

THE THREE ISMS OF PERVERSION

Periander A. Esplana

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

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 truth¹ 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 observed², "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,³ "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 theory⁴ 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 phrase⁵) “complicated attempt to avoid the obvious.” Thus, evolution like Lyell’s doctrine of uniformitarianism⁶ is a “science falsely so called.”⁷

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-cause⁸ 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,⁹ 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.¹⁰

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”¹¹ and to rub more salts to the wounds “evolution doesn’t even have the garbage,”¹² 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.¹³ The probability of its chance assemblage was calculated by Sir Fred Hoyle,¹⁴ 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.¹⁵ 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...”¹⁶

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.¹⁷

Peter S. Ruckman sums up the grades of evidences given above in the following manner:¹⁸ “ 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,¹⁹ “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.²⁰

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).²¹

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.²²

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”.²³

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,²⁴ 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;²⁵ 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.²⁶ 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.²⁷ 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.²⁸

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.²⁹

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 Eduction
 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:³⁰ (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.

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

