

# Valid Views of "God"?

The Analysts and the Synthesists



L.M. Leteane

[See Back Cover](#)

L.M. LETEANE was born on March 13, 1964 in Lobatse, Botswana. He was a full-time accountant until 2009 when he took to research and writing after discovering a linguistic key to the long-lost “Babel” language, finding that it can still link up almost every language in the world—especially Akkadian, which he shows to be still little-understood by modern scholarship.

In 2011, as a columnist he tested some of his discoveries in over 200 op-ed articles in Botswana’s leading newspaper group, and these now form the backbone of several books unearthing secrets of our collective past.

This, along with many other original solutions never before seen in print that emphatically resolve perplexing timeline and other historical problems, his time in research has led him to the many far-reaching resolutions he now shares with the world through his books.

L.M. Leteane is married to Lebo with whom he has three children, and they live in Gaborone, Botswana.

# **Valid Views of “God”?**

**The Analysts and the Synthesists**

**by**

**L.M. Leteane**

# Valid Views of “God”?

## The Analysts and the Synthesists

Published by Pitoro Publishing  
Gaborone, Botswana

Copyright © 2022 L.M. Leteane

The moral right of the author has been asserted

All rights reserved

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except as provided for by fair use copyright law of, in particular, the United States of America. For permission requests, write to Pitoro Publishing, P.O. Box 20661, Gaborone, Botswana.



## Contents

Foreword.....	vii
Introduction .....	x
Is there a “God”? .....	x
Chapter One.....	1
“Who Made God”? .....	1
Chapter Two.....	5
The Linear Time Irrationality.....	5
Chapter Three .....	9
Evolution’s Great Fallacy: Part 1 .....	9
Chapter Four .....	14
Evolution’s Great Fallacy: Part 2 .....	14
Chapter Five .....	19
Trailing Behind the Curve .....	19
Chapter Six.....	24
Cyclicity: the Chicken-Egg Conundrum .....	24
Chapter Seven.....	29
Time as a Viewed Effluxion .....	29
Chapter Eight .....	34
Creation as Thought-Manifested .....	34
Chapter Nine.....	41
Creation as a Grand Harmonic.....	41
Chapter Ten .....	46
“God is Love”: Is it true? .....	46
Chapter Eleven.....	51
“Salvation?” The Analyst vs the Synthesist.....	51



## Foreword

**I**n the course of world history, millions of books are now published on the subject of “God”. But how many of them roundly satisfy—put on solid footing—both atheist and the believer in God? *Is* a “solid footing” even possible?

The aim of this book is to provide *real* answers to both the atheists and the believer...even drawing them nearer through a new model that raises their level of debate after first dismantling and then rebuilding certain of their tenets.

In a world where most writers merely assert and impose their viewpoint on others, it is not easy to write a book *bereft of non-sequiturs* when speaking on the subject of “God”.

What tends to happen is that the atheist tries to “blind us with science” while the Deist tends to fire off assertion after assertion, delivered with aplomb but often skirting the rigors of sound logic and facts. Both sides leave many questions unanswered, leading others—knowingly or unknowingly—to sit on the less demanding fence of agnosticism.

Can anyone—and book—satisfactorily answer the slew of yet unanswered questions? Can a topic off-limits to a polite dinner gathering ever turn more palatable, enhanced by good agreement on certain fundamentals? Will the many sticky points still lying in the garbage bin of “private belief” ever be resolved?

With the elucidations in this book, outlook will now be a simple choice between the “Analyst” or “Synthesist” view of “God”—now that a solid baseline will have been established far less likely to turn debate nasty or acrimonious.

## Valid Views of “God”?

Truth at its best is not “relative” but is out there for all to see. And at their best, Science and Religion should not be contradiction in terms. One needs only a sound model—a view of “God”—not easy to contradict or dismantle. One with the iron ring of *truth*.

Are the baseline truths unveiled or articulated in this book robust enough to withstand intense scrutiny? *That’s where you come in*. There are clear handles for you to firmly grip. Each chapter *levels* with you and guides you into responding likewise. Solidity comes with knowing what you are talking about. In your next debate, with the basic expositions in this book, you will be equipped to take a resolute stand not easily shaken by probing or mischievous questions.

Then my work in this book is done.

L.M LETEANE, Gaborone, December, 2022



## **Author's note**

Due to a plethora of translation errors as noted in many scholarly works and also as per my own work, all biblical quotations in this book are specifically the King James Version (**KJV**). It is not to say that this version is error-free when collated with the original Hebrew or Greek, but that certain revealing wording has now obfuscated in the more recent translations.

This book, however, is not a standard Christian work but a vigorous interrogation of the Deist, atheist and agnostic approaches to “God”, while tendering solutions in regard to how “God” may be validly and solidly viewed.

## Introduction

### Is there a “God”?

**I**n the life of every person in this planet, the subject of “God” has cropped up for discussion or debate. If it falls to debate, and it is between **two believers**, arguments tend to be over *how* one views God, not *if* “God” exists at all. But even where there is broad agreement in this, discussions often lead to heated arguments.

For much of our collective history—and even into modern times—arguments over “God” have led to wars or campaigns that devastate whole sections of a religious community, or even whole nations and large areas of our planet.

But if the debate is between a **believer** and an **atheist** the acrimony is typically much less. The reason, of course, is that in most cases neither the believer nor the atheist can deliver a “knock-out punch” on the other—so they would just agree to disagree, and leave it at that.

The **arguments** of a well-reasoning and well-researched atheist typically leave the believer with no real rejoinder but to say, “Well, you keep believing in what you believe, and I will keep worshipping my God.” Indeed, so far as I have seen, believers have not been able to deliver **answers** that leave even the most discerning of atheists with no wriggle room for good rejoinders...answers that *hang them out to dry*.

Consider the argument by one of today’s leading atheist, Richard Dawkins: his *piece de resistance*. It is an argument that appears to deliver a “knock-out punch” to believers...at least one that roundly satisfies his many readers.

## Valid Ways to View “God”?

His argument-in-chief would have certainly stumped a visiting Muslim Imam in my secondary school days when the imam was invited or allowed to address an assembly of our mostly Christian students.

One of the students asked a question that was in just about all our minds—though somewhat half-articulated. “*But Sir, how can you be sure that there is any God at all?*”

The expression on the Imam suddenly changed. He began to vigorously undo one of the pins that held together the cuff of his shirt. For a moment I thought he was going to then roll up his sleeves, descend from the stage, and beat the living daylights out of the impudent student who dared disrespect God with such an irreverent question.

To my relief he simply waved the cuff link in the air for all to see, and then asked. “Who made this pin? Did it make itself?” The murmur amongst the students basically affirmed the obvious answer that someone, of course, made that pin. *It did not—and cannot—make itself.* “So, if a mere pin only consisting of gold—a metal—overlaid with small crystals on top *did not make itself*, how can an intelligent person like **yourself** *have come out of nowhere?*”

The sheepish grin on the student told us that he was now thinking that perhaps he was not *quite* so intelligent after all. But if Richard Dawkins had been there, he would have asked the Imam the following questions, which I paraphrase.

If we are confronted with an “**unbelievably improbable**” complexity (i.e. one that appears to be *beyond mere chance*, such as Life) and our only answer to that complexity is that “a Designer was responsible for it”, it merely raises another question: **who**, then, *designed* the Designer?

In short, if we *reduce* a **complex problem** to its *basic* parts, and *still* we are perplexed as to how the elements came to be, so we introduce a **complex solution**—a Designer—as the answer, aren’t we *going against the grain of logic?*

Of course, common sense dictates that you build a complex thing from *less* complex components, and not the other way round. This basic and almost infallible-seeming argument has practically built Dawkins’ successful career as an atheist and author of note. *But is his “logic” here really infallible?* We will look at that question in more detail.

What we must first apprise ourselves of is how the raging question of **evolution** versus **creationism** is playing out in the education systems of the world. The approach of most western countries is a rather quixotic mixture of Christian belief and an atheistic outlook. And so, by extension, is that of many other countries in the world informed, guided and led by the western education curricula. Where this contrast is most dramatically played out in the open is in the United States of America.

At the Federal government level the two systems—atheism (or secularism) and Christianity—lie in often uncomfortable juxtaposition. On one hand the very President of the United States is sworn into office through an oath whose solemnity is premised on the bible. He places his hand on a copy and *swears by it* to uphold the constitution of the Union.

On the other hand the education system upheld by the very same US government teaches the Theory of Evolution as a core outlook in its classrooms. And evolution, it cannot be denied, *goes against the grain* of what **Genesis** teaches in the Old Testament of the bible. Evolution says that Life and all the species of plant and animal evolved through an **auto-process** that very gradually built them from simple forms and elements into the complex organic forms we see.

However, Genesis Chapter One and Two teaches that God literally “**spoke**” the universe into being “at the beginning” and everything on Earth came up suddenly and complete in every way through a series of utterances God made. That, at least, is how it comes out through translation. In the original

## Valid Ways to View “God”?

text, “**said**” refers more to a “formed intention” that is given *impetus*, rather than the mere *vocalizing* of words.

Although some argue that Charles Darwin himself did not specifically advocate for atheism, his first pioneering book *On the Origins of Species* certainly laid the groundwork for atheism to take root. The book looked at the *interconnection* of species and tied their present body forms, behaviors and how they survive to “evolving through the need to survive” whereby a species survives because it adapts itself well to the environment. In this book we look at whether that outlook is logically and empirically solid or not.

So, in essence, we have two main approaches. Atheists says that all the life-forms we see **gradually evolved**, whereas believers in God aver that an all-powerful being they call “God” created all things **exactly as they are**—complete in every way—with no evolution at all.

But an **overlooked fact** we address in this book is that though their outlooks are seemingly *divergent*, when we drill down into the *bases* of their outlooks we find that atheists and believers in God *all believe in the very same thing*. It is only that they call by different names the *process of building life-forms*, and they talk at cross-purposes.

Ultimately, once everything is put in its proper place and they recognize *where* and *why* they are so different and *yet so the same*, they must then ultimately decide whether they are “**Synthesists**” or they are “**Analysts**”. *This, ultimately, is where the burning questions lies*. It is what we should all be concerned with at our stage of advancement... whether we designate ourselves “Atheist” or “Creationist”. Through this book, these divisive tags will be rendered obsolete.

This done, we will all be debating at a much higher level and can more profitably seek to understand not only where we come *from* but where we are *going*...



## Chapter One

### “Who Made God”?

**T**wo questions confront us every day of our lives. *Where do we come from? And where are we going?* As the truism goes, we can only understand where we are going if we can but better understand the **trajectory** that set us in our present course.

And here, we are not just talking about the trajectory that technology took us and its impact on the state of the planet. *That* we can understand. Quite evidently, the sad state of our planet is a casualty of the advances technology came with, that ravaged our planet with pollution and a rapid depletion of resources. So we *understand* where this will take us. We now want to know how *everything* started.

If we at least *knew* all about how existence came to be, we would be in a better position to *really* understand Nature and ourselves, and would have the wherewithal to **recreate** things if ever we ever reach a tipping point of doom. After all, we would have all of Nature’s secrets with us.

But no one in this planet can claim that we understand all about how Nature works. So, what goes *further* than the fact that we now know enough to augment or destroy Nature? It is the question of *what* made this delightful playground so nicely laid out for us. Do we still have a *connection* with that Primal Impetus? If it is “**God**”, have we any hope of finding this Being and asking a bunch of pertinent questions?

If it is **Evolution**, do we have any hope of re-finding—in a fully conscious way—all the mechanics of this auto-process that brought us all this complexity...the secrets of which—though embedded in our cells and organs and our brain—we are still battling to fully understand?

Let us be clear about one thing. Our bodies are composed of millions of cells, each doing a wonderful job. Now, a dog does *not* worry about what makes its tail wag or why it has to eat...at least that is what *we* think. It only knows that things work in a wonderfully coordinated way.

When things go wrong for any reason—say, the dog got bitten by another dog—it trusts that by licking its wounds something positive will happen: that the blood flow would cease and a magical process of healing will take place. Soon, it is as good as new.

For the more curious (like *us* as a species), we want to go *beyond* this mere trust in the system. We want to know *how* this process works. The white blood corpuscles, we know, generate certain stringy materials that cover the open wound with scab, and the cells underneath the scab then rearrange themselves to work under this protective cover such that when it is all done, the scab falls off and there is new skin—just as good as the old one.

And there are two levels to the *why* of it all. The first, even the dog knows. *It is so that the body is repaired and we can continue with our lives.* The “larger” question is *why must we continue with our lives? What is it all for?*

Although we can be aware of a good part of the process, there is still much about the cell we do not know. It takes time and trouble—years of dedicated study—to find out how the system works. And yet it is within us. And atop of it all is a very smart brain that is given the task of working it all out. But even *now* it cannot figure out something that was *there* in all its complexity 65 million years ago—when dinosaurs last roamed this planet—and even *well before* that.

So there is no denying that this Evolution—if we may call it that—is a very **smart process** indeed...*no matter how much we may wish to dumb it down.* Some might argue that it even had a periscope into *what it wanted to be before it set*



## Valid Ways to View “God”?

*out to become what it became.* Even Richard Dawkins does not really dispute that Evolution is driven by *design*.

His argument is that Evolution **felt** its way through like a “blind clockmaker”—the actual title of one of his books—and that through many small **trials and errors** it was able to come up with a *small step* that made it survive better and *outperform* its rivals, until it reaches near the top of the “hill of complexity” to become remarkably adapted.

According to this line of reasoning (or more like a line of argument) *we have come a long way, baby!* But the journey is so long—millions of years—that we can’t quite **remember** it all... like a great grandfather who hardly remembers his own children, let alone *their* children’s children.

Where we come *from* is where we have *been*. And at least the body *knows* that because it is doing what it has always done—whether “we” (our conscious memory banks) know exactly *how*, at this stage. Sadly, our brain has to “relearn” all this *knowledge*...and **still** it falls far short.

There is a cop-out we can use when things get too complex. We can say that it is “axiomatic”. In other words, *it is just there...so deal with it!* But that cop-out is not good enough for this book. We need to come up with something more **conclusive**, something we can wrap our minds around.

Let us address “Who made the maker?” and see if it is a sound argument. One might aver, “If we cannot say ‘God (a Maker) made something’, we cannot equally say ‘Evolution made this’, for *what made evolution?*” In short, by merely substituting “**What**” for “**Who**” we are not really advancing the argument. Both are premised on a basis that is axiomatic *and* mysterious: that *something* made Life.

So, if by “making” we mean a process of *synthesis* that required orderliness and intelligence to arrive at, we are also contrasting it with *blind force*...for example, wind blasting sand onto a rock and thus carving its surface into certain patterns and shapes.

## Thank You for previewing this eBook

You can read the full version of this eBook in different formats:

- HTML (Free /Available to everyone)
- PDF / TXT (Available to V.I.P. members. Free Standard members can access up to 5 PDF/TXT eBooks per month each month)
- Epub & Mobipocket (Exclusive to V.I.P. members)

To download this full book, simply select the format you desire below

