

# THE THREE ISMS OF PERVERSION

Periander A. Esplana

[www.sciencephilosophyreligion.com](http://www.sciencephilosophyreligion.com)

# **Contents**

Introduction 3

Scientism 5

Philosophism 8

Religionism 13

Conclusion 21

Notes and References 28

# THE THREE ISMS OF PERVERSION

Periander A. Esplana  
(1/1/2014)

[www.sciencephilosophyreligion.com](http://www.sciencephilosophyreligion.com)

## INTRODUCTION

“In its most popular form, nihilism says that there is no reason why the universe exists and no goal towards which it is moving; nothing is of real value; human existence is totally meaningless; human beings are biological accidents; there is no life after death and suicide could therefore be a more rational approach than the desire to go on living. As far as values, morals and ethics are concerned, nihilism makes no rules and draws no lines. The whole of life is an exercise in futility, and personal satisfaction at any given moment is sufficient justification for anything any individual chooses to do or not to do.” - John Blanchard

(John Blanchard, *Does God Believe in Atheists?* Auburn: Evangelical Press, 2000, p.141.)

There are three explanations, answers or solutions offered by man in his unbelieving belief system. Science, Philosophy and Religion which must help man to find answer to his questions and solution to his problems have been corrupted by his unbelief to explain his misery. He transformed them into three isms of perversion: Scientism, Philosophism, and Religionism.

Scientism seeks to answer the question “Where Do We Come From?” Philosophism seeks to answer the question “What Are We?” Religionism seeks to answer the question “Where Are We Going?” They try to solve the problem of origin, the problem of identity, and the problem of destiny, respectively. All studies, researches and meditation are intended to answer the question of our existence.

Stephen W. Hawking, widely regarded as the most brilliant theoretical physicist since Einstein, concluded his best-selling book “A Brief History of Time: from the big bang to black holes” with the following words: “However, if we do discover a complete theory, it should in time be understandable in broad principle by everyone, not just a few scientists. Then we shall all, philosophers,

scientists, and just ordinary people, be able to take part in the discussion of the question of why it is that we and the universe exist. If we find the answer to that, it would be the ultimate triumph of human reason for then we would know the mind of God.”

Our existence itself has become to us a problem that needed to be solved. Irish Jesuit William Johnston has pointed out this fact in his book “Silent Music: the science of meditation”: “What precisely is wrong with the human race? If we were to ask psychology about modern man’s basic sickness, we might hear that it is the sense of meaninglessness, of emptiness, of ultimate frustration. How agonizingly this was expressed by philosophers between two wars with their talk of existential anguish and all the suffering summed up by Heidegger’s terrible definition of man as ‘being-to-death’! Confronted with death, man is aware of his contingency, his incompleteness, his imperfection – it is this that fills him with existential dread. So he has to find meaning. Not just meaning for his economic, or emotional or cultural life, but meaning for his existence.”

No man can live on this earth who does not seek answers to his question and solution to his problems for “All men by nature,” as Aristotle rightly observed, “desire to know.” Our inherent rationality which distinguished us from other creatures is also the source of our failure because of the noetic effect of sin.

Most thinkers have become mystics because of the bankruptcy they saw from reason. Reason has been exhausted to the point that it does not satisfy any man by any means. Many are now resorting to irrationalism as the key to find meaning to one’s existence.

Some have surrendered themselves to insanity and suicide as the only logical conclusion of our existence. Because of cowardness to face problems, tragedy or frustrations and because of self-justification of sins, they tried to escape from them by means of wine, drugs, yoga, entertainment, gambling, vices, occultism, etc.

But man has never lost his hope; he must survive in this seeming hostile world even without beating the system. He must hope that there is always light at the end of this dark tunnel we called life. Lyall Watson concluded his book “The Biology of Death” with such words of hope: “Life is, after all, a rare and unreasonable thing. A thin fabric woven, as far as we know, only on the loom of the earth, whose warp is growth and weft a corresponding process of decay.

Without the creative tension provided by these two forces in delicate equilibrium, it would all impossible and we wouldn't be here to worry about the details. It is nevertheless a measure of our own growing awareness that we do worry, picking at the threads, sometimes even breaking them in our awkward attempts to understand. Yet, slowly, we do seem to be coming closer to the truth. We are beginning to get hints, when we relax for long enough to let the world reveal itself, of the nature and pattern of the whole cloth. And those glimpses are enthralling."

This insatiable longing to see the wholeness of all things, the unification of all particulars into one universal, prodded man to provide himself explanation, answer and solution derived from the things which he considered good, true and beautiful.

## SCIENTISM

"The tremendous emphasis on the 'proofs' that evolution has taken place, by so many modern proponents of the New Faith who nevertheless cannot show what they are, is itself a 'retreat' from fact to faith, from science to dogma." -Arthur C. Custance, M.A., Ph.D., F.R.A.I.

Why do I trust the convictions of my mind? This is a profound question that has never been asked by skeptics, critics, mystics, and atheists because they are venerating their minds as the determining factor of what truth is. But it is a common fact that truth<sup>1</sup> will never be changed by our belief or disbelief – truth is independent from our convictions.

On the other extreme, men are easily deceived to believe something that they have not even dare to question its truthfulness and validity, as R.E. Rhoades rightly observed<sup>2</sup>, "we have all but lost the art of meditation and thinking." With this thought in mind, I am prodded to ponder some possibilities on how reality came into existence. I will not meditate on the psychotic notion that "all things are illusion," or even argue against those who believed on it, like what R.C. Sproul stated,<sup>3</sup> "my argument is addressed to people *who do exist....*" (emphasis added)

It would perhaps be appropriate first to define the above word – scientism. Scientism is the extension of scientific theories to a supposedly complete philosophy of life and meaning. It primarily refers to evolutionary theory<sup>4</sup> for it has been used as the 'scientific basis' of abortionism, aggressive militarism, communism, economic imperialism, euthanasia, genocide, infanticide, Nazism, Nietzschean racism, sexual promiscuity and perversions, etc. These violence and misery were brought about by this Darwinian doctrine that man is merely an "advance animal." This is one of the greatest hoaxes ever invented and believed by man; it was admitted by evolutionists themselves

that this is not qualified to be called SCIENCE.

Science, by modern definition, is systematized body of knowledge based on facts which are observable, demonstrable and repeatable. Evolution is a blatant contradiction to all these criteria of a true science, and the arguments for it are simply (to borrow C.S. Lewis phrase<sup>5</sup>) “complicated attempt to avoid the obvious.” Thus, evolution like Lyell’s doctrine of uniformitarianism<sup>6</sup> is a “science falsely so called.”<sup>7</sup>

Since evolution is not science, it is not surprising to know that it contradicts the two great laws of thermodynamics which are the most secure generalizations about the universe that exist in science: the law of conservation of matter/energy and the law of increasing entropy. Their implications are not only obvious to the philosophic mind but also to the common mind.

The first law tells us that neither energy nor matter in the universe can be created or destroyed. Processes merely change it from one form to another but the total quantity is constant. In other words, the universe did not create itself, it rejects the notion of “self-creation.” Self-creation or self-cause<sup>8</sup> is irrational in the extreme because it further violates the law basic to all sciences, the law of noncontradiction, for something to create itself it must first exist before it can cause itself to be.

The second law, on the other hand, tells us that as energy is used, it becomes non-recoverable heat dissipating in space. Thus, it clearly implies that the universe, ultimately, will end up to its “heat death” – a total dissipation of all useful energy. If time had extended into the past, say more than ninety billion years,<sup>9</sup> the universe would already be dead. It, therefore, rejects the ancient notion of “an eternal world.” Since the universe is going to die in time, the universe must have its beginning which stipulates creation.

To sum up: the first law says the universe could not create itself, but the second law demands creation. These laws, therefore, point their fingers at the Lawgiver - - the God of creation.<sup>10</sup>

Moreover, evolution openly contradicts the law of biogenesis which has come to be known as one of the most universal laws of science: life begins only from preexisting life. The theory of spontaneous generation, which states that life comes from non-living decaying matter like garbage, was disproved once and for all by Louis Pasteur. It is a sad fact that evolution based squarely on this rejected notion of “spontaneous generation”<sup>11</sup> and to rub more salts to the wounds “evolution doesn’t even have the garbage,”<sup>12</sup> the only spices it added is the duration of time. But what really does happen as time marches on? The answer has already been discussed, the second law of thermodynamics, it is **devolution!**

Even the simplest imaginary replicating protein molecules could not be formed

naturalistically from non-living chemicals.<sup>13</sup> The probability of its chance assemblage was calculated by Sir Fred Hoyle,<sup>14</sup> and it turns out to be less than one in ten raised to the forty thousandth powers. Scott M. Huse noted that mathematicians generally consider an event with a probability of less than one in ten raised to fiftieth powers as having a zero probability.<sup>15</sup> Thus, mathematics further proves evolution highly improbable.

Some may object at the outset that the second law of thermodynamics applies only to closed systems. But the fact is that there is no such thing as closed or isolated system in nature. All in earth are open to the energy from the sun, all things are open systems, “for all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away...”<sup>16</sup>

In any case, the criteria for increasing order are not satisfied by any supposed evolutionary system. Unlike what the Big Bang theory advocates allege, energy alone cannot produce order and growth, there must always be a directing program and conversion mechanism, regardless of whether or not the system is an open system.<sup>17</sup>

Peter S. Ruckman sums up the grades of evidences given above in the following manner:<sup>18</sup> “ Since matter and energy cannot be created NOW, and the life cannot come from inanimate NOW, and an increased in complexity in organisms is not taking place NOW, the whole structure of evolution falls to the ground for the boast of every deluded fool who took the theory to be rational was: the PRESENT reveals the past; by studying the processes going on in nature NOW we know what took place THEN.” (emphasis in original) .

It may be well to add that, as Dr. Duane T. Gish pointed out,<sup>19</sup> “no theory on origin can be devoid of philosophical and religious implications.” Evolution is an atheistic theory which denies the intervention of intelligence. It is best described by the terms “self-creation” and “creation by chance,” but both these terms are nonscientific and irrational. The former has already been discussed while the latter implies that chance has the power to cause something. But chance itself is nothing more than a word used to describe mathematical possibilities, it has no being, or to put it bluntly, it is no thing – it cannot do anything.<sup>20</sup>

Biblical creationism, on the other hand, implies a universe that was planned, created, designed, and governed by a personal God – the efficient cause of creation out of nothing. True science is fully consistent with Biblical Scientific Creationism. As we have seen, it is a kind of intellectual suicide to abandon the truth of God (Rom. 1:25) by believing any of the other alternative notions, whether “reality is an illusion,” “an eternal world,” or “evolution.” We must, therefore, reject at once these “oppositions of science falsely so called” (I Tim. 6:20).

Now I know the answer why I trust the convictions of my mind, for long before Rene Descartes thought of his famous axiom: “I think, therefore I am, “ Paul the apostle of the Gentiles (Rom. 11:13) had already wrote: “But by the grace of God I am what I am” (I Cor.15:10).<sup>21</sup>

## PHILOSOPHISM

“Contemporary logic is based on a misunderstanding of the English word *all*.” - Gordon H. Clark

How man can rightly think about wrong thinking? This baffling question is the corollary of the unanswerable basic question on epistemology for infidels: how do we know that we really know what we pretend we know?

It is beyond question that man with his limitation and imperfection really needs guidance for accurate reason, criteria for good authority, and test for valid experience. Man cannot be certain of anything unless he is certain of one thing which must be properly immune from revision to serve as the standard of either acceptance or rejection of the credibility of any evidence, the basis of either affirmation or denial of the factuality of an arguable statement, and foundation of the correlation of all laws and principles of the internal thought and the external world. It must adequately account for the human rationality, morality and personality, and the universal reality, causality and unity. It must not be attested by any authority other than itself for otherwise it would not be the final authority of all truth. It must be self-attesting, self-validating and self-interpreting. It is, therefore, no other than God’s revelation of Himself as found in the perfection of His word: the Bible.

All true things which we rightly know are God-revealed knowledge through His creation (nature), image (man), and Son (Christ). We cannot know anything truly just by mere knowing our experiences. The human knowledge is very different from animal knowledge. Our knowledge involves our whole being of body, soul and spirit. We know what we know because the God Who knows all things reveals it to us. For any man to make any significant abstraction and predication, he must first of all presupposed the Bible truth as his ultimate authority of all truth.<sup>22</sup>

What is philosophism? We coined this word to describe any system that does not consider Bible truth as the final authority of all truth. It came from two Greek words: *philos* which means filial love and *sophizo* which means cunning device. The Greek word *philos* is the prefix word of PHILOSOPHY which means love (Gr. *philos*) of wisdom (Gr. *sophia*). The Greek word *sophizo* is the derivative of the Latin word *sophisma* which is the root word of sophism and sophistry. These words signify plausible but false reasoning. The synonymous word for sophism in terms of logic is FALLACY which means deceptive argument. It came from *fallere* the Latin word for



“to deceive”. PHILOSOPHISM, then, simply means “love of deceptive reasoning”.<sup>23</sup>

Even though modern logicians try to restrict logic within the bound of formal correctness or validity of an argument irrespective of the truth or falsity of its premises,<sup>24</sup> yet when it comes to the discussion of fallacy they inevitably addressed the question of the agreement or disagreement of a term, proposition and syllogism to fact and truth.

Moreover, it must be pointed out that logic does not deal only with our internal thought through deductive inference (from universal to particular) but also with the external world through inductive inference (from particular to universal). We know reality by perceiving the particular things of the natural world using our sense experience and generalizing them into universal truth;<sup>25</sup> thus, in the final analysis, induction always precedes deduction.

It is clear that reality and validity must never be separated in the realm of logic. We must remember that LOGIC is defined as the science and art of right thinking and correct reasoning in order to arrive at truth.<sup>26</sup> We cannot positively use valid argument if it only means that a false conclusion necessarily follows from false premises. It can only be used negatively in refuting an opposing position via *reductio ad absurdum*. The valid reduction of an argument to reach absurdity is not used to prove its invalidity but its error and falsity.

In fact, all reasonings about arguments has underlying ethical assumptions in them.<sup>27</sup> It intends to persuade or convince an audience. An argument is designed to change the mind of someone who has an erroneous belief. It arise out of concern to correct the epistemological path of someone threading in the wrong direction for no one in his right mind will just allow his neighbor to believe in inconsistent and absurd belief.<sup>28</sup>

Logic does not merely pertain to the valid deduction or induction of a conclusion from premises. Its primary concern is the attainment of truth. And in any pursuit of truth one must first of all know how to expose deception hidden in the misleading used of words and ideas in an argument that pretends to be true. Hence, it is necessary for us to enumerate the different fallacies often committed by ignorant (paralogist), deceiver (philosophist) and inaccurate thinker.

We can divide fallacies based on three divisions of logic which correspond to the three basic operations in our knowing process.<sup>29</sup>

Firstly, the basic mental act that we almost automatically do is the apprehension of our experience at the moment of consciousness. Through simple apprehension we know the essence or nature of a thing by abstracting concept or idea from the percept which we usually expressed by using an external sign called TERM. A term may be either an articulate sound or a written word insofar as it means (connotes) something in its

comprehension and refers to (denotes) something in its extension. Definition deals with the connotation of a term while Division and Classification deals with the denotation of a term.

Secondly, the next basic mental act we do is the enunciation of relationship between concepts commonly known as judgment. We judge either by affirming (mental composition) or denying (mental division) the agreement between ideas. We express our judgment through a connection of terms called PROPOSITION. A proposition is a declarative sentence composed of quantifier, subject-term, copula, and predicate-term.

Lastly, the basic mental act we do after we put concepts together into a proposition is the eduction of correlation between propositions by our reasoning process. The inference of a previously unknown proposition from the combination of known propositions may be in the form of either direct/immediate argumentation (such as opposition, conversion, obversion, possibility, and actuality) or indirect/mediate inference (such as deduction and induction). The conclusion of the former does not bring new truth but just a reformulation of the truth of the original premise while the latter ends with a new truth by passing from one proposition to another through the mediation of a third proposition. These series of propositions called SYLLOGISM, as we have seen, always consist of two premises (major and minor) and an inferred conclusion.

At this point, we are now in the position of distributing the different fallacies into three end results of the basic operations of our mind:

- I. Conceptual Fallacies
  - A. Fallacies of Definition
    1. Fallacy of Accidental Definition
    2. Fallacy of Circular Definition
    3. Fallacy of Figurative Definition
    4. Fallacy of Obscure Definition
    5. Fallacy of Negative Definition
    6. Fallacy of Redundant Definition
    7. Fallacy of Too Narrow Definition
    8. Fallacy of Too Wide Definition
  - B. Fallacies of Division
    1. Fallacy of Cross Division
    2. Fallacy of Remote Division
    3. Fallacy of Too Narrow Division

4. Fallacy of Too Wide Division
- II. Propositional Fallacies
- A. Fallacies in Language
    1. Fallacy of Accent or Prosody
    2. Fallacy of Amphiboly
    3. Fallacy of Figures of Speech
    4. Fallacy of Hasty Generalization
    5. Fallacy of Irrelevant Premises
  - B. Fallacies of Equivocation
    1. Fallacy of Quantity
      - a. Fallacy of Composition
      - b. Fallacy of Division
    2. Fallacy of Quality
      - a. Fallacy of Specific Accident
      - b. Fallacy of Converse Accident
      - c. Fallacy of Simple Accident
  - C. Fallacies of Presumption
    1. Petitio Principii (Begging the Question)
      - a. Assumptio Non Probata
      - b. Circulus in Probando
    2. Ignoratio Elenchi (Irrelevant Conclusion)
      - a. Argumentum ad Auctoritatem
      - b. Argumentum ad Baculum
      - c. Argumentum ad Captandum Vulgus
      - d. Argumentum ad Crumenam
      - e. Argumentum ad Hominem
      - f. Argumentum ad Ignorantiam
      - g. Argumentum ad Iudicium
      - h. Argumentum ad Misericordiam
      - i. Argumentum ad Populum
      - j. Argumentum ad Vericundiam
      - k. Argumentum ex Concessio
    3. Fallacy of Complex Question

4. Fallacy of Non Sequitor
    - a. Fallacy of Simple Non Sequitor
    - b. Fallacy of False Cause
- III. Syllogistic Fallacies
- A. Fallacies of Education
    1. Fallacy of Incorrect Contraposition
    2. Fallacy of Incorrect Conversion
    3. Fallacy of Incorrect Obversion
  - B. Fallacies in Categorical Syllogisms
    1. Fallacy of Four Terms (Quaternio Terminorem)
    2. Fallacy of Ambiguous Middle
    3. Fallacy of Undistributed Middle
    4. Fallacy of Negative Premises
    5. Fallacy of Particular Premises
    6. Fallacy of Illicit Minor
    7. Fallacy of Illicit Major
    8. Fallacy of IEO
  - C. Fallacies in Hypothetical Syllogisms
    1. Fallacy of Rejecting the Antecedent
    2. Fallacy of Accepting the Consequent
    3. Fallacy of Sublate-Posit (Tollendo Ponens)

The errors of reasoning which man may commit in his fallen state are impossible to enumerate in its totality, let alone an exhaustive explanation of them. It would not be possible for us to give all the erroneous epiphenomena of his mind. The above list of fallacies is obviously incomplete and if we will discuss each of them, it would take a book on logic to accomplish it. Thus, we left the reader to study these fallacies by using common books on logic.

But there is a kind of fallacy which we have not mentioned in the above list. It cannot be found in any textbook of logic for it is the fallacy commonly committed by all non-Christian thinkers. It cannot be categorized under the three divisions of fallacies which we have enumerated for it is the fallacy of the knowing process as a whole. It is the fallacy of the unbelieving thought-system. It lies at the very root of thinking itself and embraces the entire spectrum of a worldview.

It is the fallacy of unbelieving epistemology. We will call it as the Fallacy of Rejecting the Bible Truth. It has three types:<sup>30</sup> (1) Fallacy of Conceptual Parasitism, (2) Fallacy of Propositional Usurpation, and (3) Fallacy of Syllogistic Denial.

From these types we can see that this major fallacy can also be called as the Fallacy of Reasoning from the Circularity of Bible-rejecting Belief-system. This fallacy violates the rule basic to all laws of thought: the Principle of Consistency.

The three basic laws of thought – Principle of Identity, Principle of Non-contradiction, and Principle of Excluded Middle – firmly stand on the Principle of Consistency. It asserts that a statement can be either true or false depending upon its correspondence or dissonance to factuality and reality. Both factuality and reality based their truth on the Lord and Saviour Jesus Who is the Truth of truths.

Factuality refers to particular categories of percept which is inductively known to be true while Reality refers to universal categories of concept which are deductively known to be true. Only the Bible perfectly defined factuality and reality. Thus, to be able to know what are the Fallacy of Rejecting the Bible Truth and its three types, one must prayerfully study the Bible. Read the following passages of the Bible: Job 37:19; Jn.8:34,44; Ecc.7:20,29; Psa.10:4; 14:1-3; 18:25-26; 64:6; Prov.3:5-7; 24:7-9; 1Cor.2:9-16. There is no need for any explanation to garnish, elaborate, or systematize those strings of words that expressed the very word of God. Bible truth is perfect. It will explain itself to the heart of an open-minded reader by the Holy Spirit.

What, then, is the answer to our question at the beginning of this article? Simple for those who do not confine themselves within the bound of their reasoning process, start thinking by believing the Bible truth and we will not be misled at all. Make the Bible truth as the starting point in all your belief and thinking. Bible truth is the only ultimate circularity where science, philosophy and religion can thrive on. Outside the circle of Bible truth you can find the realm of the unreal and the imaginary. You must not live in sin-produced delusive paranoia. Let us live in the real reality and believe the true truth.

## **RELIGIONISM**

*“To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” - Isaiah 8:20*

[WARNING: You must read this article from the beginning to the end without skipping a single word. You must try to understand this whole article in one reading. Otherwise you will find yourself not as yourself but as someone else.]

All man is selfish. All that you think and all that you do ultimately revolve around yourself. Whether you admit it or not, all that you did had been done with the purpose of satisfying yourself. You do what you do because you want to do it.

You do what is right in your own eyes even though you already know that sometimes what you are doing is obviously wrong. You just do what makes you feel comfortably free in all your choices as far as it gives you a sense of self-satisfaction and self-fulfillment.

Those things which you do that seems to be heroic deeds and self-sacrificing acts are but mere expressions of your selfishness that underlies your will, desire and volition.

Nothing which you choose to do can be done without the context of your self-centeredness. Man must always start from himself and end to himself in all his thinking, action, decision, and reflection. He thinks and acts by simply considering himself in autonomy from other things.

Those situations which appear to force you in doing things against your desire are just that, appearances. Even if you experience a sort of extreme coercion, still you are the only one who can and must decide in that limited situation. Even if the options are limited into two, you still have the freedom which of them you will choose. There is a freedom of choice which still exists between the one or the other, between deprivation of things you owned and deprivation of your existence, life or death, etc.

The final decision is always your self-determination. No thing and no one can ultimately resist you. Your will is your desire. It is all your own. Egotism is the rule with no exception.

You are the only one who control your destiny. You are the only one who changes the circumstances and situations around you. Indifference and silence in this case does not mean lack of freedom and choice. It only means that you do not want to change the state where you are and that is what you really want to choose no more no less.

You are the only one who done it all for you are the one who give meaning to all your experiences. You are the god of your own self-generated world.

Do you believe it? Are all the statements written above true? Do you doubt yourself? There is no one that you can trust but your own conviction. Is it true?

When all things have been said and believed, this is where deception comes. You are being hoodwinked by no other than yourself. You deceived yourself that you have freedom which you think you have. In fact, your heredity and environment formed and conditioned you to be what you are.

You cannot control your genetic structure; it controls you. You cannot transform

your environment according to your wants and needs; it molds your wants and needs.

Your very decision has been limited by the options given to you by the situation in which you have no control. The only thing you can do is to choose from the different choices provided to you by the circumstances in which you are but a speck of dust driven by the multi-dimensional wind of the universe.

Your very choice of color, taste, right, good, music, beauty, form, shape, structure, etc. has been programmed and conditioned in your cerebral circuitries by your hereditary compositions and cultural paradigms.

Since you did not choose your origin, you cannot also choose your destiny. You did not decide who will be your parents, relatives, neighbours and what will be your place of birth, culture, country, nationality, physical characteristics, religion, etc.

You just open your eyes in the world in which the only thing left for you to do is adapt yourself in its ever-changing nature. This is your only choice, you cannot contradict and reject them at all otherwise you will be judged as mentally retarded, abnormal or insane to your death. You simply beat the system and dance with its melody.

The biological and ecological factors control your very destiny. They mold, form, nourish, change, condition, construct, sustain, modify, influence, and nurture you to become a person they want you to be.

Your self-determination has already been determined for you by nature-nurture interaction. You are mere automaton with an imaginary freedom in the world of pure materialism.

You are totally dependent to your genetic hardware and worldview software. The only difference between you and the computer is that you know you are a machine but the computer does not. But both of you do not know what to do without a specific program from your components (brain or CPU) provided into your portal of entries in your machinery by outside sources.

You cannot start thinking from a vacuum. You just respond to the different stimuli you encounter because of your sensitivity.

Traditions, authorities, outlook in life, cultural fads, common trends, etc. play a large role in your decision-making and values formation. You cannot do anything without the interaction of your physico-chemical makeup and socio-cultural surrounding.

Do you believe it? Are all the statements written above true? Do you doubt others? There is no one that you can ask to help you but from others. Is it true?

It seems now that you feel you are being trapped between two extreme beliefs.

The one is that you are a reincarnated god who created your own reality and the other is that you are an evolved machine that is being controlled by reality. You feel that both of them must be wrong, otherwise the only thing that you can do is to choose one of them.

But, again, you are hoodwinked for there is a third, middle and safe option besides these two extremes. You are obviously neither a god nor a machine for you are a man. True, in the past you were controlled by time and chance from a conglomeration of elements in a primordial soup of the prebiotic earth.

But after those millions of years of evolution have passed, you found yourself in its highest rung for you are the zenith and goal of physical evolution. You can now control your surrounding and yourself toward further evolution but not in the physical realm for you are already at its peak. The evolution must take place at the spiritual realm.

A nephilimic upgrade is needed at the very center of your brain (third eye or pineal gland) and at the very root of your DNA (nanotech biochip). You simply need a spiritual or demonic mark in your forehead for yogic society and a digital or microchip mark in your right hand for cashless society. Thus, a one-world utopian government will be formed with an ultimate one-world master leader.

You are a brainwashed machine in the past but in the future you must realize that you are god. You must control your destiny. The universe is you for you are the universe. The reality is you for you are reality.

As a machine in the past you cannot control your origin but as a god in the future you can control your destiny. As a man today you must start controlling both yourself and your surrounding.

You as a man are the link between the physical evolution and spiritual revolution. As a machine you mean nothing, as a man you mean something, but as a god you mean everything.

MAN is an acronym which means M-my self is A-all things as a god but N-nothing as a machine. You are nothing and all things. You were controlled and you will be the controller. You will be because of who you were.

Do you believe it? Are all the statements written above true? Do you doubt both yourself and others? You and they are what make all things. Is it true?

I know that you are already confused what to choose from the three opposing views written above. You are already tired of indoctrination and meditation. You have been hoodwinked three times at this point. You want to have an absolute certainty to your belief without a single particle of doubt. You want the real truth and not just another deception in the guise of truth, truth that will satisfy your innermost longing, craving, yearning, and desire.



You are not alone to this search for meaning and truth. You are just one of the seven billions of people around the world who ask the very same questions which you asked. You belong to the myriads of men who are crying for the solution of the very same problems which you have. You desperately need an adequate explanation to everything. We all need and want to free ourselves from the cycle of speculative speculation. Such confusion is caused by religionism. For religionism uses this cycle of opinionated opinions to enslave men.

What is religionism? We do not need to define this term for you already know and have experienced it at this very moment. Just by shifting beliefs from one opinionated opinion to another opinionated opinion without absolute certainty is a clear evidence of religionism in action. It is the greatest hoodwinker.

Religionism is the way of man to save himself from the condemnation of sin and damnation of death through his self-effort. Religionism like scientism is the extension of its realm beyond its ethical boundary and like philosophism it deceives people to believe the validity of such usurpation.

Religionism is a method of man in seeking ultimate peace and perfect happiness and thus by definition is limited, futile and temporary which will never reach any kind of ultimacy and perfection. Its ultimate success is ultimate failure.

Religionism always used lies in propagating its hidden agenda. Lies are truths mixed with errors, these truths and not its error make it a potent snare for the unknowing victims of religionism. In religionism, because of deception, errors are seen to be indistinctive to truths. "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!" (Isaiah 5:20)

Obviously, there are realities which must be considered in our belief. Reality which determined what to believed and what is not. There is the reality of ourselves and the world around us. But there still a third reality besides these two well-known realities.

Religionism which knows only the two realities, either extends to the extremes or combines both these extremes as you have seen (and previously believed) in the above three opposing speculations.

Religionism is too limited and too finite to see the third reality. Religionism is so blind that not only it cannot see the third reality but also it has always violated the third reality from its conception to its fruition. This third reality is the necessary precondition for the correlation of the two realities. The two realities cannot be known as such without the third reality.

What is the third reality? This is the reality of the law.

There are different kinds of laws which have been discovered by man from himself and from nature. Most of them are temporal, earthly, finite and imperfect.

But there are three kinds of law which have no beginning and ending for they came directly from the only Absolute, Eternal, Infinite and Perfect Being: God. These laws are the laws of light, of life, and of love.

The law of light reflects God's righteousness, justice and holiness. The law of life reflects God's will, glory and rationality. The law of love reflects God's grace, mercy and goodness. These laws are the reflection of God's communicable attributes.

Without these laws that govern the entire reality, man himself and the world in which he live will be utterly unrelated. Man cannot understand nature, he cannot recognize himself and he cannot even know who he is. The world will be chaotic, unintelligible and unperceivable. Man will never apprehend, sense and comprehend the things around him and he himself.

Without this third reality, the two realities cannot exist as such. Even if you take the two realities separately in their extreme form or combined them both in their modified form as we have demonstrated at the beginning of this article, they still will not exist as reality if you will exclude the reality of the law.

Religionism can only exist in the imaginary, the illusory, the unreal, and the sayable but never in the real reality for it excludes the truth of the law which is the reality that coheres and correlates the two realities.

Think what will happen if there are no laws of thought, laws of the universe, laws of the human nature, laws of reality, and laws of morality. Prima facie, all things will be worse than absurdity itself. You and the world will be meaningless. Everything will be self-annihilating. Think and believe.

It seems that we have come to a point where all questions have already been answered but there is still a fourth reality that must be considered. In fact, this reality must not be leveled together with the three realities for this reality is beyond them all.

This is the only Supreme reality, the Reality of realities and the Truth of truths. This necessary reality must be no other than God Himself: the Creator of the universe, the Maker of man and the Giver of the law. He alone can adequately account for the subject-object-law correlation.

Religionism can never go beyond its conception of reality. It does not and cannot recognize the God Who is the Reality of realities. Its idea and concept of realities is unreal and thus religionism itself and those who believe in it are less than the real reality.

The deification of the created realities is the most absurd view of reality. It is the vanity of vanities. Those who believe on it reflect its nature. Misinterpretation begets

perversion. “They that make them (i.e., vain idols) are like unto them; so is every one that trusteth in them.” (Psalms 115:8)

Religion is the root word of religionism; it came from two Latin words “re” and “ligare” which when taken together will mean “to tie again,” “to bind back,” “to reconcile,” or “to unite again.”

Religions have correctly identified the problem and the question of man. It pointed out the broken relationship between the real realities and the Reality of realities, between the creature and the Creator, and between the facts and the Truth. But religionism has wrongly supplied the solution by deriving the answer from the problem itself.

The question cannot answer itself. The problem cannot solve itself. The problem and the question can be solved and answered only by the One who has no problem and question. You cannot solve the problem of others if their very problem is also your problem. You cannot answer the question of others if their very question is also your question. You cannot cleanse yourself and others if both of you are drown in the ocean of mud and dirt. You cannot cause yourself to rise from the dead if you are dead. The dead cannot give life. You cannot save yourself from sin and death for you are a sinner condemned to die. You cannot free others from sin for you are also a servant of sin.

“Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever commiteth sin is the servant of sin” (John 8:34). You cannot annihilate deception by another deception. You cannot guide another blind if you are also blind for “if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch” (Matthew 15:14). You cannot solve the problem of evil by doing evil. “Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good” (Romans 12:21).

Religionism cannot solve a problem and answer a question for it is itself the problem and the question. The problem is that there is an enmity between God and man. The question is how to reconcile God and man. That is your problem and that is your question. (Romans 3:9-20; Ephesians 2:1-3; Luke 13:1-5). We need an explanation.

If you will say that there is no problem with the world and you have no problem at all, you merely demonstrate and show in a forceful way how grave and deep your problem is with yourself and the world. If you will say that you have no question with the world and yourself, it only means that you are already swallowed up by the question to the extent that you cannot see it anymore. What, then, is the solution and the answer to your problem and your question?

I, myself, cannot make it. You, yourself, cannot provide it. The world itself cannot produce it. All things together cannot give it.

Only the Creator, Sustainer and Redeemer of all things can solve and answer all the problems and all the questions. He alone can explain everything. He is the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. He is THE ANSWER, THE SOLUTION AND THE EXPLANATION.

He was conceived of a virgin, born in a manger, live miraculously, intensely suffered, crucified with sinners, died for the sin of the world, and rose again to give us life. He himself is light and thus cannot sin, He himself is life and thus cannot die, and He himself is love and thus He has no problem and question at all.

But he became sin for us that's why darkness surrounded the cross at calvary. He bore our sins that's why he died to save us and to impute his righteousness upon us. Because of God's love, he gave himself for us to give us eternal life. He is the ultimate expression and absolute manifestation of God's supreme perfection.

Can you conceive or think any other solution, answer and explanation? You cannot, you must not, for you are nothing if you will do it. Without Him, we are all nothing; in fact, less than nothing, for the word nothing can be understood at the backdrop of something but those who will preclude the Creator, Sustainer and Redeemer of all things are less than nothing for the only "thing" which has been left to serve as their backdrop is nothing. If we believingly trust in Him and wholeheartedly repent of all our sins, then we will have all things because He is more than everything.

You can never have pure religion at all (James 1:26,27) if there is no life of God that dwells in you (Romans 8:7-17; Ephesians 1:17-32; 2 Peter 1:2-11; I John 3:16-20). "Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John 3:3). You must receive the gift of God which He offer to you.

The God-given faith is the root; testimonial good works are the fruits (Ephesians 2:8-10). "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with Whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning. Of His own will begat He us, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of His creatures" (James 1:17,18).

You can do nothing to save yourself but Jesus had already done everything to save you. You are totally depraved but Jesus is perfectly righteous. Choose Christ and let His Spirit undo yourself. Cry out for God's mercy and forgiveness. You must accept Jesus as your personal Lord and Saviour so that His faith may become your faith (Galatians 2:16,20; Colossians 1:26-29).

Religionism can only make you religious (knowing the problem and the question but no solution and no answer). Only the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ can make you righteous (all solutions and all answers were found in Him).

He is the Lord of lords, King of kings, Master of masters, Saviour of saviours, Prince of princes, Answer of answers, Solution of solutions, Explanation of explanations, and God of gods.

In Him alone we have a triple personal revelation of all things: the revelation of who God really is and where we can find Him, the revelation of what man is and how to reclaim true manhood, and the revelation of why the universe exists.

If you will not believe in Him, it only means that you are self-righteous for you don't want to accept His righteousness (Romans 10:3). If you will not repent all your sins, it only means that you don't want to be saved and go to heaven with Him.

In other words, if you don't want to accept the only solution and receive the only answer, then you really love to go to hell fire with Satan. Think and believe.

Don't waste your time, don't be a fool, be true to reality. God loves you so much that He prepared the world in sending His only begotten Son, the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to save you from evil, sin and death (John 3:16-21). If you believed Him, you'll surely have eternal life. Let the word of God speak to your heart through the Holy Spirit. But if you will reject Him, that will be the most foolish, worst, and sinful decision that you will ever make. Think about it. Meditate on it. Religionism will kill you; Jesus alone can save you (Romans 6:16-23; Acts 16:31).

## CONCLUSION

**The Undeniability of Truth.** You must believe the true truth. You must not ignore established facts. You must reject your bigoted cynicism and romantic mysticism. You must think outside the box of scientism, philosophism and religionism. Neither the arrogant stupidity nor the hysterical foolishness is the answer. You must open your heart and mind for the entrance of truth. You must believe the self-revelation of God to you through the Bible.

You may have your laughs, insults, sarcasms, ignorance, close-mindedness, egotism, fanaticism, etc. but you will not be able to refute the Bible truth. You assumed it whenever you go against your autonomous, non-Christian presuppositions in order to live in reality. No matter what you believed, you cannot change the reality of what is. If you are still sane and normal, you must be shut up by reality.

It will slap you across the face whenever you are out of your mind. It will

kick you to go back to the real world whenever you stray from the real reality to wander in the artificial world of your Bible-rejecting belief system.

You can believe that the world is chance-controlled, evolutionary universe. You can believe that the world is gods-controlled, illusory multiverses. You can believe that you are just an intelligent machine, an advanced animal, or a deluded god. But you can never deny the order, law and beauty of the anthropic universe created by God for you to live in a sane and normal way.

True, it is already corrupted, marred, and defiled by humanity's willful disobedience to his Creator, Sustainer and Redeemer but He still loves us so much that is why we still live.

Even man's creativity in architecture, painting, music, literature, poetry, technical monograph, mathematical formula, equation, computer program, design, language, technology, movie, etc. are just infinitesimal reflection of His nature as created in God's image. God's common grace abounds all over His creation especially in man.

Those who want to challenge the reality of God's self-revelation in nature, in man and in Christ will soon find themselves either in hospital, jail, mental asylum, or worse, cemetery.

Aldous Huxley, Mary Calderone, Jackson Pollock, Helena Blavatsky, Paul Gauguin, Jimi Hendrix, Bernard Berenson, Friedrich Nietzsche, Adolf Hitler, Margareth Mead, Alfred Charles Kinsey, Gloria Steinem, Wilhelm Steinitz, Margaret Sanger, Hugh Hefner, Joycelyn Elders, Vladimir Ilich Lenin, Anton La Vey, David "Moses" Berg, Marquis de Sade, Betty Friedan, Guru Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh, Jim Jones, Kurt Cobain, Vincent Van Gogh, Julian Johnson, and Ludwig Boltzman are just some of the prominent examples who tried to live out their rejection of Bible truth.

Insanity, suicide, immorality, abomination, and wickedness are the ultimate conclusions of all Bible-rejecting worldviews and belief-systems. If you will reject the truth of the Bible, your queen will become hedonist and your king will become nihilist in the anarchic kingdom of deluded unbelief.

Those who think deeply the logical conclusion of their unbelieving belief system have chosen to live inconsistently with it by assuming Bible truth in order to live. In reality, there is simply no one can live logically according to his own

Bible-rejecting presuppositions.

Renown skeptic David Hume admitted this fact: “Should be asked me whether I sincerely assent to this argument which I have been to such pains to inculcate, and whether I be really one of those skeptics who hold that all is uncertain...I...should reply...that neither I nor any other person was ever sincerely and constantly of that opinion.... I dine, I play backgammon, I converse and am merry with my friends and when, after 3 or 4 hours amusement, I would return to these speculations, they appear so cold and strained and ridiculous that I cannot find in my heart to enter into them any further. Thus the skeptic still continues to reason and believe, though he asserts that he cannot defend his reason by reason and by the same rule, he must assent to the principle concerning the existence of the body, though he cannot pretend by any argument of philosophy, to maintain its veracity.”

Renown musician John Cage sung together with Hume by admitting that he cannot apply his chance method to his hobby in mycology: “I became aware that if I approached mushrooms in the spirit of my chance operations, I would die shortly. So I decided that I would not approach them in this way!” I know that you too dance and sing together with Hume and Cage in this regard that is why you still live in a sane and normal way. You simply live inconsistently with your belief system.

Renowned infidel Bertrand Russel has even admitted, “What the world needs is Christian love or compassion.” And the skeptic David Hume was once again struck across the face by reality when he wrote: “The whole frame of nature bespeaks an intelligent author; and no rational enquirer can, after serious reflection, suspend his belief a moment with regard to the primary principles of genuine Theism and Religion.”

Even the renown physicist Albert Einstein was awakened by reality when he pointed out that “If one purges the Judaism of the Prophets and Christianity as Jesus Christ taught it of all subsequent additions especially those of the priests, one is left with a teaching which is capable of curing all the social ills of humanity.” Einstein also tells us, “The highest principles for our aspirations and judgments are given to us in the Jewish-Christian religious traditions.”

**The Unlivability of Falsehood.** Man can sinfully invent different kinds of unbelieving belief system but he will never be able to live with them in any consistent way. You cannot fight against truth and reality without destroying

yourself.

Guru Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh can state: "I don't believe in morality, I am bent on destroying it." And Swami Vivekananda can even says: "Good and evil are one and the same." These unreal, irrational and immoral beliefs are storable, readable and writable but never livable.

These mystics and their followers can only lived parasitically through the Judeo-Christian belief system. Otherwise, side-by-side, they will allow themselves to be abused and killed. Suicide, homicide, parricide, genocide, and cosmocide are all justifiable in their unbelieving belief system. In any Bible-rejecting worldview, there is no adequate basis for man's personality, rationality, and morality, and universe's reality, unity and causality.

There is no certainty at all if your reference point is egomaniacal egotism as "the Father of modern philosophy" Rene Descartes expressed in his meditation: "Though this be true, I must nevertheless here consider that I am a man, and that, consequently, I am in the habit of sleeping, and representing to myself in dreams those same things, or even sometimes other less probable, which the insane think are presented to them in their waking moments. How often have I dreamt that I was in these familiar circumstances – that I was dressed, and occupied this place by the fire, when I was lying undressed in bed? At the present moment, however, I certainly look upon this paper with eyes wide awake; the head which I now move is not sleep; I extend this hand consciously and with express purpose, and I perceive it; the occurrences in sleep are not so distinct as all this. But I cannot forget that, at other times, I have been deceived in sleep by similar illusions; and, attentively considering those cases, I perceive so clearly that there exist no certain marks by which the state of waking can ever be distinguished from sleep, that I feel greatly astonished; and in amazement I almost persuade myself that I am now dreaming."

New Ager Shakti Gawain has pushed this egomaniacal hysteria a little bit farther when he expressed this ontological enigma in mystical bigotry: "As each of us connects with our inner spiritual awareness, we learn that the creative power of the universe is within us. We also learn that we can create our own reality and take responsibility for doing so."

All unbelieving belief systems are based not on facts and evidence but on feeling and prejudice: "I am an atheist, out and out. It took me a long time to say



it. I've been an atheist for years and years, but somehow I felt it was intellectually unrespectable to say one was an atheist, because it assumed knowledge that one didn't have. Somehow it was better to say one was a humanist or an agnostic. I finally decided that I'm a creature of emotion as well as of reason. Emotionally I am an atheist. I don't have the evidence to prove that God doesn't exist, but I so strongly suspect he doesn't that I don't want to waste my time." These are the "strong" words of renowned humanist Isaac Asimov who admitted that his rejection of God's existence is purely emotional and not rational. He is just one of the daydreamers who want to escape the reality of what is by deceiving themselves that God does not exist.

Meaninglessness runs after them throughout their lives as New Ager Joseph Campbell admitted: "What's the meaning of the universe? What's the meaning of a flea? It's just there. That's it. And your own meaning is that you're there. We're so engaged in doing things to achieve purposes of outer value that we forget that the inner value, the rapture that is associated with being alive, is what it's all about."

To reject the absolute truth is accept the absolute deception. You can never determine anything as true at all in the real sense of the word. You will find yourself rowing your boat in the shoreless ocean of conflicting opinionated opinions. This only means that in an unbelieving belief system, "truth" depends upon the conviction of an individual. Since you don't believe in an objective absolute truth which everybody must and ought to believe, then you can create your own crazy world as you please to do.

But as we all know, this demented re-creation of individual worlds is never true to the generality of mankind. This is true only to paranoid, insane, psychopathic, demon-possessed, drug addict, deluded, self-deceived, and schizophrenic persons but never to the normal, sensible and sane persons simply because the Bible is true. The truth of the Bible warrants the reality of what we commonly experience, know and believe.

If the Bible is not true and that all Bible-rejecting belief systems are true then look what you've got. Think for a moment what would happen: if there is no immanent-transcendent triune God who created, sustained and redeemed the world; if there is no true truth (absolute truth) and real reality (objective reality); if all knowledge, wisdom and understanding are merely provisional, probable, temporary and thus ultimately futile, void of sense, meaningless, and absurd; if life is not precious, if love does not exist, if light is the same as darkness; if

truth, right and good are identical and equivalent to deception, wrong and evil; if competing gods control all things; if evolution through natural selection by pure chance is true; if there is no Jesus Christ who is the Lord and Saviour of mankind; if there will be no new heaven and new earth; if there is no miracle and providence; if there is no common and saving grace; if man is not created in the image of God; if there is no faith, hope and charity; etc.

You know what will happen? You can never know for there will be no you who will know and there will be no thing which is going to happen. If the Bible is not true, there is nothing-nothing.

**The Completeness of Absolute Truth.** Only the Bible can give us the real formula of truth. The God who reveals it is the true Absolute. Because of human depravity and Satanic deception, man usually rejects God's revelation of Himself. Man has chosen to invent his own formula of truth and posed it as his new "absolute."

In science, man invented the concept of evolutionism to explain all the phenomena of nature. It has three aspects: Cosmic evolution, Biochemical evolution and Biological evolution. Cosmic evolution tries to explain the origin of the universe, biochemical evolution tries the origin of life and biological evolution the origin of different species of animals including man. Peter Medawar told us that, "It is difficult to imagine or imagine an evolutionary episode which could not be explained by the formulae of neo-Darwinism."

According to Julian Huxley, "Our present knowledge indeed forces us to the view that the whole of reality is evolution – a single process of self-transformation." This statement of blind faith to evolution has expressed by Pierre Teilhard de Chardin in religious fashion: "Evolution is a general postulate to which all theories, all hypotheses, all systems must henceforth bow and which they must satisfy in order to be thinkable and true. Evolution is a light which illuminates all facts, a trajectory which all lines of thought must follow – this is what evolution is." This is the favorite quotation of Theodosius Dobzhansky, the world's foremost spokesman for evolution, as a summarization of his search for meaning of all things. Hopeless romantic and tragic future.

In philosophy, man invented the concept of humanism to explain all the phenomena of man. It has three aspects: Naturalism, Materialism and New-Ageism. Corliss Lamont gives us a concise definition: "To define naturalistic Humanism in a nutshell: it rejects all forms of supernaturalism, pantheism, and metaphysical idealism, and considers man's supreme aim as working for the

welfare and progress of all humanity in this one and only life according to the methods of reason, science, and democracy.”

Vladimir Lenin, on the other hand, defines materialistic Humanism as follows: “Matter is primary nature. Sensation, thought, consciousness are the highest products of matter organized by a certain way. This is the doctrine of materialism, in general, and Marx and Engels, in particular.”

New Age Humanism has been defined by Beverly Galyean: “Once we begin to see that we are all God, that we all have the attributes of God, then I think the whole purpose of human life is to reown Godlikeness within us; the perfect love, the perfect wisdom, the perfect understanding, the perfect intelligence, and when we do that, we create back to that old, that essential oneness which is consciousness.” Arrogant stupidity and pure delusion.

In religion, man invented the concept of pseudo-theism to explain all the phenomena about morality, spirituality and theology. It has three aspects: Atheism, Polytheism and Pantheism. Atheism is the religion without God. Polytheism is the religion of many gods. Pantheism is the religion that all is god. Foolishness at its best.

All these unbelieving belief systems rejected the Bible truth. All these worldviews are at war with the Judeo-Christian system in the areas of theology, philosophy, ethics, biology, psychology, sociology, law, politics, economics, and history as Dr. David A. Noebel has put it: “To be more precise, it is a battle between worldviews. On one side is the Christian worldview. On the other is the Humanist worldview divided into three easily definable branches: Secular Humanism, Marxism/Leninism, and Cosmic Humanist (the New Age Movement). While the latter three don’t agree in every detail, there is one point on which they unanimously concur – their opposition to Biblical Christianity.”

As we have seen, all unbelieving belief systems are just that, belief systems. They are mere belief with no logical, scientific and moral basis at all. They are purely blind faith to unbelief based on opinionated opinions.

Only the Judeo-Christianity is based on facts and truth. It is rooted in history, sustained by evidence and protected by prophecy. It is more than a belief system. It is beyond belief. It is more than science, philosophy and religion. Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ Himself is the Truth of truths. The center of the Infinite-Personal Triune God. He is pure light, life and love.

## NOTES & REFERENCES

1. “Consciousness has a role especially in design or teleological arguments. Why is there a cosmos which is governed by laws of nature and that has included the emergence of conscious, living, moral, and religious beings? Consciousness has had a role in other arguments as well, such as arguments from religious experience (the apparent consciousness of God), knowledge or cognition (epistemological arguments), and beauty (aesthetic arguments).” - Charles Taliaferro, “Where Do Thoughts Come From?”, *The Big Argument: Does God Exist?*, eds. John Ashton and Michael Westacott, Green Forest: Master Books, 2006, p. 159.

“Facts are temporal truths which God, the eternal Truth, establishes by His works of creation and providence. God reveals facts to men through their thought processes, and in and through the facts God reveals Himself. In the facts of nature God reveals Himself as the Almighty Creator God, and in the facts of Scripture God reveals Himself as the faithful Covenant God and in the facts of the Gospel God reveals Himself as the Triune Saviour God. Certainty is our clear perception of the clearly revealed facts. Error is the sinful rejection of the facts, and especially of God’s revelation of Himself in and through the facts. “ – Edward F. Hills, A.B. (Summa Cum Laude, Yale Univ.); Th.D. (Harvard Univ.). [The King James Version Defended, Des Moines: Christian Research Press, 1984, p. 115]

“A person's worldview, then, is a matter of being attuned to the truth as God knows it: the *Truth* who is Jesus. This involves what a person believes (i.e., the content or one's cognitive disposition) and an appreciation of the belief's significance (i.e., the valuation or one's affective disposition). Being attuned to *Truth* involves believing what is true, recognizing its significance, and loving it accordingly.” - Walter J. Schultz, “What is the Relationship of Worldviews to Truth?”, *Christian Contours: How a Biblical Worldview Shapes the Mind and Heart*, ed. Douglas S. Huffman, Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 2011, p. 65.

2. R.E. Rhoades, *Studies in Progressive Revelation Vol. I* (Litchfield: Maranatha Bible Society, Rev. ed., 1995), Introduction, p.ii. See also note 7 (below)

3. R.C. Sproul, *Reason to Believe* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982), p. 106.

“Total illusion is impossible, since illusion necessarily presupposes a backdrop of reality.” - Norman L. Geisler, *Christian Apologetics*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1976, p. 201

4. Divergence, another name for evolution, is in no sense a demonstrable fact. It is exactly the opposite of Convergence (the development of similar characteristics by unrelated organisms for similar need and similar environmental process) which is an established fact is proving to be an embarrassment to evolutionists. Some have even blindly extended this unscientific and irrational theory to spiritual reality.

“The ethnic religions of the East (Hinduism, Taoism, Buddhism, Confucianism, etc.), which in

large measure continue the polytheistic pantheism of the ancient pagan religions, have long espoused evolutionary view of the universe and its living things, and so they merge naturally and easily into the evolutionary framework of the New Age philosophy.” – H.M.Morris and J.D.Morris (The Modern Creation Trilogy, Volume Three, Creation & Society, Green Forest: Master Books, 1996, p.117)

See also Ian T. Taylor, *In the Minds of Men: Darwin and the New World Order*, Toronto:TFE Publishing, 1991, 498 pp. Henry M. Morris, *The Long War Against God: the History and Impact of the Creation/Evolution Conflict*, Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1989, 344 pp. Ken Ham, *The Lie - Evolution*, Green Forest: Master Books, 1987, 168 pp. Caryl Matrisciana & Roger Oakland, *The Evolution Conspiracy*, Eugene: Harvest House Publishers, 1991, 217 pp.

5. C.S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity* (New York: Collier Books, 1952), p. 45.

“... the commonly cited proofs of evolution – the fossil horse series, vestigial organs, the peppered moth, the duck-billed platypus, Archaeopteryx, the biogenetic law, the Miller-Urey experiment, and comparative anatomy – are either mere unfounded assumptions or known erroneous concepts.” –S.M. Huse, *The Collapse of Evolution* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1993), p. 144.

See also Ken Ham, Andrew Snelling and Carl Wieland, *The Answers Book: Answer to the 12 Most-asked Questions on Genesis and Creation/Evolution*, Green Forest: Master Books, 1998, 207 pp. Paul S. Taylor, *The Illustrated ORIGINS Answer Book: Concise, Easy-to-understand Facts about the Origin of Life, Man, and the Cosmos*, Gilbert: Eden Communications, 1995, 128 pp. Vance Ferrell, *The Evolution Handbook*, Altamont: Evolution Facts, Inc., 2005, 992 pp.

6. This refers to substantive uniformitarianism of “historical geology” (uniformity of process rates of natural laws) and not to methodological uniformitarianism of true geology (partial and temporal inviolability of natural laws).

See John C. Whitcomb and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood: The Biblical Record and Its Scientific Implications*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1961, 518 pp.

7. “We must be clear that Christianity has nothing to fear from modern science. Indeed, Christianity was instrumental in the origin of science. Tradition and authority should not be just blindly accepted, but examined to see if the things previously believed are indeed true. What is dangerous is the misuse of the claim to be ‘scientific.’ We do not think it is too strong to speak of this as ‘deception.’” – Francis A. Schaeffer, known as the Swiss Sage, is one of the intellectual and spiritual giants of this century. [The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer: A Christian Worldview, Volume Five, A Christian View of the West, Westchester: Crossway Books, 1982, p. 516]

8. Without reading the Bible, atheists presupposed that God is *ens causa sui* (a self-caused being), Jean-Paul Sartre, for example, in his book “Being and Nothingness” believed this to be the case and then pointed out that this leads to a contradictory concept of God. Atheists are correct in noting that self-caused being is impossible but they are wrong in conceiving God as self-

caused being. They are merely creating their own problem for God has no beginning; He is eternal (Deut: 33:27). God is not an effect but rather He is the uncaused Pure Being (Heb.11:6). The same schizophrenia were found in the minds of Russian astronauts (cosmonauts) when they said that God does not exist because they have not seen Him in space. This proves only that they foolishly (Psa.14:1) ignored the Bible which clearly stated: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." (Jn.1:18)

9. There are many natural processes that indicate that recent creation. In his book, *Geophysical & Astronomical Clocks* (Irvine: American Writing & Publishing Co., 1993, 146 pp.), Theodore W. Rybka (Ph.D. in solid state physics at the Univ. of Oklahoma) after discussing forty-two age indicators concluded with the following words: "the earth, the solar system, and the universe are all the same age – from 6,000 to 10,000 years."

See also John D. Morris, *The Young Earth, Green Forest*: Master Books, 1996, 216 pp.

10. Such observation and other scientific evidences for creation could be further studied by reading the copious writings of creation scientists like Dr. Henry M. Morris who is the Founder and President Emeritus of Institute for Creation Research (I.C.R.). Most of the great founders and primary developers of science were Bible-believing creationist Christians such as Boyle (Chemistry), Faraday (Electromagnetics), Kelvin (Thermodynamics), Kepler (Astronomy), Linnaeus (Taxonomy), Maury (Oceanography), Maxwell (Electrodynamics), Newton (Dynamics), Pasteur (Bacteriology), Ray (Biology), etc. Even now there are literally thousands of scientists who have abandoned evolution and become creationists for all scientific evidences lend its weight to Biblical creationism. "...I want to assert that no one can point to a single fact of science, history, or archeology that conflicts with a literal reading of the Bible." - John J. Grebe, D.Sc. ("DNA Studies in Relation to Creation Concepts" in *Why not Creation?* Ed. Walter E. Lammerts, Creation Research Society, 1970, pp. 312-313).

See also Ann Lamont, *21 Great Scientists who Believed the Bible*, Brisbane: Answers in Genesis, 1997, 252 pp. Henry M. Morris, *Men of Science -- Men of God*, Green Forest: Master Books, 1997, 107 pp.

11. The famous experiment of Stanley Miller which produced amino acids even though done under controlled condition still does not prove that life would occur spontaneously. Prof. Hans Gaffron of the Univ. of Chicago in reply to Harlow Shapley of Harvard Univ. at the 1955 Darwin Centennial Celebration Conference said that, "Contrary to notions which are become popular, it does not solve the problem of life. These substances are quite dead." Quoted by A.C. Custance, *Scientific Determinism: and Divine Intervention*, Paper No. 44, Ontario: Doorway Publications, 1988, p. 37.

12. D.R. Petersen, *Unlocking the Mysteries of Creation* (South Lake Tahoe: Creation Resource Foundation, 1988, p. 73.

13. Duane T. Gish (Ph.D. in biochemistry at Univ. of California, Berkeley) in "Speculations and Experiments Related to Theories on the Origin of Life: A Critique," (I.C.R. technical monograph no. 1, 1972, 41 pp.) has proved beyond any reasonable doubt that the entire structure of nature is arrayed against the evolutionary origin of life. Only the Creator can create life!

14. Fred Hoyle, quoted by H.M. Morris, *The Biblical Basis for Modern Science*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984, p. 234.

"It has been calculated that there are 239 protein molecules in a minimal cell for the cell to be fully functioning, 'all' these have to be present simultaneously. The chances against this happening are  $10^{119850}$  to 1. Such figures are ridiculous and defy any chance of no-God process constructing such a system. No wonder the Bible says the fool had said in his heart, 'there is no Go.' (Psa.53:1)." —J.H. John Peet, *In the Beginning God...*, London: Grace Publications Trust, 1994, p.52.

15. S.M. Huse, *The Collapse of Evolution* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1993), p. 89.

16. I Peter 1:24-25. In fact, whatever experiment presented by the "scientific establishment," to prove that they can create (or more correctly, make) the basic building blocks of life (not life per se), they are applying intelligence and thought to avoid this entropic tendency by putting their experiment inside the laboratory under carefully designed and controlled conditions (it cannot be found in the prebiotic or primitive earth) which only proves the necessity of intelligence superior to man in the creation of life.

See *The Creation of Life*, A.E. Wilder-Smith, D.Sc., Ph.D., Dr. es.Sc., F.R.I.C., San Diego: Master Books, 1970, 268 pp.

17. See our article "Time and Chance" for a more detailed study of the criteria for order and organization.

18. P.S. Ruckman, *The Christian's Handbook of Science and Philosophy* (Florida: Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1985), p. 166.

19. D.T. Gish, "The Nature of Science and of Theories on Origins," *Impact* #262, (El Cajon: Institute for Creation Research, 1995):2. See also his book "Creation Scientists Answer Their Critics," El Cajon: Institute for Creation Research, 1993, 451 pp.

20. R.C. Sproul, *Not a Chance* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994), 234 pp.

21. “What I am saying is that the Christian is exactly in line with the experience of every man, But no other system except the Judeo-Christian one – that which is given in the Old and New Testament together – tells us why there is a subject-object correlation. Everybody does act on it, everybody must act on it, but not other system tells you why there is a correlation between the subject and object. In other words, all men constantly and consistently act as though Christianity is true.” – F.A. Schaeffer, *The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer: A Christian Worldview, Volume One, A Christian View of Philosophy and Culture*, Westchester: Crossway Books, 1982, p. 330.

22.

“It is undeniable truth, that they who have been inwardly taught by the Spirit, feel an entire acquiescence in the scripture; and that it is self-authenticated, carrying with it its own evidence.” – John Calvin (Timothy Tow, *An Abridgment of Calvin’s Institute of the Christian Religion Book I-IV*, Singapore: Far Eastern Bible College Press, 1997, p.18.

“Today’s climate is one of self-centered relativism with no epistemological orientation to a concept of absolute truth. This mind-set is destructive of certainty and creates in people an attitude of tentativeness. While all evangelicals believe in absolute truth, perhaps modernity has eroded a valid belief in certainty that God’s children can understand His Word in a detailed way.” – Thomas D. Ice, “Dispensational Hermeneutics,” in *Issues in Dispensationalism*, ed. W.R. Willis & J.R. Master, Chicago: Moody Press, 1994, p.46.

“The new absolutes are an abysmal failure. Even those who accept the new absolutes cannot live with them. Among them lay scattered and broken marriages, confused and angry kids, racial distrust and animosity, millions of aborted babies, and a host of other problems. We must stop the insanity. –William D. Watkins, *The New Absolutes and how they are eroding moral character, families and society*, Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1996, p.234.

23. “A fallacy is a deceptive argument; that is, an argument that seems to be conclusive but is actually not conclusive. Either its sequence seems to be valid but is actually invalid, or else its premises seem to be true but are actually false. The word “fallacy” is derived from the Latin word *fallo*, which means “I deceive.” An appearance of validity and truth is essential to a fallacy, for it would deceive no one unless it at least seemed to be valid and true.” - Andrew H. Bachuber, *Introduction to LOGIC*, New York: Appleton-Century-Croft, Inc., 1957, p.176.

Satan is the first and foremost philosopher. His question “Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?” is, to borrow Helmut Thielicke’s words, “an eminently philosophical question” (*I believe: the christian’s creed*, Carlisle: Partenoster Press, 1998, p.221) for it sown doubt to the final authority of God’s word in order to introduce denial of Bible truth and acceptance of Satanic delusion.

“The enemy, pragmatic to the core, does not care how people are deceived, only that they are. If this means he must occasionally adapt his message to changing times and circumstances, he is perfectly willing to do so. By maintaining flexibility, he can exploit our human propensity to try new things – a tactic that, in turn, allows him to transform ancient deceptions into modern attractions.” -George Otis, Jr., *The Twilight of Labyrinth: why does spiritual darkness linger where it does?*, Grand Rapids: Chosen Books, 1997, p. 218-219.



24. “An argument must satisfy two conditions to establish the truth of its conclusion. It must be valid, and all of its premises must be true. Such an argument is termed ‘sound’. To determine the truth or falsehood of premises is the task of scientific inquiry in general since premisses may deal with any subject matter at all. But determining the validity or invalidity of arguments is the special province of deductive logic. The logicians is interested in the question of validity even for argument that might be unsound because their premises might happen to be false.” - Irving M. Copi, Symbolic Logic, New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1979, p.5.

25. “There is no one kind of thing that we ‘perceive’ but many different kinds, the number being reducible if at all by scientific investigation and not by philosophy: pens are in many ways though not in all ways unlike rainbows, which are in many ways though not in all ways unlike after-image, which in turn are in many ways but not in all ways unlike pictures on the cinema-screen - and so on, without assignable limit.” – J.L. Austin, Sense and Sensibilia, New York: Oxford University Press, 1964, p.4

“All human knowing is relation to an object.” - Martin Buber, The Knowledge of Man, New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1965, p.163.

26. “Logic is both a science and an art; it is concerned with the quest of knowledge and truth, and it is also a study of the validity or correctness of our reasoning.” - John A. Mourant, Formal Logic: An Introductory Textbook, New York: The MacMillan Co., 1963, p.2.

For more technical details on the relationship and distinction between truth and validity in the realm of logic, read the following articles:

<http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/courses/log/tru-val.htm>

<http://philosophy.lander.edu/logic/tvs.html>

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/logical-truth/>

<http://www.xenodochy.org/gs/validtrue.html>

<http://www.xenodochy.org/mail/mdonvt.html>

<http://www.philosophypages.com/lg/e01.htm>

27. “Just as ethical assumptions underlie proposals, so also does an ethical assumption inform the whole proposal for teaching written argument that this book explains.” - Jeanne Fahnestock & Marie Secor, A Rhetoric of Argument, New York: Random House, Inc. 1982, p.3.

“Judgments of value are judgments about what is good and bad, desirable or undesirable. Judgments of obligation focus on what is right and wrong and on what one do or forego.” - John S. Feinberg & Paul D. Feinberg, Ethics for a Brave New World, Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1993, p.18.

28. “Nobody is deliberately inconsistent in his beliefs. It is simply impossible to believe, fully and without reservation two things which you know are inconsistent with each other. It seems we are obliged to believe only what we think is consistent, without having any real choice in the matter. In this way we are all logicians, simply because we are human. When we study logic, we are teaching ourselves to do deliberately, by rule, something we have been doing semi-consciously, by hunch, ever since the age of four.” - Wilfrid Hodges, Logic, New York: Penquin Books, 1977, p.15.

29. “There are three operations of the mind which are immediately concerned in Argument; which are called by logical writers: 1<sup>st</sup>, Simple Apprehension; 2<sup>nd</sup>, Judgment; 3<sup>rd</sup>, Discourses of Reasoning.” - Archbishop Whately (quoted by Charles H. Welch, An Alphabetical Analysis, 10 vols, London: Berean Publishing Trust, 1958, vol.10, p.327.

30. The first type is called “illusion of meaning” by Francis Schaeffer, the second type is called “rationalist-irrationalist dialectic” by Cornelius Van Til, and the third type is called “pragmatic unlivability” by Norman Geisler.

[www.sciencephilosophyreligion.com](http://www.sciencephilosophyreligion.com)

[www.thebibleformula.com](http://www.thebibleformula.com)

[www.internetsecretbook.com](http://www.internetsecretbook.com)

[www.pinoygenius.com](http://www.pinoygenius.com)