Prophets **hang** on these **two** commandments.”

Jesus in Matthew 22:36-40

“The **goal** of our teaching is **love** from a pure heart and a clear conscience”.

1 Timothy 1:15

Let us **love** one another, for **love is from God**, whoever **loves** has been **born of God** and **knows God**.

Anyone who does **not love** does **not know God**, because **God is love**.

(John the best friend of Jesus in) First John 4:7-8

*(In light of the above statement that, **God IS love**, it's important to remember that in the OT God self-revealed as **YHWH**, (**Exodus 3**) a name derived from the Hebrew verb havah meaning **to exist**. So, **YHWH** means **"I EXIST"** or **"I AM"**. A title Jesus often ascribed to himself. So, **God exists as love**. This matches God's revelation to Moses in **Exodus 34:6-7** merciful, gracious, **abounding in lovingkindness**")*

The **Ten Commandments** are **all about love**. The first four on how to **God** and the last six on how to love **others**. **Exodus 20**

When a **foreigner** resides with you in your land, **you must not oppress him**. You must **treat the foreigner** living among you as native-born and **love him as yourself**, for you were foreigners in the land of Egypt. I am the LORD your God. **Lev. 19:33-34**

John 3:16 - God so **loved the world** (Greek = Cosmos/Creation)

A **new** commandment I give you: **Love one another. As I have loved you**, so you also must love one another. **By this** everyone will **know** that you are **My** disciples, **if you love one another**.”

John 13:34-35

This is My **commandment**, that you **love** one another **as I have loved** you.

And I appointed you to go and **bear fruit** [*of love*].... **John 15**

Owe no one anything, **except to love** each other, **for the one who loves another has fulfilled the law**.

Romans 13:8

Romans 8 - is all about God's love

1 Cor 12:31 - "the most excellent way"

1 Cor 13 ALL - the famous description of love vs anti-love,
Ending with "faith, hope, love, and the greatest of these is love"

1 Cor 14:1 "Pursue love"

For the **whole law** is fulfilled in **one word**:

"You shall **love** your neighbor as yourself." **Gal 5:14**

*(The Greek literally says "one word", even though the command has seven words in it. NOTE in the further verses **Gal 5:22-23**,*

*"The **fruit** of the Spirit is **love**, joy, peace", the GREEK term for fruit is absolute singular even though nine words are listed. The first word in the list of 9, **LOVE**, is **THE** single fruit of the Spirit. The other 8 words are like the flavors or experiences produced by living agape love.)*

James 1 = character of love

James 2:8-13 Law of Love = Law of Liberty

First & Second John - Both letters are ALL about love vs. anti-love

Jesus taught a way of thinking, living (an agape-way), using a metaphor, saying: "Deny yourself, take up your cross, and follow me" (Luke 9:23-26). It's a profound psycho-social *counseling* principle that is *simple*, but *not* easy to live. It's hard to live consistently because of the natural (survival of the fittest) *selfishness* in all of us. And this plays out negatively in a lot of science, academia, and media.

I agree with Michael Curry, the first *black* bishop over the entire Episcopal Church, in his brief book, *LOVE IS THE WAY: Holding on to Hope in Troubling Times*, when he uses "selfishness" as the best modern term to communicate what is meant by the word "sin". Most people think of sin as the bad things people do. No, sin is simply a natural attitude and motive of *selfishness*. It's our inherent tendency to serve *self* in order to get what we *desire*, and causes us to end up *forgetting* about or even *ignoring* the unmet *needs* of others.

"People like Martin Luther **King**, Desmond **Tutu**, and **Gandhi** seem to be **superhuman**, born into their greatness. **But** Martin was mortal, fallible,

and **sinful, too**. Gandhi was mortal, fallible, and **sinful**. Desmond is mortal, fallible, and **sinful**. **What the word sin means is “selfishness.”** So while we are all **capable of love**, we are **equally** capable of **sin.”** [**bold added**] (pp. 90-91)

Michael Curry. *LOVE IS THE WAY: Holding on to Hope in Troubling Times*.

By the way, all three seemingly “superhuman” people mentioned by Michael Curry were inspired to their “greatness” by the life and teachings of Jesus. Gandhi acknowledged his admiration and inspiration from Christ by stating a convicting contrast - Christ’s love vs. sinful anti-love selfishness among so many Christians. The following Gandhi quotes are from a professor of Philosophy at Swarthmore College, Dr. Holmes, in an interview with the Harvard Crimson.

“I like your Christ, but not your Christianity.”

.... The **Christians** above all others are **seeking** after **wealth**. Their aim is to be **rich** at the **expense of their neighbors**. They come among aliens to **exploit** them for their own good and cheat them to do so. Their **prosperity** is far more **essential** to them **than** the life, liberty, and **happiness of others.”** [**bold added**]

<https://www.thecrimson.com/article/1927/1/11/mahatma-gandhi-says-he-believes-in/>

As mentioned earlier, I’m convinced that Agape-Love (*a love that’s willing to sacrifice self even to save an enemy*) as taught and lived by Jesus is, can, and should be the *unifying* principle to help *guide* all of us toward what scientists call a “Theory of Everything” (TOE), and then to *direct* our rapidly advancing technologies (AI etc.). Agape-love is the key to understanding reality. And, as Dr. Guillen showed earlier, my “belief” is rational, logical, *evidential* faith, that AGAPE is the *Source* of the Cosmos, the *Way* of Life, and the *Goal* toward which it all is heading. Dr. Stephen Meyer, whose humility and encouragement in personal dialogue has helped me to see *reality* more clearly, describes how his faith in a love that comes from a *personal* being, brought meaning and understanding to his worldview.

Later, as I reflected in my college **philosophy** classes on the questions of my distressed adolescence, I realized **why belief in God dissolved the fear** of meaninglessness. Only **personal** agents with subjective conscious awareness **can value or confer** significance or **meaning** on something or someone. Nothing can mean anything to a molecule or an energy field or

a rock. If, as **Bertrand Russell** wrote, the “vast death of the solar system” and the ruin of the universe ensures that eventually no personal agents will exist, then the existentialist philosophers were right. **On the other hand, theism**, if true, affirmed the existence—indeed, the eternal and self-existence—of a **personal being** who **loves** and regards as **meaningful** to himself both his creation and the persons within it. (pp. 660-661).

[bold added]

Meyer, Stephen C.. PhD in Philosophy of Science from Cambridge.
*RETURN OF THE GOD HYPOTHESIS: THREE SCIENTIFIC
 DISCOVERIES THAT REVEAL THE MIND BEHIND THE UNIVERSE.*

There’s a key reason most folks, including many scholars, have difficulty seeing *how* AGAPE is inseparably connected to every human endeavor. That reason is simply because most people don’t take into account the *important* differences between knowledge and wisdom, and the distinction between science and “scientism”.

“The primary **difference** between the two words is that **wisdom** involves a healthy dose of perspective and the ability to make sound judgments about a subject while **knowledge** is simply knowing. Anyone can become **knowledgeable** about a subject by reading, researching, and memorizing facts. It’s **wisdom**, however, that requires more understanding and the ability to determine which facts are relevant in certain situations. **Wisdom** takes knowledge and **applies** it with discernment based on experience, evaluation, and lessons learned.”

dictionary.com

“WISDOM”

TRANSCENDS “KNOWLEDGE”

When considering both scientia (knowledge) and sophia (wisdom), it’s important to recognize the *qualitative* distinction between these two. *Knowledge* is basically the *accumulation* of facts, data, or information. *Wisdom* is something beyond mere knowledge. Wisdom, is the attitude and choice to embrace the reality and value of compassionate love, and therefore to *wisely* see how to use knowledge for the good of *others*. There’s an ancient and profound *warning* about knowledge, when used *without* the wisdom of love. It was written by Paul

of Tarsus, who had been a prideful violent *anti*-Christian, but was radically transformed by the *power* of love.

“Knowledge puffs up, but love builds up.”

First Cor. 8:1

Knowledge *accumulated* is good, but it tempts individuals and cultures toward empty puffed up egotistic *pride*. This temptation has become especially strong in modern times, because our *accumulated* knowledge has allowed us to develop amazing technology. But, our increase in new *technology* is *not* because the average human IQ is increasing. New technology is primarily the result of the *exponential* accumulation of *knowledge* collectively passed-on and built-on by the next generations. In fact, the average IQ is *decreasing*, while learning disabilities and other *disorders* are *increasing*.

Recent studies conducted in Denmark, Norway and the United Kingdom are seeing a noticeable **slowing** — and even a **reversal** — of **IQ**. In effect, IQs have **lowered** in this **incredible era of technology**. **[bold added]**

(<https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbestechcouncil/2020/04/29/technology-is-on-the-rise-while-iq-is-on-the-decline/?sh=531495c7b103>)

Remember that *knowledge* can be thought of in two types. These two types are qualitatively different, yet inseparably connected. One kind of knowledge seeks to gather and know *information* about *things*. This type can include scientific - to philosophical - to theological *things*. The second type of knowledge seeks to know *persons intimately* along with understanding the *interpersonal* relationships among people, cultures, societies. And ultimately for some to even know the transcendent *Person*, who is the Source of the digitally coded Cosmos.

Both types of knowing are inseparably connected and complement one another. Many people are gifted in the first type of knowing. Other people are gifted in the *second* type of *knowing*. Sadly, each type often thinks negatively about the “other” type, and therefore fails to see that other kinds of people are vitally needed to gain a fully accurate understanding of *reality*. It’s one of the reasons why science and technology, over focused on the first type of info-data knowledge, apart from intimate personal relational knowledge, has so often led to so many negative consequences.

GENIUS PEOPLE WHO ARE “CHALLENGED” BY LOVE

There are inherent dangers connected to the new “transhumanism” movement which is rapidly spreading among the rich and famous, together with scientists and technologists. Its *hopeful* goal to “push” human vertical, macro-evolution by *merging* our biological bodies and brains with modern technologies has been described by leading scholars (like Yuval Harari) as seeking to produce “Homo *deus*” - “human gods”. More on this further on in this book. But for now first consider one of their sub-goals, which is to exponentially increase human IQ, knowledge and processing power by connecting the brain to computers and the internet. Quite a goal, but have they thoroughly thought through what this might produce without an equal increase in human compassionate love?

“Here’s the bottom line: **No matter how much** we strive to **engineer ourselves** into post-humanity, no matter the fortunes invested **by transhumanist** venture capitalists in increasing our intelligence, exponentially expanding our **capacity to love is the only way we will ever truly enhance the human species.** *[bold added]*

Wesley J. Smith. <https://www.firstthings.com/web-exclusives/2017/06/whats-love-got-to-do-with-transhumanism>.

Think about it. Even today, a person with a super high IQ can acquire a large amount of *knowledge* and process it far faster than average folks. But, so can a computer. In fact, supercomputers with complex algorithms can accumulate vast amounts of facts and data beyond any human, and can process that information at mind numbing speeds. But, a *computer* does not have wisdom or love. No, not even AI supercomputers.

Also consider the fact that everyone is a package of *abilities* and *disabilities*, even the most brilliant among us. Over the years I’ve had the privilege to be involved in many science conferences around the country, getting to know personally and to learn from a number of scholars who are recognized *geniuses*. Yet because of my experience as a psychological *counselor*, I’ve noticed that *some* (no not all) brilliant scientists can sometimes be very *similar* to computers. They can gain and juggle massive amounts of info-data and/or mathematical formulations, and process it into various theories. But, *some* seem to struggle with the ability to accurately perceive, understand, and interact with *personal-relational* realities.

From a *psychosocial* perspective, some seem to especially struggle with living and sensitively *applying* the profoundly simple *wisdom* of relational agape-love in their lives, their research, and their writing. It even seems like their intellect kind of gets in their way, clouding-over and hindering the ability to see the significance and vital applicability of love.

Interestingly, I've counseled many *wonderful* people who are on the Autistic Spectrum who've had similar struggles. And, some of them were brilliant *scientists*. No, not all scientists are on the Spectrum, but similar personal-relational struggles are common among many in the scientific fields. Also, I don't say this as a negative "put-down", because often ASD and similar qualities produce much needed *positive* abilities and perspectives that other people don't have. We all are a package of abilities and disabilities, therefore we *need* one another as we seek to understand life, love, and reality.

We shouldn't forget, however, that all of us, including brilliant scholars can fall into the mind-*blinding* effects of *prideful ego* that keeps prevents the heart from seeing love's beauty, profound simplicity, and *necessity* as the *guide*, the golden standard (rule), for advancing science and technology.

"CHALLENGED" PEOPLE WHO ARE "GENIUSES OF LOVE"

In stark contrast to folks who are "*challenged* by love", there are others who are "*geniuses* of love". Many of these *don't* have high IQ's, degrees, nor great amounts of knowledge. They include many *intellectually* "challenged" folks, *especially* those with Down-Syndrome, as discussed earlier. Yet, many of these wonderful people clearly manifests a *deep* wisdom regarding *humble*, compassionate, unselfish, other-centered, self-giving love. Maybe their lack of intellectual, mathematical thinking allows them to see through the fog of info-data, and better perceive the deeper, greater, more profound *reality* of love.

A different, yet common example sometimes happens when all things seem to be going *great* in people's lives (*their health, finances, luxuries, leisure time to play*). When all is going well, too often empathy and compassion for others *fades*. But, later as years progress, when personal *struggles* and *suffering* occur in their own lives, or are shockingly witnessed in the lives of others around them, new growth in compassionate wisdom can be stimulated.

History is filled with these folks who became "geniuses of love" through personally experiencing or witnessing suffering. Their life struggles aided the

maturation of sympathy, empathy, and compassion in their hearts and minds. And some of them likely were *not* geniuses in data-accumulating, *mathematical* thinking. Some “geniuses of love” in history were called “sages” or “prophets”. Examples abound, like Confucious, Siddhartha who was called “Buddha” (enlightened), Moses who gave up power, privilege, position, risking his life to rescue his people from slavery, Jesus who was called the “Christ” (anointed), John who was called the “apostle of love”, Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther-King Jr., etc. Each of these types of geniuses stood in the *strength* of love to *expose* and *oppose* the *anti*-love, selfish misuse and abuse of *power* by privileged people who oppressed others. These love geniuses were like human-*sheepdogs* who taught and lived lives motivated by compassion, risking their own lives for others.

Yes, you might find faults and failures in the imperfect lives of *some* of these geniuses of love, but that does not negate the *truth* of love and the impact it can and should have on our lives, relationships, and the world. In fact, those failures in love merely reveal that there is something *inherent* in all of us *mere* humans that *hinders* our ability to live *pure* agape-love. The following description and then endorsement about Dr. David Berlinski’s book, *HUMAN NATURE*, points out our tendency to turn a blind eye to the ugly reality of our deep human problem.

“**Conventional** wisdom holds that the murder rate has plummeted since the Middle Ages; **humankind is growing** more **peaceful** and **enlightened**; man is shortly to be much **improved**—better genes, better neural circuits, better biochemistry; and we are approaching a **technological singularity** that well may usher in utopia. **Human Nature** **eviscerates** these and other doctrines of a **contemporary nihilism masquerading as science**. (p. 4).

David Berlinski PhD. *HUMAN NATURE*.

“**Berlinski** combines **mastery** of classical **culture** and deep knowledge of **mathematics** and the natural **sciences** with sharp, elegant, and insightful writing. The man is fearless in **pursuing lines of reasoning** that are **considered taboo** by current standards. A wonderful display of common **sense and reason** at a **time of great confusions**.” **[bold added]**

Dr. Sergiu Klainerman, Professor of Mathematics, Princeton
<https://discoveryinstitutepress.com/book/human-nature/>

“SCIENTIA”: *CENTERED AROUND* “AGAPE” - *NOT ATOMS*

The word “science” comes from the Latin term “scientia” which simply means *knowledge*. And the field of philosophy that addresses *how* we acquire

knowledge, or what are valid *sources* of knowledge is called *epistemology*. Epistemologists agree that *science* is merely *one* of many valid sources of knowledge leading to truth. However, there are many scientists and their *disciples* who think that empirical science is the one and *only* way to know what is truth and reality. This myopic, self-limiting attitude and worldview is often called “Scientism”.

“Second, **scientism** is a **belief about** how we know (**epistemology**), which, in turn, leads to the third feature—namely, that scientism’s **claims** about how we know **guarantees** certain **conclusions about** the fundamental nature of what we know (**metaphysics**). Perhaps no one expressed this as clearly as astrophysicist and astronomer **Carl Sagan** when he famously stated that “The Cosmos is all that is or ever was or ever will be.” (pp. 418-419). **[bold added]**

David R. C. Dean in [Dembski, William A.; Luskin, Casey; Holden, Joseph M.. The Comprehensive Guide to Science and Faith: Exploring the Ultimate Questions About Life and the Cosmos

“Sometimes the clash between science and **common sense** is a conceptual matter that is **not** and cannot be **settled by empirical enquiry alone.**” (p. 253). **[bold added]**

Denis Noble PhD (Agnostic) an evolutionary Prof. of Cardiovascular & Computational Physiology at Oxford University, *DANCE TO THE TUNE OF LIFE: Biological Relativity.*

One of the reasons science has *neglected* the highest human virtue, value, and wisdom of love (agape) is that *scientism* has conditioned culture to *ignore* or even *reject* the possibility of other sources of knowledge that are outside of science. That is, to reject sources of knowledge such as experience, intuition, common sense, philosophy, theology, spirituality, etc.

“But if you’re still skeptical—if you’re someone who **stubbornly** believes that **faith** is a **weakness** and wants nothing to do with it—the next four chapters will explain how very mistaken you are. They deal with the scientific method, mathematics, physics, and astronomy—subjects in which I’m formally trained. **Subjects** widely **misperceived** as not needing faith, as being purely logical. **Subjects** that for some people **are a religion**—a tiny, misguided worldview **called scientism.**” p. 87. **[bold added]**

Michael Guillen (Christian)(Harvard Triple PhD physics, math, astronomy). *Believing Is Seeing: A Physicist Explains How Science Shattered His Atheism and Revealed the Necessity of Faith.*

“Scientism” is simply not the same as science. Scientism is a worldview, a belief-system that assumes, *presupposes*, that the methods and processes of science are the *only* valid sources of knowledge or truth. Many of the new-atheists hold to this view, so in effect they see the world through a self-limiting, short-sighted, *fixed* set of *anti*-theistic lenses (perceptual filters). They decided ahead of time (*a priori*), before investigation, that all explanations must come only from the natural (materialistic) realm. Their pre-set, fixed view *limits* their inquiries and potential awareness of *full* reality, by *disallowing* even the *possibility* of realities beyond our finite temporal observational abilities. Their chosen perceptual filters become functional *blind*ers, shielding their eyes to the theoretical possibility of transcendent, *supra* natural realities. Such a belief system is *scientism* not science. *True* science *never* blinds itself to any theoretical *possibilities* or yet unknown potentials.

Science involves **no claim** that its methods are the **only** reliable **sources** of **knowledge**. That further claim comes from **scientism**, which draws on the success and prestige of science. As a result, many confuse it with science itself. But clearly, **science** and **scientism** are **different things**. One involves the methods for learning about nature. The **other** is a **statement** about science and **knowledge** itself. **[bold added]**

Jay W. Richards PhD, Ch 11 pp. 122-123 in the book, *THE COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE TO SCIENCE AND FAITH: Exploring the Ultimate Questions About Life and the Cosmos*, which features over 40 entries authored by over 30 qualified experts. <https://www.discovery.org/b/comprehensive-guide-to-science-and-faith/>

Yes I agree that good science has corrected (falsified) many past *superstitious* beliefs, and that's great! But what most people don't realize is that as science has advanced, it has *also* corrected (falsified) many past held *scientific* theories and laws that were strongly *believed* to be true. For example, the theory/law of *spontaneous* generation was overturned by the law of biogenesis (life comes only from previous life). And the theory of “junk DNA” was once strongly *believed* by the majority of geneticists. But it was falsified by the discovery that supposedly “junk” parts of the DNA were actually *vital* regulatory codes with important functions such as the timing (switching on or off) of other codes.

“It is also good to remember that **science only covers part** of the Island, that there are **many ways of knowing** that can and should feed on one another. While the physical and social sciences surely can illuminate many aspects of knowledge, they shouldn’t carry the burden of having all the answers. **How small a view of the human spirit to cloister** all that we can achieve in **one corner of knowledge!** We are multidimensional creatures and **search for answers** in many, **complementary** ways. Each serves a purpose, and **we need them all**. Sharing a glass of **wine with a loved one** is **more** than just the **chemistry** of its molecular composition **It all sums up**; it all becomes part of what it means **to be alive**, to search **for answers**, for **companionship**, for **understanding**, for **love**. (p. 280-281) **[bold added]**

Marcello Gleiser PhD. Professor of Physics and Astronomy at Dartmouth College and was the 2019 recipient of the Templeton Prize. *THE ISLAND OF KNOWLEDGE: The Limits of Science and the Search for Meaning*.

WHEN THE LIMITS OF SCIENCE “FALL SHORT” — OF LOVE

The old *past* way of *isolated*, separated, sciences (cosmology, physics, chemistry, biology, psychology) is changing. It’s *merging* toward an *interdependent* unity including relativity, quantum physics, quantum biology, systems and information theories, speculative “panpsychism”, and the *ancient* (now current) transhumanistic desire for “godhood” (“*Homo deus*”, *human-gods*).

The driving force for all of this, is the human *desire* to answer the big questions of life, to discover a “Theory of Everything” (TOE), to understand “the whole shebang” as acclaimed science writer Timothy Ferris calls it in his popular book by that name. But so far, the use of *mathematical* values in science to achieve a complete understanding of the Cosmos has come up *short*, because it has neglected the *central* human value of agape-love. It’s fallen short of the glory (goodness) of the Source, the ultimate, *transcendent* first cause (Prime Reality) of the Cosmos.

The search for the central unifying answer to all questions has and will culminate in a *dead end*, so long as it neglects and avoids the *philosophical*, metaphysical significance of the highest human virtue and value. Science needs to embrace and let the *transcendent*, other-centered agape-type of love guide its research and developing technology.

“But many others have also **tried and failed**. As Princeton physicist Freeman Dyson once said, **the road** to the unified field theory is **littered** with the **corpses of failed attempts**.” (p. 2). **[bold added]**

Kaku, Michio PhD (Agnostic), Co-Creator String Theory. Prof. of theoretical physics at City College NY. *THE GOD EQUATION: THE QUEST FOR A THEORY OF EVERYTHING*.

“The Theory of Everything **rests on bad philosophy**. The **problem** is that the very notion of a Theory of Everything, even if restricted to the world of subatomic particles and their interactions, rests on an **incorrect understanding of how science works** and what it **can** do. The aspiration is no doubt noble, but the **philosophy behind it is faulty**. **[bold added]**

Marcello Gleiser PhD. Professor of Physics and Astronomy at Dartmouth College. <https://bigthink.com/13-8/theory-of-everything-2/>

Their efforts have “fallen short”, because they’ve chosen to exclude even the *possibility* that the Source is a *personal* consciousness that exists *as pure Agape-Love*. Please consider that in every example of coded information, *when we know the source of that information* (like books & computer programs) without exception, that *known* source has always been an intelligence. This fact leads to the logical inference that the coded informational laws of logic and math, cosmic constants, genetic and epigenetic codes, etc., all point to an Intelligent Source. Science is supposed to *follow the evidence* to wherever it *leads*, and to look to whatever or whomever the evidence *points*.

“**All of physical reality is essentially information, encoded in varying degrees of complexity in the way atoms are coupled together to form the various material structures that compose the world and ourselves.**” (p. 263) **[bold added]**

Marcello Gleiser PhD. Professor of Physics and Astronomy at Dartmouth College and was the 2019 recipient of the Templeton Prize. *THE ISLAND OF KNOWLEDGE: The Limits of Science and the Search for Meaning*.

Ironically, even the billion dollar NASA SETI program (*Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence*) proclaims that if they find information *embedded* in electromagnetic radio waves coming from outer space, then they would “know” that the source of that information *must* be an *intelligent* extra-terrestrial being.

“If a radio **signal** is detected in a modern SETI experiment, we could well **know** that **another intelligence exists,**” [bold added]

Again below, SETI’s criterion (evidence) that they believe would point conclusively to an intelligent source is *encoded information*.

“Any rapid, **information-rich** fluctuations **encoded** in the radio **signals**”

[https://www.nasa.gov/sites/default/files/files/](https://www.nasa.gov/sites/default/files/files/Archaeology_Anthropology_and_Interstellar_Communication_TAGGED.pdf)

[Archaeology_Anthropology_and_Interstellar_Communication_TAGGED.pdf](https://www.nasa.gov/sites/default/files/files/Archaeology_Anthropology_and_Interstellar_Communication_TAGGED.pdf)

Now consider again that the scientific *law* of biogenesis states that *life* always comes from *previous* life. So, the most logical inference for the original, ancient, first-cause of the digitally encoded DNA info in *life* was a *Living Intelligence*. Far more significantly, the fields of *psychology* and *sociology* reveal that whenever and wherever we have observed *personal* love, the source of that personal love has always been a living intelligent person, not just *particles*. Therefore, logically the ultimate Source must have been (and is) an *Intelligent Living Person*, who exists as pure *Love*.

So, why are some agnostic and atheistic scientists blind to the *probability* that the massively complex coded information in living cells and systems must come from super intelligence? The reason for their myopia is not science, but Scientism’s bias. For some it might be the bias of an unconscious perceptual filter produced by cultural conditioning *consensus* in the scientific community. For others, it might be a semi-conscious fear of accountability for how they have *lived* love or *failed* to do so. For others, maybe it’s that their only idea of a God is the tyrannical monstrous deity of religious *tradition*. For me, way back when I was an atheist, all of those reasons lay beneath my own short-sighted worldview.

“I have always had a **negative gut reaction to the concept of ‘consensus science.’** But **Michael Crichton explains** it best when he said:

*‘I regard consensus science as an **extremely pernicious** development that **ought to be stopped cold** in its tracks.*

*Historically, the **claim of consensus** has been the first **refuge of scoundrels**; it is a way to **avoid debate** by **claiming** that the matter is already **settled**. Whenever you hear the consensus of scientists agrees on something or other, **reach for your wallet**, because you’re being had.’*

And he continues:

‘Let’s be clear: the work of science has **nothing whatever to do with consensus**. Consensus is the business of **politics**. Science, on

*the contrary, requires only one investigator who happens to be right, which means that he or she has results that are verifiable by reference to the real world. **In science consensus is irrelevant.** What are relevant are reproducible results. The **greatest scientists in history are great precisely because they broke with the consensus.** There is **no such thing as consensus science.** If it's consensus, **it isn't science.** If it's science, it isn't consensus. **Period.**" [bold added]*

"Consensus Science and the Peer Review"

Jorge R. Barrio. Department of Molecular and Medical Pharmacology, UCLA School of Medicine
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2719747/?utm_source=substack&utm_medium=email

Hopefully, in the next section of this book, you'll be encouraged to sincerely consider the logical, scientific, and philosophical *probability* that the ultimate Source of Cosmos exists as pure love. And, to consider the positive *implications* on our lives, families, nations, and the world.

Chapter 3 - "LOGOS", IS THE ULTIMATE SOURCE OF PURE AGAPE-LOVE

"The concept of information has penetrated almost all areas of human inquiry, from physics, chemistry, and engineering through biology to the social sciences. And yet the status as a physical entity remains obscure.

.... over several decades there have been attempts to invert this interdependence and **root reality in information rather than matter.** This

contrarian perspective is most famously associated with the name of **John Archibald Wheeler**, who encapsulated his proposal in the pithy dictum “**it from bit?**”

... If **information** makes a difference in the physical world, which it surely does, then should we not attribute to it **causal powers?**

... Among the **questions** considered were:

* **What is information?** Is it a mere epiphenomenon or **does it have causal purchase?**

* **Where** does it come **from?**” **[bold added]**

Theoretical Physicists - Sara Walker, Paul Davies, George Ellis, pp. 2-3, FROM MATTER TO LIFE: Information and Causality. Cambridge Univ. Press

The ancient Greeks, before Aristotle, Plato, and Socrates, probably *beginning* with Heraclitus, called the ultimate Source of the Cosmos the “LOGOS”. The term can be translated into English literally as Word, Reason, Logic, or rational *Information*. The adjective form is *logikos*, simply meaning *logical*, yet it’s sometimes interestingly translated in the NT as *spiritual* (Rom. 12:1-2) (<https://biblehub.com/greek/3050.htm>). PBS provides a nice *concise* description of the ancient *Greek* concept of Logos.

“A **principle** originating in classical **Greek** thought which refers to a **universal divine reason**, immanent in nature, yet **transcending** all oppositions and imperfections in the **cosmos** and humanity. An **eternal** and unchanging **truth** present from the **time of creation**, available to every individual who seeks it. **[bold added]**

<https://www.pbs.org/faithandreason/theogloss/logos-body.html>

As mentioned earlier, *geniuses* come in many forms. Some are geniuses in *data-processing* and *mathematics*. Others are geniuses in *relational* realities, especially the highest human value, agape-love. Sadly, our prideful *prejudice* comes into play when we assume that folks in history who for example were *poor* and therefore had no hope of higher education, were *not* smart, and certainly not geniuses. All over the world *today* there are brilliant geniuses, some whose minds and hearts far exceed the rest of us, but they are stuck in poverty, lack of access to school, nor even to the knowledge on internet. The same has been true all through history.

Many in history had a profoundly brilliant understanding about *relational* reality. No, they did not have the advantage we have today of the extra knowledge accumulated over the past centuries, nor the accumulated technology for experimental verification. However, these ancient geniuses, using *conceptual* thinking (thought-experiments), were able to accurately envision and theorize about cosmic realities, life, and love. Thankfully some of their teachings have been passed on to us. Search the ancient writings from every culture and you will find some of their words and teachings that have survived: Confucious, Aristotle, Hippocrates, Solomon, Origen, Clement, Gandhi, Dr. King, and countless others.

YES, EVEN ANCIENT GENIUSES IN “CHRISTIAN” HISTORY

“The text said that ‘there was evening and there was morning’; it did not say ‘the first day,’ but said ‘one day.’ It is **because there was not yet time before the world existed**. But **time begins to exist** with the following days”

The theologian, whose name was Origen, in his *Homilies on Genesis* [A.D. 234].

“And **how could creation take place in time**, seeing **time was born along with things which exist?** . . . That, then, we may be taught that the world was originated and **not suppose that God made it in time**, prophecy adds: ‘This is the book of the **generation**, also of the things in them, **when they were created** in the **day that God made** heaven and earth’ [Gen. 2:4]. For the expression ‘when they were created’ intimates an **indefinite and dateless production**”

Theologian Clement of Alexandria in his *Miscellanies 6:16* [A.D. 208].

Cumulative *evidence* has convinced me that many of the people of the NT in the first century, especially Jesus, were individuals with brilliant inspiration into the reality of love, logic, and relational truths. Like the Greco-Roman culture around them, they also used the term LOGOS for the *creative* logical reasoning *emanating* from God, as the source that created, maintains, and sustains the Cosmos. Most English Bibles translate “the Logos” as “the Word”, but remember it can also be translated as logical information. Again, PBS’s *concise* summary introduction to the *Christian* view of Logos capture’s the heart of its meaning. And this concept of Logos is inseparable from that of *Agape*-Love.

A **unifying** and **liberating** revelatory **force** which reconciles the human with the divine; manifested in the world as an act of **God's love** in the **form of the Christ. ...** *[bold added]*

<https://www.pbs.org/faithandreason/theogloss/logos-body.html>

The NT Christian concept of “Logos” is summarized clearly in the Gospel of John chapter 1. Here, it is personified, and it says that the Logos of God, was uniquely *manifested* in and through the life of Jesus who was called the “Christ” (*Christ is the Greek form of the Hebrew term Messiah meaning anointed one*). As such, the term “Christ” means far more than the truncated view of traditional *religious* doctrine. In 2 Corinthians 5:19, a *parallel* statements describes this concept as “God was in Christ reconciling the World (“World” in Greek = Cosmos) ...”.

Christian theoretical physicist, Dr. John Polkinghorne, when interviewed by the acclaimed science writer, Kitty Ferguson, spoke of the universal human desire to know if the *ultimate* “reality”, is “on our side” - in other words is out for our good. More importantly, he pointed out that if that ultimate reality is a personal being who exists as *love* as Jesus taught, then to *know* that reality we need to *risk* the *vulnerability* of a “personal encounter”. I appreciate the way that Dr. Polkinghorne *graciously* diagnoses his unbelieving friend and fellow theoretical physicist, Dr. Paul Davies, as being *unwilling* to look “where that God is to be found”.

“There is a very **deep human longing to know if reality is on our side**. And I believe that's where **we need** some form of **personal encounter** with a God who, of course, is **beyond personality** but is more fittingly **described** in personal terms.”

[bold added]

[Paul Davies has] “. . . **never looked in the right place**. When you look at the structure of the **galaxy** or the structure of **matter**, you're **looking at an impersonal realm**. You will **not meet** even **human personality** there, **let alone divine personality**. If you're going to meet the God . . . rather than just the Cosmic Architect, **you've got to take the risk** and deal with the ambiguity of **personal** experience and **personal** encounter. I think that **Paul Davies knows very little about any religious tradition** and seems to be **unwilling to explore** any.

. . . **He's not looking** where that **God is to be found.**” *[bold added]*

Theoretical Physicist John Polkinghorne, interviewed by acclaimed science writer Kitty Ferguson. August 1997

<https://www.kitty-ferguson.com/articles1/Polkinghorne1.pdf>

The Logos of John 1-18 can be understood as the Cosmic Christ, *transcending* the physical Universe, *emanating* from the Source of love, the Creator who exists as pure agape. The Logos *source* of the Cosmos is a Logical Mind who designed and created all *things* in a *logically* manner. So, that is the reason scientists have found it's best to *study* what's in the universe using a logically systematic method - in other words, science.

The **opening words of Genesis** are echoed in another **majestic** statement with which **John's Gospel** begins: "In the **beginning** was the **Word**, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things were made through him." This statement will be familiar to Christians, but it may not be familiar to everyone, and, in any case, many Christians may not have grasped its **profound implications**. We are familiar with **words as a vehicle** of self-expression and intelligible communication. The **Stoic philosophers** among the ancient **Greeks** who predated the writer John used the term **Word (logos** in Greek) to express the **rational principle** that they regarded as being **behind the natural order**.

John elevates the term even higher to **denote God** himself as the **rational Creator** who is responsible for the existence of the universe and all that it contains. This is a **profound assertion about existence**. "In the beginning was **the Word**" – that is, the Word already **was**. The Word **exists eternally**. (p. 116). **[bold added]**

John Lennox Ph.D., DPhil., DSc. (*speaks five languages English, Russian, French, German, Spanish*). Oxford Prof. Math, Philosophy, Science. *CAN SCIENCE EXPLAIN EVERYTHING? 2084: ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND THE FUTURE OF HUMANITY*.

"In the beginning was the **Word** [Logos], and the **Word** [Logos] was with God, and the **Word** [Logos] **was God**. He was in the **beginning with God**. All things were made **through him**, and without him was not any thing made that was made. **In him was life**, and **the life was the light** of men. The light shines **in the darkness**, and the darkness has **not overcome it**. *[some translations say the darkness has not comprehended it]*

John 1:1-5

“The **Word** [Logos] became **flesh** and dwelt among us, and we have seen his glory, glory as of the **only Son** from the **Father**, full of grace and truth.”
John 1:14

“**No one** has **ever seen** God; the only Son, who is at the Father's side, **he has made him known.**”
 John 1:18

In order to **think**, there has to be a **mind** capable of thinking, a world-view of things to think about, and some sort of rationale or **intelligence (logos) common** to both our **minds** and **the world** of things that explains why our thoughts can correspond to things (i.e., that **grounds truth**). Without these **metaphysical** preconditions, the activity of **science** would **not be possible**. (p. 424). **[bold added]**

David R. C. Deane. Editors - Dembski, William A.; Luskin, Casey; Holden, Joseph M.. *The Comprehensive Guide to Science and Faith: Exploring the Ultimate Questions About Life and the Cosmos*.

Both the ancient Greeks and the ancient Christians taught that the ultimate, *transcendent* Logos was beyond the *finite* human mind to fully comprehend. So, we need to remember that the many terms used to communicate various aspects, attributes, and character qualities of the ultimate, *transcendent* Logos of Love, are metaphors. These include terms like, “the Light”, “the Spirit (Pneuma = Breath)”, “the Father”, “the Son”, “He”, and even “God”, etc.

The Source of Love is infinitely beyond our finite language. Yet, all of these *metaphors* convey the *mutual* agape love, *relational* quality of the Logos. And of course, the “masculine” terms are *limited* metaphors used to communicate *relational* love to the first century readers who lived in a hyper *patriarchal* culture. Please keep in mind, the transcendent Logos Source is *infinitely* beyond these metaphors. As verse 1:18 above says, no human can fully see (comprehend) the Logos, yet through the commitment, teachings, and other-centered agape-life of Jesus, much about the Logos, has been revealed.

“That has been **an absolutely key element** in **theological** understanding, that **God can't be caught in human rational nets**. That doesn't mean we can't think about God, but **we have to think in ways** that are **open to the fact** that we are **never going to do justice to the mystery and to the**

reality of what we are trying to speak about. If that is true of a world that **we** transcend, it must be **truer still of a world that transcends us.**

Theoretical Physicist John Polkinghorne, interviewed by acclaimed science writer Kitty Ferguson. August 1997

<https://www.kitty-ferguson.com/articles1/Polkinghorne1.pdf>

Jesus was committed to representing, *embodying*, the very nature and character of the Logos who exists infinitely and eternally as Love (*Agape in the flesh*). So much so, that Jesus even said when you look at his Way of life, you can see what the “Father”, the Logos Source, is truly like. And, what you see is NOT the culturally conditioned and distorted, traditional, fear-mongering God.

“Jesus said ... whoever has **seen me**
has **seen the Father** [the Source of Love].”

John 14:9

THE LIVING “LOGOS OF LOVE” IS THE FOUNDATION OF ALL SCIENTIA, INCLUDING THE BIBLE

No, not every flavor of expression found in the Bible is a clear representation of the LOGOS. Especially not in the OT, where there are things *attributed* to God, like the distorted and clearly OT laws and punishments (more about his later). Those distortions are *anthropomorphized psychosocial projections* of human qualities *onto* God, as the ancient people tried to understand the increasing revelation Logos of Love. I’ll discuss more about this later, including inspiration vs. inerrancy, and the process of progressive revelation. But for now, just consider the core message and overarching theme of the Bible, *progressing* from OT times to the NT, culminating in Jesus’s *clarifications* and *corrections* about logos and agape love. And, especially consider the influence the concept of agape love has had on knowledge and culture.

Dr. Peter Harrison, Dr. John Lennox, and acclaimed historian of science Dr. Alfred Whitehead have shown that Western science owes its *origin* and *development* to *theistic* scientists like Newton, Faraday, Johannes Kepler, Pascal Boyle, Leeuwenhoek, Joule, Mendel, etc.

“Had it not been for the **rise of the literal interpretation** of the **Bible** and the subsequent appropriation of biblical narratives by early modern scientists, modern science may not have arisen at all. **In sum, the Bible**

and its literal interpretation have played a **vital role** in the **development of Western science.**” [bold added]

Peter Harrison, Oxford Professor of Science and Religion. “The Bible and the rise of science”, *Australasian Science* 23(3):14–15, 2002.

“... the question **where the laws come from** has been **asked** and given a **perfectly intelligible answer** by the **very greatest of scientists** – men like Galileo, Kepler, Newton, and Clerk Maxwell, all of whom, like James Tour and Jeremy England, are believers in God. They **conclude** that **the laws came from God**, and that conviction **inspired their science**. C. S. Lewis, summarizing the work of the **eminent** philosopher and historian of science Sir Alfred North Whitehead, expressed it as follows: “**Men became scientific** because they **expected** Law in Nature, and they **expected Law** in Nature because they **believed** in a **Legislator**.”

Far from hindering the rise of modern science, **faith** in God was **the motor that drove it.**” (p. 36). [bold added]

John Lennox Ph.D., DPhil., DSc. (*speaks five languages English, Russian, French, German, Spanish*). Oxford Prof. Math, Philosophy, Science. 2084: *ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND THE FUTURE OF HUMANITY*.

As quoted previously, Einstein said that this “theological” principle actually *undergirds* even the scientific process used by atheists. The quote is worth repeating here.

Physicist Paul Davies says that the right **scientific attitude** is essentially **theological**: “Science can **proceed** only if the scientist adopts an essentially **theological** worldview”. He points out that “**even the most atheistic scientist accepts as an act of faith** ... a law-like order in nature that is at least in part comprehensible to us”.

Albert **Einstein** famously said:

... **science** can only be **created** by those who are thoroughly imbued with the aspiration towards truth and understanding. This **source of feeling**, however, **springs from** the sphere of **religion**. To this there also belongs the **faith** in the possibility that the regulations valid for the **world** of existence are **rational**, that is, **comprehensible** to **reason**. I cannot conceive a genuine man of science without that **profound faith**. The situation may be

expressed by an image: **science without religion is lame, religion without science is blind.**" (p. 36).

[bold added]

John Lennox Ph.D., DPhil., DSc. (*speaks five languages English, Russian, French, German, Spanish*). Oxford Prof. Math, Philosophy, Science. *CAN SCIENCE EXPLAIN EVERYTHING?*

THE GREEK OLD TESTAMENT (OT) LXX

The OT was translated into Greek (a version called the Septuagint - LXX) long before Jesus was born, In fact, the LXX was the most common version of the OT quoted by the NT writers. The OT LXX used the term Logos for the creative spoken "word" of the Cosmic Creator, who created a logical world.

Not only did the Greek OT LXX translation refer to the Ultimate Creative Source as the Logos, but the *Hebrew* OT also referred to God as the YHWH. This term is called the Tetragrammaton and means I AM or I EXIST. The story of Moses and the "burning bush" portrays God Self-revealing to Moses as the "I AM WHO I AM". In other words, the Source who is the "Self-Existent" Generator of all created "things". Every "thing" else derives its existence from the YHWH.

The Self-Existent "I AM" is the Source who maintains, sustains, and holds the existence of the Cosmos — from beneath the sub-quantum level, out to the macro galactic realm — and including all the *unseen* dimensions we 4-D humans cannot *directly* perceive. The coveted "Theory of Everything" (TOE), the answer to the big questions of life (origin, purpose, destiny, and most of all the *origin* of *suffering*) are *inseparably* connected to four central foundational philosophical subjects:

A - **COSMOLOGY** (Mind Beneath Quantum)

B - **AGAPE** (Love Beyond the "Natural")

C - **THEODICY** (Good "God" yet Suffering World?)

D - **TELEO-LOGY** (Metamorphosis Not Technology)

A - COSMOLOGY
Mind Before Matter

NOT ALL THAT EXISTS - BEGAN WITH A BANG

The law of cause and effect dictates that any “thing” that has a *beginning*, must also have been *caused* by something or someone. One of the greatest discoveries in science was that the Universe is *expanding* and therefore in the past had a single point beginning, often called the *singularity*. The discoverer was a brilliant Catholic priest and professor of physics at the University of Louvain, Georges Lemaître, in 1927. His new discovery was so shocking because it meant that before the beginning, the universe did not exist.

The old prevailing consensus believed that the Universe had always existed. That old *belief* was so blindly and *dogmatically* entrenched among scientists that many, including Einstein, initially refused to believe that the discovery was true. Einstein called Lemaître’s theory “abominable”, mainly because he disagreed with Lemaître’s physical interpretations of the mathematical observations. In 1929, Edwin Hubble published definitive evidence that the Cosmos was truly expanding and eventually others began to jump on board the *new* view, including Einstein.

In contrast to Einstein who was an *agnostic* (see below), many who were *atheists*, rejected Lemaître’s theory in part because a beginning supported the theory that a conscious Intelligent Mind might be the cause of that beginning. Gravitation physicist William Bonnor, for example, rejected the Big Bang because it was in his words, “the opportunity Christian theology has been waiting for ever since science began to depose religion from the minds of rational men”. (<https://plato.stanford.edu/Archives/fall2022/entries/cosmology-theology/>) As it turns out, Bonnor’s fear was born out, because many former atheists and agnostics *have* become convinced by the truth of a beginning that a transcendent God must exist.

‘For others, the **evidence** dramatically **affected** their **entire view of reality**. For instance, it led famed astronomer Allan **Sandage** to embrace belief in God. At a conference featuring dialogues between atheistic and theistic scientists, Sandage explained the big bang theory’s religious implications:

Here is **evidence** for what can **only be** described as a **supernatural event**. There is **no way** that this could have been **predicted** within the realm of **physics** as we know it...**science**, until recently, has concerned itself not with **primary causes** but, essentially, with secondary causes. What has happened in the last fifty years is a

remarkable event within astronomy and astrophysics. By looking up at the sky, some astronomers have come to the belief that there is evidence for a “creation event.” **[bold added]**

<https://evolutionnews.org/2022/03/efforts-to-resist-the-big-bang-and-its-implications-for-cosmic-design/>

Physicist Robert Jastrow expands on these profound implications, pointing out the extraordinary *convergence* of scientific and theological (spiritual) worldviews. Note that his use of the phrase “scientist who has lived by his faith in the power of reason”, is a reference to materialistic *scientism*. And keep in mind that his use of the word “theologians” also includes those within every spiritual tradition, not just Judeo-Christian.

“This is an **exceedingly strange** development, unexpected by all but the **theologians**. They have **always accepted** the word of the Bible: **In the beginning** God created heaven and earth...The development is unexpected because **science** has had such extraordinary **success** in tracing the chain of cause and effect **backward in time**. For the **scientist** who has **lived by his faith in the power of reason**, the story ends like a **bad dream**. He has scaled the **mountains of ignorance**; he is about to conquer the highest peak; as he pulls himself **over the final rock**, he is greeted by a band of **theologians who have been sitting there for centuries.**” **[bold added]**

<https://evolutionnews.org/2022/03/efforts-to-resist-the-big-bang-and-its-implications-for-cosmic-design/>

TRUE SCIENCE IS ALWAYS HUMBLE & HONEST

Dr. Michio Kaku, theoretical physicist and co-creator of string theory, while being a recognized genius, also seems to be a *humble* person, who’s not afraid to admit the *possibility* of a Consciousness or “God” behind the Cosmos. He readily acknowledges that *agnosticism*, not atheism, should be the *default* position for anyone who is not yet convinced by the evidence that a God does exist.

“. . . . So the **theory of everything leaves open** the question of the **existence of God.**” **[bold added]** p. 185

“... it is hard to avoid the **conclusion** that this was all **planned in advance**, that its **elegant design shows the hand of a cosmic designer**. To me, this is the **strongest** argument for the **existence of God**.” p. 188.

“This means that a hundred years from now, people **will still be debating the existence of God** and the **meaning** of the universe. This is because these concepts are **not testable**, and hence **not decidable**. They are **outside the province of ordinary science**.” p. 189 [bold added]

Kaku, Michio. PhD (Agnostic), Co-Creator String Theory. Prof. of theoretical physics at City College NY. *THE GOD EQUATION: THE QUEST FOR A THEORY OF EVERYTHING*.

In contrast to Dr. Kaku's *humility* and acknowledgement of *realities* beyond the limits of science, there are many atheistic (anti-theistic) theorists (*especially those clinging to fundamentalist "Scientism"*), who psychologically seem to have an avoidance *fear* of any evidential support for even the *possibility* that a Compassionate Consciousness exists behind the Cosmos. This "fear factor" exhibited by some atheists who cling to *fundamentalist "Scientism"* is the same as many *fundamentalist* theists (some Christians, Muslims, etc.). Both groups fear and avoid any evidence that contradicts or challenges their worldview *beliefs*. Such an attitude is not the way of science, nor is it the way toward *psychological, social, or spiritual* growth.

These kinds of atheists often employ *confabulated* "confirmation bias" such as the *false* claim that Einstein was an "atheist", in order to support their own anti-theistic worldview. As mentioned earlier, even though Einstein did *not* believe in a personal God, he also *adamantly* said he was *not* an *atheist*. Dr. Michael Guillen (3-D PhD from Harvard in math, physics, cosmology) reminds us that Einstein was *not* what many atheists want to claim.

"Einstein **didn't** believe in a **personal** God, which some **Atheists** play up to imply **dishonestly** that he was one of them. He was not. In fact, Einstein greatly resented being called an Atheist. On one occasion, he complained that "there are yet people who say there is **no God**. But what really **makes me angry is that they quote me for the support of such views.**" (p. 85). [bold added]

“From an interview with the German-American poet **George Sylvester Viereck, Einstein stated emphatically: ‘I am not an atheist.’**” [bold added]

Michael Guillen (Christian)(Harvard Triple PhD physics, math, astronomy). *Believing Is Seeing: A Physicist Explains How Science Shattered His Atheism and Revealed the Necessity of Faith.*

WHAT’S COSMOLOGY?

Cosmology is the branch of science that seeks to understand the *origin* of the Universe (the Cosmos). *When* did it begin? *Where* did it come from? *How* did it begin? There are numerous different *competing* theories about the origin of the Cosmos. It’s often described as one of the biggest ongoing *mysteries* of science. Some cosmologists even say that the limitations of science might *never* be able to fully answer questions about the origin of the Universe.

One of the reasons for the difficulty answering these questions (*maybe the impossibility*) is that they are very indirect *abductive* science inquiries. They involve the *past* which cannot be repeated, and many of the variables needed for confident answers are *not* directly available. Not only do such questions involve the very *ancient* past, but since time is a property of the physical Cosmos, no time could have existed *before* the universe existed. And at the moment of the theorized *beginning* (remember some call it the initial singularity before the big bang), the laws of physics no longer apply. Also, there would have been no “where” *before* the Cosmos, because the fabric of *space-time* did not yet exist.

Nevertheless, I’m excited that cosmologists and other theoretical physicists continue to use confirmed theories (*quantum mechanics QM & general relativity GR*), along with *relatively* recent (pun intended) *experimental* verifications, to try and answer these *origins* questions as best they can. Especially as they seek to solve the *contradiction* between relativity vs. quantum reality and to *unify* both into a single theory.

“A **new picture** began to develop that used particle **physics** to **explain the greatest mystery of cosmology, the birth of the universe.** Suddenly, two very different fields, **quantum** mechanics and general **relativity**, began to gradually **turn into one.**” [bold added] p. 96.

Kaku, Michio PhD. (Agnostic), Co-Creator String Theory. Prof. of theoretical physics at City College NY. *THE GOD EQUATION: THE QUEST FOR A THEORY OF EVERYTHING.*

As I alluded to earlier, many leading researchers and thinkers in every field (science, philosophy, theology, spirituality) seem to be *converging* and merging toward a unified view that *non-physical*, digitally coded *information* and *non-physical consciousness* are the fundamental stuff behind all that we perceive as *physical* reality. This gradual shift to a dramatically new paradigm began with the discoveries of quantum mechanics and the realities of Einstein's famed theories of relativity.

“Physics suggests information is more fundamental than matter, energy, space and time – the problems start when we try to work out what that means.

‘IT FROM bit.’ This phrase, coined by physicist John Wheeler, encapsulates what a **lot of physicists** have come to **believe**: that tangible **physical reality**, the ‘it’, is ultimately **made from information, or bits.** [bold added]

<https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg23431191-500-inside-knowledge-is-information-the-only-thing-that-exists/>

Before discussing more about these recent conclusions that result from the convergence of the various fields of knowledge, it might help to provide a very brief, simplified summary of the theories and discoveries that have led up to them. Particularly, those of you who have not read much or anything about relativity or quantum physics. Hopefully my (non-expert) effort won't make it so simplistic that it fails to cover the background sufficiently. The theories involve very advanced forms of mathematics, and *no* I cannot do any of that. However, the good news is that the math is *not* necessary for *regular* people, like me and many of you, to understand the main aspects of the theories, their conclusions, and implications.

Many gifted experts have written and provided video presentations, for us regular folks, clear, *simplified* discussions of the heart and core of what's currently theorized. That's not an easy task. I first found out personally how hard it is to simplify complex concepts when I shifted from 20 years teaching *adults* counseling-psychology at the college and graduate level, to teaching *youth* biological sciences at my children's college prep high school years ago. But, it was worth it being able to be spend more time with them.

The best way to more fully understand the *new* physics is to read about the when, why, and how their hypotheses, theories, and experimental verifications *developed* historically. Since that's not the focus of this book, I encourage any of

you interested to check out Dr. Michio Kaku's little book, *THE GOD EQUATION: The Quest for a Theory of Everything*, as a starter.

NEWTONIAN PHYSICS

For a long time historically and scientifically, the physical world was understood and described by scientists only according to laws of physics *discovered* by the brilliant Christian physicist, Isaac Newton (1642-1727). It's called "Newtonian" or *Classical* Physics. It's still the everyday *common* physics used in *normal* life for basic stuff. Newtonian physics is *true* and accurately approximates, replicates, and predicts physical interactions in the real world of our normal experience. Sometimes it's described as laws that work when dealing with *normal* (big) things at the "macro" scale, like billiard balls hitting each other, parts of machine interactions, and *some* aspects of astronomical objects in the Universe.

According to Newtonian physics, in situations and scenarios we normally live in, the observation and measurement of space, time, length, and mass are *absolute* and unchanging. In other words, observations and measurements of them are the same no matter from "where" or from what "frame of reference" two different people would make the observations or measurements. But, scientists began to realize that such is not true when it involves situations or scenarios that are not normal everyday life observations. Scientists began to discover that there are things that exist and interactions that happen, which are not intuitively normal. Einstein called them "spooky action".

RELATIVITY, QUANTUM, MULTI-D, & MULTI-VERSES?

When scientists *mentally*, through *thought*-experiments, considered and then investigated situations and scenarios beyond our "normal" experience they began to realize that the laws of Newtonian physics didn't work. Those situations involve *super* big size and/or *ultra* high speed (Relativity), *plus* situations involving the infinitesimally small scale of *matter* and *energy* at the atomic and sub atomic levels (Quantum).

"RELATIVITY" (Special and General) - Everyone has heard of Einstein's famed formula $E = MC^2$, but there's far more to relativity than that. To remember what each of Einstein's theories were mainly about, think of the alliterations: *Special* (about Speed) and *General* (about Gravity).

The really *big* situations involve things like objects moving at extremely fast speeds (*especially as they approach the speed of light*), or objects in very strong gravitational fields like planets and black holes which affect the actual structure

(fabric) of space. Albert Einstein's theories of Relativity were developed to explain what happens in those situations. The theories are called *relativity* because in these phenomenal situations, measurement or experience of space and time are not absolute. It is *relative* depending on an observer's frame of reference. You could think of it as *relative* when *compared* between two *different* observers, each from a different frame of reference.

Here are a few examples:

Relative Time - (Time Dilation) As speed (velocity) increases, or as gravity increases, then observed and measured "time" actually *decreases* (slows down). At the speed of light, time would theoretically *stop*. So, time is "relative" to both speed and gravity.

Relative Mass - As speed increases, mass increases. At the speed of light, mass would theoretically be *infinite*. So, mass is "relative" to speed.

Relative Length - (Length Contraction) As speed increases, the observed/measured length of an object would *decrease*. So length is "relative" to speed.

"Space-Time" Curvature - As *mass* increases, the actual structure or fabric of *space* becomes increasingly *curved*. In "normal" Newtonian physics we say that gravity is a *force* that *pulls* on objects. Yet the theory of General Relativity shows that there is NO pulling. Instead, objects *fall* into the *curving* of space. Yes, that means that what we think of as space is not just an idea. Space is a physical property of the Cosmos, and it can be altered, *relative* to mass, for example. None of this is "normal" or *intuitive* to our daily life and experience. Yet, it's *not* just a matter of perception. These changes in time, space, matter, length, and mass, according to experimental *verification*, really do occur. Reality really is "stranger than *science* fiction", and really does *transcend* far beyond our human imagination. But, *not* necessarily beyond our spiritual *intuition*.

RELATIVITY'S EXPERIMENTAL VERIFICATION:

Relativity is not just a theory. It has been confirmed by numerous experiments showing that the strangeness of its predictions are truly *real*. For example, "time-dilation" has been confirmed by using extremely accurate atomic-clocks. When two of these clocks are placed in two *separate* places where gravity is different (such as sea-level vs. atop a mountain), they do not run with equal rates. The clock at sea-level runs slower because it's *closer* to the earth and is affected by *stronger* gravity than the one on the mountain.

“Place **one clock** at the top of a **mountain**. Place another on the **beach**. Eventually, you’ll see that each clock tells a **different time**. Why? Time moves **slower** as you get **closer to Earth**, because, as Einstein posited in his theory of general relativity, the **gravity** of a large mass, like Earth, **warps the space and time around it” [bold added]**

Stephen Johnson. Time is “elastic”: Why time passes faster atop a mountain than at sea level. <https://bigthink.com/hard-science/time-perception/>

QUANTUM REALM & ITS UNCERTAINTY

The ultra small situations involve things like electrons, protons, neutrons, neutrinos, “photons” (*particles of light radiation*), etc. At this level, these ultra small points of reality behave as both *particles (quanta)* and *waves*, which makes no normal sense according to Newtonian Physics. Stranger still, evidence reveals that these particle/waves are not “real” as we normally use the word. They are *pre-real probabilities* that can become “real” when *observed or measured*.

“**Nature**, it was **believed**, was **supposed** to become **simpler** the deeper you searched, not more **complex**.” p. 89 **[bold added]**

Kaku, Michio PhD. (Agnostic), Co-Creator String Theory. Prof. of theoretical physics at City College NY. *THE GOD EQUATION: THE QUEST FOR A THEORY OF EVERYTHING*.

Historians of science debate whether Max Planck or Albert Einstein was the true founder of Quantum Theory, because both had a seminal role in its early formulation. Other key figures who were involved in its ongoing development were Neils Bohr, Werner Heisenberg, Paul Dirac, Erwin Schrödinger, Richard Feynman, etc. Later, through experimental *verification*, quantum theory (*also called quantum mechanics or quantum physics*) has become an established part of modern scientific consensus.

The discovery that energy was “quantized” in discreet “quanta”, was the initial *spark* that illuminated the quantum realm. Since then, however, the truths of quantum physics have revolutionized our view of *reality* - and dramatically changed the *trajectory* of future *technology*.

As the renowned philosopher of science Thomas Kuhn described in his classic book, *THE STRUCTURE OF SCIENTIFIC REVOLUTIONS*, all major shifts from an old “normal” paradigm to a *new* paradigm are not easy. Such shifts are like a *religious*

“conversion” experience, which often involves cultural struggle before the change finally occurs. Today, it seems that a new and potentially more dramatic paradigm shift may be happening. It’s a shift from the *material* view to a deeper, *non-material* perspective. And like all paradigm shifts, cultural struggle, resistance, and “conversion” will inevitably occur.

“The **transfer** of allegiance from **paradigm to paradigm** is a **conversion experience that cannot be forced**. Lifelong **resistance**, particularly from those whose productive careers have **committed** them **to an older** tradition of **normal** science, is not a violation of scientific standards but an **index to** the nature of scientific **research itself.**” [bold added] (p. 151)

"The man who **embraces anew paradigm** at an early stage must often do so in **defiance of the evidence** provided by problem-solving. **He must, that is, have faith** that the new paradigm will succeed with the many large problems that confront it, **knowing only** that the **older paradigm has failed** with a few.

A decision of that kind can only be made on faith.” [bold added] (p. 157)

Thomas Kuhn PhD. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*.

Here are a few counter-intuitive *quantum* phenomena:

Quantum Superposition - Particles, or particle *systems*, can exist in multiple states at the same time, until they are measured/observed. They exist in all *possible* states simultaneously until measured. Each state exists only as a probability, *not* reality. It’s as if the particle, *only when measured*, settles into *only one* of the possible states.

Quantum Entanglement - Entanglement is related to superposition, and reveals the relationship between two particles. Einstein called it “spooky action at a distance”. Entanglement is when two sub-atomic particles are able to affect each other even if separated by vast distances. The phenomenon is also referred to as “non-locality”. This is *impossible* for *normal* objects. It would be like two billiard balls separated by miles, yet if you cause one ball to spin, then the other ball would also spin at the exact same time.

Quantum Tunneling - Particles can “tunnel” through barriers they should not be able to go through. Even weirder is that it takes “less” time to tunnel through, than it would take if there were *no* barrier at all. It’s as if the barrier acted as a short-cut. Experiments indicate that the time or speed of tunneling is *faster* than

the speed of light. Yet, according to Relativity nothing should be able to travel beyond the speed of light-speed (186,000 miles per second).

Quantum Biology - This branch of biological sciences investigates involves, for example, the role that quantum physics and chemistry might play in the generation of life from non-living matter (molecules). Some leading *macroevolutionists* over the past couple of decades have been speaking *out* about the *failure* of the “old” *neo-Darwinian* model to explain the origin and development of life on earth, via the mechanisms of mutations and natural selection *alone*. So, they’ve sought evidence for other *mechanisms* yet undiscovered. And many of these scientists say they have found evidence of quantum mechanisms underlying biological (life) processes.

Quantum Psychology - Along with the as yet unexplained *mysterious* origins of the *Cosmos* and of *life*, is an equal mystery to science. The origin or source of conscious *minds* in humans and in non-human sentient animals is unknown. The many different theories about the origin of conscious minds are controversial, with less consensus among scientists. Like many hypotheses in theoretical physics (*such as “String Theory” and “Multiverse Theory”*), they’re controversial because there’s no way yet to *experimentally* verify them. But, this is how all currently verified theories *start* out. In this case, there are numerous hypotheses among scientists who theorize about the relationship between consciousness and the quantum realm. However, the implications for the central subject of my book, which is compassionate agape love, are fascinating to say the *least*.

Quantum Cosmic Psyche - Numerous scholars in science, philosophy, and theology/spirituality now theorize that the “prime reality” that exists behind the Cosmos is a super (supra) Mind, a transcendent Psyche. No, not all theorists say that the Mind is a *personal* being. Some simply refer to an *impersonal* “Prime Consciousness” that transcends yet *pervades* all that we perceive as physical reality. As mentioned earlier, some refer to this as Panpsychism. Others use the term “Cosmopsychism”.

“... even if we eventually uncover a complete mechanistic understanding of the wiring and firing of every neuron in the brain, we will still be unable to explain the **phenomenon of qualia** (roughly speaking, the **subjective experience of the observer**) and the impression that neural information (loosely speaking, thoughts and urges) **seemingly possess causal power**.

(p. 4)

[bold added]

By theoretical physicist GEORGE ELLIS IN - Sara Walker, Paul Davies, George Ellis, FROM MATTER TO LIFE: Information and Causality.

“From this point of view [**Cosmopsychism**], **consciousness** may be **causally** efficacious and turn out to be the **ultimate intrinsic force underlying** the dynamic transformations described by **physics**, thus laying the foundations for a scientifically informed **idealist worldview.**” [**bold added**]

Joachim Keppler PhD. *Cosmopsychism and Consciousness Research: A Fresh View on the Causal Mechanisms Underlying Phenomenal States*. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00371/full>

[**Cosmopsychism**] was added for clarification in the quote. Also note that the “idealist” worldview does *not* mean “ideal” as in “best”. Idealism is a metaphysical philosophy proposing that conscious “ideas” from mind are the substance of reality, not material objects.]

QUANTUM CONFIRMATION

Just like the Special and General Theories of Relativity, the theory of quantum physics has been experimentally verified. When a theory is confirmed through rigorous experimentation, it’s a crucial step toward general *acceptance* in the scientific community.

So, as **strange** as the idea of material **particles** briefly **appearing from empty space** might seem, it's absolutely essential to explain our best measurements of physics. Virtual particles, like wave nature and non-locality, are an essential part of quantum physics, and **absolutely confirmed by experiment.** [**bold added**]

Chad Orzel PhD is a professor of physics and author of numerous books including, *How to Teach Quantum Physics to Your Dog*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/chadorzel/2015/07/20/three-experiments-that-show-quantum-physics-is-real/?sh=debc3901ae5f>

One of the most exciting and potentially *scary* things is that the reality of the quantum realm will likely become the key to the next giant *leap* forward in computer technology. If this new technology follows the trajectory predicted by many scientists, the projected phenomenal increase in computer capability would become *exponential*. Future quantum computers could perform calculations in only seconds, yet it would take current classical computers thousands of years. If you think that’s mind-blowing, consider what a future

combination of Artificial Intelligence (AI) with Quantum Computing could potentially produce - advances beyond imagination - both exciting and frightening. More on this in my discussion about Teleology.

“Today, **quantum computers are feared** for what we **know** about them and for what we **don’t know** about them; for their ability to **break encryption**, for the **security threats** they pose, and for the **power boost** they will give other technologies, **like AI**. All of this **uncertainty** begs the question—**should we be afraid** of quantum computers?” **[bold added]**
<https://projectqsydney.com/should-we-be-scared-of-quantum-computers/>

RELATIVITY & QUANTUM THEORIES IN CONFLICT

There are aspects of General Relativity and Quantum Theory that don’t fit and seem contradictory to one another. So, there are numerous further theories, such as the very *indirect* science of String Theory, which seek to resolve or reconcile the inconsistencies between the physics of relativity and quantum physics. String Theory attempts to unify the four fundamental forces (gravity, electromagnetic, the weak nuclear force, the strong nuclear force) and, by doing so, to also unify general relativity and quantum theory. String Theory posits that the universe exists in 10 or more different dimensions, not just the four that we directly experience (length, width, height, and time). Even though string theory is a fascinating mathematical speculation, it is not a fact. It has *no* direct, objective experimental evidence to support it. And, *some* predictions derived from string theory have failed. This doesn’t necessarily prove it to be false, but does demonstrate it to be at this time more a speculative, hypothetical “hunch” rather than a supported theory.

“Yet **experiments** conducted at the LHC have **repeatedly failed** to detect such supersymmetric particles. **This failure provides** a straightforward **refutation** of a predictive test **of string theory** using the **standard logic of scientific falsification**. These **failed** predictions as well as the **embarrassment of an infinite** number of string-theory **solutions** have engendered a **growing skepticism** about string theory among many **leading physicists**. As the **Nobel Prize–winning theoretical physicist Gerard ’t Hooft** has explained:

I would **not even** be prepared to call string theory a **“theory,”** rather a **“model,” or not even that: just a hunch.**”
 (pp. 524-525). **[bold added]**

Meyer, Stephen C.. Return of the God Hypothesis

In fact, a new *shocking* discovery using the JWST (James Webb Space Telescope) may cause cosmologists and theoretical physicists to rewrite their theories and textbooks. This new revelation *illuminates* the *biases* and *hyperbolic exaggerations* of many scientists in academia and of producers in media who so often present the very *indirect* science theories of cosmology and theoretical physics as if they are established facts. It's especially and sadly true among some atheists who use the *tentative indirect* science theories to claim that "science has proven God does not exist".

"The James Webb Space Telescope (JWST) just **revealed** six massive **galaxies** that **scientists previously thought could not exist**. These findings have the **potential** to **shatter our scientific understanding of the** universe. Physicist/Futurist, Dr. Michio **Kaku**, author of the bestselling book, THE GOD EQUATION: The Quest for a Theory of Everything appeared on **NBC News NOW** with Gadi Schwartz **to discuss these groundbreaking discoveries"**

<https://mkaku.org/home/kaku-on-jwst-discoveries/#:~:text=The James Webb Space Telescope, scientific understanding of the universe . https://www.nbcnews.com/now/video/james-webb-space-telescope-images-shatter-understanding-of-age-of-the-universe-164025413830>

As this recent JWST discovery shows, *current* theories may be *fundamentally* wrong, despite the stubborn *resistance* of the scientific communities conditioned consensus to *see* new possibilities. And this is not just limited to cosmology and theoretical physics. John Horgan, a prolific writer in the respected journal, Scientific American, in his book, *THE END OF SCIENCE: Facing the Limits of Knowledge in the Twilight of the Scientific Age*, predicted that the general science community when faced with its emerging *limits* would increasingly turn to desperate exaggeration to convince themselves and the public that science theories are facts that give us definitively answers.

"In some ways, **science is in even worse shape today** than I would have guessed back in the 1990s. In **The End of Science**, I **predicted** that scientists, as they struggle to overcome their **limitations**, would become increasingly **desperate** and prone to **hyperbole**. This trend has become more severe and **widespread** than I anticipated. In my thirty-plus years of covering science, the **gap** between the **ideal** of science **and** its messy, all-too-human **reality** has **never been greater** than it is today. **[bold added]**
Location 170

Physicists' hubris is epitomized by **Krauss's 2012**

book *The Universe from Nothing*, which **asserts** that physicists have **already discovered why** there is something rather than nothing. **Krauss's "answer" is just stale, hand-wavy speculation** that leans heavily on **quantum uncertainty**, which clever theorists can employ to explain away **anything**. **[bold added]** Location 200

"In *The End of Science*, I coined the term **"ironic science"** to describe propositions so **speculative and fuzzy— string and multiverse** theories come to mind—that they **should be viewed as fictions**. I **predicted** that as conventional science yields **diminishing** returns, **ironic science will proliferate**. Location 314

John Horgan. *The End Of Science: Facing The Limits Of Knowledge In The Twilight OfThe Scientific Age* (Helix Books). BasicBooks, 2015.

Way too many people *assume* that science theories are proven facts, and sadly the media (*TV, movies, internet discussions*) present most theories as if they are. Another example, of an *extremely* indirect science theory, which currently has no experimental evidence to verify it, is "Multiverse Theory". Actually, this theory may be impossible to ever support experimentally. The multiverse hypothesis has even been accused of being merely an effort to avoid the Intelligent Design implications of the "anthropic" fine-tuning qualities of the Cosmos, especially Earth. The *anthropic* principle in science refers to the many special factors that make life, especially intelligent life, on the earth possible, such as (cosmic mathematical constants, positions of the solar system's planets, the many relationships between Earth and its moon, etc.). Just a thought, but maybe it should be called the "agapic" principle, since it makes possible life that can live agape-love.

"Of course, in an **attempt to explain** the extreme **improbability of the fine tuning**, some contemporary physicists have **postulated** the existence of other universes—that is, the **"multiverse."** (p. 419).

"Some **leading physicists have told me**—in all candor—that **they regard the multiverse hypothesis** as a **speculative metaphysical hypothesis, not a scientific one**. For them, since **neither other universes nor God** can be observed or measured, the **choice** between the two theories comes down to **subjective preference**. They would **deny any evidential** or theoretical

reasons for preferring one hypothesis over the other. **I've** come to a **different conclusion**. Because **both** scientific and metaphysical hypotheses **can be evaluated** by **comparing their explanatory power** to that of their competitors (see Chapter 11), we can assess the **relative merits** of the **theistic design** and **multiverse** hypotheses. And there are **many reasons for preferring theistic design over the multiverse**. **[bold added]**

Meyer, Stephen C.. *RETURN OF THE GOD HYPOTHESIS*. (p. 509).

So far, none of these unifying attempts has succeeded in producing a truly unified explanation of the Cosmos. The point in all of this is that more scientists need to recognize there is *much more* about *reality* that we do *not* know.

“As Princeton physicist Freeman Dyson once said, the road to the unified field theory is littered with the corpses of failed attempts. (p. 2). **[bold added]**

Kaku, Michio. *The God Equation*

Mathematical theories *limited* to the *material* realm have failed, I believe, because a truly *comprehensive* unified explanation and understanding of reality *must* involve a new shift that encompasses the deeper *non-material* as well. In fact, it seems that such a shift is occurring. Aspects of relativity and quantum physics, are now being integrated with biology, psychology, philosophy, and metaphysics. And, this new integration is increasingly “mirroring” the foundational principles found in many spiritual (theological) worldviews, which have been intuitively (just like science’s “thought-experiments”) proposed for thousands of years. This is most evident in the growing scientific discussions and theorizing about the origin of mentally *moral* realities like empathy and compassionate, altruistic love.

People often focus on the *negative* differences between the various spiritual-religious worldviews. However, instead of focusing on the *differences* between superficial religious *doctrines*, it can be eye opening to consider the deeper core *similarities* common to most. It becomes especially enlightening if our considerations are motivated by the commitment to humbly, cooperatively learn and understand the *ultimate* truth of reality, whatever that might turn out to be.

This mutual cooperative, *cultural* effort toward a comprehensive understanding is not and never can be a purely *objective* process. It is just as much a *subjective* psychosocial, interpersonal, neurobiological process as is any other human

endeavor. And as discussed earlier, such human *reasoning* processes always involve elements of rational faith/belief. Psychiatrist, Dr. Curt Thompson describes some of the common *false* assumptions regarding science that cause many to miss the fact that scientific observation and interpretation of data unavoidably involve scientists' personal *subjective*, mental elements of uncertainty, emotions, and *faith*.

“Science. I turn next to this realm because it is one that I live in. **Those who are not** professional scientists or science philosophers generally **assume that this field is** strictly limited to **logical interpretation of data** and that other elements of the **mind**, such as emotion or memory (especially implicit memory), do not peddle much influence. **Real life tells us otherwise.”** [bold added]

“ ... there is, in fact, **no way of knowing anything without** committing oneself in **faith** to something **outside oneself**, something that **cannot be controlled** and **therefore is doubtful**. I am aware that this is not new information to novice, let alone seasoned, scientists. Most are well-aware of the **Heisenberg principle**, which posits that the **very act** of **observing** some phenomenon **alters** that **phenomenon** in some way. In addition, the scientists I know work hard to remain aware of these synthesizing and (at times) **competing elements of the mind** in order to practice their trade with integrity. Still, I believe it **would be helpful** for **science** communities to **explore** together how they are living out their vocation and **how alternative parts of their minds shape** the way they process and **interpret data.”** [bold added] p. 260.

Curt Thompson MD, Christian Psychiatrist Neurologist. *ANATOMY OF THE SOUL: Surprising Connections Between Neuroscience and Spiritual Practices that can Transform Your Life and Relationships*

BEWARE THE YAWNING EFFECT OF MIRROR MIMICRY

I can still remember when I was in a doctoral program for counseling psychology taking a course in physiological psychology and marveling at how much the *mediation* of our subjective mental states are *influenced* by biochemical neural circuitry. Even more, how our interpersonal relationships and the exposure to the patterns of attitude and actions of others around us shaped our own views - often *unconsciously*. This natural mimicking effect (the contagious yawning effect of *social osmosis*) links our brains and minds with the culture or subculture around us. The process can produce good or bad results, depending on *what* we are exposed to.

Many people acquire their worldview by osmosis from their surrounding culture. They often have **unexamined** presuppositions about the nature of nature, of **human** beings, or of **ultimate reality**. An important question, therefore, is: Do we **just** have to **accept** some **worldview** or another as a **presupposition** through which we **interpret reality**? Or **can we** rationally **evaluate** different worldviews as **competing** metaphysical hypotheses and **determine** which, if any, is most likely to be **true**?" (pp. 344-345). **[bold added]**

Meyer, Stephen C.. PhD in Philosophy of Science from Cambridge. RETURN OF THE GOD HYPOTHESIS: THREE SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERIES THAT REVEAL THE MIND BEHIND THE UNIVERSE.

So, a crucial key to cooperating together in our mutual search for truth, with the least amount of preconceived, *mind-blinding* biases, is the need to humbly resist our human tendency to *protect* our *socially* absorbed beliefs. Humility recognizes we each can be and probably are "wrong" about some aspects of our own worldview (cosmic perspective) of reality. And humility acknowledges that we can each potentially *learn* from others, yes, especially those who hold "opposing" views. Most importantly, compassionate love for all others, if genuine, seeks to empathize (truly understand) through the eyes and hearts of those "others".

Sadly, this important virtue is fading in our *virtual* reality, *unsocial* media, *digitally* dominated worldwide culture. Dr. Thompson, explains how and why we all must commit to *practicing* and *modeling* humble empathy in our collective effort to seek the truth of the Cosmos together. *Failure* to practice it consistently (which is hypocrisy) hinders our current progress, and subsequently creates conditions that could cripple the younger generations who are watching our *conflict*.

"Each of these systems has a specific **neural circuitry** or **biochemical route** that connects different parts of the brain and body. One system of particular interest to **researchers** in the last ten years is that of **mirror neurons**, which leads to mimicry. **Virtually all** intentional human behavior is ultimately **mimicked**.

.... This has important **implications** for actions such as **empathy**. Empathy can be described as an **action rather than merely a feeling** alone because

we **demonstrate empathy** through **nonverbal** and **verbal cues or actions** that project the intent of **connecting** with another's state of mind. When a **child** is the **subject of another's empathy**, he or she will likely **undergo the activation of his or her mirror neuron** system related to **empathy**. In other words, children **learn how to be empathic with others by seeing it** demonstrated toward them. This mirror neuron system is one of many that are **vital** in **regulating** how we interact both within our own minds and in relationship with others." **[bold added]** (p. 42)

Curt Thompson MD, Christian Psychiatrist Neurologist. *ANATOMY OF THE SOUL: Surprising Connections Between Neuroscience and Spiritual Practices that can Transform Your Life and Relationships*

In the next section on "AGAPE", my discussion will obviously be coming from a spiritual, somewhat theological perspective. No, not Christian as in the current cultural, politicized, commercialized version. But simply as a person who embraces and tries to follow the agape love principles taught and lived by Jesus. So, yes, that's my own personal bias. The good news is that I *recognized* my bias, and I actively strive to be fair-minded. Plus, I bet you'll find that the *core* of my viewpoint matches much of *your own* core values and deepest convictions. So, please reserve *judgment* and beware of the natural temptation to form prejudicial *assumptions* before you've read on through to the end.

My personal journey, to the perspective that I now have, is similar to that of Dr. Stephen Meyer, however, clearly Steve's intellect and knowledge are way beyond my own.

"Three Big Questions. ... My own interest in what **scientific discoveries show** about the **possible existence of God** germinated over thirty years ago when I attended an unusual conference. At the time, I was working as a **geophysicist** doing seismic digital signal processing for an oil company in Dallas, Texas. In February 1985, I learned of a **Harvard historian of science** and astrophysicist, Owen Gingerich, who was coming to town to talk about the **unexpected convergence** between **modern cosmology and the biblical account** of creation as well as the **theistic implications of the big bang theory**. ... They would be **discussing three big questions** at the intersection of science and philosophy: the origin of the **universe**, the origin of **life**, and the origin and nature of human **consciousness**. ... What **shocked me** was the **persuasive** talks by other **leading scientists** who thought that recent **discoveries** in their own fields had decidedly **theistic** implications.

.... **Neither** wanted to **claim** that these discoveries “**proved**” the existence of **God**. They cautioned that **science cannot “prove” anything** with absolute certainty.

.... I decided to **focus** my own energies on assessing that **possibility**, eventually completing my **PhD thesis** at the University of **Cambridge** on the subject of **origin-of-life biology**. Much later, in 2009, I published *Signature in the Cell*. (p. 21-22) **[bold added]**

Stephen C. Meyer PhD in Philosophy of Science from Cambridge.
*RETURN OF THE GOD HYPOTHESIS: THREE SCIENTIFIC
 DISCOVERIES THAT REVEAL THE MIND BEHIND THE UNIVERSE.*

In addition, you’ll see that one of the central aspects of my current worldview is a concept called “kenosis”. It’s not just some *fancy* philosophical term. It simply refers to a human virtue that all of us value highly. That virtue is genuine selfless *humility*. The term “kenosis” comes from ancient Greek and its verb form means “to empty out”. The opposite would be “full of”. So, empty or full of what? It’s selfishness. We all agree that being “full of yourself” is a *bad* thing, and that being empty of that attitude is a *good* thing. Genuinely humble, compassionate love, the highest human value, arises from a chosen attitude of “kenosis”. The agape, kenosis kind of love taught and lived by Jesus (and by many others in history) is the ultimate Source, the Way, and the Goal of the Cosmos.

If you’re interested in learning more about how the concept of “kenosis” relates to cosmology, I encourage you to read some of the writings of Christian theoretical physicist, George Ellis PhD. Just be prepared because his books and articles include a lot of technical discussion. Yet, throughout most of them, he has many lengthy sections that are very down to earth, not only for our individual personal lives, but also *society* now and as we all head toward the *future*.

B - BEYOND AGAPE: AN UNNATURAL “SERVANT-FRIEND” TYPE OF LOVE

“This can all be **integrated** into a **kenotic cosmological-theological-ethical view**, providing a consistent picture which is in principle **capable of uniting the sciences and humanities in an overarching worldview ...**” p. 67. **[bold added]**

In Chapter 6, “Kenosis as a Unifying Theme for Life and Cosmology”, by Cosmologist George F. R. Ellis PhD. (Theoretical

physicist who is considered to be a world leader in relativity and cosmology)

THE WORK OF LOVE: Creation as Kenosis.

Editor, John Polkinghorne PhD.

“.... The **key idea** is that the **fundamental aim of loving action shapes the nature of creation** and of transcendence in practice, setting their meaning, implications, and limitations. Thus we **take seriously** the concept that the **purpose of the universe** is precisely **to make this kind of sacrificial response possible**, and pursue the implications.” p. 67

In Chapter 6, “Kenosis as a Unifying Theme for Life and Cosmology”, by Cosmologist George F. R. Ellis PhD. (Theoretical physicist who is considered to be a world leader in relativity and cosmology)

THE WORK OF LOVE: Creation as Kenosis.

Editor, John Polkinghorne PhD.

Remember that agape was the ancient Greek term used for the *highest* form of unselfish love. Yet, Jesus and his followers pushed the term and its concept much *farther* than its normal meaning. *Normal* or “natural” agape will risk one’s life to save family or friends. But Jesus taught and lived a form of agape that willingly sacrifices oneself even to save an *enemy*. This is *not* a normal or natural kind of love. It transcends human nature and is a “supra” natural kind of love.

Picture this. When a person is attacked, the *normal* reaction *physically* is to use one’s arms to either defend or attack. But, diametrically opposed to each of those responses, is the kind of agape-love Jesus taught, lived, and died. This transcendent kind of agape chooses, arms opened wide, to *embrace* an enemy with compassionate, forgiving love.

“Father, **forgive them for they do not understand** what they are doing”.

Luke 23:34

“Everybody knows that love is the **greatest thing** in the world, and Christians know why. It is because **God is love**, The **meaning of agape** is the sacrifice of oneself in the **service** of others.” **[bold added]**

Dr. John Stott. THE RADICAL DISCIPLE: SOME NEGLECTED ASPECTS OF OUR CALLING.

The type of agape that Jesus taught and lived is an other-serving, voluntary *servant*-type of love. It's a love that uses power and knowledge to *serve* others. One of the most tragically funny events in the New Testament involves two of Jesus's disciples, two *immature* "grown" men, and their mother. These man-boys were brought to Jesus by their "mommy". She *mistakenly* believed that Jesus would soon become a *powerful* ruler, just like the typical "emperors" of that world. So, she asked Jesus to place her sons at his right and left seat of power, in the *wrongly imagined* "kingdom" she hoped for. The kind of kingdom she envisioned was the typical survival (rule) of the fittest, where rulers *dominate* over others.

But Jesus corrected and explained to her, and her sons, and to all the followers standing around, that his *Way of rule* was the very opposite of the *natural* way of power in the world. His *Way* and his *power* was agape-love, ruling as true civil-*servants* for all people, especially to the poor, outcasts, downtrodden, underprivileged, rejected, and oppressed.

"Jesus called his **followers** together and said,
'You know that the **rulers** ...
exercise **tyranny**

But it must not be so among you.
Whoever wants to become **great** among you
must be a **servant** of all others'."

Matthew 20:25-28

SO, WHY DOES "GOD" IN THE OLD TESTAMENT SEEM SO UNLOVING & DOMINEERING?

It's a great question, and one that bothers a lot of people, including a lot of Christians, and me for a long time in my past. If the God of Jesus exists as the kind of humble, gentle, agape servant-love revealed in the NT writings, then why does "God" in the OT seem so violent, vindictive, and even sometimes cruel? Why do so many OT laws, supposedly given by God, seem so *shockingly* immoral?

For example, the *offenses* causing a person to be *stoned to death* included:

- a woman if she falsely claimed she was a virgin
- a youth who curses his parents, any adulterer
- any person who worshipped another god
- anyone caught “working” on the Sabbath day, etc.

Can you imagine if America had such laws? Of course not. American law would call such laws “cruel and unusual punishment”. So ask yourself, why are such things in the Old Testament? Are they *really* from God, or are also how Moses and the people of that time struggled to understand and to *imagined* God to be?

“But, **worst** of all, a **literalist** reading of Scripture depicts **God** as a moral **monster**, capable of constructing, committing, and commanding evils that violate any healthy human conscience. **But it hasn’t always been this way**. There **was** a richer, **deeper, literal sense** in the **early** church—one that didn’t lead to crass **caricatures** of our loving God. (p. 119). **[bold added]**

Jersak, Bradley. *A More Christlike WORD*.

Some ultra conservative Christians try to *defend* those parts of the OT as being *exactly* what God *wanted*. They do this because of *their* version of a doctrine called “inerrancy”. They say, as I once did, that every part of the Bible is perfect and exactly as God wanted it. This *insecurity*-filled logic goes like this, if any part of the Bible is not fully from God, then the whole Bible would be untrustworthy and therefore of no value. I understand their belief because I once held it and *reluctantly* defended it.

Don’t panic yet, my fellow Christian friends. Yes, I’m convinced by strong evidence that the Bible is *inspired*. However, the Bible authors make no such claim about inerrancy. So, no, I don’t believe it’s “inerrant” as many define the concept.

Sadly, I’m ashamed to say that a *small* part of me kept silent about my inner questions and concerns, because our family *income* was tied to the organizations for which I worked, and we had ongoing expensive *medical* needs for a couple of my children. By the way, I’m not the only one to have struggled with that temptation. As a counselor, I’ve had many conservative pastors and church leaders privately admit to me their own questioning doubts, and their fear of losing their income if they revealed their full heart publicly.

But as I've continued studying the issues, reading and *researching* many Christian scholars with different perspectives, I've now come sort of "out of the closet" to correct my error. That particular definition of *inerrancy* as *distorted*, because it is logically *inconsistent* and theologically *unnecessary*.

"It is **Christ** Himself, **not** the **Bible**, who is the **true word** of God. The Bible, read in the right spirit and with the guidance of good teachers, will bring us **to Him**. We **must not use the Bible** as a sort of encyclopedia out of which texts can be taken for use as **weapons.**" **[bold added]**
(C. S. Lewis)

JULIUS CASAER

For example, when it comes to historical figures like, Julius Caesar, those same *inerrantists* trust the *truth* value of the historical documents *about* Caesar. Yet they understand, that those documents are *not* inerrant. They know parts of the Julius Caesar historical documents could be or likely are *inaccurate* exaggerations, embellishments, or confabulations. Yet, even so, they do still accept as true and trustworthy the *core* history about Julius Caesar and the Roman Empire.

I now see the Bible in a somewhat similar light. I believe it is "inspired" with *uniquely* valuable ethical and spiritual principles *inspired* from the *ultimate* transcendent Creator Source of agape-love. I no longer see it as "inerrant" the way hyper-conservatives do. Some of you who are Christians might be *assuming* that my *appreciation* for Jesus, and the Judeo-Christian scriptures, must therefore have become *lessened* with this change in my view.

Not at all! In fact, having been *freed* from limited *literalism*, rigid *inerrantism*, and now *interpreting* the Bible through the agape-*lens* of Jesus's life and teachings, I see a deeper, even more awe-inspiring beauty shining *through* the dark human historical, clouded stories in the Bible. Those dark clouds were caused by the natural human process called psychological "projection", through which biblical authors wrote.

'Bibliolatry' - is a reverence for Scripture that becomes **worship of the book** itself, where the Bible is described in terms only attributable to God himself, and **loyalty to one's interpretation** of the Bible **trumps faithfulness to the Gospel.**
(p. 312) **[bold added]**

Bradley Jersak. *A More Christlike **GOD**: A More Beautiful Gospel*.

“Archbishop of Canterbury Michael Ramsey once said, “**God is Christlike,** and in Him there is **no unChristlikeness at all.**” **[bold added]**.

Bradley Jersak. *A More Christlike **GOD**: A More Beautiful Gospel*.
(p. 84)

So, where do those *many* cruel sounding, violently immoral looking laws, that do *not* look like the life or teachings of Jesus, actually come from? And why do so many *immature* Christians look and act like the *distorted* traditional images of “God” that they worship?

I am especially taken with Pete Enns’s “Christotelic” **interpretation**, which is why I asked him to explain it in the foreword to this book. In fact, he’s answered one of my most bewildering **questions** in one sentence: **Why does the Bible contain so many bizarre, offensive, and un-Christlike depictions of God?** Pete’s answer:

‘Because **God let his children tell the story.**’ (p. 53).

[bold added]

Jersak, Bradley. *A More Christlike **WORD**: Reading Scripture the Emmaus Way*.

When people *worship* an *inspired*, yet clouded *book* instead of the crystal clear Creator *Source*, who *inspired* the book, they eventually become what they idolize. Especially when the truths about love in the book are partially *obscured* by the human writers’ distorted psychological “projections” of a God with human-like selfish, unloving character flaws? The result of such “bibliolatry” is believers, followers, who look like that same *unloving*, un-Christ-like, kind of character. In contrast, people who take the life and teachings of Jesus seriously and use his *love*-lens as their perceptual filter to understand the God of the Bible, they become more and more like the loving God they value (worship).

PROGRESSIVE REVELATION OF AGAPE-LOVE

Remember that the Greek LXX was the most common OT translation quoted in the NT. The OT LXX used agape, just as the NT did, for God’s *transcendent* supra-natural kind of love. However, God’s *self*-revelation as Agape-Love was *increasingly* made known and recorded in the OT, *gradually* as time unfolded across history - like training an *immature* child step by step toward maturity.

“Therefore the **Old Testament** law was our **tutor** [*leading*] to Christ,”
Galatians 3:24

This theological concept is called the “progressive revelation” (PR) *from* God *about* love. Alongside PR, is also the fallible, progressive *understanding* (and often *misunderstanding*) of God’s self-revelation. This progressed from the beginning story of the Garden of Eden, to the teachings of Jesus.

An example is the concept of the “Trinity”. There is no verse in the Bible that directly, explicitly says God exists as a trinity. But it does say that God exists as agape love, which is always a *giving* type of love, flowing out to others in a relationship. Logically, if that is God’s nature, then prior to creation of the Cosmos, there was only God. And, God’s agape type of love must have been flowing in relationship. This logic along with the many OT verses referring to God in Hebrew as “Elohim” (plural), plus NT verses about God the “Father” and the “Spirit” and the “Son” existing eternally as *distinct* persons led to the concept of the Trinity.

“However, in my view, this development is not a late, evolving conception that contradicts an earlier one but is an instance of unfolding **(progressive) revelation**, analogous to the **progressive revelation** of the **Trinity**.” (p. 81). **[bold added]**

Peckham, John C.. PhD, Prof. Theology and Philosophy. *THEODICY OF LOVE: COSMIC CONFLICT AND THE PROBLEM OF EVIL*.

“The biblical **account** of the **Garden of Eden** is one of the most **profound** stories in all of **literature**.” p. 135 **[bold added]**

“The divinely guided **historical process** that brought him into the world was spread over many centuries because of the **preparatory lessons** that humanity needed to **learn**.” (P. 161) **[bold added]**

John Lennox Ph.D., DPhil., DSc. (*speaks five languages English, Russian, French, German, Spanish*). Oxford Prof. Math, Philosophy, Science. *2084: ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND THE FUTURE OF HUMANITY*.

Along the way, humans, including the people of Israel struggled to *understand* the Creator’s self-revelation of agape, in part because of the psychological and sociological tendency to *project* onto God their own fallen nature and character. In other words, to make “idols” in our own human image. That’s why the OT *begins* as a *picture* of a *peaceful* Garden of Eden (Hebrew for Eden = place of

pleasure), with *no* survival of the fittest, or violence, or selfish competition among sentient creatures.

Little known, even among pastors, is the fact that Genesis 2:15 *clarifies* and *qualifies* the chapter 1 “dominion” role of humans. It says that humans are to be “serving protectors”, not selfish predators. In that verse, two specific Hebrew terms (*abad* = to serve, and *shamar* = to protect) are used. These two important terms counter our human tendency to interpret “dominion” as “domination”. Sadly, most Christians, and even many pastors and theologians, are either unwittingly *ignorant* of this important qualification, or *choose* to ignore it. This has led to a gross *misinterpretation* and *misuse* of what’s sometimes called, the *dominion* mandate, resulting in Christians failing to live and proclaim our human responsibility. Our *delegated* human responsibility is to “serve” and “protect” the environment (creation), especially the human and sentient non-human animals (creatures) the Way the Creator designed for us. (*Remember the earlier quote of Jesus expounding, expanding on this humble servant-rulership agape principle in Matthew 20:20-28*).

Then by Genesis chapter 3, things degenerate into selfishness (“*sin*” = *anti-agape, lack of love*), and subsequently into violent, survival of fittest. Ancient cultures, with their use of language, metaphors, and practices, projected and reflected a *less* than agape character, *even about God*. Which is why the OT portrayal of God often seems so vengeful, vindictive, and violent. Later, OT prophets *exposed* and *opposed* much of what was thought, taught, and practiced in the OT before and during their time. Eventually, Jesus, using the full truth of humble compassionate agape, directly *confronted* and *corrected* many OT laws and traditions. Even more, Jesus himself disobeyed and violated many OT laws, in order to live out compassionate agape for others.

Not only the OT prophets, Jesus, and his NT followers, but also agape-centered, altruistic-activists from other cultures and/or within other “religions” throughout history taught a similar message. Sages and spiritual mystics, like Siddhartha in India who was called the Buddha, all taught some truths about the way of compassionate love. And, all of them also similarly *exposed* and *opposed* anti-love, especially *confronting* those in power who failed to live and rule with a compassionate, humble, “civil-servant” heart.

**WE’RE STILL PROGRESSING, YET CHILDISHLY,
3 STEPS FORWARD THEN 2 STEPS BACKWARD**

None of us have arrived at perfect, pure love, not individually and definitely not collectively. Yet the awareness of humble, compassionate, other-serving love continues to shine through the obvious darkness of selfishness and suffering that still saturates this world. More and more people from all walks of life are talking about how important it is and how desperately it's needed. Yet, even Christians who claim to be following the Christ, who centered on this love, talk it far more than we walk it out.

Since agape is used in the NT for the very *nature* and *character* of God, the ultimate first-cause Source, then agape is also the summation of the *law* of God, which is built into the very laws and fabric of the Cosmos. As such, agape is therefore the *way* of God for life, and subsequently the *goal* toward which God is moving all things in the Cosmos (*1 Cor. 15:28 "God will be all in all"*). But, even though the centrality of agape-love is recognized and taught by virtually all Christian groups, it's too often minimized, neglected, ignored, or even *avoided* in their lives, articles, books, sermons, and other presentations. At best, it's given minimal lip-service. Jesus confronted those in religious leadership who talked about love but rarely lived it.

[Jesus said to them] **"Isaiah was right when he prophesied about you hypocrites; as it is written:**

**'These people honor me with their lips,
but their hearts are far from me.'**"

Mark 7:6

Check it out for yourself. Go online and search articles and books by pastors and theologians to see if love is more than lip-service. Love is rarely the functional *foundation* and *guide* throughout their writings. Worse, is that many current conservative Christians seem to be mocking, ridiculing, and vilifying any emphasis on love or "compassion" as if those terms and concepts are "*liberal-lies*". But *love is not* liberal. Love is the Creator's way for *all*, no excuse.

Initially, it may seem *incompatible* and even *contradictory* that the Creator is characterized by love, yet the "creation" is so saturated with horrible *suffering* among humans *and* animals. Recently, an agnostic friend from England posted online a link to an article about how *horrific* many *parasites* are. In my friend's comment on Facebook, he asked a common question about this *apparent* incompatibility. " If all things including parasites were created by **the mind of**

God, then “**what was God thinking!**”. My friend’s question is the core of a philosophical issue called, “**Theodicy**”.

C - THEODICY: Why Suffering Exists in a “Good” God’s Cosmos?

Theodicy addresses the question (the *problem*): How can there be a *good* “Creator”, who exists as pure unselfish agape-love (1 John 4:8, 16), yet the “creation” seems to be saturated with selfish evil and suffering. This is one of the most common reasons many people doubt or *reject* God.

Later, I’ll flesh out a more complete solution to the theodicy issue, *but for now*, keep in mind the universally accepted fact that genuine love must and always does give the other person the *freedom* to choose either a mutual relationship of self-giving love and trust - or to reject it. That gift of *liberty* means that some might choose to reject the relationship of reciprocal self-giving love and trust. Those who reject it, choose instead to go their own way, the self-serving way.

Consider the broader scope of the theodicy question. It involves the psychosocial, seemingly universal, *intuitive* awareness of a “good vs. evil” reality. All throughout history in legends, and seen today in movies, books, and online cultural *concerns*, our collective consciousness recognizes there are “forces” of anti-love *selfishness* (“evil”) that seem to battle against our desires and goals toward “good”.

I use the term “forces” because most folks are aware of the possibility or even *probability* that the *evil* of selfishness, and subsequently its *conflict* with good, originates from beyond the limited number of physical dimensions we can perceive. *Evidence* for this collective *intuitive* awareness can be seen in our often *scary* novels, movies, and TV shows, discussions about possible extra-terrestrial and or extra-dimensional intelligent life, and concerns about UFO’s or UAP’s. All cultures in history have intuitively *known* that there are *forces* of good vs. evil *beyond* our direct perception. In other words, they have an awareness of a “Cosmic Conflict” that extends beyond or behind our physical world. The fact that various cultures have invented *superstitious myths* to explain not only the intuition but even the personal *evidences* of such forces *does not negate* the *possible* reality *beneath* those myths.

Astrophysicist, computer scientist, technologist, and internet pioneer, Dr. Jacques Valle, studied this cultural, psychosocial phenomenon for decades. I began

reading Dr. Valle’s writings as an insatiably curious teenager. Dr. Valle’s scientific career began as a professional astronomer at the Paris Observatory. He also co-developed the first computerized map of Mars for NASA, and now at 82 runs a research and development company. Dr. Valle has proposed and championed what’s called the “Interdimensional Hypothesis”.

“The **interdimensional hypothesis** of unidentified flying objects (UFOs) and related events, **advanced by astrophysicist Jacques Vallee**, holds that **these phenomena** are **visitations** from other **universes (or dimensions)** that **coexist separately** alongside our own. It further proposes that they are a modern manifestation of entities or phenomena which have appeared throughout and possibly before recorded history, and which **were previously explained as mythological or supernatural creatures.**” **[bold added]**

<https://en-academic.com/dic.nsf/enwiki/800457>

“The UFO **phenomenon** represents **evidence for other dimensions beyond spacetime**.... What we see here is not an alien invasion. It is a **spiritual system** that **acts** on humans and **uses** humans.” **[bold added]**

<https://reasons.org/explore/blogs/take-two/the-supreme-kind>

In a 2022 interview for wired magazine, Dr. Valle, discussed his *current* conclusions, which coincide with those of some leading theoretical physicists regarding *consciousness* as a fundamental property of nature.

“**Whatever** the **scientific truth** here is, Vallée **suspects** that it may be knotted up with the **secret of consciousness itself**. The thing that **philosophers** call **qualia—the conscious experience** each human has—seems to be more than the sum of our physical parts. There’s **an unsolved x** there. Vallée’s friend Federico Faggin, for one, argues that **consciousness is a basic property of nature**, that the **dimensions** we call **spacetime** are in fact **byproducts of some deeper reality.**” **[bold added]**

<https://www.wired.com/story/jacques-vallee-still-doesnt-know-what-ufos-are>

These considerations and theories mirror the *spiritual* concepts found in many ancient worldviews, including the Judeo-Christian one described in the Bible. These theological perspectives reveal a “cosmic-conflict” that extends, transcends, our physically observable dimensions. The *terms* used are different, but the concepts are interestingly similar. Beyond our normal, natural immediate

perceptual experience exists a trans, inter, or extra dimensional realm with entities (beings) who can “inter-act” with our own. The ancient Judeo-Christian tradition called them “angels” (good ones: who are agape motivated) and “demons” (evil ones: who are selfishly motivated by anti-love survival of the fittest). This *transcendent* realm, along with its interactive interventions, including *negatively* infective influences, is a significant element of the full answer to the questions of “theodicy”.

In light of this, it’s reasonable to consider that our understandings of the micro or macro evolutionary *development* of life on Earth may have been influenced for *good* and/or *bad* by forces that were *not* from Earth. Remember, many evolutionary theorists have already postulated a theory called “Panspermia”, in order to try and explain the inexplicable *mystery* of life’s origin on Earth - molecules to microbes. Panspermia theorizes that millions of years ago extra-terrestrial intelligent beings from another planet or dimension came to Earth and “seeded” the first life. And that these “ET’s” may have also manipulated the development of life as the millennia have progressed.

For example, Professor Avi Loeb at Harvard is a leading theorist in this area of research, and is highly respected. Below is an extensive bio and quote to help you realize that such theories are not just fringe speculations. Dr. Valle, Dr. Loeb, and many others are respected members of the scientific community.

“Dr. Loeb received a PhD in plasma physics at age 24 from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem (1986) and was subsequently a long-term member at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton (1988-1993), where he started to work in theoretical astrophysics. In 1993 he moved to Harvard University where he was tenured three years later. ... Loeb has authored nearly 700 research articles and 4 books.” <https://astronomy.fas.harvard.edu/people/avi-loeb>

Here’s Dr. Loeb’s explanation of his view:

“**Despite** the impression one gets from **textbooks**, our **current scientific knowledge represents a small island in a vast ocean of ignorance**. The scientific enterprise is all about expanding the land mass of this island. And it is fun to be human and engage in the activity of **gaining** knowledge. It would have been much more boring to know **everything** in advance, **like God**. But given that, it would be shocking for us to suddenly learn much more **by meeting the product of an alien civilization** that had

billions of years of scientific exploration instead of merely a few centuries, and hence **appear to us as a pretty good approximation to God.**

.... Is there something **we might be missing** already here and now? When looking around us, the most **mysterious** phenomenon we encounter routinely is the **sophistication of complex life**. Some scientists wondered whether life itself was **seeded on Earth by an alien civilization in a process called “panspermia”**.

.... **If life was seeded artificially on Earth**, one may wonder whether the **seeders are checking on the outcome**. And if so, the fact that we have not heard from them may indicate that they are disappointed. The experiment may have failed or we are simply too slow to mature. Well, this may not come as a surprise given the irresponsible way we behave sometimes. Perhaps **if we only knew** that **someone is looking** over our shoulders, **we would do better.** *[bold added]*

Avi Loeb PhD, Harvard. “Advanced Extraterrestrials as an Approximation to God” <https://lweb.cfa.harvard.edu/~loeb/GE.pdf>

EARTHLY? OR EXTRA TERRESTRIAL? OR BOTH?

Before discussing further the possibilities of intelligent forces, *external* from earth, influencing the origin and development of life, it’s important to first understand more fully why even *atheistic* and *agnostic* scientists are searching for answers *beyond* the *old*, neo-Darwinian model and its mechanisms. In other words, *why* are they seeking a *better* theory.

This EVO discussion has 5 short sections:

- 1) **Two Evolutions:** Micro vs. Macro
- 2) **Micro-Evolution:** Verified Reality
- 3) **Macro-Evolution:** Missing Mechanisms
- 4) **“Atheistic” Macro-Evo:** vs. God
- 5) **“Theistic” Macro-Evo:** A Monster God

“This chapter and the previous one have **revealed** the **extraordinary** range of **counterexamples** to the processes **assumed** in **Neo-Darwinism** to be **sufficient** to **explain** biological evolution.

.... The single process of gradual accumulation of small **mutations** followed by natural **selection** is **clearly inadequate** as the basis of a **comprehensive theory.**” *[bold added] (p. 232).*

Denis Noble PhD (Agnostic) an evolutionary Prof. of Cardiovascular & Computational Physiology at Oxford University, *DANCE TO THE TUNE OF LIFE: Biological Relativity.*

So, the following is a brief *deeper* look at the scientific questions involving micro and macro evolution. Then I'll pick back up the theory regarding an *external* insurgent influence on the development of life on Earth, by *extra-dimensional malevolent* beings. Just keep in mind that many scholars in science, philosophy and theology are convinced such an *external* influence is a significant part of the *cause* of horrific *suffering* in the world. Also, consider that since we humans can genetically engineer (manipulate and alter) life on Earth, how much more might have intelligent ET's or ED's (extra-dimensional) done so in the past. Remember, some of us humans (all of us at times) have misused and abused our delegated responsibility, power, and capabilities by messing up the earth and harming fellow creatures to fulfill our personal desires. Therefore it's theoretically possible, probable in fact, that ED's we cannot directly perceive (extra dimensional creatures) did the same in history - and maybe still do.

“**Experimental results** in **epigenetics** and related fields of biological research show that the **Modern Synthesis (neo-Darwinist) theory** of evolution **requires** either extension or **replacement**.

.... most **particularly** work focused on trans-generational **inheritance mediated** by those **mechanisms**

.... **This paper** explains **why replacement** rather than extension **is called for.**” *[bold added]*

Denis Noble PhD. *Evolution beyond neo-Darwinism: a new conceptual framework. In the Journal of Experimental Biology. Epigenetics Scope and Mechanisms.* <https://journals.biologists.com/jeb/article/218/1/7/13568/Evolution-beyond-neo-Darwinism-a-new-conceptual>

1) TWO EVOLUTIONS: MICRO VS. MACRO

A good place to start is to examine the *technical* scientific distinction between micro and macro *evolution*. In most books and videos the simple word “evolution” is usually used for both, but this can produce *misleading* misunderstandings. Keep in mind that the term evolution in its most basic form simply means “change”. For example, my views on child raising have “evolved”, especially after having six children! Below is a concise explanation with useful scientific definitions from Biophysicist, Dr. Kirk Durston.

“I often observe that in **discussions of evolution**, both evolution **skeptics and those who embrace** neo-Darwinian evolution are prone to make **one of two significant mistakes**. Both stem from a **failure to distinguish** between **microevolution** and **macroevolution**.

.... The **mistake** I often hear **evolution skeptics** make is to the effect that “evolution” is all rubbish, bunk, and false. They are often astonished to learn that **variation** (which they completely **agree with**) is **defined as “evolution.”** The solution is for evolution skeptics to be more precise on exactly what they have problems with. **They can endorse microevolution (variation)** but point out that a) it is **misleading** to call variation “evolution” and, b) their **problems** are with **macroevolution**.

.... So in order to **clearly distinguish** between microevolution and macroevolution in a **rigorous scientific way**, let me propose the following definitions:

Microevolution: genetic variation that requires **no** statistically significant **increase in functional information**.

Macroevolution: genetic change that **requires** a statistically significant **increase in functional information.” [bold added]**

*Microevolution versus Macroevolution: Two Mistakes. Biophysicist.
Kirk Durston PhD.
<https://evolutionnews.org/2015/07/microevolution/>*

2) MICROEVOLUTION: VERIFIED REALITY

Nearly everyone accepts *micro*-evolution, even those who don’t think they do, like some religious fundamentalists. Microevolution is simply the *adaptation* of populations to their changing environments through the process of survival of the fittest. My favorite example as you can imagine is wolves becoming coyotes and domestic dogs. Even though I was a personal caregiver to two elephants, two

tigers, two lions, five leopards, two wolves, and two hyenas 45 years ago at the Audubon Zoological Institute (and loved them all as “friends”), *dogs* are still my favorite animal. Dogs are dogs because humans *artificially* selected *out* various wolf gene *alleles* and therefore specific *phenotypic* characteristics. *No new functional genetic information was generated* in the process. Coyotes became coyotes the same way, but coyote micro-evolution happened by *wild* natural selection. And by the way, *many* of the selected traits remaining, plus the additional mutations, in domestic dogs, are deleterious (destructive), making them *less* survivable than wolves in the wild. They are *dependent* on human care and protection. Think about pugs, chihuahuas, etc.

“For the most part, **microevolutionary changes** (such as **variation** in color) **merely** use or express **existing** genetic information, while the **macroevolutionary change** necessary to assemble **new organs or whole body plans** requires the **production** of **new** genetic information.

Recognizing **this and other problems**, in 2008 a group of **sixteen evolutionary** biologists met in Altenberg, **Austria**, to discuss **their doubts** about the **creative power** of the **mechanism of random mutation and natural selection**. Known as the “Altenberg 16,” **they and others have called for a new theory of evolution**—one based on some **mechanism** other than—or in addition to—random mutation and natural selection.”
[bold added]

Meyer, Stephen C.. Return of the God Hypothesis (pp. 303-304).

3) MACROEVOLUTION: *MISSING MECHANISMS*

As mentioned, most *evolutionary* theorists today are looking for a better explanatory theory for life’s origin and development than the old neo-Darwinian model. That’s because every year new discoveries reveal an increasingly complex picture of what is happening at the cellular and sub-cellular levels of life. The old model and its proposed mechanisms of mutations and natural selection is woefully inadequate to account for the intricate, interdependent, interlaced, irreducibly complex cascading nano-scale systems within micro cellular machinery, all controlled by specified, functional, teleological genetic and epigenetic information programming that’s like a chemical super-computer. Mere mutations and natural selection *cannot* account for all that we now know, not statistically nor biologically.

Charles Darwin, was a brilliant observational theorist. But, during Darwin's times, neither he nor anyone else knew hardly anything about the complexity *inside* a living cell. And they knew *nothing* about chromosomes, genes, epigenetics, mutations, etc. All of that was discovered later. Darwin's astute and accurate observations *merely* recognized the micro-evolutionary adaptive variation changes within populations over the short-term, and then he extrapolated that into his theory we now call *macroevolution* over long spans of time. However, keep in mind, there is no known *sufficient* mechanism capable of producing the mind-blowing amounts of *additional* functional, specified, teleologically coded information necessary to go from molecules, to microbes, to mice-like, to monkey-like, to human-like organisms. Mutations *cannot* generate the kind of novel functional genetic information required by the theory of macroevolution. Also, natural selection is *inadequate* to "fix" advantageous traits in populations. [For more information see - [https://www.discovery.org/a/24041/.](https://www.discovery.org/a/24041/)]

"In November 2016, the Royal Society, the world's oldest and arguably most august scientific body, over which Isaac Newton once presided, hosted a similar conference in London to address perceived inadequacies in the standard neo-Darwinian theory of evolution. Austrian evolutionary biologist Gerd Müller (Fig. 10.4) opened the proceedings by outlining "the explanatory deficits" of neo-Darwinism, including its inability to explain the origin of "phenotypic complexity" and "anatomical novelty" in the history of life.

... Other evolutionary biologists have echoed this concern. ... affirming that mutation and natural selection can account for 'the survival of the fittest, but not the arrival of the fittest' ... that is, small-scale variations, but not large-scale innovations in biological form." [bold added]

Meyer, Stephen C.. Return of the God Hypothesis (pp. 304-306).

4) "ATHEISTIC" MACROEVOLUTION VS. GOD

Atheistic theorists often reject the possibility of a God, because they *assume* that *physical* "macroevolution" by some natural mechanism (including violent selfish survival of the fittest and suffering) is the *way* of life. So, using their set of *macro-evolutionary* lenses, they inevitably, yet *incorrectly*, conclude that a "good", omnipotent God *could* not exist. Superficially, this rejection of a *good* God might at first sound *philosophically* logical to some, but when examined at a deeper level it is *inconsistent* or at least *insufficient*. Remember, when some scientists, who are mainly gifted in *mathematical* info-data collecting and processing, *attempt* to speak as *philosophers* or metaphysical theorists, they often miss profoundly simple, logically philosophical, agape relational truths.

More significantly, these same scientists are usually *unaware* of the philosophical, metaphysical aspects connected even to many of their own theoretical assumptions and *speculations*. Einstein, Astronomer Ludlow, and Philosopher of Science Dr. Stephen Meyer point out below that many “scientists are very poor philosophers”, and usually have “read little philosophy and even less theology”. In other words, although they *are* scholars, they are scholars *limited* to their own narrow scope of knowledge. They are often *not* at all scholars widely read in other disciplines of knowledge.

“Einstein once said that **scientists** make **poor philosophers**. I am sorry to have to say that **Hawking**, brilliant scientist though he was, certainly demonstrated that **weakness**. The British **Astronomer Royal, Baron Rees of Ludlow**, who was a **friend of Stephen Hawking**, was asked by the Guardian newspaper what he thought of **Hawking’s pronouncement** that the creation of the **universe did not require a God**. Rees replied, “I know Stephen Hawking well enough to know that he has **read little philosophy and less theology**, so I don’t think his views should be taken with any special weight.” (p. 19). **[bold added]**

John Lennox Ph.D., DPhil., DSc. (*speaks five languages English, Russian, French, German, Spanish*). Oxford Prof. Math, Philosophy, Science. *CAN SCIENCE EXPLAIN EVERYTHING?*

In the quotes *below*, Stephen Hawking, though a brilliant genius in *mathematical* info-data processing and theorizing about the *physical* Cosmos, inadvertently reveals his *limits* of and maybe even *lack* of awareness of the philosophical, *meta*-physical subjects he so glibly dismisses. His rejection of God is in reality the rejection of even the *possibility* that anything “eternal” could exist. So, he is not only rejecting the concept of an eternal God, but also rejecting his own equally brilliant fellow *atheistic* scientists and philosophers who do believe in things that are *eternal*. A couple of examples are an eternally fluctuating universe (*repeatedly expanding and then contracting, over and over again*), and an eternally bubbling brew of quantum *virtual* particles that pop into or out of existence.

I agree with Dr. Hawking that when theists claim that the laws of the universe are the “work of God”, such a claim is more a “definition ... than a proof”. Yet, notice, the same holds true for his own claim that the Big Bang “had no cause”. His belief also is merely a *definition*, *not* a proof. His statement is merely a definitional proclamation.

And notice, in his *philosophical* struggle to explain, Dr. Hawking's other *proclamations* are *inconsistent*. An example is his effort to use the *fact* of "no time" before the beginning of the Cosmos as his bullet to shoot down the possibility of an eternal Consciousness behind the Cosmos. He proclaims that God could *not have created* the Universe because there was *no time* before the Universe for God to have existed or created. I *agree* with the science that there was no time before the 4-D space-time Cosmos existed. Yet, Hawking ironically *believes* the Big Bang came into existence - *when* there was *no time*. If his claim were true, that God could *not exist* because there was *no time*, then the Big Bang also should not have been able to happen either.

Remember as you read Dr. Hawking's statements, that he, Dr. Krauss, and other anti-theistic cosmologists say that before the big bang there was "nothing". So, their major problem as discussed earlier is their efforts to define what that "nothing" was. At that point of history, "when" no-time became existing-time, their extremely *indirect* speculations are just that, *speculations*.

As previously shown, there is no scientific way to prove or disprove God's existence either before or after the beginning of the Cosmos. Therefore, their claims at and on that point are definitional, propositional, philosophical statements, not even empirical scientific evidence. To *avoid* this major problem, Dr. Hawking and other atheists simply *proclaim* as a fiat statement that the Big Bang *was* something that occurred with *no time* and *no cause*, and supposedly therefore no God. Here are Dr. Hawking's claims:

"If you believe in science, like I do, you believe that there are certain laws that are always obeyed. If you like, you can say the laws are the work of God, but that is more a definition of God than a proof of his existence.

Hawking, Stephen. Brief Answers to the Big Questions (p. 26).

"You can't get to a time before the Big Bang because there was no time before the Big Bang. We have finally found something that doesn't have a cause, because there was no time for a cause to exist in. For me this means that there is no possibility of a creator, because there is no time for a creator to have existed in.

People want **answers to the big questions**, like **why** we are **here**. ... When people ask me **if a God created** the universe, I tell them that **the question**

itself makes no sense. Time didn't exist before the Big Bang so there is **no time for God to make the universe in.**

.... **Do I have faith?** We are each free to **believe** what we want, and it's **my view** that the simplest explanation is that there is **no God.** No one created the universe and no one directs our fate. **This leads me** to a profound realization: there is **probably** no heaven and afterlife either. I think belief in an afterlife is just **wishful** thinking. I think that when we die we return to dust.

(pp. 37-38) **[bold added]**

Hawking, Stephen.

Brief Answers to the Big Questions.

In addition to his *above* statements, Dr. Hawking says:

".... I don't believe in boundaries, ... for what we can do in our personal lives ..." (p. 208).

Hawking, Stephen.

Brief Answers to the Big Questions.

His *belief* that there are *no personal behavioral "boundaries"* sounds a lot like the *motive* admitted by atheist Dr. Aldous Huxley about why he did not *want* to believe in a God that would hold him accountable for *moral choices* in life. Compare Dr. Hawking's belief in *no boundaries for personal behavior* with Dr. Huxley's admission below. I'm not saying they are *exactly* the same, but the general similarities are revealing.

"I had **motives for not wanting** the world to have **meaning**; consequently **assumed** that it had **none**, and was able without difficulty to find satisfying **reasons** for this **assumption**. ... For myself, as, no doubt, for **most** of my contemporaries, **the philosophy of meaninglessness** was essentially an instrument of **liberation**. The liberation we **desired** was simultaneously liberation from a certain political and economic system and **liberation from** a certain system of **morality**. We objected to the morality because it **interfered** with our **sexual freedom.**" **[bold added]**

<https://www.greeleytribune.com/2010/08/07/lost-faith-can-be-a-result-of-lack-of-accountability/>

For some atheists, just like some theists, *beneath* their theoretical proclamations about God's existence or not, there are *biased* motives that cloud their perception and their *interpretation* of available evidence. For that reason, both

groups should set aside their a priori biases and simply *follow* the evidence to wherever or *whomever* is leads.

Speaking of Sex - What do we think of it? - We love it!

Funny thing, not only when I taught biological sciences to *youth*, but even when I taught counseling psychology to *adults*, all I had to do was mention the word “SEX”, and immediately I had the attention and engagement of the whole class!

Since I *negatively* quoted Dr. Huxley’s desire for “sexual freedom”, I need to make an important personal point to clarify. My wife Linda and I, life-partners now for 40 years, love the joy and gift of sex! And, we fully support the freedom of all people with different sexual orientations and gender identities to live their lives according to who they are. All humans, biologically and psychologically, range on a *spectrum* of sexuality, and of gender experiences.

Technically, medically, we’re all on a complex *continuum* of *conditions*. This spectral continuum is determined by our biological and neuropsychological development from conception to fetus to adulthood. A myriad of factors play into our sexual development, including genetics, epigenetics, how the fetus’s body and brain respond to hormones, etc.. The process for each of us determines not only the external and internal characteristics of our individual sexual phenotypic anatomy, but especially the sexual characteristics of our developing *brain* and *psychology*, from fetus through puberty and on throughout adulthood. The result determines how a person *responds* to and is *attracted* to the pheromones and other phenotypic characteristics of other people.

In relatively uncommon cases, the above mentioned multi-factorial sexual development can result in extreme complication, for example, a person born with both sets of sexual anatomy. There are many different types and degrees of these complex complications, each with its own medical label. Collectively, they are called in the medical literature, DSD, (Differences or “Disorders” in Sexual Development). Compassionate understanding and support is the greatest need, not only for people with these complications, but also for all of us regardless of our sexual conditions.

So, the question of “who” each of us are in our sexuality is a *condition*, not a choice. And each of us are *responsible* to make wise choices in life regardless of our conditions. In this light, there is a type of “sexual freedom” that Linda and I do *oppose*, and so do *most* if not all of our friends, including our LGBTQ+ *friends*, and I’ll bet you do to. What we oppose is “*selfish-sexuality*”. What we mean by

that is any person pursuing the personal pleasure of sex - *at the expense of* - other people they selfishly *use*. That's not the agape-way for sexuality.

Remember, love is not sex and sex is not love. Yet, sex can and should be a beautiful avenue through which faithful committed love is shared. The agape way for *anything* in our lives should always be *mutual*. So, this for all of us should involve the *maturity* to say "no" to our selfish desires to *use* others. I'm talking about self-denial of temptations like adultery, using coercion, manipulating a vulnerable person into sex, etc.

I've written specifically on this subject in a separate essay, so you can check that out later if you're interested. And I encourage you to do your own research on this subject carefully, compassionately, and honestly. It's not just about a "topic", it's about *people*, their hearts and their lives, and their honest desire to find joy, peace, and contentment in life.

5) "THEISTIC" MACROEVO: A MONSTER GOD

Some theistic macroevolutionists who *do* believe in a God, do *not* believe in "angels" (that is, any ED's - Extra Dimensional beings). So, just like their *atheistic* counterparts, some *theistic* theorists believe that macroevolution *alone, apart from* any *extra-dimensional* beings like "angels" or "diablos", is the *sole* cause of life developing the way it did on Earth. These *theistic* macroevolutionary theistic theories end up painting an image of a *monstrous* "God". Their worldview says that God alone *desired* and therefore *intentionally* designed the *horrific* process of *selfish* competition, survival of the fittest, pain, fear, and suffering among *sentient* creatures. Such a theistic worldview makes their God solely and personally responsible for the suffering that has saturated so much of the world.

But, this view of God is antithetical to the God of unselfish, non-violent, self-sacrificing love for others, taught by Jesus. Unwittingly, they present a God that's

more a great predator *monster*, than a humble protective serving *Shepherd*. In contrast, Jesus's explanation for the existence of *horror* and suffering of sentient creatures in "creation" includes the *corrupting* intervention and infective influence of *malevolent* trans/inter/extra-dimensional beings, long before humans existed.

An excellent book addressing this subject of "theodicy" is by Dr. John Peckham, *A THEODICY OF LOVE: Cosmic Conflict and the Problem of Evil*.

Dr. Peckham is respected by many other scholars, even those with *different* perspectives. The book is fairly philosophical and technical, but also contains a lot of down to earth *practical* conclusions and *applications*.

Our "anger, hostility, and sadness" should be directed **not against the God** who took on our suffering ... on the cross **but against the enemy of love** and his minions and against the **evil** that resides in the human **heart**. As **C. S. Lewis** maintains,

‘**Enemy-occupied territory**—that is what this world is. Christianity is the story of how the **rightful king** has landed, ... **in disguise**, and is calling us all to take part in a great campaign of sabotage.’

Those of us who **recognize** there is a **real conflict** between **forces** of good and evil **cannot** remain **silent** we must turn and **fight** against darkness with light—that is, **in a way that imitates Christ's** own form of resistance against evil...." **[bold added]**

Peckham, John C. PhD, Peckham, John C.. Prof. Theology and Philosophy. *THEODICY OF LOVE: COSMIC CONFLICT AND THE PROBLEM OF EVIL*.

Now, more than ever before, evidence convinces me that the *full* good news (*John 3:16* - "for God so loved the world - NT Greek for world = *Cosmos*), as communicated by Jesus and the NT writers, addresses this central theodicy problem in a profoundly *simple* way. Jesus answered the question by explaining and demonstrating through his life, death, and resurrection that evil (selfish/sin), and subsequent suffering, exist, *precisely because* God does exist as pure unselfish agape-love. God's kind of agape love *must* allow *freedom to choose*.

"This **theodicy** of **love** posits, however, that **free will** is a functional **good**, a means to the **greater end of love**—where love is perhaps the **highest** intrinsic good.

As **Lewis** puts it,

“**Free will** is what made evil possible. **Why**, then, did God give [creatures] free will? Because free will, though it makes evil

possible, is also **the only thing that makes possible any love or goodness or joy worth having**. A world of automata—of creatures that worked like **machines**—would **hardly be worth** creating. The **happiness** which God **designs** for His higher creatures is the happiness of being **freely, voluntarily united to Him and to each other**. . . .

And for that they **must be free.**"

(pp. 11-12). **[bold added]**

Peckham, John C.. Prof. Theology and Philosophy.

THEODICY OF LOVE: COSMIC CONFLICT AND THE PROBLEM OF EVIL.

True love must and always does give *liberty*. It's the free gift (grace) to choose either mutual self-giving dependent intimate *union*, or to choose self-serving independent broken *separation*. Logically, partial *separation* from the ultimate Source (*who held all things in order and harmony*), and from God's way of agape, results then and now in things "falling-apart" (*division, disorder, dysfunction, disease, selfish competition, violence, etc.*). Nature (creation) needs to be rescued. The NT Greek term for *saved* is "sozo", which literally means to "make-whole", and to "heal". The Creator's entire cosmos/creation needs to be "saved" (healed, restored) - into a *new* inter-dimensional Cosmos. And we are responsible to work *together* toward that positive goal.

COSMIC-CONFLICT & CORRUPTION

EXTRA-TERRESTRIAL & INTER-DIMENSIONAL

I'm sure you've heard the phrase, "Reality can be stranger than fiction". When it comes to relativity, multiple dimensions, quantum cosmology, you've seen that weirdness definitely is *real*. "Reality", it turns out, really is at least as strange as your favorite science fiction or fantasy films. It's especially true when it comes to the shadowy *themes* of "good vs. evil" lurking behind our human "reality", as portrayed in many TV and movie *scenarios*. In fact, these good vs. evil, Earth-transcending, extra-dimensional *themes* can be seen all throughout history in ancient literature and cultural worldviews. Yes, a lot of it is *exaggerated* superstitious myths. Yet, behind many myths are *intuitions* of insidious realities (entities), *seemingly* universally perceived across the globe and throughout all of history.

Remember that many atheistic evolutionary scientists embrace the theory called “panspermia”, which says that “extra”-terrestrial beings came to earth a long time ago and “seeded” the first DNA/life. And that many of these same scientists also accept that “extra” dimensional beings *could* exist in the unseen realms postulated by quantum and string theories. Yet these same scientists reject and *mock* the ancient *spiritual* belief in the same *type* of beings, *simply* because the ancient terms for such beings was different.

“Getting back to the matter at hand, it is **ironic** that **some people who reject the Genesis account** of the fall as having nothing to do with reality **are prepared to accept without question** the verdict of scientists who inform them that the universe must be teeming with **extraterrestrial life**, even though they have not as yet discovered evidence of its existence. The Bible claims that **humans are not the only beings in the universe** – there are **angels, and there are evil demonic power.**” (pp. 109-110).
[bold added]

John Lennox Ph.D., DPhil., DSc. (*speaks five languages English, Russian, French, German, Spanish*). Oxford Prof. Math, Philosophy, Science. *Seven Days that Divide the World*, 10th Anniversary Edition

Most of the ancient spiritual worldviews claim that *some* of the *extra* - dimensional angels chose to separate from the Creator’s way of love (agape). Those beings in many traditions were called “demons”. The ancient Greek term “diabolos” means “accuser” or “slanderer”. These entities rejected the Creator’s way of mutual other-serving agape, and instead embraced the self-deceptive way of anti-love, self-serving competition, survival of the fittest. They not only have actively *corrupted* the originally good Cosmos (Creation), including manipulating its human and non-human *animals*, but seek to slander the Creator. Their survival of the fittest goal is a blind self-delusional attempt to evolve upward, to compete with and overcome the Creator. And, they work to convince human beings and more extra-dimensional beings that the Creator is a selfish deceiver, who’s not committed to our best interests.

Whether you take the details of the stories about “angels” in the histories of many other philosophies and religions as literally accurate or not, the core *message* communicated is clear. The message is that the *horror* of suffering that saturates the animal and human world was originally caused by a free-will active infective *insurgence* from extra-worldly, *malevolent* intelligences. And that such a corrupting of creation is a *rebellion* against the Creator, the Source, of Love and

Liberty. Dr. John Lennox and C. S. Lewis describe well this *invasion* and the resulting disorder and dysfunction in the Cosmos.

“Was there, for instance, a **difference** between the behavior of **animals outside** the Garden of **Eden** and that of those in the **idyllic situation inside**? If so, what was the **cause**? One thing **at least** seems to be **implied** by the Genesis 3 account of the fall as discussed above: that **a dark power** had **corrupted** at least part of the **animal creation**. Could it be that this is the **direction** in which **we must look** in order to begin to **comprehend** the **origin of the pain and suffering** that seem to permeate the **animal kingdom**?” (p. 119). **[bold added]**

John Lennox Ph.D., DPhil., DSc. (*speaks five languages English, Russian, French, German, Spanish*). Oxford Prof. Math, Philosophy, Science. *Seven Days that Divide the World, 10th Anniversary Edition*.

“If humans will eventually be capable of creating intelligences superior to themselves, and extraterrestrial life already exists as so many think, there is **certainly no a priori reason** apart from prejudice **for rejecting** the biblical **introduction of an intelligent alien**. **C. S. Lewis** puts it this way:

‘... I mean the story that man was **not the first creature to rebel** against the Creator, but that some **older and mightier being long since became apostate** and is now the emperor of darkness and (significantly) the Lord of this world . . . It seems to me, therefore, a reasonable supposition, that some mighty created power had **already been at work for ill on the material universe**, or the solar system, or, at least, the planet Earth, **before ever man came on the scene**: and that when man fell, someone had, indeed tempted him . . . If there is such a power, as I myself believe, **it may well have corrupted the animal creation before man appeared**.’ (pp. 138-139). **[bold added]**

John Lennox Ph.D., DPhil., DSc. (*speaks five languages English, Russian, French, German, Spanish*). Oxford Prof. Math, Philosophy, Science. *2084: ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND THE FUTURE OF HUMANITY*.

Dr. Michael Heiser, a scholar in ancient culture, languages, and worldviews, has done excellent research showing how the theory of such a free choice intervention by *transdimensional* beings, helps to understand and answer many issues regarding *theodicy*. Below, Dr. Heiser explains that the Hebrew term in the

OT sometimes used in reference to angelic beings is “elohim” which is the plural form meaning “gods”. They were created and given *delegated* authority over the physical natural world, just as we humans bear that same responsibility. And just like us, many of those inter-dimensional beings have misused and abused that delegated authority.

Below, Dr. Heiser refers to the biblical story about a good, peaceful “Garden of Eden”. Too many Christians over focus on whether or not the story is literal, and they *miss* the *message* that the story communicates. The first few chapters of Genesis are a profoundly practical psychosocial set of case studies in human relational dynamics. It’s all about mutual other-serving love vs. self-serving anti-love, and the social, relational consequences of choices. I’ll discuss more on this in CHAPTER 4 - LIVING LOVE TOGETHER FOR EVERYONE.

So, regardless of whether you take the story to be metaphorical or literal, it *introduces* the theme that, long before humans existed, extra-dimensional “elohim” “angels” had previously turned from the way of agape and corrupted (infected) the physical creation (and sentient animal creatures) with an “*anti*” agape way of *selfish* competition, violent survival of the fittest. Remember that since we humans can genetically engineer and alter life, so could have ET’s or ED’S in the ancient past.

“Think about the setting in **Eden**. Adam and Eve aren’t alone. **God is there with his council**. Eden is the divine/human **headquarters** for “**subduing**” the rest of the **earth** (Gen. 1:26–28)—**spreading** the life of **Eden** to the **rest of the planet**. But **one** member of the council **isn’t happy** with God’s plans.” **[bold added]**

Heiser, Michael S. PhD. SUPERNATURAL: What the Bible Teaches about the Unseen World And Why It Matters.

“The **unseen** world has a **hierarchy**, something reflected in such terms as archangel versus angel . That hierarchy is sometimes difficult for us to discern in the Old Testament, since we aren’t accustomed to viewing the unseen world like a dynastic household (more on that following), as an Israelite would have processed certain terms used to describe the hierarchy. 1 In the ancient **Semitic** world, **sons of God** (Hebrew: beney **elohim**) is a phrase used to identify **divine beings** with higher-level responsibilities or jurisdictions. **[bold added]**

Heiser, Michael S.. The Unseen Realm: Recovering the Supernatural Worldview of the Bible (Kindle Locations 360-361).

“**Psalm 82:1** is especially interesting since **elohim** occurs **twice** in that single verse. In Psalm 82:1, the **first** elohim must be **singular**, since the Hebrew grammar has the word as the subject of a singular verbal form (“stands”). The **second elohim** must be **plural**, since the preposition in front of it (“in the midst of”) requires more than one. You can’t be “in the midst of” one . The preposition calls for a group—as does the earlier noun, assembly . The **meaning of the verse** is inescapable: The **singular elohim** of Israel presides **over an assembly of elohim**Psalm 82 informs us that God has called this council meeting to judge the elohim for corrupt rule of the nations. Verse 6 ... declares that these elohim are sons of God. God says to them: I have said, “You are gods [elohim], and sons of the Most High [beney elyon], all of you”. **[bold added]**

Dr. Michael Heiser, p. 407, *UNSEEN REALM: Rediscovering the Supernatural Worldview of the Bible*.

“... **fallible**, the angels The holy ones are capable of making **less than correct** (or even optimal) **decisions in mediating** God’s will **cannot mean** that those fallible decisions **were God’s decisions**, as though the decision of the holy ones had merely been programmed into theme by God. Rather, **angels can fail** because **God allows them to make decisions** and they are lesser beings than the perfect God. ... **They weren’t preprogrammed spirit robots** whose errant thoughts were implanted in their minds by God.”

Michael Heiser PhD in Hebrew and Semitic Languages from University of Wisconsin. *ANGELS: WHAT THE BIBLE REALLY SAYS ABOUT GOD’S HEAVENLY HOST*. p. 49

Christian scholars in philosophy and theology have for centuries provided an answer to the atheistic theodicy critics in various forms. But like most academics, those Christian scholars often did it in such way that the simple solution to theodicy, that is *agape-love*, which they had *intended* to convey, was *clouded-over* and *choked-out* by their convoluted language. Academic training can sort of condition you to write that way, sadly.

Sometimes common sense analogies (which Jesus often used - especially about nature, families, and children) can be the best ways to explain. Here’s a brief way of thinking about theodicy that helps me. “Good” loving parents “create” children and *give* them *freedom*. They give *liberty* to their children as they grow up to be adults. The children are free to choose either their parents “way” of

love, or a lifestyle of less than loving *selfishness* (“*sin*”). The selfish anti-agape way creates destruction for themselves and others around them. The parents loving gift of *freedom* does not make the parents “bad” or evil. In fact, *if* the parents had *forced* their children’s choices and behaviors, then almost everyone of us would consider them to be “bad” parents - even “evil” depending on how violently they *enforced* the outcome.

Some of you might now be thinking, “Hey, violent enforcement by God is all over the Old Testament (OT)”. You’re right, but once again, remember the process of “Progressive Revelation” discussed previously. The OT portrayals of God were the psychosocial *projection* of *immature* ancient barbaric culture’s human characteristics. They had *not yet* understood the true nature and character of God as revealed, modeled, clarified, and corrected by Jesus as pure, unselfish, humble agape-love.

The *lack* of a clear, simple, yet reasonably *comprehensive* answer to theodicy question from Christians has left a social and academic vacuum into which modern pop-“science”, particularly the radical “new-atheist” (anti-theistic) pop writers, have sought to fill the gap. And to some people, the atheistic scientists, *attempting* to be moral *philosophers*, *appear* to have succeeded. But, Dr. Noble reminds us that when atheistic scientists, especially those dogmatically committed to Scientism, try to play philosophers, and use very indirect science to speculate about the uncertainties of the Cosmic past, they often lack the “humility” to admit their limitations.

“In common with many other scientists, I **feel** embarrassed by the lack of basic philosophical **awareness** in much of what is written on this matter **on behalf of ‘science’**. Whether the authors know it or not, **they** are in fact **speaking not on** behalf of **science but** rather on behalf of an alternative **metaphysical** viewpoint, and often enough they do not appreciate the **need for humility** in the face of the deep **uncertainties**. To **claim** to speak to the general public with ‘Scientific’ **authority about** the deepest ‘**why**’ questions with a **false certainty** that **cannot be justified** simply creates problems, it does not solve them.” p. 254

[bold added]

Denis Noble PhD (Agnostic) an evolutionary Prof. of Cardiovascular & Computational Physiology at Oxford University, *DANCE TO THE TUNE OF LIFE: Biological Relativity*.

D - TELEO/LOGY: THE GOAL OF

MATURE METAMORPHOSIS BEYOND TECHNO-TRANSHUMANISM

“**Teleological fine tuning** refers to cases where a system is designed, configured, or built in a particular way for the **purpose of producing a desired outcome**. ‘Teleological’ **means** that something was done for a **particular purpose**, in order **to achieve some end**. (p. 201).

[bold added]

Moreland, J. P., Meyer, Stephen C., Shaw, Christopher, Gauger, Ann K., Grudem, Wayne. *Theistic Evolution: A Scientific, Philosophical, and Theological Critique*.

“In the **debate between science** and fundamentalist **religion** that the world's citizens watch so attentively, **the burden is on science to demonstrate how purposive processes can emerge in the absence of antecedent intelligence**, carefully selected **prior** conditions, or intrinsically **teleological** components.”

[bold added]

(Deacon and Sherman, 2008, pp. 59–76). Theoretical physicist Paul Davies. *Information and the Nature of Reality* (Canto Classics) (pp. 257-258). Cambridge University Press.

Teleology is *inseparably* linked to *Cosmology*. *Cosmology* is about the beginning of the Cosmos and its causes. *Teleology* is about the end, purpose, and goal of the Cosmos. And both are likewise connected to theology, because both *theism* and *atheism* are *theological* theories about *God*. One says there *is* a God, while the opposite other says there is *no* God. All are connected to “science” or “scientia”.

Not only scientists, but everyone uses *evidence* drawn from an available base of knowledge (scientia) to determine whether or not there is a Consciousness behind the Cosmos - a Mind who caused it and who also has a teleological *purpose* for it - and subsequently for us. Remember, neither science nor general “scientia” can *prove or disprove* God.

Therefore, the only two truly rational worldviews should be either agnosticism or theism. “Atheism is inconsistent with the scientific method”, as agnostic theoretical physicist, Dr. Marcelo Gleiser, explains.

“A **physics and astronomy professor** whose specializations include **cosmology**, 60-year-old Gleiser was born in Rio de Janeiro, and has been in the United States since 1986.

An agnostic, he doesn't believe in God—but **refuses to write off the possibility of God's existence completely.**

‘**Atheism is inconsistent with the scientific method,**

Gleiser told AFP Monday from Dartmouth College, the New Hampshire university where he has taught since 1991.

‘**Atheism is a belief in non-belief.** So you categorically **deny something** you have **no evidence against.**

I'll keep an open mind because I understand that **human knowledge is limited.**’

he added.

“When you **hear** very famous **scientists** making pronouncements like ... **cosmology has explained** the origin of the universe and the whole, and we **don't need God anymore.**

That's complete **nonsense,**”

he added.

‘Because we have **not explained** the origin of the universe **at all.**’
[bold added]

Marcello Gleiser PhD. (Agnostic) Professor of Theoretical Physics and Astronomy at Dartmouth College and was the 2019 recipient of the Templeton Prize. *Physicist Gleiser: Science Does Not Kill God.* <https://phys.org/news/2019-03-physicist-marcelo-gleiser-science-god.html>

“Many people **perceive** the struggle to understand our Universe as a **battle between science and God.** But this is a **false dichotomy.**”

[bold added]

Marcello Gleiser PhD. (Agnostic) Professor of Theoretical Physics and Astronomy at Dartmouth College and was the 2019 recipient of the Templeton Prize.

Science vs. God: Understanding reality is not a battle between reason and faith.

<https://bigthink.com/13-8/science-god-false-choice/>

Scientific hypotheses are *predictive*. They're like mini “prophecies” about the short-term future. Hypotheses are often stated formally as “IF THEN” statements which are *predictions*. “IF this happens, THEN that will happen (*or will be the observed future result*)”. Most people are familiar with the way

experiments are conducted in the *present* time using a hypothesis as the *predictive* statement before it's conducted. But cosmologists do the same type thing, yet about the *past*. Their hypotheses are like those of forensic scientists and historians. Remember, they use *abductive* reasoning to make *retroactive* hypotheses: "If that happened in the *past*, then this is what we should find (observe) in the *present*."

Oxford professor, Dr. John Lennox, contrasts the two historical possibilities (theories) for the origin or cause of the Cosmos and of us, along with the *future* (teleological) hope for where things and we humans *could* be heading. One view is his own conclusion that the evidence of science, philosophy, and theology points to a conscious, intelligent, loving Creator as the cause. Dr. Lennox contrasts his view with the other, *opposite*, view ("*blind evolutionary process, devoid of any purpose*"). He includes an example for that view using the words of Dr. Yuval Harari, renowned atheistic historian and *cautious* proponent of technotranshumanism, the making of "Homo deus" (Human-gods).

[Dr. Lennox] "Indeed, **if there is a God who has created this universe and has sustained it ever after, it is not at all implausible to think that his relationship to time is not the same as ours, that he has an overarching knowledge perspective on history and that he is able to be causally involved in the unfolding of events.**

The other reason for taking **biblical prophecy** seriously is its **uniqueness** as a historical phenomenon. There is **so much of it whose fulfillment** can be pinpointed, and it does not take much **statistical** insight to realize the extreme prior improbability of so many long-range predictions being **fulfilled so accurately** especially if you assume a naturalistic worldview like that of **Yuval Harari**:

"Just as **people were never created, neither**, according to the science of biology, is there a **'Creator' who 'endows' them** with anything. There is only a **blind evolutionary process, devoid of any purpose**, leading to the birth of individuals."

Indeed, **fulfilled biblical prophecy provides strong evidence against Harari's beliefs** and for the **truth of Christianity**, so we shall give some examples." (p. 162)[**bold added**]

John Lennox Ph.D., DPhil., DSc. (*speaks five languages English, Russian, French, German, Spanish*). Oxford Prof. Math, Philosophy, Science. *2084: ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND THE FUTURE OF HUMANITY*.

Keep in mind that relativity and quantum theories have given us a peek behind the curtain of our limited 4-D perceptions of the physical world. These *scientific* “revelations” have shown us that what we *see* in everyday *experience* is *not* the true *reality*. These scientific revelations pull back the veil to the possibility, even *probability*, of an eternal Consciousness behind the Cosmos.

In a podcast discussion between neurosurgeon Dr. Michael Egnor, and Dr. Bruce Gordon, they discuss the theological implications of these discoveries.

Dr. Egnor is a Christian Professor of Neurosurgery and Pediatrics at State University of New York, Stony Brook. He has served as the Director of Pediatric Neurosurgery, and is an award-winning brain surgeon. He was also named one of New York’s best doctors by the New York Magazine in 2005.

Dr. Gordon is a Christian philosopher of science (physics), metaphysician, and philosopher of religion. He has taught at various universities including Notre Dame and Baylor.

Here are a few relevant comments from Dr. Gordon that reflect the philosophical view found in both ancient Greek and ancient Christian philosophers, that God is the Self-Existent Conscious-Source, the Logos, “in whom we live and move and derive our existence”. The heart of Dr. Gordon’s comments revolve around the *quantum discovery* of the *mind dependent* character of *reality*

“a context in which the universal wave function becomes a **manifestation of divine omniscience**”.

“So what does that mean? It means that unobserved **quanta don't exist anywhere in space**, and thus have **no existence apart from being observed**.”

“There is **no physical substrate**, but the property has to inhere in something, **so it's inhering in the mind that perceives** it. There is no, ultimately, there is no physical substrate that undergirds that property. ... **What they inhere in is a mental substance, not a physical one.**”

From a discussion between Neuroscientists Michael Egnor and Theoretical physicist Bruce Gordon in a podcast on MIND

MATTERS. "BRUCE GORDON ON IDEALISM AND QUANTUM PHYSICS (PART II)".

<https://mindmatters.ai/podcast/ep130/Transcript-Mind-Matters-130-Bruce-Gordon.pdf>

This is why increasing numbers of scholars in mathematics, science, and philosophy are turning *from* atheism *to* agnosticism, and even turning *from* agnosticism *to* theism. Among these, some have pursued further evidence leading them to embrace the God, who *is* pure love, as taught and modeled by Jesus. I realize that *neither* the scientific evidence *nor* the evidence of increasing numbers of new scholarly *believers* in God is proof that such a God exists. But both are *evidence* which supports that as a rational conclusion. And in my estimation, it's a conclusion that is - *beyond reasonable doubt* - just like the final decision made in a court case, using abductive forensic, historical, and legal evidence.

Remember that many purely scientific theories, which have *nothing* to do with God, also *cannot* be proven. Listen to the words below from the highly regarded philosopher of science, Dr. Karl Popper, about the *inability* to have certainty, yet the potential for having highly *probable* conclusions (evidential beliefs):

"We do not know: we can **only guess**. And our guesses are guided **by a faith** in the **orderliness of nature** and that this orderliness **can be comprehended** by the human **mind**.

"The popular **notion that the sciences** are bodies of established **fact is entirely mistaken**. **Nothing** in science is **permanently** established, nothing unalterable, and indeed science is quite clearly changing all the time, and **not through** the accretion of new **certainties**."

"I think we shall have to get accustomed to the idea that we must **not look upon science as a body of knowledge**, but **rather** as a **system of hypotheses**; that is to say, as a system of **guesses** or anticipations which in principle cannot be fully justified, but with which we work as long as they stand up to tests, and of which we are **never justified in saying that we know they are true** or more or less certain or even probable."

Dr. Popper also said that scientists who *refuse* to be open minded about the challenge from other equally qualified scientists are in effect *refusing* to practice *true* science.

“Those among us **who are unwilling to expose** their **ideas** to the hazard of **refutation do not take part in the scientific game.**”

Below, psychiatrist Dr. Curt Thompson, in his book *THE ANATOMY OF THE SOUL: Surprising Connections Between Neuroscience and Spiritual Practices that can Transform Your Life and Relationships*, in the last chapter entitled, “*Mind and Community: The Brain on Love, Mercy, and Justice*,” describes the same *teleological* purpose or goal as does Dr. Lennox. Both scientists are pointing to a personal, ultimate Being, the Self-Existent Source of love. Whereas Dr. Lennox describes God, the Creative Source, from a cosmological physics viewpoint, Dr. Thompson describes God, from an interpersonal neurobiological perspective. Both are pointing to a Being who exists as the teleological “completeness”. Who is the “Wholeness” existing as agape love and toward which all things are heading.

“**Love never fails.** But where there are **prophecies**, they **will cease**; where there are **languages**, they will be **stilled**; where there is **knowledge**, it will **pass away**. For **we know in part** and we **prophesy in part**, but when **completeness** comes, what is in part disappears. (1 Corinthians 13:8-10) Here Paul suggests that **history anticipates a future**. Not any random future, but rather one in which those **things that endure**—the new earth/new heaven realm with our new bodies and our new work to do—**will be defined by the spirit of love.**

.... But when **completeness comes**, what is incomplete, dis-integrated and living apart from the present moment; what is judging, shaming, and fearful, will disappear. And **what is this completeness?**

.... It is not unreasonable to suggest that **it is this completeness to which research in attachment and neuroscience point.**

.... This **completeness** suggests what it **means** to be in the **presence of Wholeness.**” [bold added]

Curt Thompson MD, Christian Psychiatrist Neurologist. *ANATOMY OF THE SOUL: Surprising Connections Between Neuroscience and Spiritual Practices that can Transform Your Life and Relationships*

WHAT HEART MOTIVE - WILL RUN THE SHOW?

There are basically two *ways* of living. One is the way of passionate love which is *cooperative* living for all *others*. The second way is *anti-agape*, *competitive* living, which is mainly for *self*. The way of love seeks personal and corporate *transformation* by *non-material metanoia* (literally meaning change of mind, yet translated often as “repent”) and *metamorphosis* for the benefit of all

others. The opposite *anti-love* way seeks *material transhumanism* via *technology* as it attempts to tweak evolutionary survival of the fittest (survival of the *coolest, richest, most powerful elites*). As this movement advances, especially as it merges with AI and possibly AGI, the potential dangers are *immense*.

“For AI computer systems have **no conscience**, and so the **morality** of any decisions they make will **reflect** the morality of the computer **programmers** – and that is **where the difficulties start**. How can we be sure that the programmers will **build in a morality** that is **benevolent and humane**? Rosalind **Picard**, director of the Affective Computing Group at **MIT**, puts it succinctly: **“The greater the freedom of a machine, the more it will need moral standards.”** Political scientist and author of *The End of History* Francis **Fukuyama** regards **transhumanism** as **“the world’s most dangerous idea”** in that it runs the **risk** of affecting **human rights**. (pp. 145-146). **[bold added]**

John Lennox Ph.D., DPhil., DSc. (*speaks five languages English, Russian, French, German, Spanish*). Oxford Prof. Math, Philosophy, Science. 2084: ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND THE FUTURE OF HUMANITY.

Teleology addresses the end *goal* of a process. Any process with a *future* goal implies that the beginning *Source* of the process was *purposeful*. The term and concept of teleology is frequently used in science, philosophy, and theology. In fact, recent scientific efforts to develop a unifying “Theory of Everything” (TOE) emphasize the *teleological* “nature” of nature *itself*. In the past, *atheistic* scientists tried to avoid terms like goal or purpose, as well as the concept of teleology in nature, because they *feared* it sounded too much like the existence of a *plan* from a cosmic intelligent *designer*. Now, mounting evidence makes it impossible to ignore the amazing “appearance of design” in nature. So, it seems some atheists who continue to *dismiss* the possibility of a Designer do so, because of reasons that are philosophical *not* scientific. And, some have invented new terms, such as “teleonomy”, in order to avoid at all *costs* any theoretical *possibility* of a *personal* Mind behind the Cosmos. Sadly, that “cost” is the legitimacy and credibility of *science itself*.

“Richard **Dawkins** once said, ‘Biology is the study of **complicated things** that give the **appearance of having been designed for a purpose**.’ (The Blind Watchmaker, 1996, p. 1).”

“... So what is **“teleonomy”**? Mainstream **scientists** continue to be **philosophically allergic** to the idea that **design** (the observation) is **caused by design** (the intelligent process), or **too afraid** to be seen to acknowledge it. This has led to the **coining of a new term** and a new distinction: the hard-to-deny **facts** of biological **purpose** and design are **now labelled “teleonomy,”** whilst the contentious and **frightening “theological” idea** of a primordial actor or **creator** is **now labelled as “teleology.”** They loudly **assert** that **teleology** has long been **discounted** and now teleonomy takes its place. That’s fine if you want to **believe it.** All we are going to do here is to **point** out that **facts have driven biology back towards notions of design,** and mainstream **scientists** are **going as far as they dare** to bring back into biology thoughts that most of **us** **already knew intuitively.** Good for them. May it continue.

<https://evolutionnews.org/2017/12/design-but-not-design-is-the-new-unifying-principle-of-biology/>

Theistic scientist Dr. Stephen Meyer (PhD Cambridge Univ. in Philosophy of Science) shares an eye opening conversation he had with *atheistic* scholar Dr. Thomas Nagel, Professor of philosophy NYU. Their conversation revealed this common fear of a God that many atheists (*just like me in my past*) personally experience as an inner struggle. For Dr. Nagel, it was a *conscious* struggle, but for many others it’s an *unconscious* one. Most commonly, it’s a fear of the possibility that there might be a “God” who holds us *responsible* and *accountable* for how we live unselfish love for all others.

“ **As I started to explain the argument** from epistemological necessity, he politely **interrupted me.** “Oh yes,” he said. “There is **no question** that **theism solves a lot of philosophical problems.”**

.... and that, further, he **actually didn’t want** the universe to be the kind of place **in which God existed.** His explanation of his views over lunch echoed a famous admission he’d made in print years earlier. As he explained in 1997: “I want atheism to be true and **am made uneasy by the fact that some of the most intelligent and well-informed people I know are religious believers.** It isn’t just that I don’t believe in God and, naturally, hope that I’m right in my belief. It’s **that I hope there is no God! I don’t want there to be a God; I don’t want the universe to be like that.”**

[bold added]

Stephen C. Meyer PhD in Philosophy of Science from Cambridge.
RETURN OF THE GOD HYPOTHESIS: THREE SCIENTIFIC

DISCOVERIES THAT REVEAL THE MIND BEHIND THE UNIVERSE (p. 671).

Similarly, back in my own youth and young adulthood, I struggled with this same issue. But, a lot of my own fear of God was that I had a grossly false distorted image of “God”, which I had absorbed from the religious “traditions” that dominate much of cultural Christianity. This false image of God is *not* “the” God, the Source of Love, nor the Way of God that can heal relationships and even the volatile dangerous divisions between groups and nations. I’ll discuss more about this in the last chapter of the book.

Dr. Meyer continues and explains how his conversation with Dr. Nagel reminded him of his own past struggle with the fear of a God who might hold him accountable for his attitudes and actions in this life.

Nagel’s **candor** about his philosophical predilections impressed me and **reminded me of some of my own** internal struggles. During college, I was particularly conflicted in my philosophical inclinations and desires. As I perceived how theism answered many philosophical questions, some of my existential angst abated. At the same time, **the sense of accountability** that **theistic belief placed on me** put me in the awkward position of **believing in God for philosophical reasons, but not wanting theism** (and specifically Christianity) **to be true** for other, more **personal reasons**. [bold added]

Stephen C. Meyer PhD. RETURN OF THE GOD HYPOTHESIS. (p. 671).

Remember that similar to Dr. Nagel, yet in an even more candid admission, atheist Philosopher Dr. Aldous Huxley admitted a core *motive* often *underlying* the rejection of a God with a Law of unselfish Love, to whom we might be *accountable*.

“I had **motives** for **not wanting** the world to have **meaning**; consequently **assumed** that it had **none**, and was able without difficulty to find satisfying **reasons** for this **assumption**. ... For myself, as, no doubt, for **most** of my contemporaries, **the philosophy of meaninglessness** was essentially an instrument of **liberation**. The liberation we **desired** was simultaneously liberation from a certain political and economic system and **liberation from a certain system of morality**. We objected to the morality because it **interfered with our sexual freedom**.” [bold added]

<https://www.greeleytribune.com/2010/08/07/lost-faith-can-be-a-result-of-lack-of-accountability/>

The mounting evidence of teleological design *throughout* nature now makes it nearly impossible to ignore or avoid. And, we all know that we have failed to live *consistently* the way of agape for all without *partiality*. So, it seems at least some atheistic and agnostic scientists are seeking, at times it *desperately* searching, for *any alternative* to an Intelligent Designer, to explain away the pervasive presence of teleology, not merely “teleonomy” in nature. They seem to be seeking any way to avoid *accountability* to a universal *law* of agape *love*, originating from a Conscious Lawmaker.

In addition to the *new* avoidance term *teleonomy*, another new concept is “emergence” or “emergent properties”. It’s the idea that even *without* any intelligent Mind behind the Cosmos, mere molecules and biochemical-systems were somehow able to cause the “emergence” of new properties that pushed macroevolution forward and upward. While some limited degree of actual emergence of new properties may have actually occurred, there is woefully insufficient evidence that it could have been the core cause of life on Earth and its incomprehensibly complex coded genetic and epigenetic information.

Agnostic Dr. Denis Noble, professor of Cardiovascular and Computation Physiology at Oxford in his excellent book, *DANCE TO THE TUNE OF LIFE: BIOLOGICAL RELATIVITY*, accepts the term “teleology”. And, to his credit, Dr. Noble humbly acknowledges that science alone still cannot explain how such properties “emerge”. Yet he uses his *belief* in the ability of material nature alone to somehow “emerge” the complex system properties of life, to replace the concept of a *transcendent* Consciousness behind the Cosmos.

“**Goal-directedness** is traditionally called **teleology**,

“But interpreted as the simple and verifiable statement **that the behavior of a system is goal-directed**, ... so I see no reason to avoid the word **teleology**.”

“We will see that **goals** can be **properties** that **emerge** during the **process of evolution**. **Goal-directedness** is therefore also a **relative** property.

Goals are always **relative** to some particular context, internal or external to the organism. **Goal-directedness** is traditionally called **teleology**.

We simply **do not understand the processes** by which the fundamental **properties of matter emerge** that enable the characteristics of water that are advantageous to life (pp. 45-46).

[bold added]

Denis Noble PhD (Agnostic) an evolutionary Prof. of Cardiovascular & Computational Physiology at Oxford University, *DANCE TO THE TUNE OF LIFE: Biological Relativity*.

Scientists, including atheists and agnostic, recognize that living systems exist and maintain because of truly *purpose-driven, goal-oriented* processes that *appear* designed. And so much so, that for biologists to do their work (to scientifically predict cause and effect outcomes), they must *function* as if it truly is *designed*, as if by a super engineer.

(Christian Professor of Physics and Astronomy at the University of Pittsburgh] “David Snoke **showed** that the **use of teleological** concepts and terms is **widespread** in contemporary systems biology, and that therefore the scientists in that discipline are **actually working** under a **design rather than an evolutionary** program” **[bold added]**

Moreland, J. P., Meyer, Stephen C., Shaw, Christopher, Gauger, Ann K., Grudem, Wayne. *Theistic Evolution: A Scientific, Philosophical, and Theological Critique*. (p. 164).

ATHEISTIC TELEOLOGY IS DEPRESSING

Consider that *atheistic* scientists, especially cosmologists and astronomers, actually do predict an ultimate universal *final* future for the Cosmos toward which all things are eventually heading. And if you think “global warming” is scary, take a look forward at their predicted ultimate end. It’s not a pretty picture. Their predicted final ultimate end-goal for all things is either a “heat-death” (“Big-Freeze”) or a “Big-Crunch” of the Cosmos. Understandably, this is *not* a teleology that *inspires* peace and joy. In fact, such a predictive *prophecy* more naturally *inspires* anxiety and depression, which are now at epidemic levels in societies across the world. Wonder why!

“.... **Accompanying** these breathtaking insights are **deep** and **persistent questions**. Why is there **something** rather than nothing? What sparked the onset of **life**? How did **conscious** awareness emerge? We have explored a range of **speculations**, but definitive **answers** remain **elusive**.

Perhaps our **brains**, well adapted for survival on planet earth, are just **not** structured for **resolving** these **mysteries**.

... As we **hurtle** toward a **cold** and barren **cosmos**, we **must accept** that there is **no grand design.**" [bold added]

p. 404 (Evolutionary Atheist) Brian Greene PhD Prof. physics and mathematics at Columbia University. He is world-renowned for his groundbreaking discoveries in the field of superstring theory. *Until the End of Time: Mind, Matter, and Our Search for Meaning in an Evolving Universe.*

"How will the universe end? Humanity has pondered this question for thousands of years. And now science actually has the knowledge and tools to **attempt an answer.**

"Until rather recently, astronomers **thought** the cosmos would repeatedly expand and collapse in an infinite **cycle** of cosmic death and rebirth. **But the best evidence points to a distant Armageddon** filled with **more existential dread than the Book of Revelation.** ... Slowly, **stars will fizzle out,** turning night skies black. All lingering matter will be **gobbled up by black holes** until there's **nothing left.**"

... **Rather than** meeting its end through **fire and brimstone,** the cosmos will likely succumb to **'heat death.'** Astronomers call it the Big Freeze." [bold added]

<https://astronomy.com/news/magazine/2021/01/the-beginning-to-the-end-of-the-universe-the-big-crunch-vs-the-big-freeze>

THEISTIC TELEO/LOGY GIVES HOPE

This *pessimistic* doom and gloom *atheistic* future for the Cosmos stands in stark contrast to the *optimistic* theistic science future embraced by a growing number of scientists. For example, here's more of the dialogue between philosopher of physics, Dr. Gordon, and neurosurgeon, Dr. Egnor. In their discussion, they lay the *foundation* for an *optimistic* evidential theistic worldview.

Bruce Gordon: "There is a **purpose** that is **given to reality by the divine mind,** that makes **reality** itself **directional** and intentional in respect of **God's purposes.**

Michael Egnor: And it has been proposed, and I have a lot of sympathy for this proposition, that the **intentionality that's characteristic of mental states** is found by analogy in **teleology, in nature,** in the sense that **teleology is nature's intentionality.**

Bruce Gordon: I absolutely think that's a useful perspective. In fact, I think it's pretty much the way things are. ... the **teleology** that we observe in nature, the **directedness** that we observe in nature,

The argument from **design**, the idea that **nature is directed toward a goal**, and the noumenological, or **law-like, structure of nature** that constrains the behavior of things, **which has no internal explanation**, must either be taken as is, which seems very strange and is deeply problematic from the standpoint of the principle of sufficient reason, to take it as a brute fact. Rather, this is something that has been **imposed as a structure on reality by the divine mind**. It's discernible. It's **mathematically describable**. We **discover it** as we analyze our experience. All of this points to the **teleological structure of nature**, which is a **manifestation of divine intentionality**. So intentionality, in the form of **teleology**, absolutely **pervades the structure of the universe**.

<https://mindmatters.ai/2021/04/a-physicist-and-philosopher-examines-at-panpsychism/>

Dr. Gordon and Dr. Egnor's theistic dialogue grounds the future in evidential assurance that our fate and the fate of the Cosmos is not hurling toward a *cold* end, or a *crushing* conclusion. Instead, there is a Self-existent conscious, intelligent Being of Love (the solid ground upon which all else depends), who started, oversees, and is guiding it all ultimately toward a *positive* future. One who has the intellect, power, and love to repair and *restore* what we humans and the ED's have messed up.

CHRISTIAN NEGLECT OF LOVE AS THEIR STANDARD

However, as I mentioned earlier, even most theistic scholars, including many who say they are followers of the God who *is* love and whose *law* is *therefore* love, fail to utilize agape love as the central conceptual standard and guide for their writings and presentations on other subjects. Christians, Dr. Gordon and Dr. Egnor are no exception. Why stop at merely presenting evidence for a *generic* Intelligent Designer, and *fail to* emphasize the *core* characteristic of that Creator who exists as agape love (First John 4:8)? The foundational and overarching principle of agape love should be repeatedly used in our writings, our lives, our relationships, and society. Remember the old adage, "out of sight, out of mind".

By the way, it's not just *theistic* scholars, including Christian theists, who fail to have the standard of love guide and illuminate their writings. As I've mentioned,

atheistic scholars especially seem to *avoid* this highest valued human virtue. Maybe it's the academic, *intellectual* conditioning that avoids anything that sounds sentimental and therefore supposedly not like esoteric, *dry* science they've been conditioned to produce.

Regardless their reasons, the good news is that there are theistic scholars, who are bold enough to take the discussion and the scientific investigation into the real heart of human matter. That is, core questions like - What's love got to do with it? How can we tap into, *connect* to, the ultimate Source of pure, genuine, unselfish agape love? How can we *grow* in that way of agape, so that our personal lives and collective cultures more and more reflect the image and character of agape? And ultimately, if the Source of the Cosmos and of us is Agape, *where* is that Source taking us? As Christian theoretical physicist Dr. John Polkinghorne has said:

“There is a very **deep human longing to know if reality is on our side.** And I believe that's where **we need** some form of **personal encounter** with a **God** who, of course, is **beyond personality** but is more fittingly **described in personal terms.**”

[bold added]

Theoretical physicist John Polkinghorne PhD.

<https://www.kitty-ferguson.com/articles1/Polkinghorne1.pdf>

Philosophers have debated for millennia about the apparent *teleological* character of *all* reality. In the first century, Jesus and his followers taught that the *Source* Creator (metaphorically the “Father” and the “Spirit”) of the Cosmos exists as pure *love*, and has an end goal. It's the culmination of the timeline toward a *transformation* (a Cosmic metamorphosis), so that all things in the multi-dimensional universe will become *saturated* with the nature and character of pure, perfect agape-love .

“... so that **God [who is love]** may be **all in all.**”

1 Cor. 15:28

“The **wolf** will live with the **lamb**, and the leopard will lie down with the goat; the **calf** and young **lion** ... **will lie down together**, and a little child will lead them. The **cow** will graze with the **bear**, their **young** will **lie down together**, and the **lion** will eat straw like the **ox**.”

.... They will **neither harm** nor **destroy** on all My holy mountain, for the earth will be **full of the [intimate] knowledge** of the LORD [YWHW] as the sea is full of water.” Isaiah 11:6-9

Chapter 4 - LIVING LOVE TOGETHER FOR EVERYONE

A - Is the World Spinning *Out* of Control?

B - Imagine if We Lived Agape Love *Perfectly*?

C - Why is it so Hard to Live It *Consistently*?

D - How Can We *Grow* in the Way of Agape?

“Let us put our minds **together** and see what life **we can make for our children.**”

- Chief Sitting Bull

This final part of the book kicks off with a *negative* sounding note. Yet, I'm not a *pessimist*, though the temptation is often there. I'm also not a blind *idealist* who pretends that all is well, even while the house is burning. I try always to be a "balanced" *realist*, seeing the good, the bad, and the future potentials for both. Balance often seems *boring* to people, so we tend to gravitate toward *extremes*.

"This **tendency** is called **acrophily**, or **love of extremes**.

.... **Helping** people make more **accurate evaluations** of **their** group could therefore **reduce acrophily** and **inform how** individuals **shape** their **views**. If we are **exposed to less extreme** views in our social environment, **our ideas** may also become **less extreme**, which could **reduce** further political **segregation** and **polarization**.

.... We found that the **combination** of acrophily and homophily likely **leads** people to rapidly self-select into more **extreme** camps. Ultimately, that pattern speeds up segregation and **makes it harder** to cooperate, compromise and find common ground—all **essential** features of a **healthy society**." **[bold added]**

Amit Goldenberg. *Extreme Views Are More Attractive Than Moderate Ones*. <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/extreme-views-are-more-attractive-than-moderate-ones/>
#:~:text=This tendency is called acrophily, or love of extremes.

The good news about this last chapter of the book is two-fold. The *first* is that my discussion of positive, *hopeful* potentials for the future will eclipse any of the negative. The *second* is that this final part will be short, because it's merely a *spring-board* to my other book and articles which are of a more *practical* nature. My other, more down-to-earth, writings are about the "How to's" of individual *growth*, mutual conflict *mediation*, and relationship *reconciliation*. And yes, all of my other books, essays, and articles carrying forward the same *goal* of helping people *grow stronger* in the kind of love we all value as the highest human virtue. Such growth is necessary for the future of society.

"But if you need more **convincing**, consider this:

If all the **decent** people sit this one **out**, we're **handing** our country and our **future** to **extremists**." **[bold added]**

Michael Curry, the first "black" head of the Episcopal Church in America. *LOVE IS THE WAY: Holding on to Hope in Troubling Times*. (p. 227).

A - IS THE WORLD SPINNING OUT OF CONTROL?

Some (not all) elite power-players in academia, media, science, technology, and politics have *pridefully* sought to find and then *control* the unifying physical *forces* that drive the Cosmos. For them, it seems that their motive is to propel *themselves, their families, and their friends* higher in the survival of the fittest pecking order. Yes, they often say their efforts are for the benefit of *all* humankind, but their actions and lifestyles seem to say the opposite. Missing from their “equations” is a commitment to *humbly* seek the real unifying *non-physical Source* of “love” that the world truly needs. Sadly, too often, we, like human “sheep”, have blindly followed these *authoritarian, “expert”* elites down a path, a way, that could end up at the edge of a very precarious cliff. As an old proverbial statement warns, “there is a *way* that *seems right*, but it *ends in destruction*” (Proverbs 14:12).

"Yet, in spite of these **spectacular** strides in **science** and technology, and still unlimited ones to come, **something basic is missing**. There is a sort of **poverty** of the **spirit** which stands in **glaring contrast** to our scientific and technological abundance. The **richer** we have become **materially**, the **poorer** we have become **morally and spiritually**. We have learned to fly the air like birds and swim the sea like fish, but **not learned the simple art of living together** as brothers."

[bold added]

Dr. Martin Luther-King Jr., quoted in the journal, SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN,
by John Horgan. <https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/cross-check/martin-luther-king-jr-s-haunting-reflections-on-science-and-progress/>

Dr. King, astutely described the *hole in soul* of modern society when he said - “.... in spite of these spectacular strides in science and technology, and still unlimited ones to come, something basic is missing”. Like a spiritual physician, Dr. King delineates the symptoms of our human relational “dis-ease” that keeps us from living “at-ease” both individually and collectively. His *diagnosis* of the etiology is *profound*, and I whole-heartedly agree with his assessment - “the richer we have become materially, the poorer we have become morally and spiritually”. Like a wise father *counseling* his *immature* children, he reminds us that we have “not learned the simple art of living together”.

So, what's the good Dr.'s *prescribed cure* for our *failure* to live peacefully "at-ease" with one another? He says it's simply to become a *cooperative* "participant in the being of God".

"**Love** is the greatest **force** in the universe. It is the **heartbeat** of the **moral cosmos**. He who **loves** is a **participant in** the being of **God.**" **[bold added]**
 Dr. Martin Luther-King Jr. <https://www.cnn.com/2020/02/09/us/martin-luther-king-jr-handwritten-note-for-sale-trnd/index.html>

Surveys and research studies are revealing an alarming increase in feelings of confusion, insecurity, lack of hope, depression, fear, and addictions of all sorts. More and more people are *withdrawing* into personal isolation, and the rate of suicide is *epidemic* among youth and young adults. Others are experiencing bitterness, anger, conflict, division, and violence. There's a growing potential of *internal* civil-war *within* a number of nations. Worse is that deteriorating *external* relations *between* nations are escalating the risk of a third *global* war.

"People are **angry** to the point that **debate** has ceased to be productive, **ruled by** ad hominem **attacks** and **cruel** innuendo from **both sides.**"
[bold added]

Michael Curry, the first "black" head of the Episcopal Church in America. *LOVE IS THE WAY: Holding on to Hope in Troubling Times*. (p. 226).

Many of the *negative* psychological and social factors contributing to and exacerbating these symptoms are *ancient*. They're deeply rooted in the *inherent* survival of the fittest system, originating from the ancient infective intervention by *malevolent* free moral "ED" agents (*extra/inter-dimensional manipulative beings*).

Other insidiously negative factors are *recent*, and rapidly becoming *ingrained* into our lives, families, and nations. For example, the U.S. Surgeon General recently warned of the profoundly *harmful* risk of *social media* on the minds and hearts of *youth*.

"May 23, 2023 – The **U.S. surgeon general** officially **warned** that **social media** use poses 'a **profound risk of harm** to the **mental health** and well-being" of **young people.**" **[bold added]**

Surgeon General Issues ‘Urgent’ Social Media Warning for Kids.
<https://www.webmd.com/mental-health/news/20230523/surgeon-general-issues-urgent-social-media-warning-for-kids>

Any new scientific technology will have potential for both good and bad effects on individuals and society. So, it’s crucial to keep in mind that we are now moving into a realm of phenomenal advancements that could *exponentially* escalate, exacerbate both the good and the bad. AI will move ever closer toward AGI (Artificial *General* Intelligence - a seemingly conscious digital mind). And, this advancement will likely become powered by Q-CPS’s (Quantum Central Processing Systems). As this “quantum-leap” in AI technology races forward, the potential dangers will become immense.

No, it will probably not be like the AI computer “HAL 9000” in the movie, *2001 A Space Odyssey*, nor like the AI system “Skynet” in the *Terminator* series. More likely, it will pose the danger of creating a *class* of cybernetic super human hybrids who are physically and mentally enhanced and empowered by tech implants (chips, neural networks) and other embedded attachments. The *elite* class of *privileged* people already in positions of power and profit will be the only ones able to afford these super-human enhancements. The result could be an unimaginable *divide* between the “have” and the “have-nots”. Those few who *get* and “have” the best of the cyborg enhancements would have immense power to rule over those who don’t “have”. The “have-nots” then become a underclass of forced human workers.

Remember that the transhumanist’s goal *cautiously* supported by many powerfully positioned people and corporations, such as Yuval Harari, is to *enhance* human macroevolution toward a new *super*-human race: “*Homo Deus*” (*Human Gods*). But, given the historical reality of human selfishness, pride, and the survival of the fittest drive that’s inherent in all humans, this leap of *techno-faith* just might create “*Homo Diablos*” (*Human Devils*) instead. Dr. Michael Guillen, referring to Dr. Harari, pinpoints the problem.

Finally, I have one other **serious concern** about **transhumanism**. For the foreseeable future, the **cyborg enhancements** promising to make us smarter, faster, stronger, and closer to immortal **will be affordable only to the very wealthy**. “Those unable to afford the new miracle treatments—**the vast majority of people**—will be beside themselves with **rage**,” warns historian **Yuval Harari**. “Throughout **history, the poor and oppressed** comforted themselves with the thought that at least death is even-

handed—that the rich and powerful will also die. **The poor will not be comfortable** with the thought that they have to die, **while the rich will remain young and beautiful forever.**” Major **inequities** between **rich** and **poor already exist**, of course—for instance, Second Sight’s bionic eyes cost about \$100,000. But as I’m about to explain, the growing, **technology-driven rift between the world’s haves and have-nots is heading** toward an unprecedented extreme. **[bold added]** (p. 132).

Michael Guillen (Christian)(Harvard Triple PhD physics, math, astronomy). The End of Life as We Know It: Ominous News From the Frontiers of Science.

One of the chapter titles in agnostic Dr. Marcelo Gleiser’s book, *THE ISLAND OF KNOWLEDGE: The Limits of Science and the Search for Meaning*, contains the phrase, “SINISTER DREAMS OF TRANSHUMAN MACHINES ...”. Dr. Gleiser is not alone in his concern regarding the human hubris of believing we can make ourselves “like gods”. Another leading voice of concern regarding transhumanism without love is Christian Oxford Professor of mathematics, science, and philosophy, Dr. John Lennox Ph.D., DPhil., DSc., (*who by the way speaks five languages English, Russian, French, German, Spanish*). Dr. Lennox recognizes the wonderfully *positive* potentials of AI and even some good that might result from a degree of transhuman techno enhancements. But he balances that hope with sober warnings. In an interview on MIND MATTERS, Dr. Lennox expresses his own concerns and also refers to another leading voice of warning, Dr. Francis Fukuyama, political theorist, and Senior Fellow at Stanford University.

“And the political scientist and **author of The End of History, Francis Fukuyama**, regards **transhumanism** as the **world’s most dangerous idea** because it runs the **risk of infringing human rights now**.

.... **Political theorist Fukuyama** explains, “Underlying this idea of the **equality of rights** is the **belief** that we all possess a human essence that **dwarfs** manifest **differences** in skin color, beauty, and even intelligence. This essence, and the **view that individuals therefore have inherent value**, is at the **heart** of political liberalism. **But modifying** that essence is the **core of the transhumanist project**. If we start **transforming** ourselves into something **superior**, **what rights** will these enhanced creatures **claim**, and **what rights** will they possess when **compared** to those **left behind**? If some move ahead, can anyone afford not to follow? These questions are **troubling** enough within rich, developed societies. Add in the **implications** for citizens of the

world's poorest countries — for whom biotechnology's marvels likely will be out of reach — and **the threat to the idea of equality** becomes **even more menacing.**"

– Foreign Policy (October 23, 2009)

[bold added]

<https://mindmatters.ai/2022/10/john-lennox-transhumanism-versus-traditional-humans/>

Keep in mind that the human desire (lust) for power, position, and thus privilege over other people is not new, it is *ancient*. And often standing against them were ancient prophetic voices *warning* of the dangers inherent in this desire.

The author of the ancient book of Genesis tried to picture for us the subtle, pridefully self-deceptive *temptation* to believe we can make ourselves "like gods". Remember the old Genesis story about a peaceful Garden of Eden, the characters Adam and Eve, and the intervention of a "Serpentine" being (Hebrew term is "nachash").

Whether you see the narrative in some literal way or as a metaphorical *moral* story, the message and meaning are the same. The dangerous temptation was and always is the self-centered desire to go our *own* pridefully self-centered "way", *separately* from the only true Source of Love. The core of the Genesis message is that seeking more "knowledge" and human enhancement *independently* from the true Source of Love, the Consciousness behind the Cosmos, is the road to disaster.

As the moral message of the story unfolds, a "Serpentine" deception *began* by tempting the humans to *doubt* whether God, the Source of all, was really motivated by other-serving *love*. The temptation continued with a false promise, the bait, claiming humans could "*become* like gods (elohim)", independent from the true Source. The deception offered a *way* to "become", to "evolve", upward into god-hood. Hidden in the bait however was a dangerous *hook*. The hidden danger was and is that separation from the ultimate and only source of pure other-serving love eventually ends in self-destruction, individually and collectively. As the subsequent Genesis chapters unfold, they paint the picture of human history as infected with selfish survival of the fittest, competition, conflict, and violence. Yet all along the way, special (*enlightened, awakened, anointed*) individuals arose to confront that deceptive way, and to proclaim another way, one of unselfish, other-serving, cooperative love.

Dr. Lennox carries forward the ancient prophetic warning about this powerful *self*-deceptive desire which can blind us from seeing the risks ahead. God, the Source of Love, is not opposed to humans gaining knowledge. God warns against the self-centered, self-serving desire to seek knowledge in a way that's *not* connected - rooted and grounded - in the Source of love, and the Way of Love

“Why? **Because** the **idea** of human beings **becoming gods** is extremely **ancient** and deeply rooted in almost **every culture** in the world. It begins on the opening pages of the Bible, where the fundamental attack on humanity comes from the **suggestion** that **if** the humans will only disobey God and eat the forbidden fruit of the Tree of the **Knowledge of Good and Evil**... Please note, **not** the **Tree of Knowledge**. God is not against knowledge. **But if** they eat that forbidden fruit they shall **be as gods**, knowing **good and evil**.” **[bold added]**

<https://mindmatters.ai/2022/10/john-lennox-transhumanism-versus-traditional-humans/>

In the same interview, Dr. Lennox further *specifies* one of the most significant concerns. What will transhumanist transformations of the elite do to our *concepts* of being human, of *human dignity*, and of *human values*, if it is *divorced* from the ultimate and only true *Source* of pure agape-love?

“I would go **further** than that. I would say this is where the **great danger of AGI** and its **transhumanist agenda resides**. We're almost in the first generation that is capable, not only of implanting chips in human brains and so on, but **actually of altering the fundamental specification of human beings** by reconfiguring their germline and therefore **determining the kind** of beings that will **exist in the future**. Now, one of the reasons I wrote my book, **2084** was precisely this: That **AGI**, whose agenda is largely **driven by atheists** so far as I can see, is raising perhaps the deepest question of all that we face today: What is a human being? What dignity, what value, what rights does a human being have?” **[bold added]**

<https://mindmatters.ai/2022/10/john-lennox-transhumanism-versus-traditional-humans/>

Dr. Lennox's concern speaks to the heart of this little book. An agape, “cross” type of other-serving, self-giving, enemy-forgiving, relationship-reconciling love is the highest human value and virtue. It is the very Source of who and what we are. Therefore, *if we fail* to connect to that Source, and fail to make the Way of Agape the unifying and governing guide for all human “scientia”, science,

technology, and political leadership, *then* the fruit of our efforts will be a class of Homo *Diablos*, not Homo *Deus*. The Homo *Diablos* elite, will rise to the *top* in the fallen survival of the fittest system and eventually *rule over* the less privileged masses of normal people down beneath them. And this rule by the few *over* the many, could make past tyrannies pale by comparison, far worse even than that predicted by George Orwell’s prescient dystopian social sci-fi novel, *1984*. Though written in 1949, Orwell already could foresee the potential for technology to be horrifically misused and abused by an elite party of power-players.

“No novel of the past century has had **more influence** than **George Orwell’s *1984***. ... the vocabulary of the **all-powerful Party** that **rules** the **superstate** Oceania with the **ideology** of Ingsoc—*doublethink, memory hole, unperson, thoughtcrime, Newspeak, Thought Police, Room 101, Big Brother*—they’ve all entered the English language as instantly **recognizable signs** of a **nightmare future**. It’s almost impossible to talk about **propaganda, surveillance, authoritarian** politics, or **perversions of truth** without dropping a reference to *1984*. Throughout the Cold War, the novel found avid underground readers behind the **Iron Curtain** who wondered, ***How did he know?*** [***bold added***]

<https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2019/07/1984-george-orwell/590638/>

So, how can we prevent or at least lessen this negative development and dangerous abuse of scientific technological advancement? The first step is to *envision* and *pursue* a way that can achieve “good” for all people. And as long as we’re imagining, why not start with the vision of a *perfect* social realm. A reality where pure agape love fills, saturates, and overflows throughout every aspect of a society.

“Then God said, “**I give you** every seed-bearing **plant** on the face of the whole earth and every **tree** that has **fruit** with seed in it. They will be **yours for food**. And **to all the animals** of the earth and all the **birds** in the sky and all the creatures that move along the ground—everything that has the breath of life in it—I give **every green plant for food**.” And it was so. God saw all that he had made, and it was **very good**.”

Genesis 1:29-31

“The **wolf** will live with the **lamb**, and the leopard will lie down with the goat; the **calf** and young **lion** ... **will lie down together**, and a little child will lead them. The **cow** will graze with the **bear**, their **young** will **lie down together**, and the **lion will eat straw like the ox**.

.... They will **neither harm** nor **destroy** on all My holy mountain, for the earth will be **full of the [intimate] knowledge** of the LORD [YHWH] as the sea is full of water.”

Isaiah 11:6-9

“He will **wipe away every tear** from their eyes, and **death shall be no more**, neither shall there be **mourning**, nor **crying**, nor **pain** anymore, for the former things **have passed away**.”

Revelation 21:4

B - IMAGINE IF WE LIVED AGAPE LOVE PERFECTLY?

Yes, I know that *perfection is impossible* for us humans to live out. But what if?

“... the **hope that these memoirs**, in some manner, I know not how, **may find their way** to the **minds of humanity** in Some Dimension, and may **stir up a race of rebels** who shall **refuse to be confined to limited Dimensionality**.” (p.29).

Edwin A. Abbott. *FLATLAND: A Romance of Many Dimensions*.

As a youth when I first read Edwin Abbott’s classic novel, *FLATLAND: A Romance of Many Dimensions*, it lit a fire inside my mind and my heart to investigate greater possible realities beyond our direct human perceptual abilities. Abbott’s allegorical story is about beings from different dimensional realms. One group exists in a realm that’s limited to fewer dimensions than the other group, and

therefore cannot perceive the fullness and richness of the other greater realm. I won't spoil the book for you, but suffice it to say that Abbott shows how *evidence* in the lesser realm can *reveal* the *existence* and the *character* of the greater realm.

Since physics has *revealed* there are *dimensions* of reality we humans cannot *directly* perceive, and *since* we all know humble, compassionate *love* for others is the *highest* most valued virtue, then it's worth using our rational imaginations to *envision* the probability that a greater "perfect" realm of *pure* love exists above, behind, and beyond our own. Then, by using that evidential *envisioning* of an *ideal* (like a scientific thought-experiment), we can *see* more clearly a way to move forward toward a similar future goal.

As Dr. King so eloquently encouraged us, we need to maintain the "dream" of all people living *strong* mature love together, *consistently*. Every decision we make in life has a goal, a *teleological* purpose to motivate and guide our ongoing attitudes, thoughts, and actions. We need a long-term goal, along with intermediate short-term goals with plans, to keep us going and growing in agape-love as a human race. We need a vision of our old world transformed into a new world, a transformation as dramatic and beautiful as the *metamorphosis* of caterpillar into a butterfly!

"Dr. King was right: 'We must discover the power of love, the power, the redemptive power of love. And when we discover that, we will be able to make of this old world a new world. Love is the only way.' [bold added]
Michael Curry, the first "black" head of the Episcopal Church in America. *LOVE IS THE WAY: Holding on to Hope in Troubling Times*. (p. 241).

Picture what it would be like if all everyone's motives, attitudes, word choices, facial expressions, and habit patterns were filled with *genuine* care and action for the benefit of *others* as much as themselves. People and societies filled with a love that willingly, even eagerly, postpones personal *desires* (delayed gratification) to help others meet their basic *needs*. Not the kind of "help" that expects to *get* something back in return. That kind of "help" is never the *giving* of love. That's actually the "selling" of love for a price.

"... do good, and lend, expecting nothing in return." Jesus - Luke 6:35
"... 'It is more blessed to give than to receive.'"
Jesus - Acts 20:35

“What causes fights and quarrels among you? Don’t they come from your desires that battle within you? You desire but do not have, so you kill. You covet but you cannot get what you want, so you quarrel and fight.” [bold added]

Jesus’s brother James - James 4:1-2

INDIVIDUALLY, if we lived love continually, then *each* person internally would experience peace, contentment, and joy. Each person’s *motive* would be to *live to give, not to just get*. Each person’s *natural* survival of the fittest tendency, the temptation to be self-focused, self-serving, and defensive (*and therefore insecure, anxious, and dissatisfied*) would fade away. Instead of being fragile, insecure, and easily offended, people would become emotionally strong and independently secure.

RELATIONALLY, among and between people who all have this same agape love character, interactions would be *filled* and characterized with mutual trust, openness, honesty, and understanding. There would be a “oneness” of mind and heart without barriers from fear of rejection or betrayal. Gone would be the angry, bitter, *competitive* divisions that have saturated societies all throughout human history. People and groups would be caring, and *cooperative*, seeking to help *all* others meet their basic *needs*.

NATIONALLY & INTER-NATIONALLY, things could be so different than they are today. *Nationally*, can you imagine what each country would be like? Each nation would be an oasis of peaceful cooperative coexistence. What if *political* leaders really were *civil-servants*, not *self-serving* power-players seeking to gain greater positions of power and profit to fulfill their own personal *desires*? *Internationally*, picture what relationships *between* countries would be like? What if world leaders were truly seeking to serve the basic *needs* of all people together, to build a harmonious world culture for all?

What if *scholars* in science and philosophy didn’t *just* seek to discover a profoundly beautiful, *mathematically-physical* “Theory of Everything”, merely to use (and misuse) the forces connected to it to enhance human IQ, medical health, and longevity? What if primarily they invested their efforts to help society learn *how* to grow in the kind of humble compassionate other-serving love we all deeply desire and that this fragmented, hurting world desperately needs? What if the amazing *technological* advances (medical, educational, practical) were all

being used to benefit *everyone* not just the few privileged elites who can afford them?

“CHRISTIANITY”? What if Christians, and churches actually practiced the Christ-like agape love they preached? What would it look like if they actually would “walk their talk”. Gone would be the hypocrisy and phoniness that currently characterizes so much of Christianity. Not only that, but also gone would be a whole lot of the *traditional* beliefs and practices that have been added on top Jesus’s teachings! Yes, I’m talking about the “man-made” stuff that clouds-over and chokes-out the profoundly simple teachings of Jesus about humble, self-giving, other-serving, self-sacrificial, “cross-type” agape love for *all* others.

In 1845, former slave and brilliant Christian prophet of love, Frederick Douglass, contrasted the “good, pure, and holy” Christianity of Christ, to the “bad, corrupt, and wicked” cultural Christianity of his day. All throughout the history of Christianity, *prophets* (radical social-activist, human *sheepdogs*) have stood up and barked against the *traditions* that have so twisted Christ’s truths. So, please don’t miss those prophets’ main point. It’s not primarily about the *clouding*, obscuring distortions. The central *singular* message is about the reality and truth, the *light*, of the way of love, which in spite of us still shines through the darkness.

“.... for, **between the Christianity of this land, and the Christianity of Christ, I recognize the widest possible difference — so wide, that to receive the one as good, pure, and holy, is of necessity to reject the other as bad, corrupt, and wicked. To be the friend of the one, is of necessity to be the enemy of the other. I love the pure, peaceable, and impartial Christianity of Christ” [bold added]**

Brilliant Christian former slave, Frederick Douglass.

<http://utc.iath.virginia.edu/abolitn/abaufda14t.html>

Michael Curry, describes the *envisioned* “dream” and commitment of these shepherd and sheepdog *leaders*, those who stood strong in love, who practiced what they preached. They *led* by *modeling* the self-sacrificing *example* of love, *not* by coercive power, force, or manipulation.

“Given that **these leaders** were as **human as the rest of us**, maybe they weren’t born differently, **but lived differently**. They worked harder, longer, at their **commitment to love**. Courage, faith, love—these all must be **cultivated!** For love to survive when dreams are deferred, it **must be**

practiced day in, day out. And in the end, **living the way of love requires what King called “cosmic companionship.”** When it’s **dark** on earth, God is the one who whispers, “Say, let me tell you about **this dream . . .**” **[bold added]**

Michael Curry, the first “black” head of the Episcopal Church in America. *LOVE IS THE WAY: Holding on to Hope in Troubling Times.* (p. 91).

Christian astrophysicist and cosmologist, Dr. George Ellis, echoes this same timeless sentiment, as well as the profound Way, the practical *path* of self-giving other-serving love, so beautifully modeled by Jesus. Remember, it was Jesus who inspired both Dr. King and Gandhi, along with so many others. Dr. Ellis here and in many of his others writings uses the Greek term “kenotic” to describe the humble nature of this Way.

The **additional key element** is that this is to be **used for the good of others**, indeed to help **give them true freedom**, and **not to dominate** them or place them in subjection. On this view, **ethical behavior** should be **shaped along kenotic lines** in order to be consonant with the **deep nature of reality**, expressing a **fundamental aspect of the nature of God**, and so of **the underpinning of the created universe**.

The Work of Love: Creation as Kenosis (Kindle Locations 1387-1393).

It is also the **foundation of a profound path of social and political action**, as evidenced in Martin Luther **King's** political life,¹ and in the writings and life of Mahatma **Gandhi**. It will indeed in the end lead to a **better life for oneself** as well, but that is **not the ultimate reason** for adopting it. Enlightened **self-interest** will suggest this way to some extent, but **in the end will not justify it**.

[bold added]

The Work of Love: Creation as Kenosis (Kindle Locations 1395-1397).

That term “kenotic” and its noun form kenosis have a basic root meaning of “empty”, or “to empty out”. The terms are used in the NT a few times with this simple basic meaning. But the concept is also used for the humility that’s the core nature of the Creator who is agape love - especially as modeled by Jesus’s teachings and life example (Philippians 2:1-11). The key phrase is presented in 2:7, saying that Jesus “emptied himself, by taking the form of a *servant*”. The

nature and character, the very heart of God, is *service* to and for others. The Creator of the Cosmos, exists as humble *other-serving* love. This *servant* nature is consistent, continual, and therefore trustworthy. It shows no partiality. It is not selective. It is the quality of “maturity”, the teleological goal for every person.

The opposite type of nature or character is that of an *immature* child, anti-agape and anti-kenosis. We often say that people with that kind of character are “*full of the themselves*”. They’re people who refuse to chose the way of humble *self-emptying* for the sake of others.

Dr. John Stott, was one of the most widely respected evangelical scholars and *leaders* of the 20th century. Yet, in his older, more “mature” years, Dr. Stott shocked many in the evangelical world. He spoke out about many failures regarding the teaching and practice of love in modern, *western* Christianity. Not only did his older more *mature* convictions lead him to change significantly some of his own views, but he also stood as a *sheepdog*, lovingly confronting the evangelical Church to radically change their ways. One of his most dramatic changes was his *rejection* of the *traditional* teaching about “hell” as a place of eternal suffering. I too came to reject that man-made view myself after 40 plus years of research, study, and prayerful thought in the light of agape-love.

At the end of his life, Dr. Stott wrote his last book, *THE RADICAL DISCIPLE: SOME NEGLECTED ASPECTS OF OUR CALLING*, in which he covered seven serious areas of Christian negligence: nonconformity, Christlikeness, *maturity*, creation care, simplicity, balance, dependence and death. Each section is excellent, yet one of them is my favorite, the section on *Maturity*. He starts off summarizing the current condition of the Christian scene. Then he goes on to describe the “*teleios*” maturity of agape.

“I would **sum** it up in just three words, namely ‘**growth without depth**’. from the pen of Paul in which he writes **about maturity**, and it is on these verses that I propose to focus in this chapter:

We proclaim [Christ], admonishing and **teaching everyone with all wisdom**, so that we may present everyone **fully mature (teleios)** in Christ.

(Colossians 1:28)

The **Greek** adjective **teleios** occurs **nineteen times** in the New Testament and whether it is translated **‘perfect’ or ‘mature’** depends mainly on its **context**. It rarely if ever means ‘perfect’ in an absolute sense. Instead **the teleios (person) is contrasted with the child or infant** (e.g. 1 Corinthians 13:10–11). It is in this sense (**‘mature’**) that I think it **best to understand the meaning of teleios. [bold added]** (pp. 26-28).

Dr. John Stott. THE RADICAL DISCIPLE: SOME NEGLECTED ASPECTS OF OUR CALLING.

C - WHY IS IT SO HARD TO LIVE IT *CONSISTENTLY*?

Think about your own love-life? No, *not* your sex life. I’m talking about how well genuine humble, other-serving compassionate love is or is not flowing and growing through your life to others? How’s it going and growing in your family, among you and your friends, in your nation, between nations around the world?

I’ve learned an important truth after serving as a family counselor and organization mediator for over 40 years. It’s that all of us and every group regularly needs *guidance* that’s grounded in, centered around, and pointing toward greater growth in the way of mutually strong, humble, compassionate love.

But, when you search the internet for guidance, counsel, and wisdom about how to overcome our human struggle to live love *consistently*, you will find a whole spectrum of views. They range on a continuum between two unbalanced extremes.

One extreme includes the overly hard, condemning, legalistic models that emphasize our *negative* problem, our inherent selfishness, pride, greed, etc. This model, or way, only works short-term to change people and groups. It sort of *beats-down* the human tendency to selfishness. But it never produces the long-term inner transformation (*metamorphosis*) that's needed.

The other extreme includes the too soft and mushy, overly complimenting models that focus only on the *positive* and ignore the seriousness of our human problem of selfishness. These mushy models often claim that the answer to our human problem is *just* to dwell on how *wonderful* we are, or how much God "likes" us, just the way we are. This view also only works in the short-term, but fails in the long run to provide a way to truly deal with the malignant root of selfishness.

Like all unbalanced ways, these two extremes *seem* right, but they ultimately fall short of actually changing people and societies. Eventually, they end in personal disaster and social destruction. What's needed is a profoundly simple, balanced, middle way that can effectively help us *know* how to overcome selfishness and how to *grow* in unselfish, humble, compassionate, other-serving love.

In recent decades this continuum of guidance models has merged with the transhumanistic hope that *physical* technology merged with our *physical* human brains and bodies can produce an evolutionary leap up to a new and better humanity. Plans are to integrate the hopes and dreams of *physical* transhumanistic enhancements with either of the two counseling psychology, guidance extremes (*negatively legalistic or positively mushy*). But remember, this transhumanistic dream focuses on enhancing only human intellect, health, strength, and longevity.

It has no viable plan for *physical* technology to enhance human capacity for compassionate love. It's as if deep down, they realize that such a *non-physical* quality (qualia) cannot be accomplished by *physical* technology. I believe their intuitive realization is correct.

Dr. Yuval Harari, and other leading thinkers, warn of the insidious danger looming at the event horizon of such an emerging and merging plan. Their dream of a new "singularity" for human advancement could actually become the elimination of all that it means to be truly, lovingly human ("humane").

“ ... we may be fast approaching a **new singularity, when** all the **concepts** that give **meaning** to our world—me, you, men, women, **love** and hate—**will become irrelevant.**”

[bold added]

<https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2020/02/17/yuval-noah-harari-gives-the-really-big-picture>

Our deepest most vital need as individuals and as an emerging global society is not the *merger* of physical technology with our human brain and bodies. What's most needed is a *merger* of our non-physical minds and bodies with the one and only *non-physical, immaterial* Source of pure love. That's the only “way” that can produce the inner *metamorphic* transformation needed in human hearts, cultures, and societies.

Why? It's because the root cause and powerful influence of the “selfishness” (the old English term was “sin”) within us, cannot be cured by us alone. We cannot independently “become like gods”, Homo Deus. We need *the* God, the *Source* of Love. And therefore we need *humble* dependence upon God, to draw from the Source, who is not merely a “force”.

Evidential proof of our need *is* history, the *story* of human-kind. It's not a pretty picture. It reveals a self-repeating, vicious cycle of humans living out the way of self survival of the fittest, the coolest, the most powerful, and the cruelest. We tend to pretend that we alone are rising from the ashes of the last and only most recent human holocaust, never to let it happen again. And yet it has, and does, and will, over and over again. Each time, we are shocked, *awakened* (very “woke”) out of our self-deceptive day-dream, only to worry about the next human-caused nightmare.

Yes, human technology has done wonderfully good things. And it has the potential for even better things beyond our imaginations. But not unless the heart and soul of humans and human-kind is changed, so that we don't blow it once again. What we need is not just *education*. We need *transformation*, a metamorphosis, as dramatic as a lowly caterpillar becoming a radiant butterfly. And not just physically, it must be psycho-socially and relationally, which are merely modern terms remember for the *old* one - “spiritually”. It was called

spiritually because it included the psychological socialization, the relational transformation that necessarily *included* a relationship with the Source, the God of Love.

Please listen carefully to the following appeal, the clarion call, by Dr. John Lennox. He points us to a future far greater than the transhumanists vision of an AI or even an AGI techno-utopia. While Dr. Lennox's call comes from his Christ-centered perspective, the same Way and the same goal that he's talking about has been revealed to everyone by the same Source throughout all history - deep within every religion, every culture, and every human heart. I say "deep within" because our human traditions and psychological projections have continually clouded-over and choked-out the universal call of the compassionate Consciousness behind the Cosmos.

The Logos intelligence behind the information codes of reality has Self-revealed by Self-encoding, throughout the physical realm in history, freely offering and gently drawing any who are willing to embrace the way of agape-love relationships.

"AI may well make many good and **helpful advances** that will **improve** the lot of humanity. **However**, no matter what the promise might be, the **central claim of Christianity** is that the **future** is far **greater** than anything **AI or AGI can promise** since something **infinitely** bigger than either of them has already happened on our planet: God, who is responsible for the **existence** of the **universe** and its **laws** and the architecture of the **human mind**, the **divine Logos** who was in the beginning, **has coded himself into humanity** – the Word became **flesh** and dwelt among us. This is **not artificial intelligence**; this is **Real Intelligence** – way **beyond** anything **conceivable**, let alone constructible, by humans. **[bold added]**

John Lennox Ph.D., DPhil., DSc. (*speaks five languages English, Russian, French, German, Spanish*). Oxford Prof. Math, Philosophy, Science. 2084: *ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND THE FUTURE OF HUMANITY*. (pp. 186-187).

D - HOW CAN WE GROW IN THE WAY OF AGAPE?

Before discussing a summary overview of a *few* basic principles for the “how to” of growth in agape-love, it’s important to first take a deeper look into the nature and character of the *Source* of love.

So many religious terms have lost their simple meaning in the fog of our human traditions. Recall that the word *spiritual* simply refers to our inner and inter personal agape-love relations, *horizontally* with other people (*and sentient animals*) - as well as vertically (*transcendently*) with the Source of agape-love. And that, deep within nearly every spiritual philosophy or religion, you will find the profoundly simple way of agape-love taught and lived by various individuals and groups.

The way is not unique *to* Christianity, yet the way is *uniquely* revealed *thru* Christianity. Don’t panic my old Christian friends. I’m not negating the realities of who Jesus is and what he did as the one called the Christ. I’m simply emphasizing that the Source of Love, who exists as love, would not and did not leave any

other people without a way, without *the way*, to connect, learn, and grow in compassionate love.

So what's *unique* about the Christian revelation and application of this basic meaning of spiritual as multi-personal relational interactions. Jesus taught that the ultimate Source, God, who exists as pure agape-love, *transcends* our finite understanding of a *singular* person. Jesus taught that God who is agape-love exists as a multi-personal, "triune" being. In other words, a multi-personal Consciousness who created a multi-dimensional Cosmos, neither of which can we fully comprehend.

Jesus used the metaphorical, analogous language of "Father" "Son" "Spirit" to help us understand this relational nature of God. Before asking "How" is that possible, first consider again "Why". Agape-love is always *self-giving to another*, the active mutual *sharing* of agape between others. Remember, God exists as infinite eternal agape-love. Before the Cosmos was created, only God existed. So, God who is agape, must have been actively sharing agape with "others", multi-personally, within the Being of God.

So, It Still Doesn't Make Sense to You?

I can still remember my own young voice, way back when I was an atheist, saying, "That doesn't make much sense to me, how that could that be?". Even the greatest scientific minds today cannot *directly* perceive or *fully* understand the multi-dimensional reality of the Cosmos. Yet, ironically they *accept*, as Dr. Guillen demonstrated, by evidential belief, that those multi-dimensions really *do* exist.

Similarly, none of us can fully understand *how* "infinity" or "eternality" could exist. Or for that matter, how and why the speed of light is the universal "speed limit", a constant beyond which no "thing" can exceed. As you've already seen from the discussions and explanations of Drs. Guillen, Lennox, Ellis, Kaku, etc., we are finite, temporal beings. Therefore our various fields of "scientia" (science, philosophy, theology) are severely limited. Yet, even though we can't "fully" comprehend such concepts and realities, we can see sufficient *indirect* evidence in each of these fields to logically understand all that's needed to accept them as truth. Or more scientifically stated, as the IBE (Inferred Best Explanation).

The same *abductive* logic applies to *evidential* belief (rational faith) regarding the reality and truth of a Consciousness beyond the Cosmos who exists as agape-love. And therefore, who, *as* an agape being, must also exist as *multi*-personal, eternally-*giving* love, one to *another*.

Growing as a Branch in a Vine Producing Good Fruit

Throughout history, virtually every spiritual philosophy or religion had individuals who taught the profoundly simple principles for “how to” *connect* to the Source of love, *grow* in love, and *share* that love with others - one to another. Remember though, that these principles have often been clouded-over and choked-out by added human traditions. Those twisted traditions usually involve self-righteous “ways” (rules/rituals) that are the opposite of the way of agape-love. So, you have to dig down into the history and writings of most spiritual “traditions” to see the common agape heart at the center.

The true and simple principles of agape-love have been expressed and described in many varied forms thru the different world religions. Sometimes they’ve been expressed in lofty philosophical ways, but more often (and more effectively) by simple descriptive analogies and common imagery about everyday life experiences. That’s what Jesus was doing through the metaphorical analogies of “Father” “Son” “Spirit”, in order to give a simple, down to earth picture of God’s relational nature. And, like a master *counseling* psychologist, he used many other practical, profoundly simple analogies to explain the “how to” of connecting, growing, and sharing God’s kind of enemy-forgiving, self-giving “cross-type” of love.

And **modern psychology** is calling on us now to **love**. But **long before modern psychology** came into being, **the world’s greatest psychologist** who walked around the **hills of Galilee** told us **to love**. He looked at men and said: **“Love your enemies; don’t hate anybody.”** **[bold added]**

Dr. Martin Luther-King Jr. “LOVING YOUR ENEMIES,” Sermon
Delivered at Dexter Avenue Baptist Church. <https://kinginstitute.stanford.edu/king-papers/documents/loving-your-enemies-sermon-delivered-dexter-avenue-baptist-church>

“If you were to take the **sum total** of all the authoritative articles ever written by the most **qualified of psychologists and psychiatrists** on the subject of **mental hygiene** — if you were to combine them, refine them, and cleave out the excess verbage - if you were to take the whole of the

meat and none of the parsley, and if you were to have these unadulterated bits of **pure scientific knowledge** concisely expresses by the most **capable of living poets**, you would have an awkward and **incomplete summation** of the **Sermon on the Mount**. And it would suffer immeasurably through comparison." **[bold added]**

(Fisher, J. T., & Hawley, L. S. (1951). *A few buttons missing: The case book of a psychiatrist*. pp. 273 Philadelphia: Lippincott.)

One of my favorite analogies by Jesus is his simple outdoor counseling talk using the imagery of a *branch* in a grape *vine* producing good *fruit*. It's recorded in John 15:1-17. In that message, Jesus describes *himself* as the "vine", *you* and me as the "branches", *God* (the Father/Source) as the "gardener", and agape-love as the "fruit". The fluid "sap" flowing through the vine is analogous to the "Spirit" of God who is Love.

Jesus calls himself the "vine" because he's pointing to his own *consistent* life-way of pure agape. He was committed to living as the physical *embodiment* of pure agape-love (love in the flesh). He continued to love his enemies, even knowing and predicting that they would one day kill him. And, he was able to do it the same "way" that he taught others to live it, by simple humble dependence, not egotistic independence.

"I am the true **vine**, and my **Father** is the **gardener**.... **No branch can produce fruit by itself; it must remain in the vine**. Neither can you bear **fruit** unless you remain in me. I am the vine; **you** are the **branches**. ... I have **told you** this so that **my joy may be in you** and that your joy may be complete. **My command** is this: **Love** each other **as** I have loved you. Greater love has no one than this: **to lay down one's life for one's friends**. ... You did not choose me, but I chose you and appointed you so that you might **go and produce fruit**—fruit that will last This is my command: **Love each other.**" **[bold added]** John 15:1-17

His listeners in that agricultural culture understood easily the "how to" of this way to produce the good fruit of agape-love. A branch cannot produce fruit *apart* from the vine. That would be like you or me self-righteously, pridefully believing we can live the purity of agape-love *independently* from God the Source.

"**Not** by [human] **might nor** by **power**,
but by my Spirit,' says the LORD [YHWH]
[bold added]

Zechariah 4:7 (Remember the Hebrew YHWH means the Self-Existent Being]

Jesus's way is called "good news" (the literal meaning of the term "gospel"). A branch doesn't have to *struggle* by *self-willed will-power* to produce fruit. The branch simply and dependently *yields* openly to let the vine's sap freely flow through it to produce good fruit. In the same way, humbly yielding, surrendering, *following* is all you or I need to do so that the Spirit of love can flow freely through our lives. That's what the often misused phrase "Spirit-filled" means. The Consciousness behind the Cosmos who is humble compassionate love, fills us and overflows through us, out to the hearts and lives of others.

In other writings, I've expanded in more detail on the *specific* "how to's" for applying the practical, counseling-psychology principles of agape in our personal lives and our relationships. Here, however, I only want to focus on the heart and core of these "how-to's". This core, foundational *root* addresses two common questions people seek answers to.

1 - What'll it do for *me*?

2 - What about the *other* people in my *life*?

1 - WHAT'LL IT DO FOR ME?

When people are thinking this kind of question, they're wanting to know if living the way of agape will produce the fruit of happiness and peace that we all desire. Can it produce a stable, secure life of contentment, or in other words, mature mental health? They're asking if the way of love is an effective way to have victory over feeling down, or feeling like there's no hope in sight. Sadly, some are even hoping for a way to climb out of the pit of full on depression.

Remember that Jesus in John 15:11 said the principles conveyed in his analogy of the vine and branches would produce personal *joy*. But, also notice he said joy will *only* happen *if* a person lives the principles *sincerely* and *consistently*. Earlier in that same "nature" talk, Jesus also said that living the "way of love" would produce a strong stable sense of *peace*.

"Peace I leave with you; **my peace** I give to you. **Not as the world gives** do I give to you. Let **not** your hearts be **troubled**, **neither** let them be **afraid.**" *[bold added]*

John 14:27

When Jesus said “my peace” - “not as the world gives”, he’s highlighting the fact that the world’s kind of peace is dependent on changing uncertain circumstances. The world’s peace is unstable and insecure and we all know it. So even when things are going well in our little sphere of the world, deep down we know it could fall apart if things around us change.

Serious depression and anxiety, *the opposites of joy and peace*, are now epidemic and increasing in modern society among people of all walks of life. The need for an effective solution, a practical simple “way” is vitally needed. I’m convinced, not only by serving 40 years as a counselor and mediator, but also by my own personal life, that compassionate agape love is that way. As I’ve already mentioned, my childhood and young adulthood were crippled by anxiety, insecurity, bitterness, and depression. It was by applying the profoundly simple principles of the way of love that changed my life.

Biology as a Causative Factor

It’s important to keep in mind that there are times when neurophysiological, biochemical factors are involved as part of the cause. And that can make the struggle to experience joy, peace, and a life of contentment more difficult. When biology is a factor, psychiatric medications can often help. Sadly, for some people, these neurological *conditions* are significant and a life long struggle. They need and deserve our compassion and support. In a lot of these cases, it’s caused by genetic predispositions. Psychiatric medications along with specific types of interpersonal counseling are *essential* to help their neurological system function as well as possible.

However, be wise in determining *which* medical professional is best to help *you* decide “if” you need medication, what kind, how much, and for how long. Some medical professionals prescribe psychiatric medications carelessly. Medication should be a last resort, not a quick fix remedy, that might only treat the *symptom*, and not deal with the underlying cause.

Attitudes-Thoughts-Beliefs as Causative Factors

Regardless of whether or not biological factors are involved, living the “way of agape-love” for others is the most effective way to produce in your life - “joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control”. Those eight qualities come from one of the NT writers, Paul. He had been transformed, by the “way of love”, from a prideful, bitter, violent “religious” leader into a humble, forgiving, man of peace. He put it this way:

“The **fruit** of the **Spirit** [of agape] is **love**: [*which produces the flavors/ experiences of*] **joy, peace, patience**, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, **self-control.**” [*The Greek term used here for “fruit” is singular, not like English which can be singular or plural. So the single fruit cannot be all nine words listed. The Greek manuscripts to save space did not use punctuation. Based on the singular term for “fruit”, the punctuation would be “the fruit of the Spirit is Love: joy, peace” So, the single fruit is “love”, and the other eight terms refer to the flavor/experiences when love is lived consistently.*]

[bold added] Galatians 5:22-23

Everyone’s *thoughts, attitudes, and beliefs* powerfully affect what kinds and degrees of “feelings” are experienced. Even if biological factors are involved, attitudes and beliefs significantly affect what kind of feelings, *actions*, reactions, or responses result. Here’s a sort of funny example (*maybe not for some of you*) to prove the point that attitudes and beliefs can affect, even *produce*, your feelings.

Suppose you were intently watching a movie on your big screen TV, sitting in the dark on your couch. You begin to have a tickling sensation on your bare ankle, so your mind begins wondering what’s causing it? But at first you don’t think much about it because you’re so engrossed in the movie. But, the tickling sensation keeps getting stronger. So more possible *causes* float into and out of your mind. Is it a loose pet hair blowing in the wind? Is it a thread from your pants leg?

Then suddenly, you wonder, maybe it’s an antennae from a *roach* that’s about to crawl up your leg. At first you discount that idea, but the *possibility* grows to a *probability* in your imagination until you now *believe* it *is* a roach. Like most folks, as soon as you believe it you *feel* fear or maybe also disgust. You immediately react by shaking your leg, or for some of you even jumping up in a panic, dancing around, and running in circles. At that point, you’ve lost control!

Why?

Your *root belief* produced the *fruit of feelings and actions*. And, even if there was actually NO roach at all, you would have reacted the same. *False* beliefs are just as powerful as true ones. By the way, roaches aren’t dangerous, cannot bite or sting, and actually are fairly clean animals. People fear and are repulsed by roaches because of culturally conditioned programming as kids. Their family’s reactions taught them to “believe” *myths* about roaches.

What’s All This Have to Do with the Agape Way?

Our *internal* patterns of attitudes, motives, and beliefs impact our personal experience of:

- * joy vs. depression,
- * peace vs. anxiety,
- * contentment vs. dissatisfaction

Because we've all grown up in and live surrounded by the natural way of "survival of the fittest", the coolest, and often the cruelest, we've learned habitual, deeply ingrained attitudes and patterns of *self*-protection and *self*-pleasing. We're reluctant to open our hearts fully to others in relationships. To varying degrees, we unconsciously protect ourselves with walls made of defensive or aggressive thinking, speaking, and acting. The result is that other people never get to fully know the real us. And we never fully get to know them.

“**Now** I know in part; **then** I shall **know fully**, even as I have been fully known. So **now** faith, hope, and **love** maintain, these three; but the **greatest** of these is **love.**” *[bold added]*

1 Corinthians 13:12-13

This is why so many people *feel* lonely, even when they're with others. My wife and I have counseled many couples who've been together for decades, yet they feel *alone* in their relationship. They love one another, yet their mutually self-protective walls keep them from fully experiencing the oneness of heart and soul. They're missing the deep *friendship* that they innately desire and need.

Worse is that whenever somebody says or does something that causes us hurt or disappointment, our inner self-protective walls can get bigger, more defensive or angrily offensive. Inner isolation grows in both people's hearts. When children witness this kind of pattern, they feel it, deeply. So, the children's own inner walls of self-protection also get thicker and *harder*. As time and the patterns progress, everyone is less willing to take the risks necessary to open up their gradually hardening hearts. These natural but *negative* patterns (the ways of self-survival) become vicious cycles repeating again and again, progressively becoming worse and worse.

The Solution is Simple, But Not Easy, Nor Cheap!

The *heart* of the solution, pun intended, is for someone in the relationship to choose the risk and *cost* of softening and *opening* the heart. That's the way of agape-love. Some of you, understandably, are thinking,

“No way, not until the other person opens up too. It’s not worth the risk. I’ll only do it if the other person does it too.”

Guess what, the other person is thinking and clinging to the same self-protective, self-pleasing, self-deceptive, self-destructive attitude. The result is that no one opens up, no one grows in agape, and the relationship deteriorates or escalates until it dies.

“There’s a **way** that **seems right**,
but it **ends in death**.” Proverbs 14:12

Common question? What if *you* choose to open up and embrace the way of agape, but the other person in the relationship won’t. Why would that be worth the risk? What would you “get” out of it?

There’s good news and bad news. The bad news is that just thinking the attitude of what *you* would “get” is destined for disappointment. Because the attitude of *getting*, is a dangerous slide away from the agape way. As Jesus said, “It’s *better* to give than to receive”. If your joy and peace is *dependent* on *getting*, then you’ll *never* get enough. I call it the *painful* pursuit to pleasure self. It always fails in the end.

The good news though is that you *will* gain something wonderful “if” you sincerely and consistently open up, live, and *give* agape love, even in the face of hurt. In fact, it’s *guaranteed* that you’ll *get* and *grow* in the “fruit of the Spirit of love”, increasingly experiencing and enjoying the flavors of love’s fruit flavors: “joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control”. This list is everything anyone ever sought counseling for. Can you imagine what your life would be like if this list was the strong, stable, character of *your* personality.

Believe it or not, your inner character and personal experience is *not* dependent on other people. It’s dependent on your deepest inner *motive*, attitude, and life commitment. If your life commitment truly and genuinely is to let the *Source* of love live and give compassionate agape through you to *help* others, then it’s *guaranteed* that you’ll grow stronger in the experience of love’s fruit flavors.

Again, think and imagine this list as characterizing *you* - “joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control”.

So, why aren’t more people living, giving, and experiencing such a strong, stable life character? What keeps them from having and enjoying it? Answer - *they* are! No other *person* and no other *thing*, except *you* yourself, can stop the fruit of love and its fruitful experience in *your* life. That’s good news. But beware, all of us are naturally and powerfully tempted to either *never* do it or to *quit* doing it. Why? Because it’s risky and vulnerable to open up and love others as much as we naturally care about ourselves. To “do unto others”, *even those who act like our enemies*, “as we would want them to do to us”, the way Jesus taught, is simple but not easy.

The way of agape seems so counterintuitive because we self-deceive ourselves into believing that self-protection, inner self-isolation, defense and offense are the *safe* way to joy, peace, etc. The truth of the agape way is a *paradox*. Here’s how Jesus described it, although the English translations fail to convey the practical simplicity of his wise counsel.

“And he said to **all**, “If anyone would **come** after me, let him **deny** himself and take up **his cross daily** and **follow** me. For whoever would **save** his **life** will **lose** it, but whoever **loses his life** for my sake **will save** it.” Luke 9:23-24

Take a look more closely at his choice of words as they were written in the original Greek NT language. It says he spoke to “all”, to everyone. Thousands of people were seeking Jesus because they wanted what he had - his strong, stable life of joy, peace, amazing patience, etc. So, he gave them a universal counseling psychology *prescription*.

First, he said a person must choose the attitude of self-denial, (psychology calls it, “delayed-gratification”). The NT Greek for “deny self”, literally is “say no to self”, like the old slogan, “say no to drugs”. Why delay self-gratification? Because it’s the way to achieve a bigger, better goal for yourself and for others later on. This is the *opposite* of our culturally conditioned quick fix, fast food, selfie society that seeks, expects, and demands *instant* self-gratification plus affirmation from everyone else.

Next, Jesus said to them, to all of us who want joy and peace, that we must “take up our *own* cross”, *not* his cross. What’s “our” cross? It’s our life commitment to

embrace the risk and sometimes even the hurt of loving and forgiving others, who act like our enemies, just like Jesus modeled for us. Anything less is not love, or at least not full, consistent, fruit producing agape-love. Then he presented the counterintuitive paradox. “If we seek to save our life, we will lose it”. And, he said *if* we are willing to lose our life, for his sake (his will, his way of helping, serving others), only then can we discover our full overflowing, genuine life.

The Greek term for “save” is “sozo”, which means to *heal* and *make whole*. It talking about the solution to the *typical* human life of repeatedly feeling like we’re “falling apart”. Also, the Greek term for “life” in this passage is “psyche” as in psychology. That’s right, psychological joy, peace, contentment, satisfaction, etc. He’s saying that the way to *develop* personal *psychological* maturity is a lifestyle committed to helping others meet their genuine needs.

So, how and why does this agape paradox *work*? And, in contrast, why does the way of self-centered survival of the fittest *fail*? It’s simple. If our core motive and attitude is *self-gratification* and *self-protection*, then the fruit we “get” will be nothing more than *self*, alone, empty inside, even in a crowd. Sure, we might *get* a bunch of *stuff* like money, cars, house, important job, *superficial* friends, or a life-partner who's only attracted to outward *stuff*. However, *if* our central motive and attitude is to let the Source of pure love live and give through us to others in need, we *will* increasing gain a growing character of stronger love, greater inner joy, deeper peace, “patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control” (remember Galatians 5:22-23).

But, what if we stray off the path of agape?

What about the moments when we *fail* during a relationship? Then what can we do? No problem. Simply get back on the path, re-commit, re-embrace, and walk on. And be sure to seek *forgiveness* from others you may have hurt during your falling and failing to live agape-love. The goal is *not* immediate *perfection*, which none of us can achieve on this earth. The goal is *growth*, so that we give up and blow up less often, and less severely. Improvement, *success*, in the agape way is simply our *humble* trust (faith) in the Source of love becoming *stronger*, and subsequently our *ability* to love others around us becoming more *consistent*.

In other writings, I've expanded on these simple core principles, so you can check those out to learn about more types of applications and practical principles. They cover the "how-to's" for *specific* situations, particular *kinds* of relationships, and different *types* of personalities.

2 - SO, WHAT HAPPENS TO THE *OTHER* PEOPLE IN MY LIFE?

There are always two kinds of *other* people in our lives. Some people will be equally as committed to the way of love as you are. Together, you and those who consistently follow and grow in the way of love will enhance and empower one another's lives. How will you know who those loving people are as you navigate through life? Jesus counseled, "You will know them by their fruit". That is, the fruit of agape love. No one is perfect in love, so clearly he's talking about a life of love that's *growing* in *consistency*.

While this counsel does mean that we all have to be "fruit inspectors" to some degree, it does *not* mean being critical and judgmental. Remember that he also said, "Do not judge". So yes, we should wisely *evaluate* the growth and consistency of agape love in the lives of people we choose to build relationships with. Yet, we should also be *humble*, merciful, and gracious when others stumble in their practice of love. An ancient proverb says, "Love covers a multitude of sins". When Jesus said we should "not judge", he's primarily saying don't judge and condemn the person's *inner* heart *motives*. None of us as humans can know for sure what someone else's heart motive is. Only God, the Consciousness behind the Cosmos, can know the inner consciousness of other people in your life. We humans only have the ability to evaluate the *consistency* of other people's *outer* fruit *patterns*, their words, tones, countenance, and behaviors.

Now for the big question - “What about other people who *won’t* live the way of love, and even those who act like *enemies*?” In other words, what about people in your life who *refuse* to practice the way of love, either in a particular *moment* or maybe as an habitual *pattern* of living.

As you probably already realized, there’s *no* guarantee that if you live love, the other person will *change* and also choose to live love in return. So, beware of our natural tendency to try and either force, coerce, or manipulate the other person into changing. Trying to “make” the other person change by fearful force, coercive pressure, or subtle manipulation never works in the long run. Yes, it might cause the person to temporarily and superficially *act* better, but it won’t last. No deep heart-level change will happen. Yet, Dr. King summarizes *consistent* love’s uniquely powerful *potential* for changing the hearts of others around us.

“Now there is a **final reason** I think that **Jesus says, “Love your enemies.”** It is this: that love has within it a redemptive **power**. And there is a power there that eventually **transforms individuals**. ... Because **if you hate** your enemies, you have **no way** to redeem and to transform your enemies. ... You just **keep loving** people and keep loving them, even though they’re mistreating you. ... Just **keep being friendly** to that person. ... **Don’t** do anything to **embarrass them**. Just **keep loving** them, and **they can’t stand it too long**. Oh, **they react** in many ways **in the beginning**. They react with **bitterness** because they’re mad because you love them like that. They react with **guilt feelings**, and sometimes they’ll hate you a little more at that transition period, but just keep loving them. And by the **power of your love** they **will break down** under the load. That’s love, you see. It is redemptive, and this is why Jesus says love. There’s something about **love** that **builds up and is creative**. There is something about **hate that tears down** and is destructive. “love your enemies.”

I think of one of the **best examples** of this. We all remember the **great president** of this United States, **Abraham Lincoln ...” [bold added]**

<https://kinginstitute.stanford.edu/king-papers/documents/loving-your-enemies-sermon-delivered-dexter-avenue-baptist-church>

It’s important to remember that living strong love does *not* mean you *must* stay in a seriously abusive, violent, or dangerous situation. There are times when the *strength* of love will and must *separate* short-term, or permanently, in order to protect others and yourself. Such separations can actually be a powerful lesson for the abusive person. But, separation should *not* be used as an *excuse* to avoid the uncomfortableness of living agape-love.

The good news is that if and when you live the way of agape sincerely and consistently, it's the most powerful *encouragement* for the other person to change. An ancient proverb says it well. It's written in Proverbs 24:21-22, and is repeated by Paul, the transformed apostle, in his Romans 12 (verse 20) discussion on living *strong* love in the face of hurtful enemies.

“If your **enemy** is **hungry** give, him **food** to eat.
If he is **thirsty**, give him **water** to drink. By doing this, you will heap
burning **coals** [*of conviction*] on him. And the Lord will **reward** you.”

The profoundly simple point of the proverb is that if you live genuine agape love, the other person can't blame their own hateful attitude and actions on you. And, your ongoing *consistent* love will be a striking contrast, producing the *power* to *convict* your enemy, until he sees his own opposite heart by comparison. It often takes longer than the ways of force and fear, or manipulation and coercion. But the way of love is the only way to encourage real heart-level change in the other person. In fact, it is the only hope to transform a full blown *enemy* into a life long-*friend*!

Check out the following story about Democrat Governor George Wallace, a prideful racist who was transformed by the amazing love lived through Dr. Martin Luther-King Jr.. Most people don't know that for much of American history, it was the Democrat Party that housed the racists, the pro-slavery crowd, the KKK.

I grew up in the deep south during those days. And it was two wise elder “black” family friends, my boyhood spiritual mentors, Mr. Will Hall and Mrs. Jerline Henson, who showed me the way to agape-love. They learned it from Dr. Martin Luther-King, who had learned it from the teachings of Jesus. The way of agape transformed my life as it has for countless others, and it can do the same for you.

Not only individual people but even groups and cultures can be transformed by compassionate love. Keep in mind as you read this story about Dr. King and Gov. Wallace, that if a rock *hard*, self-protective heart won't *willingly* soften and open to the way of love, it will sometimes have to be broken open — by the *consequences* of life.

Remember that Dr. King was killed by a hate filled racist assassin, just as he had predicted would likely happen one day. Even knowing that his life might end by that violent way, Dr. King had courageously continued traveling and preaching the

agape way until his death. All during that time, Gov. Wallace, had opposed and fought against Dr. King's message and movement of love. Then one day, Wallace had his own encounter with an attempted assassination, and was left paralyzed. But it didn't end there.

[Dr. King's church] Dexter Avenue Baptist Church is less than half a mile from the Alabama Capitol, yet it took an **attempted assassination** that **left Wallace paralyzed** for him to visit Dexter again. In 1979, he entered in a **wheelchair**, unannounced, to **apologize**. His words were simple and contrite: "I have **learned what suffering means**. In a way that was **impossible** [before the shooting], I think I can **understand** something of the **pain black people** have come to **endure**. I know **I contributed to that pain**, and I can only **ask your forgiveness**."

King was not there, of course, having been **assassinated** more than a decade earlier, but the **congregation forgave Wallace**. When I imagine King's response had he been present, part of his **Christmas 1957 sermon comes to mind**:

"**Forgiveness does not mean ignoring** what has been done or putting a false label on an evil act. It **means**, rather, that the **evil act no longer remains** as a **barrier** to the **relationship**.
... While abhorring segregation, we shall love the segregationist.
 This is the
only way to create the beloved community."

A hint of King's dream come true"

I never met King or Wallace, but I know **Wallace's older daughter**, Peggy Wallace Kennedy. When I emailed to ask about her father's change of heart, she responded, "**Daddy's acts of contrition were real** and for the right reasons. For it was his own Journey to Jericho that led him home. ... [I]t was **his own suffering** as a paraplegic that carried him **to a higher ground of peace and understanding**. I believe that Daddy's **transformation** later in his life **affected the hearts of both African Americans and Whites**, in America."

Wallace's full-circle journey has taught me the **truth of King's words**:
"Love is the only force capable of **transforming an enemy into a friend.**"
[bold added]

By Walter Houston Robinson.

<https://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/2021/0114/George-Wallace-Martin-Luther-King-Jr.-and-the-power-of-forgiveness>

This amazing grace story reminds me of a *small* book written by Dr. King entitled, **THE STRENGTH TO LOVE**, which I strongly recommend. His elegant way with words, and the *power* of the principles he counsels, are profoundly practical.

Again, I've written elsewhere, much shorter, more practical essays and articles on the "how-to's" for specific situations and particular relationships. For now, just remember that no matter the conditions or relations, the profoundly simple principles for living humble compassionate agape-love are *guaranteed* to produce in *you* the growth of *mature* joy, peace, patience, etc., in your life. Of course, that is, *if you maintain* a truly sincere attitude and motive to live love for others. And also it's the most powerful way to encourage *change* in the other people around you. Random acts of agape love, spreading like the socially contagious effect of "yawning" could transform your family, your peer group, your culture, and maybe even the emerging global society.

Can we ever create a perfect world of agape? Some say yes, if we just keep on spreading it and don't give up or blow ourselves up. Others say that perfect global agape won't happen without a "divine" intervention from the Source of *pure* agape.

MAYBE *already*, that *divine* intervention has happened, and it's *now* simply up to us to spread it. Remember, no *finite* human can self-righteously live pure agape love *independently* from the Source. Instead, like a branch in the Vine bearing good fruit, the only viable *way* is simply by humbly yielding and *allowing* the Source's "sap" (Spirit of Love) to flow and grow through us. God who exists as love won't force or coerce you. Love always gives liberty, the freedom to choose. The choice is yours, ours.

FINALLY, here are a few encouraging words to motivate us all, from another favorite book, **THE WAY OF LOVE: Holding on to Hope in Troubling Times**, by Michael Curry, the first black head of the Episcopal Church in America.

"King's driving belief was that **Jesus's teachings** introduced a **way of life** that could **change** the **world**, and the **individual**, for the better. **Changing laws** was important, **but the real progress**, the real moment of stepping into the **dream**, comes **when you change hearts**. There was something in me that said, **"That's what faith does. That's the faith business."** King got that, and I was starting to as well. And **so I went to seminary, not to law school."** *[bold added]*

Michael Curry, the first “black” head of the Episcopal Church in America. *LOVE IS THE WAY: Holding on to Hope in Troubling Times*. (p. 104)

“And yet **we all took the risk** and **accepted** the potential of **sacrifice**. We did so because of a simple truth: **Failure to love is guaranteed to fail**. We had to **meet in love**, and make whatever **baby steps** we could, because **refusing** to do so—**backing away** from the challenge—**would have eclipsed** even the possibility of a **shared future**.”

[bold added]

Michael Curry, the first “black” head of the Episcopal Church in America. *LOVE IS THE WAY: Holding on to Hope in Troubling Times*. (p. 204).

“The **more personal** we became with each other, the more people’s **animosity** seemed to **fall away**. We **couldn’t demonize** each other when we knew each other well, one **reason** that debates with strangers on **social media ...** or even between friends in the **disassociated space of email or text escalate** so quickly and are often **unproductive**.” **[bold added]**

Michael Curry, the first “black” head of the Episcopal Church in America. *LOVE IS THE WAY: Holding on to Hope in Troubling Times*. (pp. 200-201).

“**Love** doesn’t just **belong** in the **public square**; it is **desperately needed** there to **break through** deadlock and **make** our **diversity** of perspectives an **asset**. ... It’s **not rocket science**. And it is true that there are **some** matters on which we simply **won’t agree**. But you **don’t build on the negative**. **Build on the positive** and on what **can be done**.”

[bold added]

Michael Curry, the first “black” head of the Episcopal Church in America. *LOVE IS THE WAY: Holding on to Hope in Troubling Times*. (p. 235).

**FOR MORE BOOKLETS, & RECOMMENDED READING,
GO TO OUR NEW WEBSITE
& SIMPLER DOMAIN NAME:**

<http://www.SidGalloway.com>

[GallowaySid at gmail dot com](mailto:GallowaySid@gmail.com)