

A man was thinking and he wondered why ...

the thought processes of most of the people of the world, and the thought processes coming from: the educational systems of the world, the governments of the world, the intelligentsia of the world, and the religions of the world are so, generally speaking, poor.

What went wrong and why?

Intellectual Warfare:
The Corruption Of Philosophy And Thought

By

Job S. Friend

Attribution Page

Copyright 2013 by:

Christian Thinkers Publishing
C/O Barnabas Ministries
P.O. Box 3393
Farmington Hills, Michigan 48333
USA

Creative Commons License granted: CC BY-NC-ND

Explanation of Creative Commons License grant:

CC: Please refer to creativecommons.org

By: The user must acknowledge the author and copyright holder as follows:

Author: Job S. Friend

Copyright holder:

Christian Thinkers Publishing
C/O Barnabas Ministries
P.O. Box 3393
Farmington Hills, Michigan 48333
USA

NC: The user may not use this book for commercial purposes. However, the user may place a downloadable copy of this complete book onto a website for free downloading even though the website itself has banner and other ads. In other words there must be no charge for this book itself.

ND: The creative commons license grant only allows the user to use the original unmodified work. The user may not make a derivative from the original work, or any part of it. In other words, fair use quoting is allowed, but the user may not transform this book, or any part of it, into a derivative work.

Table Of Contents

Introduction	1
God As The Ultimate Philosopher	3
Satan As The Anti-Philosopher	17
Man Is Unique	28
The Importance Of Thought To Man	37
The Corruption Of Philosophy & Thought	55
The Philosophy Of History & Plato	87
The Results Of Bad Philosophy	125
Summary	142

To The Thinkers

Introduction

In a prior book your author has written of the connections flowing from the values one holds to the choices one makes and to the consequences that ensue (*Values, Choices And Consequences*). This is true for individuals, for companies, for governments, and also for religions. Of course, there are no company brains, or government brains, or religious brains. Any decisions for those companies or collective entities come from a Chairman, or a President, or a religious leader, or a committee of individuals representing that particular collective entity. Only individuals have minds and only individuals think. **The quality of the thinking determines the quality of the decisions and their ultimate consequences.** And those consequences are not just something for the evening news, or university white paper analysis, or government statistics. Those consequences are affecting real people's lives.

Accordingly, the quality of the thinking behind decisions is of paramount importance to mankind in general and to each of us personally. The world has come to the place where it is an intellectual train wreck. The very real problems plaguing mankind are, in large part, the result of

compound failures from the field of philosophy and a resulting corruption of the process of thought. The corruption of thought leads to bad decisions that negatively affect all of us. This is what this book is about.

How did this state of affairs come to be? There are literally library shelves full of philosophy books – each with arguments and counter-arguments going back for thousands of years. Just understanding the history of the various issues, speculations, and arguments is incredibly time consuming. Philosophers don't even agree on the meaning of concepts, how language is developed and used, how words are associated with reality, or if there even is an objective reality, etc. With all that said your author will share his thoughts and do his best to provide an explanation of where philosophy has failed mankind. To do so, in a relatively short and hopefully readable book, is a very difficult task.

It is always your author's goal to provide a camera angle as to what is really happening and why. In the pages that follow I share with you my take on what I believe has really happened, which is that there has been Intellectual Warfare waged against mankind. This intellectual

warfare has had devastating results. As always, some of my reasons are Biblical, some are historical, and some are based on logical reasoning and life experiences.

As a housekeeping point, the scriptural references, herein, are from the Modern King James Version, MKJV, unless denoted otherwise. And sometimes I will use the word, "God" collectively for the two Jehovahs, although the context of any scripture quoted would give the correct identification as to whether it meant the Father and the Son, Jesus Christ, or only one of them. Any emphasis, in the scriptural or other quotations, is mine throughout this book. Having said that, let's get started. I offer for your serious consideration and hopeful edification what I have learned below.

God As The Ultimate Philosopher

"The LORD has founded the earth by wisdom; by understanding He has founded the heavens." Proverbs 3:19, MKJV

"To Him who by wisdom made the heavens; for His mercy endures forever."
Psalms 136:5, MKJV

“For all things were created by Him [Jesus, see verse 13], the things in the heavens, and the things on the earth, the visible and the invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers, all things were created through Him and for Him.”
Colossians 1:16, MKJV

“He has made the earth by His power; He has established the world by His wisdom, and has stretched out the heavens by His judgment.” Jeremiah 10:12, MKJV

Before the two Jehovahs created the heavens and the earth (Ephesians 3:9, Colossians 1:16 above) they had already met and solved almost innumerable challenges. Some might think the most intellectually demanding challenges would be what the laws of physics would be and how they would function and what the result would be. How all of the forces of physics and astronomy fit together is a mystery to man, not God. Some might believe atomic and molecular chemistry would have been the biggest challenge. Others might believe that biology and botany, both having to do with life, would be, by far, the hardest challenge. Creating life, from apparently nothing, sounds quite difficult to me.

Getting more specific, the human anatomy with its intricate organ systems and chemistry seem to be mind-boggling in their complexity and interactions. The same holds true for plants and all of their intricate life systems. Going further, the complexity and functionality of the mind of man takes the complex to an even more "out there" level – as evidenced by the numerous philosophical and scientific debates concerning it. If a philosopher believed in God, he/she might consider the functioning of the mind of man as his biggest challenge. And let's not forget about the laws of logic and mathematics and all of the other laws that govern the universe. All of these disciplines interact with each other. How do you invent one part of the universe without re-affecting the rest of the whole? The two Jehovahs are the great Master Philosopher geniuses who not only figured all of these things out, they actually then proceeded to put them into practice by creating the entire universe. The laws the Master Philosophers created exist and govern the universe. Fortunately for us, they also created man in their image and likeness (Genesis 1:26) – which is, all things considered, a great honor.

Despite the formidable list of intellectual challenges listed above, your author believes

that the single most important intellectual challenge facing the two Jehovahs was to determine a rational, objective ethical system by which they would live. And not only how they would live, but also how other created beings (guests in God's universe) would have to live if they wished to continue to be welcome in it. I realize that some reading this might immediately object that the two Jehovahs just innately always do what is right – in other words what is right is just part of their nature and so they cannot act any other way. The problem with this explanation is that it makes the two Jehovahs almost robotic in their righteousness. It implies there is nothing for them to choose as right is sort of hard-wired into them. They just do right because there is nothing else they could do. When we look a little bit farther down the line at created angels and created mankind, why would God not just hard-wire "right" into each of these groups of created and contingent beings? Problem solved. Every being in the universe just always does what is right. But, that is not what we see in the created order – not for angels and not for man. Both types of created beings have to choose to do right.

Choosing requires freedom of choice.
Choosing also requires a standard of what is

correct, what is, in fact, right. And how would such a standard of right, or correctness, be established? It could only be done both rationally and objectively. There must be rational and objective ethics for the two Jehovahs to establish a standard of right. This standard of right is what the angels and men will be held accountable to. This standard cannot be arbitrary. It has to be both rational and objective and angels and men have to be capable of living according to it. When men fail, as we all do, the two Jehovahs in their love can apply mercy. But they do not change the standard of right. They cannot, or it would no longer be a standard.

To make a point, the Bible seems to indicate the being that became Satan chose to rebel against the two Jehovahs. And in this rebellion he evidently enticed and drew away one-third of the created angels who followed him. In so doing he launched both an actual warfare against the two Jehovahs and he also commenced an intellectual warfare – where he tried to lead other contingent beings into overt and covert rebellion against the two Jehovahs. He failed in his actual attempt at warfare and was expelled from heaven. But, Satan has largely succeeded in his intellectual warfare

against them – so far. The being that became Satan evidently thought he could oust the two Jehovahs in a power struggle for control of the universe.

“How you are fallen from the heavens, O shining star, son of the morning! How you are cut down to the ground, you who weakened the nations! For you have said in your heart, I will go up to the heavens, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; I will also sit on the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north. I will go up above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the Most High.”

Isaiah 14:12-14, MKJV

“You were the anointed cherub that covers, and I had put you in the holy height of God where you were; you have walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire [most likely a reference to the planets]. You were perfect in your ways from the day that you were created, until iniquity was found in you.”

Ezekiel 28:14, 15, MKJV

“And his [the dragon, aka Satan] tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and cast them onto the earth. And the dragon stood before the woman being about to bear, so that

when she bears he might devour her child.”
Revelation 12:4, MKJV

This goes a bit too far afield for this short book, but suffice it to say that resurrected saints (I Corinthians 15) shall actually judge the angels. And there will be a rational and objective standard that is used.

“Do you not know that we shall judge angels, not to speak of this life?”
1 Corinthians 6:3, MKJV

As for the two Jehovahs themselves, your author prefers to believe that they are so supremely intelligent and moral that they purposely determined this rational and objective standard of ethics and have consistently lived by it since - going backward in time farther than a human mind can even begin to contemplate. That it is now a part of their divine nature your author would have to concede. And perhaps your author's critics are, in fact, correct in that the two Jehovahs' divine nature makes it impossible for them to do wrong and maybe they just formulated their nature into rational and objective moral laws. It just seems more logical to me that they thought about how they would live and when they thought about it, it

was clear there is only one way to an abundant life, but many and innumerable ways to go astray. And so whether the rational, objective ethical standards of the two Jehovahs were simply formulations of their innately right nature, or were consciously chosen by them eons ago to live by (and thus becoming their nature) – **the fact remains there are rational and objective ethical standards by which angels and men must live.** If angels and men choose to break these moral laws, which govern the universe, pain, suffering, confusion, and death will ensue – and so they have.

To your author the likely correct progression, that a necessarily limited human mind can understand, is that the two Jehovahs first formulated a rational, objective ethical system they committed themselves to live by. And only after that did they formulate all of the schools of thought necessary to create the universe and only then did they create the actual universe. In other words, Philosophers with perfect integrity first, Entrepreneurs second. Further, in additional human words, the two Jehovahs have completeness and perfect balance of all of the moral and intellectual virtues. And all of the following are aspects of their divine wisdom:

Rational, objective ethics
Laws of physics, chemistry, biology, botany,
astronomy, etc.
Laws of logic
Laws of mathematics
The mind of man
Epistemology – how knowledge is established
Laws of the social sciences
Etc. – the list could go on and on

The philosophers and scientists of The Enlightenment were at least partly about men using their minds in an attempt to understand what God did and how he did it. Unfortunately, we have moved far from this approach and it has only hurt mankind in general because there is a lot of God's wisdom to apprehend – if we will only make the effort.

“God’s purpose was to show his wisdom in all its rich variety to all the rulers and authorities in the heavenly realms. They will see this when Jews and Gentiles are joined together in his church. This was his plan from all eternity, and it has now been carried out through Christ Jesus our Lord.”
Ephesians 3:10, 11, NLT

The rational and objective ethics that the two Jehovahs established, along with the other fields of truth of the universe, can be considered Truth in its entirety. The Bible makes it a point, in numerous places, to establish that God is merciful and there are numerous scriptures where truth and mercy appear in the same scripture. In fact truth and mercy appear to be linked in a sense. For man, they almost have to be because all have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God (Romans 3:23) and the wages of sin is death (Romans 6:23), but God is merciful and did NOT send Jesus Christ to this earth in order to condemn people (John 3:17). However, God cannot just change the standard of right because, as men, we do not perfectly live up to it. The standard of right (truth) remains and because the two Jehovahs are love (1 John 4:8), they add mercy. In the meantime men are to attempt to understand God's truth and to live up to it as best they can.

This short book is about the intellectual warfare that ensued when Satan, commencing with his rebellion and attempt to take over the universe, also commenced his attempt to corrupt philosophy and thought. That being said, your author is not attributing all bad thinking by all the philosophers in history to

have been directly inspired by Satan. In many cases it could have been a man, with all of a man's limitations, doing the best he could to further human thought, but who ended up inadvertently shunting mankind off onto the wrong philosophical road. Unfortunately, when one looks at the body of philosophical thought over the millennia one has to wonder, or suspect, that nothing could have gotten so bad without some diabolical help – without Intellectual Warfare being waged. How bad the state of the field of philosophy has become will be covered later in this book. Philosophy, which is supposed to mean “the love of wisdom”, has been shredded. The disastrous results are before us.

Why would Satan and the angels who followed him wage intellectual warfare instead of actual warfare? One answer is that their failed rebellion showed them they do not have the force necessary to win in an outright war against the two Jehovahs. The other answer is because philosophy provides the basis for all other intellectual disciplines and modes of living. This is because, classically speaking, ethics (how to live) is part of philosophy and so is epistemology (how knowledge is established). Also, ontology (the branch of metaphysics

dealing with the nature of being, the law of identity, cause and effect, etc.) is also part of philosophy, classically understood. In other words the existence and nature of the universe, man's place in it, the establishment of knowledge, and how to live are all part of philosophy. The corruption of philosophy and thought is lethal to man. The corruption affects literally everything.

Men make choices and take action based on the ideas they hold, the ideas they believe in. If Satan can make men think that clear thinking is not possible, either because knowledge cannot be reliably established, or because the process of reasoning itself does not work, then men will not trust their minds. Or, if Satan can make men think that ethical standards are subjective, now unprincipled men can rationalize doing what they want – even if it hurts others. Or, if Satan can make men think that man and the universe are all an accident, without purpose or design, it will make life seem somewhat pointless. And all of these corruptions of thought affect the choices men make and the actions that men take on the earth. And all those choices will have consequences.

Further, correctly understood, the philosophy held by the majority will dictate the legal systems we live by. The legal systems we live by will dictate the economic systems we live by. The economic systems we live by will determine only our standard of living – which is to say, more importantly, whether men live or die and whether men flourish in life or just live a tortured existence. And philosophy has had and continues to have a profound impact on various religious and metaphysical systems, which affect men in how they conduct themselves on earth and in what those men's expectations are for the hereafter, if any. Philosophy, it turns out, is quite important. Its corruption and the corruption of thought itself is literally killing man and making his time on earth much less happy than it could have been.

Now let's get back to the two Jehovahs and their rational, objective ethics. To try and elaborate on their ethics is beyond the scope of this book, but forms the subject of a book on law and societal norms soon forthcoming. To give a very shorthand answer, life is better than death. Flourishing life is better than life. Each person and their property should be respected and not encroached upon – in other words there should be no initiation of force or fraud against

others, or their property. And there is no social theory of violence. Any supposedly social theory that entails coercing others into behaving in a certain way, or that involves fraud, theft, violence like pillaging, etc., is just setting the stage for the next war. Once life is chosen over death and blessings (abundant life) over cursing (tortured existence), an entire set of rational and object ethical principles has also been chosen. In addition, there is the concept of original appropriation, meaning that the creator of something, e.g., a sculptor sculpting a sculpture establishes his ownership to that sculpture. Since the two Jehovahs created the entire universe they own it outright. Ergo, even if their system of ethics were subjective (which it is not), it would still be an objective fact for angels and men who are guests in their universe. And so the two Jehovahs' will ought to be done in any case. Fortunately, their ethical system is rational and objective and it can be learned and practiced by men.

"I call Heaven and earth to record today against you. I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing. Therefore, **choose life**, so that both you and your seed may live,"
Deuteronomy 30:19, MKJV

In short, the two Jehovahs are right (ethical), rational, and their way works to produce a flourishing life. Satan, as we shall see in the next section, has chosen to use force and fraud. His way is wrong (not ethical), irrational, and does not produce a flourishing life – in fact, just the opposite. Following Satan and his irrational, unethical, “social theories” leads to pain, suffering, actual warfare, and death.

Satan As The Anti-Philosopher

Satan loves it when the God of the Bible (the two Jehovahs) is sometimes derided for being cruel. And ergo how could a cruel God be someone who was using rational objective true and good ethics to guide their decision-making? In this regard, such a critic has a superficial view. There are several summary points to be made which can help correct this wrongly held view.

First, people assume that the reason there is so much pain, suffering, and death in the world is due to God having power, but not acting. The truth is that the two Jehovahs have given each of us so much freedom and so much time and men and angels can evidently spend both as they wish. However, at some point, the

freedom will be up and the time will be up and then each of us must answer for our lives. To attribute bad decisions which hurt to anyone but the one who made the bad decision is to lay the blame on God for something he did not do. This was explained in more detail in a prior book by your author entitled *The Source Of Evil*.

A second point of confusion comes from not realizing or remembering that there is a state of war in the universe between the two Jehovahs and those who faithfully follow them and Satan and those who follow him. Sometimes in a state of war communication is intentionally unclear so as to deceive the enemy and sometimes in a state of war orders are given to kill, e.g., when the Israelites were told to wipe out the tribes then inhabiting the Promised Land (the book of Joshua). What the two Jehovahs do in a state of war does not describe or exemplify their judgment, communication, or character were they to be functioning in a time of peace - where social harmony and cooperation would be given emphasis.

A third point of confusion occurs because many people do not realize that once Adam sinned and man was thrown out of the Garden of Eden (Genesis 3:23-24), the two Jehovahs

have basically stood back from mankind and allowed man to go his own way. The two Jehovahs reserved the right to intervene any time they wished, but they stepped back. And Satan stepped in and he became the "god" of this world. Satan does or inspires countless evil acts and then stays in the background knowing that most unthinking men will blame the God of the Bible. **In this regard it is literally a case of mistaken identity.** It will end when Jesus Christ comes again (Revelation 19 and other places).

"But also if our gospel is hidden, it is hidden to those being lost, in whom **the god of this world** [Satan] has blinded the minds of the unbelieving ones, so that the light of the glorious gospel of Christ (who is the image of God) should not dawn on them."
2 Corinthians 4:3, 4, MKJV

The entire reason the Apostle Paul was called was in order to perform a ministry of reconciliation whereby people would learn the truth and turn to it. Jesus himself came down to recruit Paul and told him the reason for his recruitment:

“But rise and stand on your feet, for I [Jesus] have appeared to you [Paul] for this purpose, to make you a minister and a witness both of what you saw, and in what I shall appear to you; delivering you from the people and the nations, to whom I now send you in order to open their eyes so that they may turn from darkness to light, **and from the authority of Satan to God**, so that they may receive remission of sins and an inheritance among those who are sanctified by faith in Me.” Acts 26:16-18, MKJV

The fourth error critic’s make is to look at some of the commands given to the ancient Israelites and attempt to find fault with them. The problem here is in not realizing that the two Jehovahs were very limited in that they were basically instructing former slaves who were evidently quite uneducated. It was so bad they had to instruct them to bury their own dung and not leave it lying around above ground (Deuteronomy 23:13). The two supreme minds of the universe would much rather not have to communicate at the “bury your dung” level. Rather they would prefer to be able to just say something along the lines of “Choose life, do not encroach on others or their property, keep your word, and love your neighbor as yourself.” But,

they had to consider the context of that situation and they ended up giving a lot of rules. If the two Jehovahs felt they could teach at the level they actually think at and if there were not a state of war in the universe, their communication could have been higher level, more overtly principled, and easier to understand and follow. In short the two Jehovahs were not then in a position to be able to teach in a way and in a manner that would have been easier for everyone involved. If people are largely anti-conceptual, which is to say, poor thinkers, then they need a lot of detailed rules to memorize and mimic. The more ideal would have been to be able to say something as simple as, "love your neighbor as yourself." Unfortunately, that is not enough detail for most people. The subject of law, including its purposes, is to be covered by your author in an upcoming book and is beyond the scope of this short book.

To summarize the critic's errors, in unfairly criticizing the two Jehovahs:

1. Evil comes about because angels and men make bad choices, which bad consequences the chooser is responsible for.

2. There is a state of war in the universe and in a state of war communication and actions are taken that are outside normal.
3. Satan is the current "god of this world" and he does innumerable malicious, hurtful acts toward mankind and then stands back and lets the two Jehovahs take the blame.
4. The two Jehovahs were forced to communicate within the context of a state of war and toward ignorant and uneducated people who used to be slaves. They were not then in a position to be able to teach at the same level they think at.

The Bible speaks of the importance of obtaining wisdom, throughout, and particularly in the book of Proverbs.

"The proverbs of Solomon the son of David, king of Israel; **to know wisdom** and instruction; to recognize the words of understanding; to receive the instruction of wisdom, justice, and judgment, and uprightness; to give sense to the simple, knowledge and judgment to the young man; the wise hears and increases learning; and understanding ones gets wisdom; to understand a proverb and its meaning; the words of the wise, and their acute sayings. The fear of the

LORD is the beginning of knowledge; but fools despise wisdom and instruction.”
Proverbs 1:1-7, MKJV

Philosophy, the love of wisdom, covers a lot of intellectual ground. This is intimated in the Proverbs scriptural passage quoted above, but not directly stated. For example, justice implies philosophy affects and guides the legal system. Uprightness implies philosophy guides the ethical and religious systems. Judgment means men are free to choose, but there is an objective, ethical standard of right to correspond to. The two Jehovahs would like mankind to seek after wisdom, to love true philosophy as it were. Not so, with Satan the adversary. After all, one must think correctly before one can choose and act correctly.

Satan hates the two Jehovahs and mankind made in their image and is in a state of war against them. As has been observed (and is clearly evident) men are rational beings and we are also social creatures. Men need to think and men need to cooperate with each other in order to survive and thrive on this earth. Knowing this, Satan has worked long and hard to corrupt philosophy and thought. He launched Intellectual Warfare against mankind. How he

did so and its devastating results form a large part of the balance of this book in later sections below. Satan attacked reason because men are rational beings. Satan also wants men to fight against each other because this is Satan's way to attack and disrupt the social needs of man. Satan has worked to get men to fight tribe and against tribe, nation against nation, men against women, etc., because in so doing mankind is fighting a civil war against itself – to our own destruction.

Getting men to fight against each other instead of cooperating with each other is one of Satan's greatest triumphs. There are no winners in a civil war. Everyone loses. What kind of a mind would so hate its creators and those made in their image that it would attempt to conquer the throne of the universe by force? The answer is an unprincipled mind – one that does not recognize the clearly true principle of original appropriation. The two Jehovahs created the universe and everything in it and own it all because of this. So Satan put himself outside of rational ethics when he attacked their throne and tried a coup. Now he is the outlaw. When someone does not have an intelligent argument, they have to resort to force, aka using a gun in place of an argument. It has

been observed, rightfully so, that there is no social theory of violence. There is no rationale for the initiation of force against non-aggressors. There is only a "might makes right," "the winners write the history" crude, thuggish mindset. When Satan chose to go down this road he became "the god of forces" (Daniel 11:38). Satan was and is wrong so he tried to use force. It did not work. Jesus Christ, who knows him well, characterized Satan's character as follows:

"You are of the Devil as father, and the lusts of your father you will do. **He was a murderer from the beginning**, and did not abide in the truth because there is no truth in him. **When he speaks a lie, he speaks of his own, for he is a liar and the father of it.**"

John 8:44, MKJV

The natural rights of man are life, liberty, and private property. And, of course, the right to contract is also a right; one derived from private property rights. Not initiating force and/or fraud are the requirements of a civilized society. Note that Jesus Christ, in the passage above, identified Satan the Devil as a murderer (initiator of force) and a liar (initiator of fraud).

The end results when men are moral, rational, and properly social is that a society is formed whereby goods and services are produced and exchanged for each other and men develop their intellectual and moral virtues. This results in a society where, through effective individual effort and social cooperation, flourishing life results - (as flourishing as possible). And it results in the natural resources of the earth being used in order to sustain a larger population. In short, more men get to live and to live well. All of this forms the basis for the topics of law and economics, which are covered in two other books by your author.

Satan does not wish men to live, nor does he wish them to live well. He failed in his coup attempt to dethrone the two Jehovahs. But he has done remarkably well in getting mankind to engage in an almost continuous civil war of man versus man. It should be noted that in the ancient tribal and national wars the loss of a war resulted in three principle things:

1. Death,
2. Slavery to the losers who survived and
3. Destruction of property (anti-property)

Death, slavery, and anti-property just happen to be the opposite of life, liberty, and property – man’s natural rights. Satan, by starting and sustaining wars, destroys man and his natural rights. This is the thrust of Satan’s anti-social efforts. War results in the death of man and the gross violation of man’s natural rights. There simply is no social theory of violence. No one has ever dared the intellectual scorn and public ridicule of attempting to put forth a social theory of violence. They would ultimately end up having to say, “Might makes right.” Anyone who attempted to put forth such a theory would be rightly ridiculed. Any proposed social theory of violence would never produce real peace or social harmony. There would only be interludes between wars where the losing side works on finding a way to gain enough strength and resources in order to attempt revenge. And all of the above is a short summary of Satan’s attacks on the need for man to be social.

Satan tried to enslave and/or kill the two Jehovahs, but failed, and now he is engaged in anti-social efforts against mankind. Is it rational to pick a fight with the two supreme minds and the two supreme powers of the universe? Satan is immoral; a war-starting outlaw who sees nothing wrong with initiating

force and fraud. Satan is irrational because he engages in anti-life, anti-liberty, and anti-property tactics that might offer him some seeming short-run advantage, but will only get him killed in the long-run (Isaiah 27:1). And Satan's policies produce pain, suffering, and death. In short Satan is wrong. Satan is, properly understood, irrational – an enemy of right reason and right philosophy. And Satan's system does not work. No matter who would be in charge of a social system based on fraud and violence the end results would be a disaster. In the long run Satan, his team of fallen angels, and all who follow them will come to nothing.

“But, we speak wisdom among those who are perfect; yet not the wisdom of this world, nor of the rulers of this world, that come to nothing.” 1 Corinthians 2:6, MKJV

Man Is Unique

In a prior book, *Honor*, your author explained in detail that it was a great honor that man was made in the image and likeness of God (Genesis 1:26). The two Jehovahs could have made man to look like a platypus, or something even worse. It was an honor and it was an intentional design choice by the Creators of the

universe that man was chosen to look like them physically. Ultimately there will be a resurrection where man is changed to spirit and then man will really look like the two Jehovahs (1 Corinthians 15). For now man has the responsibility to grow and develop and to become like the two Jehovahs in mind and character as well as appearance. Your author also wrote a book speaking to the process of character creation in man that was entitled, *Creating Characters With Character*. Ergo, there is no need to dwell, in detail, on the fact that it was an honor that we look like God, physically speaking, and that we are to grow in character so that we not only look like them, but also think and act like them – an internal change. You could say that mankind has been tasked with obtaining and learning how to correctly use the intellectual and moral virtues.

“But to which of the angels, did He say at any time, “Sit on My right hand until I make Your enemies Your footstool?” Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for those who shall be heirs of salvation?”
Hebrews 1:13, 14, MKJV

“For He has not put in subjection to the angels the world to come, of which we speak.

But one testified in a certain place, saying, "What is man, that You are mindful of him; or the son of man, that You visit him? You have made him a little lower than the angels. You crowned him with glory and honor and set him over the works of Your hands. You have subjected all things under his feet." For in order that He put all things under him, He did not leave anything not subjected. But now we do not see all things having been put under him. But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor, that He by the grace of God should taste death for every son.

For it became Him, for whom are all things and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons into glory, to perfect the Captain of their salvation through sufferings. For both He who sanctifies and they who are sanctified are all of One, for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brothers, saying, "I will declare Your name to My brothers; in the midst of the assembly I will sing praise to You." And again, "I will put My trust in Him." And again, "Behold Me and the children whom God has given Me."

Since then the children have partaken of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise

partook of the same; that through death He might destroy him who had the power of death (that is, the Devil), **and deliver those who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.** For truly He did not take the nature of angels, but He took hold of the seed of Abraham. Therefore in all things it behooved him to be made like His brothers, that He might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of His people. For in that He Himself has suffered, having been tempted, He is able to rescue those who have been tempted.” Hebrews 2:5-18, MKJV

In order for man to be able to fulfill his unique destiny he has to be free in order to choose to be good because morality is bound up with the freedom of choice. Robots and computers are not moral, they just do what they are programmed to do. In order to be moral man must be free, first in order to choose the right thing and second, in order to actually do the right thing.

It has always puzzled your author as to why anyone who believes in determinism would spend any of his or her time arguing for determinism. Determinism basically holds that

none of us is free and forces beyond our control dictate what everything and everyone in the universe does. But if everything is predetermined why would anyone waste time attempting to make an argument in order to change someone else's mind, e.g., someone who rejects determinism? The very fact those who believe in determinism are free to think up arguments and to choose to make arguments to those others who don't believe in determinism actually shows that deep down inside even determinists believe men possess freedom of choice. Their arguments betray them.

Further there are actually those who, while realizing that man appears unique, are uncomfortable with all that man's uniqueness implies. They particularly do not know what to do with man's mind. These people are usually either advocates of what could be called scientism, the belief that eventually all biology will be reduced to chemistry and all chemistry will eventually be reduced to physics – particles in motion causing change according to the laws of physics. Or, these people are behaviorists, which is the belief that the actions of people can be explained in terms of conditioning without regards to conscious thoughts or feelings.

Again, your author is amazed by scientism because quite contrary to the laws of physics men can actually be the source of causation based on how they think and choose and then act. Further, the same mind might respond to the same core situation by going to the left one time and the right the next time. In other words the same exact man with the same exact genetics chooses differently over time. And then a different result occurs. There never will be a regularity in how men choose to react because different men make different choices in response to the same exact phenomena and the same exact man chooses differently from one time to the other in response to the same set of circumstances. It is the height of folly to think that stimulus and response applies to man like inanimate objects. It is scientifically false. Both scientism and behaviorism are intellectual dead-ends when it comes to explaining the choices of men and their actions. This is because men were designed to be free to choose and so they do.

In fact, it turns out that it is actually necessary for men to be free to choose. Man cannot out-compete wild animals for food in nature. Man has to think, to take action, and to work together socially with others in order to

find his way to successful living on this earth. Man cannot outfight, or outrun a lion, but he can grow food, build barns and domesticate animals, build houses for shelter, develop transportation systems, etc. As a further rebuke against scientism and behaviorism, it should be noted that men can and do learn from their experiences. Men can write books, record history, in short, share knowledge with each other. Ideas produce other ideas. Stimulus and response cannot be used to explain the choices of men. Any attempt to do so is, quite frankly, unscientific and just plain wrong. Man can learn and grow intellectually and can accumulate knowledge that can be shared with and used by others. Houses, computers, farming techniques, etc., are all improved over time. For example, the first generation of a computer is looked upon as a necessary first step toward having computers. However, looking backward, from say the tenth generation of a computer, the first generation looks primitive. A behaviorist or advocate of scientism would have to explain, in detail, the stimulus response of man's intellectual progress. They could not do so because their theories are false. Determinism, scientism, and behaviorism and anything of their ilk are useless when it comes to providing useful information pertaining to

man's unique ability to think, choose, and take action.

It was explained in the previous section why Satan wants men to fight against men. He knows that man is a rational being and also a social being. Man needs to think and to cooperate with others in order to survive on this earth. If Satan can get tribe fighting against tribe, men fighting against women, nation fighting against nation, etc. he has started a civil war where men will be killed, hatreds will be fostered that last for years, and there will be no social harmony or cooperation while the fighting continues. Death will be the result for many, with the surviving balance of mankind far worse off due to the diversion of limited resources to war efforts instead of the production of food, clothing, and housing. Mankind will also be worse off due to the negative effects on productivity that results from the lack of social harmony and joint effort. The importance of social cooperation of man with other men leads to the topics of both law and economics that form the subject of two other books yet to be written by your author.

Men are unique in terms of being made in God's image, in terms of being the rational

animal, aka a rational being who is free to choose, and in terms of being a social creature. Man is further unique in being conscious of self, conscious of others, conscious of other things in nature, etc. If men will learn to embrace their uniqueness and no longer fear being responsible for their own lives, they will begin to learn how important it is for every man to think clearly and for every man to choose correctly and for every man to act responsibly and for all men to cooperate with each other socially. The resulting huge increase in production would enable men to have more time left over to further develop themselves. By further developing himself or herself, your author means for each of us to actively work toward obtaining as many of the moral and intellectual virtues as is possible for that man or woman based on the context of his/her own life.

By recognizing and embracing man's unique role in the universe we can learn to value who and what we are. We can also learn to value those things that are important for man to sustain his life on this earth. We can value life and what is necessary for man to live on this earth, which is that we are free to choose, we are free to be moral, we are free to take action, we will do better if we find ways to cooperate

with each other instead of killing and frustrating each other. Our actions are not pre-determined by some outside force beyond our control. Others have the same right to choose and take action as we do and others also have hopes and dreams that are important to them. Ergo, we must not initiate force or fraud against others or their property and we must keep any voluntarily agreed upon contracts we make. All of these recognitions and choices to value properly and to take action accordingly would make our time on this earth the best that is possible, i.e., it would enable the most flourishing life for the greatest number.

The Importance Of Thought To Man

For man to survive on this earth he must both think and take action. Man has to choose goals he would like to achieve, choose the best means possible to achieve those goals, and then take the action to actually achieve the goals chosen. It does man no good to think about satisfying his hunger, e.g., to think about eating a piece of fruit. He actually has to obtain the piece of fruit and then eat it. In its simplest form the above is the correct subject matter of economics, which is covered by your author in a separate book entitled, *Economic Fallacies*

Versus Rational Thought.

Animals do not think. They operate by instinct in a battle of survival of the fittest. In nature, the loser gets eaten alive. With man, it is different. Man can both think and he can also cooperate with others in a joint effort to overcome nature. By thinking and by working together men can overcome nature and live the best life possible. If men choose not to think and choose not to cooperate, they only hurt themselves. Man is both a rational and a social creature. As previously explained, these are two of the key points that make men unique.

Life is better than death. Aristotle would probably say that life is the ultimate given. Life just is. Accept the fact that you are alive and make the most of it. Your author would say that life being better than death is an axiom. Anyone who attempted to argue that death was better than life would have to be alive to make the argument – thus contradicting his own argument and rendering it invalid. And others might just say that life being better than death is only a postulate – not a necessary part of existence itself and not at the higher level of an axiom. Life does not have to be. We just are fortunate, for the moment, that it is so for those

of us who are now alive. Whichever particular group someone falls into, there is no better premise to put into its place than life is better than death. Anyone who argued the opposite, that death was better than life, would be subject to ridicule and would be disregarded. It would just show that, for the moment, they hated their own life and were trying to pull others down with them.

Since life is better than death, the next silly argument that men have wasted time on is what kind of life? Is the key point life, or does life have to have a certain minimum level of good things, etc.? In other words is life just having to do with existence, or should life be concerned with flourishing, or abundance? To your author, this is much ado about nothing. What man would only want existence instead of a flourishing, abundant life? No one. So why waste time arguing such things. It is clear that man wants and should want a flourishing, abundant life – if at all possible.

An animal is not self-conscious. Nor does an animal look up into the heavens and ponder its place in the universe. Man is self-conscious and does look up into the heavens and ponders his place in the universe. Man asks questions. For

example, he wants to know what is happening and why. Fortunately for man, there is a logical structure to the universe and there is a logical structure to the human mind. And there is no contradiction between the two.

Man can identify things. He can associate, integrate, and abstract, i.e., he can think. He can learn concepts. He can name things and form languages. Language does not just allow man to communicate. It allows man to think. Man can learn patterns of stimulus and response and establish or discover the laws of cause and effect. He can use his ability to accurately identify, name, and group things and his ability to discover the laws of cause and effect to know how reality is ordered. As man learns how reality is ordered he can make plans to alter it for his benefit. Man can calculate the engineering forces necessary to build a bridge over a river, or to dam a river and generate electricity, etc. Man can learn how, when, and where to plant crops. He can learn how to build shelters to protect himself from his environment and innumerable other things to do to make his life better on the earth.

If there were not a logical structure to reality there would be no laws of cause and effect and

even the ability to identify things would be in question. If one time an apple was red and round and another time it was purple and a square man would have a hard time identifying that the thing in question was an apple. He would also have a hard time knowing if it was safe to eat. For example, if when the apple was red and round it was safe to eat, but when it was square and purple some men who ate it got sick, man would have to wonder what was going on. It would make life difficult.

Thankfully, the two Jehovahs knew that men would have to use their mind in order to understand how to function on this earth and they did not play games with men in this regard. They gave mankind a spirit, a non-physical component to the human brain that enabled mankind to be able to think logically. The philosopher, Ludwig Wittgenstein, was correct when he said that all thinking is logical or it is not thinking. In other words for something to qualify as thinking, it conforms to the rules for thinking, which is to say all thinking is logical, or it is not thinking. There is no such thing as polylogism - different logics for different groups of men. There is not one kind of logic for Germans and another for Jews, or one kind of logic for capitalists and another kind

for workers. The logical structure of the human mind is uniform for all men. None other than a biased bigot would assert otherwise and there never has been a detailed attempt to explain, from any bigot, exactly how, in detail, minds possessed and utilized any such supposed logical structural difference. Again, Wittgenstein nailed this one when he succinctly observed that there are rules for thinking and that all thinking is logical, or it is not thinking. The philosopher, Gottlob Frege, further offered that in order to think normally men must use the laws of logic because the laws of logic are descriptive of reality.

"But a spirit is in man giving them perception, even the breath of the Almighty."
Job 32:8, MKJV

"The burden of the word of the LORD for Israel, says the LORD, who stretches forth the heavens, and lays the foundation of the earth, and forms the spirit of man within him."
Zechariah 12:1, MKJV

"So says Jehovah God, He who created the heavens and stretched them out, spreading out the earth and its offspring; He who gives breath

to the people on it and spirit to those who walk in it.” Isaiah 42:5, MKJV

“The spirit of man is the lamp of the LORD,
searching all the inward parts of the belly.”
Proverbs 20:27, MKJV

For centuries men have pondered how it was possible for men to be conscious, not just of themselves and others, but also of reality, aka the universe. In the past there were intelligent men who actually speculated that some day doctors would find a hidden organ in the brain that would explain thought. Not so. The Bible explains that the two Jehovahs gave men the gift of thought by placing a unique spirit within them. This unique spirit enabled thought and the consciousness/thought of men has a logical structure that corresponds with the logical structure of the universe, i.e., reality. The two Jehovahs did not play games with the mind of man and make the structure of thought different somehow from the logical structure of the universe. Man was created with both the need and the ability to be able to think. Thank you God.

The reader can notice from the two scriptures quoted from Isaiah and Zechariah

above that both the creation of the universe and the placing of a spirit in man, which enabled thought, are both included within the same verses. This is not an accident. It is the two Jehovahs confirming that there is no contradiction between the logical structure of reality and the logical structure of the human mind. There could not be a contradiction because man had to be able to think clearly/logically in order to fulfill his Creator's purpose for him. Man had to be able to think and to have freedom of choice in order to be moral. And man had to be able to think in order to live effectively on this earth. Without the ability to think there could be no accurate identification of things and abstraction of concepts. There could be no learning of cause and effect. And there could be no effective goal setting, no effective means selecting, and no effective actions undertaken. A confused man, unable to think clearly, or to figure out what was really going on, would be at the complete mercy of his environment and man would be outcompeted by mere animals. Thankfully, none of this is so.

An error that some have held is to believe that the laws of logic are somehow only psychologically perceived and not true in

themselves. This is known as psychologism. Frege refuted this silliness by pointing out that psychologism confuses being true with being regarded as true. It also confuses the fact that $A = A$, in this case that all men are men. There are laws that actually govern the universe and they are not just psychologically perceived. And men do not have different mental operating systems. To be a man is to have a mind with a logical structure that enables us to understand the logical structure of reality. As Frege mentioned, "I understand by logical laws, not psychological laws of holding [or believing] as true, but laws of being true." "Logic is concerned with the laws of truth, not with the laws of holding something to be true, not with the question of how people think, but with the question of how they must think if they are not to miss the truth." In short, psychologism and polylogism are nonsense.

Man, with freedom of choice, with the ability to think clearly, and with the freedom to take action can be moral, can be logical, and can live a flourishing abundant life on this earth. Whether he will take advantage of these God-given abilities is a different question.

In philosophy one of the central questions generating countless arguments and counter-arguments and filling entire library shelves with books is called the mind-body question, or the soul-body question. This will be explained in the next section of the book where we get into more detail as to how Satan, the anti-philosopher, has corrupted both philosophy and thought. For now, suffice it to say that the two Jehovahs, while not providing a lot of details, did give the Executive Summary of the solution to the problem in the scriptures quoted above. There is a spiritual component added to the physical brain of man that enables thought. Your author believes, but cannot prove, that this spirit in man is what scientists call the sub-conscious mind. This is just a speculation by your author and if the speculation is proven incorrect at a later time it does not take away from what is clearly and necessarily true. There is a logical structure to reality – the universe. There is also a logical structure to the human mind. There is no contradiction between the two. Any apparent contradiction just means either incorrect or incomplete thinking that will be corrected at a later point in time when more information is available to mankind. The freedom of choice and the ability to think allow for men to be moral. Again, thank you God.

What all of us do with these God-given gifts is up to us and we are each responsible for the choices we make. Each of us has so much freedom and so much time and then, at some point in the future, the freedom is up and the time is up and we will have to answer for our lives. This is why both thinking and choosing are so critical for man. The two Jehovahs gave man the honor of making us in their image and likeness and they gave us the responsibility to have dominion over the earth (Genesis 1:26-30). Now man must live up to the honor. We live up to the honor by being moral. We live up to the honor by using our God-given ability to think. We live up to the honor by cooperating with each other to make the best of our limited time on this earth, instead of hurting and killing each other. We are supposed to exercise dominion over the earth, not our fellow man – as our fellow men are also made in God’s image and likeness. We live up to the honor by realizing that our fellow men have hopes and dreams that are important to them just as we each have hopes and dreams that are important to us. This means that we must have a respect for other people’s lives, liberty, and property. Any breach of such respect leads to retaliation on their part and the next feud, or worse, war.

And war is always anti-life, anti-liberty, and anti-property.

It is nonsense to argue about whether life is better than death. Further, it is nonsense to argue about whether life should somehow be minimally defined as bare existence, or whether man should strive for a flourishing and abundant life. It is clearly the latter. If someone chooses bare existence, that is their choice but they cannot expect that others would follow them. It is nonsense to think that life could flourish in a time of war. War is the anti-thesis of life, depopulates the earth, and reduces man to existence instead of flourishing.

Objective rules for life are then necessary. Even at the non-religious level there are basic axioms or premises for a flourishing life. Even at the non-religious level there is the basis for a rational and objective ethics. At the human level, each of us owns ourselves. We are responsible for our own lives. No one else owns us, or a part of us. And we do not own anyone else, or a part of them. Self-ownership is an axiom for all men, even if it were not based on the gift of God to each of us (which it is). No one could argue otherwise because they would have to have title to themselves in order to be

free to make an argument. And could they assert title to themselves so they could be free to make an argument while denying the same freedom and self-ownership to others? No, because A equals A, in this case, all men are men.

A further axiom for an objective ethics for men is the concept of original appropriation. Original appropriation means that when a man mixes his labor with previously unowned and unused natural resources that the resulting transformation of property gives that man title to what is now his private property. And he is now free to use or dispose of that private property as he sees fit. This is necessary because man needs an exclusive jurisdiction in which to live and he also needs the liberty to be able to obtain and use resources in order to, at a minimum, sustain his life and hopefully to flourish on this earth.

Both of these axioms, self-ownership and original appropriation and the conclusions that follow enable man to realize, if he thinks about it, that he should not encroach on others, or their liberty, or their property. And further, since most contracts involve property for property exchanges of some kind, that he

should do all he has agreed to do, which is to say to honor any contract he enters into. The world would be a completely different place if all men did this. And if all men did this it would even enable men with different religious beliefs to cooperate with each other. In other words, it would cut across religions to respect life, liberty, and property and to allow for cooperation even among men who would not be so inclined otherwise. A further elaboration of this is the subject of a book by your author - mainly on the subject of law, natural law, social cooperation and societal norms. This book is entitled, *Why There Is No Justice: The Corruption Of Law*.

The subject of this section of the book is the importance of thought to man. A rational and objective ethics is possible to man just by considering the concepts of self-ownership and original appropriation. Further, the importance of thinking and acting to sustain one's life is a necessity to man. Thinking and acting is the subject of economics, or praxeology (the logic of action). Within economics each man's subjective valuation of various goods and services determines what he will give up in exchange to receive them. It is each man's personal hierarchy of values that determines how he actually chooses and acts. Your author

will explain this in more detail in an upcoming book on economics. For now, suffice it to say that subjectivity of valuations coming from each individual's personal hierarchy of values is a critical part of how the laws of economics function.

The beautiful thing that the two Jehovahs did, for each individual man, is not only: the honor of making us in their image; of ordering the reality of the universe in a logical way; of giving our physical brains a spiritual component to enable us to think logically; and also that the logical structure of the human mind is not in contradiction to the logical structure of reality. They went far beyond that – much farther. They also gave us the ability to derive a rational and objective set of ethical principles to live by. And beyond that, within the context of these rational and objective ethical principles, they gave us the gift of being able to be ourselves. They gave us the ability to subjectively value various things and they allowed us the freedom and the dignity to be able to work toward achieving and obtaining those things that are of a high value to us.

In other words within the context of being moral, we can be our unique selves without feeling guilty about being different.

What a gift! I can be me. You can be you. And as long as each of us is moral, it is all right.

This section of the book could go on and on, but your author needs to keep it to a reasonable length. There are just a couple of more points your author would like to make pertaining to this section.

Philosophers argue about the silliest things. Another puzzlement to your author is the arguments that have raged for years about how and when it "counts" for an act to be considered moral. Basically three schools of thought have emerged. The first is the deontological school of thought that says something counts as moral only if it is an intrinsically correct act. The second is the consequentialist school of thought that says something is moral only if it produces a good result (the utilitarians would be in this camp). The third is the motivist school of thought that says the act only counts for good if the motive of the doer was good, hence the

name motivist. Over time your author has observed that most dichotomies are false, in this case trichotomies are false, because there is an attempt to ground the truth in only one part of the whole instead of looking at the complete picture. For example, the conflict between the above three schools of thought appears to require only a very little holistic thinking to resolve the matter.

First, the definition of holistic (from the Dictionary supplied on the Apple Macbook computer) is as follows:

“holistic [hō'listik] adjective: chiefly Philosophy characterized by comprehension of the parts of something as intimately interconnected and explicable only by reference to the whole.” Macbook Dictionary

If something is intrinsically right it is the right thing, which of course must be established within the context of the situation. This sort of goes without saying. If something is to get a good result it must be, according to Aristotle's golden mean, not too much and not too little of whichever virtue we are speaking of and it stands to reason, following the same line of thinking, that it must not be too soon and not

be too late, i.e., it must be the right thing at the right time so as to get a good result. And why not have a good motive in doing right, i.e., to be able to say we have the right reason for doing right? If we put all of the above together, into a paraphrased phraseology, we could derive: Do the right thing, at the right time and in the right amount, for the right reason. If we were to do so, then we can expect to get a good result and we can quit arguing about inane things and move on to use our time, talents, and energy to attempt to achieve an abundant and flourishing life. Sometimes philosophers, who are supposed to love wisdom and be wise, think like hillbillies.

One last point regarding thought and man is that because men can think and act and do so, they become the cause of certain effects. Man individually and collectively are a cause. This is unlike the natural sciences where particles move and collide and chemical bonding takes place, etc. Man is a first cause of subsequent events. This requires proper thought from the scientific community in order to scientifically explain how the universe works. There is a need for methodological dualism. There is empirical testing, experimentation and hypothesis, theorems, etc., which is to say the scientific

method, for the natural sciences. And there is the realization that we do not know how the physical, chemical, and physiological affect human thoughts and judgments of value. This ignorance of how human thoughts and judgments of value are formed forces science to split into the natural sciences and the social sciences. Both are or should be scientific, but it is folly to attempt to use the methods of the natural sciences to explain the thoughts of man. It cannot be done. Man chooses. He chooses goals. He chooses means to achieve those goals. And he chooses to be moral, or not, in how he attempts to achieve those goals. In order for man to choose correctly he must think. There is nothing more important to man than thought.

The Corruption Of Philosophy & Thought

It is not possible to list the entire attack upon thought since time immemorial. There have just been too many bizarre theories as to what constitutes correct metaphysics (religion), what constitutes correct epistemology (how knowledge is established), what constitutes correct ethics (a set of values by which man should live), etc. However, we can cover some

of the main problems and what they led to in this section of the book. Your author would categorize all of the corruption of philosophy and thought as being what amounts to this: **It is a rebellion against reason and reality.** The three "R's" used to stand for reading, writing, and arithmetic. Now the three "R's" stand for the rebellion against reason and reality. And since the two Jehovahs are the creators of logic and of the universe and of human consciousness and of objective rational ethical principles, this rebellion against reason and reality amounts to a rebellion against the two Jehovahs and against their most important creation to date – man.

It is quite possible, but not provable, that Satan rebelled against the two Jehovahs when he learned of their plan to make man in their image. Satan hates the two Jehovahs and he hates men made in their image. The most important work that the two Jehovahs are doing is to help mankind develop in character and ability with the goal of ultimately giving man eternal life (1 Corinthians 15). In fact, the Bible is quite clear that mankind is God's most important workmanship.

“For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus to good works, which God has before ordained that we should walk in them.”
Ephesians 2:10, MKJV

Satan has been lying to man and trying to corrupt both his character and his thinking process from the Garden of Eden onward (Genesis 3). Many writers have already said much on the encounter between Satan and man in the Garden of Eden, so your author will forgo comment. This section of the book is more about the corruption of thought through history and its effects.

An early problem came when Plato put forth that what is really real is timeless, perfect, unchanging, and in another dimension. This basically punted reality into a dimension not accessible to man and his senses and his thinking process. There was no proof. How could there be? It was basically false metaphysics – a false religion. The truth is there is a physical reality, with a logical structure, and our minds can perceive it. We can differentiate and identify things and also integrate and abstract concepts. These concepts have content based on things we can identify as belonging to that concept's group,

and we can, through trial and error determine cause and effect. Reality is available to man and his mind. It is not in another dimension, unchanging and timeless. If it were so, which it is not, then reality could therefore never be known.

Another corruption of thought has been something called "the mind-body problem." It is sometimes called "the soul-body problem." In this case the mind is man's consciousness and the body is reality, or the universe. This age-old argument took a turn for the worse when the philosopher Rene Descartes decided he existed because he could think, "I think therefore I am." The problem with this thought is that it, in essence, elevated consciousness over reality. However, in this conflict, while our minds are important in that we use them to perceive reality, reality exists whether one man is alive and conscious or not. Reality is reality. It is up to us to use our minds as best we can to come to understand it. But in any conflict between reality and consciousness, reality has to have the last word.

In addition to elevating consciousness over reality Descartes made another big mistake. Descartes was looking for certain knowledge.

And certain knowledge is a very high standard of knowledge for man to achieve. As soon as one philosopher would put forth his view as to what was certain knowledge a whole group of other philosophers would tear down his "proof" or methods. The quest for certain knowledge led to skepticism and the belief that man cannot come to know anything for certain. But skepticism is disastrous for man in that it makes him question his own mind and thinking processes and it makes man question whether he can ever know the real world. As has been explained man must both think and take action to function in this world. A man has to be able to trust his mind. If he cannot, he is crippled. The quest for certain knowledge ends up leading to skepticism and this cripples man intellectually. To your author a more intelligent approach is to lower the bar for "certain knowledge" and to utilize knowledge that seems to produce good results and knowledge that has been personally observed, or knowledge that has been tested, or also observed by others (endoxa). Perhaps this knowledge could be called working postulates because we have to leave open the possibility that a more accurate postulate can be established at a later time when more information is available. In other words if we are to lower the standard for

knowledge, below “the certain” level, we have to keep in mind that our postulates might be in need of correction and we have to be willing to correct them when better information is available. How high should the bar be set, for something to be established as knowledge, has also been a huge philosophical debate over the years.

It gets worse. Skepticism led to relativism. Relativism is the doctrine that knowledge, truth, and morality exist in relation to culture, society, or historical context and are not absolute. Relativism is extremely dangerous for mankind because it can and has led to the conclusion that since nothing can be known for certain that each man’s opinion on the truth of a matter is as good as any other man’s opinion. Reality might as well, like what Plato did, be in a different dimension or universe because relativism ignores reality. Relativism pretends that reality is not ever-present and ready to deliver a verdict against stupidity in thought and action, but it is. As the saying goes, “we get what we deserve, not what we expect.” This is another way of saying that reality is ready to veto dumb ideas at all times.

It gets worse again. Setting relativism into an age of democracy you end up having people concluding that they can vote on truth. Or, that a public opinion poll and/or statistical analysis are a valid substitute for objective reality. The class in an elementary school can vote that $2 + 2 = 7$, but it does not make it so. Adults in a democracy can vote to spend money they do not wish to pay for in taxes and they can vote that deficits do not matter, but at some point in time reality will come along and help them understand there are objective laws that govern the universe and mankind had better take the time and trouble to learn what they are.

The mind-body problem led to what are the mind guys and the body guys. The problem with the mind guys (various forms of rationalism or idealism) is that they evade reality by going inside their minds and conjuring up what amounts to word games. They want certain knowledge within what they view as the real world of pure ideas. But, what is clear and distinct to one person might not be to another and so big arguments rage about the smallest details. And the fact that since most mind guys do not trust the human senses there is little to adjudicate any dispute, except for argumentation. The word games they come up

with are disconnected, or are not adequately connected to reality. Some of the mind guys actually question whether matter even exists. The end result is a corruption of human thought in that they have attacked the law of identity. Man has to be able to identify and name things in order to be able to think and communicate. As Wittgenstein would correct, a concept implies at least some factual content and connection to reality.

All of the "isms" associated with the mind guys led to a reaction of those wishing to establish reliable knowledge through the use of our human senses - as sensations and perceptions are common to us all. This type of knowledge theory is usually called empiricism. Empiricists use the scientific method to attempt to gain and use knowledge. They are the body guys. However, the body guys have their own set of self-inflicted wounds. For one thing, they look down on any other methods but the scientific method. Further, they have defined the scientific method as being required to be value-free. Of course, their unproven assertion that true science should be value-free is, ironically, an unproven judgment of value. The truth is that science should be free of bias, but not value-free. Science should promote

flourishing life because life is the ultimate value. One has to be alive to value anything. Science should promote life.

Another problem with the body guys is that the perception of facts without adequate categorizing by concepts and values (both required by thought) leads to truth being "what works." This led to pragmatism. The problem with pragmatism, especially in terms of the social sciences is that it could lead to human experimentation and has. In their minds since there are not objective ethical values and since truth is what works the next thing you know you have races of people being exterminated to see if this makes the world a better place. The body guys cling to reality by abandoning their mind and the mind guys do language clarifying word games and arguments and abandon reality. Then they talk past each other like the other side is inferior. Both sides have bought into a false dichotomy where they try to place truth into mainly one place instead of realizing that, as Ayn Rand would say, "Man's knowledge is not acquired by logic apart from experience, or by experience apart from logic, but by application of logic to experience." Perhaps an easier paraphrase would be, "Man's knowledge is not acquired by consciousness separated from

reality, or by reality separated from consciousness, but by application of consciousness to reality." In other words, man cannot get fooled into buying into either the mind guys' arguments, or the body guys' arguments. And there is no need to as the two Jehovahs created both the universe and the mind of man with a logical structure. Man should use his senses AND think about what he perceives and always use his mind to attempt to accurately identify things. And he should also work to ascertain and establish concepts and accurate definitions that correspond to reality. And he must use his mind to also ascertain the laws of cause and effect.

The mind guys have spawned the following "isms" (most of the definitions are either from Wikipedia, or Merriam-Webster, or the Dictionary supplied on the Macbook computer, with some possible rewording or additional comments from your author, and there may be some minor differences of opinion regarding the definitions of the below "isms." Any emphasis mine throughout):

Rationalism – "a theory that reason is in itself a source of knowledge superior to and

independent of sense perceptions." Merriam-Webster

Conventionalism - "the philosophical attitude that fundamental principles of a certain kind are grounded on (explicit or implicit) agreements in society, rather than on external reality." Wikipedia

Constructivism - "Constructivists maintain that scientific knowledge is constructed by scientists and not discovered from the world. Constructivists argue that the concepts of science are mental constructs proposed in order to explain sensory experience." Wikipedia

Subjectivism - "Metaphysical subjectivism is the theory that reality is what we perceive to be real, and that there is no underlying true reality that exists independently of perception." Wikipedia [Your reality might be different than mine.]

Immaterialism / subjective idealism - "... that only minds and mental contents exist. It entails and is generally identified or associated with immaterialism, the doctrine that material things do not exist." Wikipedia

Idealism – “is the group of philosophies, which assert that reality, or reality, as we can know it, is fundamentally mental, mentally constructed, or otherwise immaterial. Epistemologically, idealism manifests as skepticism about the possibility of knowing any mind-independent thing.” Wikipedia

Relativism – “is the concept that points of view have no absolute truth or validity, having only relative, subjective value according to differences in perception and consideration.” Wikipedia. [There are no absolute truths.]

Perspectivism – “is the philosophical view developed by Friedrich Nietzsche that all ideations [concept formations] take place from particular perspectives. ... there are no objective facts, nor any knowledge of a thing-in-itself. ... Rules (i.e., those of philosophy, the scientific method, etc.) are constantly reassessed according to the circumstances of individual perspectives. ‘Truth’ is thus created by integrating different vantage points together.” Wikipedia [Integrating different vantage points together thus creates truth.]

Phenomenology – “is primarily concerned with the systematic reflection on and study of the

structures of consciousness and the phenomena that appear in acts of consciousness. ... To understand phenomenology, one must identify its roots in the philosophy of Immanuel Kant (1724–1804). In his *Critique of Pure Reason*, Kant distinguished between 'phenomena' (objects as interpreted by human sensibility and understanding), and 'noumena' (objects as things-in-themselves, which humans cannot directly experience)." Wikipedia

Nominalism – "the theory that there are no universal essences in reality ... and that only individuals and no abstract entities exist."
Merriam-Webster

Deconstructionism – "focuses on a text as such rather than as an expression of the author's intention, stressing the limitlessness (or impossibility) of interpretation and rejecting the Western philosophical tradition of seeking certainty through reasoning by privileging certain types of information and repressing others." Macbook Dictionary [It is almost: resort to every possible interpretation and look for every possible contradiction or inconsistency. It seems to your author to amount to intellectual nihilism via literary criticism.]

Analytic philosophy [logical atomism] – “A broad philosophical tradition characterized by an emphasis on clarity and argument (often achieved via modern formal logic and analysis of language) and a respect for the natural sciences.” Wikipedia

Ordinary language philosophy – “is a philosophical school that sees traditional philosophical problems as rooted in misunderstandings philosophers develop by distorting or forgetting what words actually mean in everyday use.” Wikipedia

Your author is sure the mind guys would say I missed some, or did not perfectly describe their favorite “ism.” Whatever. Immanuel Kant will be discussed in a little more detail below.

The body guys have spawned the following “isms” (most of the definitions are either from Wikipedia, or Merriam-Webster, or the Dictionary supplied with the Macbook computer, with some possible rewording or additional comments from your author, and there may be some minor differences of opinion regarding the definitions of the below “isms.” Any emphasis mine throughout):

Empiricism – “is a theory of knowledge that asserts that knowledge comes only or primarily from sensory experience. One of several views of epistemology, ... empiricism emphasizes the role of experience and evidence, especially sensory experience. ... Empiricism in the philosophy of science emphasizes evidence, especially as discovered in experiments. It is a fundamental part of the scientific method that all hypotheses and theories must be tested against observations of the natural world rather than resting solely on a priori reasoning, intuition, or revelation.” Wikipedia

Pragmatism – “is a philosophical tradition centered on the linking of practice and theory. It describes a process where theory is extracted from practice and applied back to practice to form what is called intelligent practice. Important positions characteristic of pragmatism include instrumentalism [defined below], radical empiricism [defined below], verificationism [defined below], ... and fallibilism [defined below].” Wikipedia

Radical empiricism – “is a postulate, a statement of fact and a conclusion, says William James in *The Meaning of Truth*. The postulate is

that 'the only things that shall be debatable among philosophers shall be things definable in terms drawn from experience.'" Wikipedia

Verificationism – "is the view that a statement or question is only legitimate if there is some way to determine whether the statement is true or false, or what the answer to the question is." Wikipedia

Fallibilism – "the principle that propositions concerning empirical knowledge can be accepted though they cannot be proved with certainty." Macbook Dictionary [This is the philosophic "ism" that gives the natural scientists their escape clause so they can pretend to be certain while talking down to other people. It is their way out of the seeming dilemma created via the analytic-synthetic dichotomy proposed by Immanuel Kant – more of which is later in this book.]

Positivism – "is a philosophy of science based on the view that information derived from sensory experience, logical and mathematical treatments is the exclusive source of all authoritative knowledge, that there is valid knowledge (truth) only in scientific knowledge. Verified data received from the senses is known

as empirical evidence." ... "Positivism states that the only authentic knowledge is that which allows positive verification and assumes that there is valid knowledge only in scientific knowledge." Wikipedia

Logical positivism – "or logical empiricism are variants of neopositivism that embraced verificationism, a theory of knowledge combining strong empiricism - basing all knowledge on sensory experience - with mathematical logic and linguistics so that scientific statements could be conclusively proved false or true." Wikipedia

Instrumentalism – " ... is the view that a scientific theory is a useful instrument in understanding the world. A concept or theory should be evaluated by how effectively it explains and predicts phenomena, as opposed to how accurately it describes objective reality." [It is a form of pragmatism that basically says if something works we can ignore whether it says anything about reality. It just works so let's use it.] "Instrumentalism avoids the debate between anti-realism and philosophical or scientific realism [defined below]. It may be better characterized as non-realism. Instrumentalism shifts the basis of evaluation

away from whether or not phenomena observed actually exist, and towards an analysis of whether the results and evaluation fit with observed phenomena.” Wikipedia

Scientific realism – “is, at the most general level, the view that the world described by science (perhaps ideal science) is the real world, as it is, independent of what we might take it to be.” Wikipedia

Materialism – “holds that the only thing that exists is matter or energy; that all things are composed of material and all phenomena (including consciousness) are the result of material interactions. In other words, matter is the only substance, and reality is identical with the actually occurring states of energy and matter.” Wikipedia [This is sometimes called scientism. Materialists basically believe that human consciousness will eventually be explainable by reducing biology to chemistry and chemistry to physics – particles in motion cause reactions.]

Naturalism – “the philosophic viewpoint according to which everything arises from natural properties and causes and supernatural

explanations are discounted or excluded.”
Macbook Dictionary

Your author is certain he has neglected some other body “isms,” but the body guys’ point of view should be pretty clear. As a few have observed the body guys are sort of like Attila the Huns, who are mainly action oriented, perceptual, and anti-conceptual. They will try anything to see if it works, even if it ends up hurting people. Attila believes that force, fraud, enslavement and murder are practical. Nietzsche aided in this modern day Attila mentality by postulating that God is dead; there is no objective truth; a man should attempt to be a superman who creates his own values in a will to power, thus rising above the notion of good and evil that limits the herd. Nietzsche must be an Attila’s philosopher hero. Human experimentation, or the building of nuclear weapons, does not particularly trouble Attila. Attila can now do anything he thinks is practical, or necessary, or what he somehow regards as intrinsically right (without regard to the actual context of the situation), or expedient for the moment, without any regard for rational and objective ethical principles, without any regard for those men negatively affected, and without regard for the long-term. What does Attila care

about the long-term? Attila knows that in the long-term he will be dead anyway. If there is a train wreck of a mess for others to have to clean up, that is their problem.

Further, as a few have observed, the mind guys abandon reality to cling to their mind and their feelings and they are the modern day equivalent of the old tribal witch doctors. They feel reality should be different than it is, but emotions and feelings are not a substitute for rational thinking and proper action. And emotions and feelings do not change reality, however much the wisher wishes. They provide the tribal leaders, aka the "Attilas," with rationalizations and philosophic air cover to do what appears necessary to run and ruin the world. After all, if there are no objective ethical values and truth is relative, then there are no natural law checks and balances remaining to act as a brake on anything Attila might choose to do. The results are before us.

The mind-body problem, and efforts to resolve it by concentrating an answer in a non-holistic manner, has been an intellectual disaster for humanity and it has led philosophers on a wild goose chase, writ large, which has shredded philosophy.

There are a couple of other philosophers who have led to a corruption of thought that need to be covered next. One of them is David Hume. And the other is Immanuel Kant.

Hume has an entire litany of the corruption of thought to his credit. He basically cast doubt on or argued against cause and effect. He pointed out that it is not deducible that just because effects follow from causes they always will. It could be different the next time and no one can prove otherwise. In other words nature might not continue to be uniform. This is basically saying that there is not a logical structure to the universe, there are no natural laws, and it is also basically saying that there is a limitation on the logical structure to the human mind in that we are not able to demonstrate how the effect is always specifically linked back to the cause. In essence, Hume attacked both the logical structure of the mind and the logical structure of the universe and his attack leads to skepticism and nihilism, both of which are destructive to man. In addition, his line of thinking led to many arguing against and abandoning natural law. Further, his line of thinking also amounts to an attack on the law of identity. This is because if it is true that nature

might not be regular, or continue in the future as it has in the past, how do we know that any identification is and will continue to be correct?

Hume further argued that reason is not usable in setting goals. Reason is and should be a slave of the passions. We are creatures of our desires, which we use to set our goals. Hume denied theoretical rationality – using reason to establish premises and/or to set goals. Hume conceded that once a goal is set we could use reason to pick the appropriate means to achieve it. This is known as practical rationality, although how a man who argues against the certainty of cause and effect in nature can turn around and advocate practical rationality as a viable method for man to achieve his arbitrarily set goals escapes the limited mind of your author. An additional problem with all of this is it is not true that man cannot use reason to establish goals, for example, to lose weight rather than to keep eating the foods he has a craving for. In this case a man can use his mind to veto his passion for his favorite foods.

Reason does not have to be limited to deductive reasoning. Man can also use inductive reasoning. Inductive reasoning, while it may not be conclusive, can be used to provide

reasonable working premises, or postulates. In so doing, man can be said to be using reason in order to establish premises: whether one uses inductive reason to ascertain a statement of fact, which becomes a working postulate which can be corrected later with better information, if necessary; or men can use endoxa, the reasonable beliefs of wise men, aka the postulates that others have vetted in order to have functional working postulates. All of these premises can be established by using reason. Man can also think, i.e., use reason, to recognize axioms – basic truths subsumed from all truths, e.g., that life is better than death. Axioms are negatively demonstrable premises we can reason from. Any attempt to refute an axiom requires its usage and is therefore self-contradictory and self-refuting. An axiom can be recognized by thinking, which is to say, one's self can recognize a self-evident axiom and it can also be recognized when someone else has pointed it out to me.

Further, a man can choose, via reason, to prefer the long-term as against the short-term. A man's passions would almost certainly preclude this. Man has a mind and he can choose via reason, or his passions. It is up to him. The attempt by Hume to elevate passion

over reason was, intentionally or not, an attack on the human mind and on man himself.

Hume also held that ethics were based on feelings rather than objective abstract moral principles. His argument was something along the lines that because we are not governed by reason alone, but also require the input of passions, reason cannot totally be behind morality. This is nonsense. Hume observed that most who start out by saying that something **is**, then proceed to say we **ought** to do xx because of what **is**. Hume then observed that there is no logical deductive connection between the **is-ought** statements. This is known as Hume's guillotine. There are many problems with all of this. First, there can be rational and objective ethics starting with the axiom that life is better than death. Second, there are requirements for the living to continue living, for example, the need to obtain and use property to stay alive. Third, there is need for freedom to obtain and use property in order to stay alive. Life, liberty, and property are necessary for a man's life on this earth. Since all men are men, these same three things are necessary for other men, too. Ergo, all men need to respect and not violate each other's life, liberty, and property, aka the natural rights of

man. Objective and rational ethical principles are possible, even if some inductive reason to complement deductive reasoning is necessary to establish them. There is nothing better to put in their place. Hume is wrong and his wrongness opens the door to ethical subjectivism and voting on what is right and wrong. Hume is a disaster on ethics.

If all this were not enough, Hume further corrupted thought by what is now known as Hume's fork. Hume's fork basically led to Immanuel Kant's analytic-synthetic dichotomy whereby relations of ideas (the mind) are strictly separated from reality. The relations of ideas are considered analytic. These are statements that are necessary and true by definition, but they say nothing about reality. The world of ideas and words and concepts are true, but not connected to the real world. They are "a priori" or tautologies. The real world is the world of synthetic (a posteriori) postulates that are subject to verification by the natural sciences. But, because as Hume believed the natural order might turn out to be different some day, even this scientific verification could not establish knowledge with 100% certainty. So this left mankind with analytic knowledge that was necessarily true – but said nothing

about reality, or synthetic knowledge that was presumably “verifiable,” but not certain. It severed man’s ability to establish the truth about reality. It was an attack on both the logical structure of the mind of man and on the logical structure of reality. Later Frege would explain that even an analytic truth could provide much information, like when a man sees a full-grown tree having grown up from just a tiny seed. In other words, by working from analytic premises men could learn a lot about an entire field of study, just like seeing that a full-grown tree is a lot different than seeing just a tiny seed and because the seed is so small you are not even sure what kind of plant the seed is from.

Further, there are synthetic a priori axioms, which are basic facts subsumed from all facts (empirical facts) and these synthetic a priori premises provide real knowledge about the real world – irrespective of whether Hume or Kant would place them into the analytic category. Your author will explain this more in an upcoming book on the subject of economics. It is somewhat ironic that Hume, the empiricist, and Kant, the rationalist, would have a “knowledge-divider” so similar to each other as Hume’s fork and Kant’s analytic-synthetic

dichotomy are. But, both still fall into the false dichotomy trap of trying to concentrate truth in only one non-holistic aspect - either in the mind or in the body, aka in either consciousness or reality. And has already been explained the real truth of the matter is that there is no logical contradiction between the logical structure of the human mind and the logical structure of reality. And no amount of clever arguments about mind or body will ever change this.

Hume's writings highlighted the problem of induction versus deduction and to the philosophical question of whether inductive reasoning can lead to knowledge. The problem of inductive reasoning is a problem of whether it can establish the 100% certainty of a matter now and forever. For example, just because the sun has always come up every day in the east in the past, does this mean that the sun will come up tomorrow in the east? And, will the laws of nature continue as they always have, or will they change in the future? Generally the problem with any dichotomy argumentation, in this case induction versus deduction, is that the arguments are argued at the wrong level. Your author has found that by going up one or more levels the apparent problem can usually be resolved. Reasoning is necessary for man on

this earth because man has to think and take action. Deductive methods of reasoning might very well be the most accurate and certain method of establishing knowledge and men do well when resorting to it. But if conclusive deductive reasoning is not possible is it not better to use what reasoning we currently, at this time, have available to us – at least until something better comes along? And if, on a matter at hand, we only have use of inductive reasoning, or we only have use of endoxa, due to some limitation or another, at least we are reasoning and at least we are using the best-vetted knowledge we have available to us. And we can reason with the awareness that we might be corrected later if it turns out that later we have better and more reliable information. We can stand corrected then. Until then, we can reason deductively if possible, inductively, if necessary, and do the best we can to establish knowledge, identify things, learn cause and effect, establish goals, choose means to achieve those goals, correct any errors we encounter along the way, and to always work within the rational and objective ethics of not violating other's life, liberty, or property, and to honor any voluntary and known intentional agreements we have entered into along the way. What else can men do? We are not God

and we have to live on this earth. And to do that we need our minds; attacks on our minds by Hume and Kant and others be condemned.

Kant further led to a pollution of thought by stating he did not believe that man could ever know reality because man's consciousness filters reality through the lens that is man's mind. Wow. So no man can know reality because he actually uses his mind in the attempt to ascertain it. Thanks for that one, Kant. What else can man use, but his mind, in order to ascertain and establish the facts pertaining to the logical structure of reality? Unintentionally or not, this was also an attack on the mind of man.

All of the above "isms" and philosophical reasoning has led to what? In addition to skepticism and relativism, your author would contend they led to nihilism, existentialism, and post-modernism, which are defined below. It has led from who cares about truth, to who cares at all?

Nihilism – "... from the Latin nihil, nothing, is the philosophical doctrine suggesting the negation of one or more putatively meaningful aspects of life. Most commonly, nihilism is presented in

the form of existential nihilism, **which argues that life is without objective meaning, purpose, or intrinsic value.** Moral nihilists assert that morality does not inherently exist, and that **any established moral values are abstractly contrived.**" Wikipedia [Nihilism is the very essence of anti-life, anti-man, and anti-God.]

Existentialism – “a chiefly 20th Century philosophical movement embracing diverse doctrines but centering on analysis of individual existence in an unfathomable universe and the plight of the individual who must assume ultimate responsibility for acts of free will without any certain knowledge of what is right and wrong or good or bad.” Merriam-Webster [Martin Heidegger, in his attempt to discover the nature of being, concluded that the important thing is that each of us has a death that is uniquely our own, “we are each a being unto death.” Well done, Satan and his friends. If all of this is not an accurate description of what happens to the mind of man when his thinking has been virtually completely corrupted, I don’t know what is.]

Postmodernism – “It frequently serves as an ambiguous overarching term for skeptical

interpretations of culture, literature, art, philosophy, economics, architecture, fiction, and literary criticism. Because postmodernism is a reactionary stereotype, it is often used pejoratively to describe writers, artists, or critics who give the impression they believe in no absolute truth or objective reality.” Wikipedia [That is because they do not believe in absolute truth, or objective reality.]

Philosophy has been corrupted to the point that anything smacking of metaphysics, or religion has been expelled from philosophy. Epistemology can no longer establish truth. Facts are to be established by the natural scientists and these facts are subject to change. The best that can be done is for questions to be clearly asked. Ethics is relative and subject to change, including by majority vote. Philosophers question philosophy itself! It makes your author wonder how any other profession could stay in business, as it were, if when someone needing a bridge came to a bridge-builder and the bridge-builder started saying things like, “How do you know you exist? How do you know there is really a river needing crossing? We can build a bridge, but we are not sure if the bridge will really exist, or just be in our minds. We don’t know how long the bridge

will last or what it will be made of. The laws of nature that allow us to build a bridge that will not fall down might change in the future and the bridge might fall down, etc.” What other profession could even stay in business thinking and speaking and acting like that? As Ayn Rand would say, “modern intellectuals tolerate anything but certainty and approve of anything, except values.” The study of the field of philosophy was a real eye-opener for your author. Wow!

The two Jehovahs knew man would mess up his thinking process if they did not choose to have a relationship with them and if they did not choose to use their God-given minds.

“Stop fooling yourselves. If you think you are wise by this world’s standards, you will have to become a fool so you can become wise by God’s standards. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness to God. As the Scriptures say, “God catches those who think they are wise in their own cleverness.” And again, “The Lord knows the thoughts of the wise, that they are worthless.”” 1 Corinthians 3:18-20, NLT

The philosophy profession, in its current state, has become substantially worthless. And

we have not even discussed the "Philosophy Of History" yet, which is the subject of the next section of the book. The false metaphysics, known as the Philosophy Of History, is a further trek down the wrong road as concerns mankind's thinking.

The Philosophy Of History & Plato

The Philosophy of History does not mean the love and pursuit of wisdom when it comes to studying history. It is a system of speculation about a hidden force that propels mankind toward some end state. No proof is offered as to how this end state will arrive. Each stage of human history is closer to the desired prophesied end state and is a necessary step toward the goal. Each later stage of history is therefore better than the stage preceding it because it is one step closer to the end state. There is always a philosopher, a spokesman, e.g., Hegel, or Marx, or some religious leader, who describes a metaphysical system whereby a powerful force will inevitably lead us all toward the necessary end state. Specific details about how the force works, what the intermediate steps are along the way, cause and effect, etc., are all usually quite sparse, or missing altogether. As a grammar note, your author

has chosen to capitalize the first letter of each word of Philosophy Of History to call out the fact that he is writing of a metaphysical system referred to by this phraseology. The philosopher who is the "knower" of what must come to be has an otherworld, intuitive connection to the unknown reality and he is the voice that must be listened to and obeyed. The Philosophy Of History is metaphysical because it refers to some hidden force that is, quite literally, outside of physics, or verification, i.e., it is metaphysics. Of course, the Philosophy Of History always turns out to be false, e.g., Hegel believing there are only seven planets and that is the necessary and correct number of how many planets there had to be and Hegel believing history was fulfilled with him, etc. Whatever Philosophy Of History is being put forth, as some inevitable system, is always, pure and simple, a metaphysical system. And it has always been false. In other words, it is false religion with a failed false prophet philosopher.

It would be hard to make up something as silly as all of the above, but whole civilizations have adopted various forms of Philosophy Of History - and then were destroyed because of it. And the lives of the men in those civilizations

were destroyed as well. That is why it is so dangerous.

As Ludwig von Mises more than adequately stated in his book, *Theory And History*: "any philosophy of history must demonstrate the mechanism by means of which the supreme agency that directs the course of all human affairs induces individuals to walk in precisely the ways which are bound to lead mankind toward the goal set. In Marx's system the doctrine of the class struggle is designed to answer this question."

Unfortunately for Marx, he never could prove class conflict and, in fact, his ideology came from the bourgeois class, not the proletariat. His theory of value (labor) was intellectually demolished and shown to be 100% wrong. The iron law of wages was demolished intellectually and also refuted by empirical evidence. The idea that the tools of production (material productive forces) create ideas rather than a man with an idea creates a machine is laughable and a reversal of cause and effect. The impossibility of economic calculation under socialism shows it could never work as an economic system. His dialectical materialism was basically a secularization of Hegel's brand

of Philosophy Of History. Everything substantive about Marx and his system have been intellectually demolished and the empirical evidence also confirms that it is a completely failed system. But people still want to believe in it. They want to believe that it is possible to rebel against reason and reality. Many people want socialism for emotional reasons and put their heads in the sand so as to exclude any logic and facts to the contrary. It is sad.

Marx called his system scientific, but everything about it was one more version of a Philosophy Of History. He called his system materialistic because at the time of his writing the world had gone over to empiricism. Idealism, the mind guys, was losing out scientifically to an empirical materialism, the body guys. But his system was not scientific. It was metaphysical with Marx as the false prophet with the intuitive inner voice. His system was secular, but not materialistic, and his system had nothing to do with the mind-body problem. Your author will have more to say on Marx in his upcoming book on economics. For now, Marx was the latest false prophet of another failed Philosophy Of History, another false metaphysical system.

One of the central problems of any Philosophy Of History is that it denies reality; in particular it denies human consciousness and choice. Human beings think and take action based on ideas. A new and better idea can come forward at any time. In any period of history different ideas compete and different men react differently to the various ideas offered. Human choice as a result of an idea can change history and human choice is not pre-determined. Human, angelic, and divine choices interact to cause things to happen. As these things happen time unfolds. Time is linear. Men are not the product of an era in the sense that all mankind's thinking is pre-determined. Different men in the same era react in different ways, not necessarily the same way, to the same idea. And the same man earlier in life might reject an idea that he adopts later in life. Any Philosophy Of History denies choice - which is to say it ignores human consciousness - which is to say it ignores reality.

Any correct research pertaining to history considers a man, or group of men, and what specifically they were attempting to accomplish. Human choice is a critical component of the

correct study of history. As Dr. Ludwig von Mises would correctly observe:

“Philosophy of history looks upon mankind's history from a different point of view. It assumes that God or nature or some other superhuman entity providentially directs the course of events toward a definite goal different from the ends which acting men are aiming at. ... The historical process has a definite purpose set by Providence without any regard to the human will. It is a progress toward a preordained end. The task of the philosophy of history is to judge every phase of history from the point of view of this purpose.”

So from the point of view of a Philosophy Of History, progress means advancing toward the ultimate goal. Your author cannot describe this any better than Mises and so he will quote Mises further below, and at length, from his *Theory And History* [any emphasis mine throughout]:

“Every variety of the philosophy of history must answer two questions. First: What are the final end aimed at and the route by which it is to be reached? Second: By what means are people induced or forced to pursue this course?”

Only if both questions are fully answered is the system complete.”

“In answering the first question the philosopher refers to intuition. In order to corroborate his surmise, he may quote the opinions of older authors, that is, the intuitive speculations of other people. The ultimate source of the philosopher's knowledge is invariably a divination of the intentions of Providence, hitherto hidden to the non-initiated and revealed to the philosopher by dint of his intuitive power. To objections raised about the correctness of his guess the philosopher can only reply: An inner voice tells me that I am right and you are wrong.”

“Most philosophies of history not only indicate the final end of historical evolution but also disclose the way mankind is bound to wander in order to reach the goal. They enumerate and describe successive states or stages, intermediary stations on the way from the early beginnings to the final end. The systems of Hegel, Comte, and Marx belong to this class. Others ascribe to certain nations or races a definite mission entrusted to them by the plans of Providence. Such are the role of

the Germans in the system of Fichte and the role of the Nordics and the Aryans in the constructions of modern racists.”

“With regard to the answer given to the second question, two classes of philosophies of history are to be distinguished.

The first group contends that Providence elects some mortal men as special instruments for the execution of its plan. In the charismatic leader superhuman powers are vested. He is the plenipotentiary of Providence whose office it is to guide the ignorant populace the right way. He may be a hereditary king, or a commoner who has spontaneously seized power and whom the blind and wicked rabble in their envy and hatred call a usurper. For the charismatic leader but one thing matters: the faithful performance of his mission no matter what the means he may be forced to resort to. He is above all laws and moral precepts. What he does is always right, and what his opponents do is always wrong. Such was the doctrine of Lenin, who in this point deviated from the doctrine of Marx.”

“It is obvious that the philosopher does not attribute the office of charismatic leadership to

every man who claims that he has been called. He distinguishes between the legitimate leader and the fiendish impostor, between the God-sent prophet and the hell-born tempter. He calls only those heroes and seers legitimate leaders who make people walk toward the goal set by Providence. As the philosophies disagree with regard to this goal, so they disagree with regard to the distinction between the legitimate leader and the devil incarnate. They disagree in their judgments about Caesar and Brutus, Innocent III and Frederick II, Charles I and Cromwell, the Bourbons and the Napoleons.

But their dissent goes even further. There are rivalries between various candidates for the supreme office, which are caused only by personal ambition. No ideological convictions separated Caesar and Pompey, the house of Lancaster and that of York, Trotsky and Stalin. Their antagonism was due to the fact that they aimed at the same office, which of course only one man could get. Here the philosopher must choose among various pretenders. Having arrogated to himself the power to pronounce judgment in the name of Providence, the philosopher blesses one of the pretenders and condemns his rivals."

"The second group suggested another solution of the problem. As they see it, Providence resorted to a cunning device. It implanted in every man's mind certain impulses the operation of which must necessarily result in the realization of its own plan. The individual thinks that he goes his own way and strives after his own ends. But unwittingly he contributes his share to the realization of the end Providence wants to attain. Such was the method of Kant. It was restated by Hegel and later adopted by many Hegelians, among them by Marx. It was Hegel who coined the phrase 'cunning of reason.'"

"There is no use arguing with doctrines derived from intuition. Every system of the philosophy of history is an arbitrary guess, which can neither be proved nor disproved. There is no rational means available for either endorsing or rejecting a doctrine suggested by an inner voice."

"... However Hegel, Comte, and Marx may disagree with [the prophet] Daniel and with one another, they all accept this notion, which is an essential element in every philosophy of history. They announce either that the final stage has already been reached (Hegel), or that mankind

is just entering it (Comte), or that its coming is to be expected every day (Marx).”

“The purpose of Marx's philosophy of history was to silence the critical voices of the economists by pointing out that socialism was the next and final stage of the historical process and therefore a higher and better stage than the preceding stages; that it was even the final state of human perfection, the ultimate goal of human history. But this conclusion was a non sequitur in the frame of a godless philosophy of history. The idea of an irresistible trend toward salvation and the establishment of a perfect state of everlasting bliss is an eminently theological idea. In the frame of a system of atheism it is a mere arbitrary guess, deprived of any sense. There is no theology without God. An atheistic system of philosophy of history must not base its optimism upon confidence in the infinite goodness of God Almighty.”

In any Philosophy Of History there is a fatalistic determinism, which means that each stage of history is going to happen no matter how hard men try and avoid it. Continuing with Mises:

“In depicting the history of the future the philosopher of history as a rule restricts himself to describing big scale events and the final outcome of the historical process. He thinks that this limitation distinguishes his guesswork from the augury of common soothsayers who dwell upon details and unimportant little things. Such minor events are in his view contingent and unpredictable. He does not bother about them. His attention is exclusively directed toward the great destiny of the whole, not to the trifle which, as he thinks, does not matter.”

Any Philosophy Of History ignores that man can choose and change the future in so doing. Any Philosophy Of History is necessarily metaphysics and all have been shown to be false. Mises sums it all up in the below paragraph:

“One of the fundamental conditions of man's existence and action is the fact that he does not know what will happen in the future. The exponent of a philosophy of history, arrogating to himself the omniscience of God, claims that an inner voice has revealed to him knowledge of things to come.”

Your author believes that Plato and his view of metaphysics and politics and knowledge were forerunners of various Philosophies Of History. Plato basically believed that the real world was the world of ideas or forms. This was the static world of perfection. The physical world was more the world of appearance than of reality. Plato speculated there was a Demiurge who lived on the border of the two worlds and attempted to impose the perfect forms on the chaotic material world. To your author this sounds a lot like Satan wanting to re-institute order after man was created, which creation disrupted how Satan thought the universe should be. Plato also thought that the soul, after the end of bodily existence, could go upward to the eternal and perfect world of ideas and forms.

Regarding politics Plato was an authoritarian who thought that the State should be divided into three parts, as was, he assumed, the human soul. The first part was the rational element, like the mind of man and it would consist of rulers who were philosophers, aka the wise. These were the aristocracy, from the Greek words *ariston* and *kratos*, together which essentially meant, "ruled by the best" – obviously according to reason. The second part

was the spirited element, which was the part that supposed to be courageous, like the military. The third part was the appetitive element, which was the part that had appetites for the more basic things like food and sex, aka the masses. This part would be the bulk of society and they would work to support the intellectual aristocracy and the military. In other words a totalitarian state ruled by an intelligentsia that would control the appetites of the masses, via reason, and use the military to enforce their rulings. And Plato encouraged the philosopher rulers, if necessary, to tell a "noble lie" in order to control the masses. Does any of this sound familiar?

Later Platonists thought that the perfect world of forms should be an active force and so they speculated that the world of forms was now an active source of power and reality. A third century philosopher, the Egyptian Plotinus, thought man could change his nature by renouncing interest in the physical world and he should be more concerned with the ideal world. One should concentrate on the idea of ideas, "the one," and then a mystical union could take place between oneself and the one. This would overcome the alienation and degradation between the natural world, the lower physical

world, and the higher and real world of “the one.” Plotinus had three stages of history: the original unity with God, the human history stage of separation from God (“the one”) and degradation, and the final re-absorption of all human beings being merged back into “the one” and history then ending.

Murray Rothbard, in his excellent multi-volume history of economic thought, explains Plotinus and his effect on later philosophers, particularly Hegel and Marx. Volume 2 of his history of economic thought is entitled, *Classical Economics*, which I will quote from extensively below [emphasis mine throughout]:

“It all started with the third century philosopher Plotinus, a Platonist philosopher and his followers, and with a theological discipline seemingly remote from political and economic affairs: **creatology**, the 'science' of the First Days.”

“The critical question of creatology is: why did God create the universe? The answer of orthodox Augustinian Christianity, and hence the answer of Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists alike, is that God, a perfect being,

created the universe out of benevolence and love for His creatures. Period. And this seems to be the only politically safe answer as well. The answer given by heretics and mystics from early Christians on, however, is quite different: God created the universe not out of perfection and love, but out of felt need and imperfection. In short, God created the universe out of felt uneasiness, loneliness, or whatever. In the beginning, before the creation of the universe, God and man (the collective organic species, of course, not any particular individual), were united in one, so to speak, cosmic blob. How we can even speak of 'unity' between man and God before man was even created is a conundrum that will have to be cleared up by someone more schooled in the divine mysteries than the present author. At any rate, history then becomes a process, indeed a pre-ordained Process [the beginning of the Philosophy Of Histories to come later], by which God develops His potential, and man the collective species develops its (or his?) potential. But even as this development takes place, and both God and man develop and render themselves more perfect in and through history, offsetting this 'good' development a terrible and tragic thing has also taken place: man has been separated, cut off, 'alienated' from God, as well as from

other men, or from nature. Hence the pervasive concept of **alienation**. Alienation is cosmic, irremediable, and metaphysical, inherent in the very process of creation, or rather, irremediable until the great day inevitably arrives: when man and God, having both fully developed themselves, finish the process and history itself by re-merging, by uniting once again in the merger of these two great cosmic blobs into one."

"Note, first, how this great historical process comes about. It is the inevitable, pre-ordained 'dialectical' process of history. There are, as usual, three stages. Stage one is the original phase: man and God are in happy and harmonious unity (a unity of pre-creation?) but things, particularly with the human race, are rather undeveloped. Then, the magic dialectic does its work, stage two occurs, and God creates man and the universe, both God and man developing their potentials, with history a record and a process of such development. But creation, as in most dialectics, proves to be a two-edged sword, for man suffers from his cosmic separation and alienation from God. For Plotinus, for example, the Good is unity, or The One, whereas Evil is identified as any sort of diversity or multiplicity. In mankind, evil

stems from self-centeredness of individual souls, 'deserter[s] from the All'."

"But then, finally, at long last, the development process will be completed, and stage two develops its own Aufhebung, its own 'lifting up', its own transcendence into its opposite or negation: the reunion of God and man into a glorious unity, an 'ecstasy of union', and end to alienation. In this stage three, the blobs are reunited on a far higher level than in stage one. History is over. And they shall all live (?) happily ever after."

"But note the enormous difference between this dialectic of creatology and eschatology, and that of the orthodox Christian scenario. In the first place, the alienation, the tragedy of man in the dialectical saga from Plotinus to Hegel, is metaphysical, inescapable from the act of creation itself. Whereas the estrangement of man from God in the Judeo-Christian saga is not metaphysical but only moral. To orthodox Christians, creation was purely good, and not deeply tainted with evil; trouble came only with Adam's Fall, a moral failure not a metaphysical one. Then, in the orthodox Christian view, through the Incarnation of Jesus, God provided a route by which this alienation could be

eliminated, and the individual could achieve salvation. But note again: Christianity is a deeply individualistic creed, since each individual's salvation is what matters. Salvation or the lack of it will be attained by each individual, each individual's fate is the central concern, not the fate of the alleged collective blob or organism, man with a capital M. ..."

"But in this allegedly optimistic mystical view [Rothbard speaks of creatology] (nowadays called 'process theology'), the only salvation, the only happy ending is that of the collective organism, the species, with each individual member of that organism being brusquely annihilated along the way."

All the above and below have profound consequences for mankind as we shall see. Continuing with Rothbard below:

"This dialectical theology, in particular its creatology, began in full flower with the Plotinus-influenced ninth century Christian mystic John Scotus Erigena (c. 815 - c. 877) an Irish-Scottish philosopher located in France, and continued through a heretical underground of Christian mystics, in particular such as the fourteenth century German, Meister Johannes

Eckhart (about 1260-1327). The pantheistic outlook of the mystics was similar to the call of the Buddhist-theosophist-socialist Mrs. Annie Besant: as Chesterton perceptively and wittily noted, not to love our neighbour but to be our neighbour. Pantheist mystics call upon each individual to 'unite' with God, the One, by annihilating his individual, separated, and therefore alienated self. While the means of various mystics may differ ... whether through a process of history or through an inevitable Armageddon, the goal remains the same: **obliteration of the individual** through 'reunion' with God, the One, and the ending of cosmic 'alienation', at least on the level of each individual."

"Particularly influential for G.W.F. Hegel and other thinkers in this tradition was the early seventeenth century German cobbler and mystic Jacob Boehme (1575-1624), who added to this heady pantheistic brew the alleged mechanism, the force that drives this dialectic through its inevitable course in history. How, Boehme asked, did the world of pre-creation transcend itself into creation? Before creation, he answered, there was a primal source, an eternal unity, an undifferentiated, indistinct, literal Nothing (Ungrund). (It was, by the way,

typical of Hegel and his Idealist followers to think that they add grandeur and explanation to a lofty but unintelligible concept by capitalizing it.) Oddly enough, to Boehme, this No-thing possessed within itself an inner striving, a *nisus*, a drive for self-realization. It is this drive which creates a transcending and opposing force, the will, which creates the universe, transforming the Nothing into Something."

So the Nothing had an urge to create itself. This again, sounds like Satan pretending he could or did somehow create himself so he would not be beholden to the two Jehovahs for their gift to him of his life. Continuing with Rothbard:

"The key step in secularizing dialectic theology, and thus in paving the way for Marxism, was taken by the lion of German philosophy, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831)."

"In the spirit of the Romantic movement in Germany, Hegel pursued the goal of unifying man and God by virtually identifying God as man, and thereby submerging the former into the latter."

Your author next quotes Rothbard who quoted Professor Robert C. Tucker re Hegel (single quote marks) as follows: "Hegelianism was a 'philosophic religion of self in the form of a theory of history. The religion is founded on an identification of the self with God.' It should not be necessary to add at this point that 'the self' here is not the individual, but the collective organic species 'self'."

Hegel objected to Christianity for separating man from God except for Jesus and Hegel attempted to resolve this problem pointing out that the achievement of Jesus was to become God. The main idea of Hegelianism, per Professor Robert C. Tucker, is that: "... there is no absolute difference between human nature and the divine. They are not two inseparable things with an impassible gulf between them. The absolute self in man, the homo noumenon, is not mere godlike, ... it is God. Consequently, in so far as man strives to become 'like God', he is simply striving to be his own real self. And in deifying himself, he is simply recognizing his own true nature." Back to Rothbard:

"If man is really God, what then is history? Why does man, or rather, do men, change and develop? Because the man-God is not perfect,

or at least he does not begin in a perfect state. Man-God begins his life in history totally unconscious of his divine status. History, then, for Hegel, is a process by which the man-God increases his knowledge, until he finally reaches the state of absolute knowledge, that is, the full knowledge and realization that he is God. In that case, man-God finally realizes his potential of an infinite being without bounds, possessed of absolute knowledge."

"Why then did man-God, also termed by Hegel the 'world-self' (Weltgeist) or 'world-spirit', create the universe? Not, as in the Christian account, from overflowing love and benevolence, but out of a felt need to become conscious of itself as a world-self. This process of growing consciousness is achieved through creative activity by which the world-self externalized itself. This externalization occurs first by creating nature or the original world, but second - and here of course is a significant addition to other theologies - there is a continuing self-externalization through human history. The most important is this second process, for by this means man, the collective organism, expands his building of civilization, his creative externalizing, and hence his increasing knowledge of his own divinity, and

therefore of the world as his own self-actualization. This latter process: of knowing ever more fully that the world is really man's self, is the process which Hegel terms the gradual putting to an end of man's 'self-alienation', which of course for him was also the alienation of man from God. To Hegel, in short, man perceives the world as hostile because it is not himself, because it is alien. All these conflicts are resolved when he realizes at long last that the world really is himself. This process of realization is Hegel's *Aufhebung*, by which the world becomes de-alienated and assimilated to man's self."

"But why, one might ask, is Hegel's man so odd, so neurotic, that he regards every thing that is not himself as alien and hostile? The answer is crucial to the Hegelian mystique. It is because Hegel, or Hegel's man, cannot stand the idea of himself not being God, and therefore not being of infinite space and without limits. Seeing any other being, or any other object, exist, would mean that he himself is not infinite or divine. In short, Hegel's philosophy is severe and cosmic solipsistic megalomania on a grand and massive scale. Professor Tucker develops the case with characteristic acuity:

'For Hegel alienation is finitude, and finitude in turn is bondage. The experience of self-estrangement in the presence of an apparent objective world is an experience of enslavement... Spirit (or the world-self), when confronted with an object or 'other', is ipso facto aware of itself as merely finite being, as embracing only so much and no more of reality, as extending only so far and no farther. The object is, therefore, a 'limit'. (Grenze.) And a limit, since it contradicts spirit's notion of itself as absolute being, i.e., being-without-limit, is necessarily apprehended as a 'barrier' or 'fetter'. (Schranke.) It is a barrier to spirit's awareness of itself as that which it conceives itself truly to be - the whole of reality. In its confrontation with an apparent object, spirit feels imprisoned in limitation. It experiences what Hegel calls the 'sorrow of finitude'.'

'The transcendence of the object through knowing is spirit's way of rebelling against finitude and making the break for freedom. In Hegel's quite unique conception of it, freedom means the consciousness of self as unbounded: it is the absence of a limiting object or non-self... This consciousness of 'being alone with self' ... is precisely what Hegel means by the consciousness of freedom... Accordingly, the

growth of spirit's self-knowledge in history is alternatively describable as a progress of the consciousness of freedom.”

“Typically, determinist schema leave convenient implicit escape-hatches for their creators and advocates, who are somehow able to rise above the iron determinism that afflicts the rest of us. Hegel was no different, except that his escape-hatches were all too explicit. While God and the absolute refer to man as collective organism rather than to its puny and negligible individual members, every once in a while great individuals arise, 'world-historical' men, who are able to embody attributes of the absolute more than others, and act as significant agents in the next big historical Aufhebung - the next great thrust into the man-God or world-soul's advance in its 'self-knowledge'. ...”

“Hegel was enthusiastic about Napoleon because of his world-historical function of bringing the strong state to Germany and the rest of Europe. Just as Hegel's fundamental eschatology and dialectic prefigured Marxism, so did his more directly political philosophy of history. Thus, following the Romantic

writer Friedrich Schiller, Hegel, in an essay in 1795, claimed that the equivalent of early or primitive communism was ancient Greece. Schiller and Hegel lauded Greece for the alleged homogeneity, unity and 'harmony' of its polis, which both authors gravely misconceived as being free of all division of labour. The consequent Aufhebung disrupted this wonderful unity and fragmented man, but - the good side of the new historical stage - it did lead to the growth of commerce, living standards, and individualism. For Hegel, moreover, the coming stage, heralded by Hegel's philosophy, would bring about a reintegration of man and the state."

Hegel was disillusioned by the failures of the French Revolution and turned, politically-speaking, toward state absolutism. Continuing with Rothbard:

"In particular, Hegel was greatly influenced by the Scottish statist, Sir James Steuart, a Jacobite exile in Germany for a large part of his life, whose Inquiry into the Principles of Political Economy (1767) had been greatly influenced by the ultra-statist German eighteenth century mercantilists, the cameralists. Hegel read the German translation of Steuart's Principles which

had been published from 1769-72), from 1797 to 1799, and took extensive notes. Hegel was influenced in particular by two aspects of Stuart's outlook. One held that history proceeded in stages, deterministically 'evolving' from one stage (nomadic, agricultural, exchange, etc.) to the next. The other influential theme was that massive state intervention and control were necessary to maintain an exchange economy. It comes as no surprise that Hegel's main disillusion in the French Revolution came from its individualism and lack of unity under the state. Again foreshadowing Marx, it became particularly important for man (the collective organism) to surmount unconscious blind fate, and 'consciously' to take control of 'his' fate via the state. And so Hegel was a great admirer not only of Napoleon the mighty world-conqueror, but also Napoleon the detailed regulator of the French economy."

"Hegel made quite evident that what the new, developing strong state really needed was a comprehensive philosophy, contributed by a Great Philosopher to give its mighty rule coherence and legitimacy. ...

We need make only one guess as to what that philosophy, or who that Great Philosopher, was supposed to be. And then, armed with Hegelian philosophy and Hegel himself as its fountainhead and great leader, [Rothbard quotes Professor Raymond Plant] 'this alien aspect of the progressive modern state would disappear and would be seen not as an imposition but a development of self-consciousness. By regulating and codifying many aspects of social practice, it gives to the modern world a rationality and a predictability which it would not otherwise possess ... ''.

“Armed with such a philosophy and with such a philosopher, the modern state would take its divinely appointed stand at the height of history and civilization, as God on earth. Thus [Rothbard quotes Raymond Plant repeatedly below via single quote marks, emphasis mine]: 'The modern State, proving the reality of political community, when comprehended philosophically, could therefore be seen as the highest articulation of Spirit, or God in the contemporary world'. The state, then, is 'a supreme manifestation of the activity of God in the world', and, 'the State stands above all; it is Spirit which knows itself as the universal essence and reality'; and, 'The State is the

reality of the kingdom of heaven'. And finally:
'The State is God's Will.'"

"Of the various forms of state, monarchy is best, since it permits 'all' subjects to be 'free' (in the Hegelian sense) by submerging their being into the divine substance, which is the authoritarian, monarchical state. The people are only 'free' when they are insignificant particles of this unitary divine substance."

Hegel was the philosopher who really made state power divine. Quoting Rothbard, who also quoted Karl Popper (single quotation marks) in the section below [emphasis mine throughout]:

"As Karl Popper puts it: 'Hegel was appointed to meet this demand, and he did so by reviving the ideas of the first great enemies of the open society [especially Heraclitus and Plato] ... Hegel rediscovered the Platonic Ideas which lie behind the perennial revolt against freedom and reason. Hegelianism is the renaissance of tribalism... [Hegel] is the 'missing link', as it were, between Plato and the modern forms of totalitarianism. Most of the modern totalitarians, ...know of their indebtedness to Hegel, and all of them have been brought up in the close atmosphere of

Hegelianism. They have been taught to worship the state, history, and the nation.”

“On Hegel's worship of the state, Popper cites chilling and revealing passages: ‘**The State is the Divine Idea as it exists on earth**... We must therefore **worship the State** as the manifestation of the Divine on earth... The State is the march of God through the world... **The State must be comprehended as an organism**... To the complete State belongs, essentially, consciousness and thought. The State knows what it wills ... **The State... exists for its own sake**... The State is the actually existing, realized moral life.”

“All this rant is well characterized by Popper as **'bombastic and hysterical Platonism.'**”

Your author quoted extensively from Mises as he does a great job of explaining the Philosophy Of History in a way it is easy to grasp. Your author quoted Rothbard regarding Plotinus, creatology, and Hegel because he, too, did a great job of explaining creatology and Hegel and their effects on the thinking of men. The truly sad part of all of these false religions is that they led to the place where, via Hegel, the State was enshrined as god on earth.

Further, the State was made to be alive – in other words to be organic. Further, individual men were made out to be insignificant particles of a “collective man.”

If one wants to understand how it could be, particularly from an American point of view, that the United States went from a nation of individuals with natural rights to a nation with a large overwhelming organic State you have to understand that there are many men on earth who subscribe to Plato, Plotinus, creatology, Hegel, and Marx. These men think it is necessary to sacrifice individual men, insignificant particles to them, to fuel their version of an Organic State. After all, if the State is an Organic State, it must eat to stay alive. And what else would an Organic State eat, but people - its own citizens. The Organic State, instead of safeguarding a man's life eats him as fuel for a “necessary” fire. The Organic State instead of safeguarding a man's liberty regulates and organizes his every activity into a slavery sustaining the needs of the State. The Organic State instead of safeguarding a man's property thinks nothing of taking a man's property and converting it, too, into fuel for the Organic State fire. Why have our natural rights of life, liberty, and property been pre-empted,

disrupted, and cancelled? Why have our natural rights been violated by the Organic State? Because the Organic State needs to eat men in order to stay alive. All of this is possible because too many men subscribe, wittingly or unwittingly, to some form of creatology, or some form of Platonic metaphysics, as amplified by Plotinus, Hegel, Marx, and others. Men are literally being killed because of bad philosophy and the corruption of thought. The two Jehovahs warned of this many years ago:

“Beware lest anyone rob you through philosophy and vain deceit, according to the tradition of men, according to the elements of the world, and not according to Christ.”
Colossians 2:8, MKJV

This section of the book is very long and your author apologizes for its length, but it was not possible to explain how we have come to the point of an Organic State without knowing what the Philosophy Of History is, without knowing something of Plato’s metaphysics and its effects, and without knowing something about creatology and its effects. All of this led from Plato, to Plotinus, to Hegel, and to Marx. Rothbard quoted some of Marx’s poetry, (single quote marks), in his *Classical Economics*, which

was volume 2 of his history of economic thought. The quotes are telling indeed and are reproduced below:

“Going first to the University of Bonn and then off to the prestigious new University of Berlin to study law, Marx soon converted to militant atheism, shifted his major to philosophy, and joined a Doktorklub of young (or Left) Hegelians, of which he soon became a leader and general secretary.

The shift to atheism quickly gave Marx's demon of ambition full rein. Particularly revelatory of Marx's adult as well as youthful character are volumes of poems, most of them lost until a few were recovered in recent years. Historians, when they discuss these poems, tend to dismiss them as inchoate romantic yearnings, but they are too congruent with the adult Marx's social and revolutionary doctrines to be casually dismissed. Surely, here seems to be a case where a unified (early plus late) Marx is vividly revealed. Thus in his poem 'Feelings', dedicated to his childhood sweetheart and later wife Jenny von Westphalen, Marx expressed both his megalomania and his enormous thirst for destruction:

'Heaven I would comprehend
I would draw the world to me;
Living, hating, I intend
That my star shine brilliantly ...'

And

'...Worlds I would destroy forever,
Since I can create no world;
Since my call they notice never...'

Here is a classical expression of Satan's supposed reason for hating, and rebelling against, God.

In another poem, Marx writes of his triumph after he shall have destroyed God's created world:

'Then I will be able to walk triumphantly,
Like a god, through the ruins of their
kingdom.
Every word of mine is fire and action.
My breast is equal to that of the Creator.'

And in his poem, 'Invocation of One in Despair', Marx writes:

'I shall build my throne high overhead

Cold, tremendous shall its summit be.
For its bulwark - superstitious dread
For its marshal - blackest agony.'

The Satan theme is most explicitly set forth
in Marx's 'The Fiddler', dedicated to his father:

'See this sword?
the prince of darkness
Sold it to me.'

And:

'With Satan I have struck my deal,
He chalks the signs, beats time for me
I play the death march fast and free.'

Particularly instructive is Marx's lengthy,
unfinished poetic drama of this youthful period,
Oulanem, A Tragedy. In the course of this
drama his hero Oulanem, delivers a remarkable
soliloquy, pouring out sustained invective, a
hatred of the world and of mankind, a hatred of
creation and a threat and vision of total world
destruction. Thus Oulanem pours out his vials
of wrath:

'... I shall howl gigantic curses on
mankind:

Ha! Eternity! She is an eternal grief...

Ourselves being clockwork, blindly
mechanical,
Made to be the foul-calendars of Time and
Space,
Having no purpose save to happen, to be
ruined,
So that there shall be something to ruin ...

If there is a something which devours,
I'll leap within it, though I bring the world to
ruins
The world which bulks between me and the
Abyss
I will smash to pieces with my enduring
curses.
I'll throw my arms around its harsh reality:
Embracing me, the world will dumbly pass
away,
And then sink down to utter nothingness,
Perished, with no existence - that would be
really living!'

And

'... the leaden world holds us fast,
And we are chained, shattered, empty,
frightened,

Eternally chained to this marble block of
Being...
and we-
We are the apes of a cold God.'

All this reveals a spirit that often seems to animate militant atheism. In contrast to the non-militant variety, which expresses a simple disbelief in God's existence, militant atheism seems to believe implicitly in God's existence, but to hate Him and to wage war for His destruction. Such a spirit was all too clearly revealed in the retort of the militant atheist Bakunin to the famous pro-theist remark of the deist Voltaire: 'If God did not exist, it would be necessary to create Him.' To which the demented Bakunin retorted: 'If God did exist, it would be necessary to destroy Him.' It was this hatred of God as a creator greater than himself that apparently inspired Karl Marx."

Again, your author apologizes for the length of this section of the book. However, it was necessary to show the progression of false religion and bad metaphysics from Plato onward culminating (so far) in Marx and his pure hatred of God. When one reads the poems of Marx they cannot be dismissed as accidental. And now you, dear reader, can see why your author

attributes the corruption of philosophy and thought as tantamount to Intellectual Warfare – because it is. And who is waging this Intellectual Warfare, to the detriment of mankind? It is the god of this world (2 Corinthians 4:4), Satan the devil, the hater of the two Jehovahs, the hater of mankind, and the very first rebel against reason and reality.

The Results Of Bad Philosophy

Man must think and take action in order to sustain his life on this earth. Correct thought really matters to man. Unfortunately, through the years, the field of philosophy has been corrupted - in numerous ways. In point of fact, the corruption of philosophy and the effects thereof are too numerous for a short book like this to completely detail. The results for the human race have been literally catastrophic. This section of the book will likely prove hard to read and your author apologizes in advance for the below partial delineation of the corruption of philosophy and thought.

Man needs a moral code to live by. There are objective ethics pertaining to life being better than death, flourishing life being better than bare existence, and original appropriation

being the only just way to establish the right to private property ownership. Further, each man owns himself and the property he has legitimately obtained via original appropriation, via inheritance, or through performing a contractual service, or through a contractual trade for other property. In other words each man, and all men are men as in $A = A$, have the natural rights of life, liberty, and property.

Through philosophical arguments, particularly by Hume, that no "ought" logically follows from an "is," ethics has become subjective. Further, also from Hume, who stated that effects do not necessarily follow from causes, natural law has been overturned – at least in the minds of those who buy such nonsense that nature might not be the same tomorrow. And now silly men think there is no such thing as rational objective ethics and that their opinion as to what is right or wrong is just as valid as any other man and that societal norms, social conventions, or opinion polls, or statistical analysis, or laws passed by parliaments can serve as moral guides – even if they violate some men's natural rights to life, liberty, and property. **Subjective ethics in an age of belief in democracy means that some men will be sacrificed to others via**

the legal system. The stated or unstated rationale for so doing will likely be some form of social utilitarianism – “the greatest happiness for the greatest number,” or, in a different form, “the greatest good for the greatest number.”

One of the main problems of social utilitarianism is that it provides a rationale for politicians to attempt to undertake actions whereby some men are sacrificed to others in the name of the greatest happiness or good. But, method matters in interpersonal relations, and while a complete dismantling of social utilitarianism is beyond the scope of this short book, there are at least a few points to be made against using social utilitarianism as a guide to public policy. First, if you are one of the members of the minority who are being sacrificed to the majority, your natural rights have been violated. That your natural rights were violated via the legal system is not a consolation for you. Second, there is no method of measuring happiness, as there is no invariable standard to use to perform such a measurement. The greatest happiness is an arbitrary and unscientific assertion, which is used as a rationalization for violating the victim’s natural rights. You cannot measure happiness for one man, let alone all men in a

collective grouping. Third, natural rights are more logical and understandable to men and are conducive to ongoing social harmony. Fourth, social utilitarianism cannot even define "the good" or "the valuable" because what is good and what is valuable are individual and not group concepts. Only individuals think. Social utilitarianism is not conducive to ongoing social harmony. It simply begets the next wave of wasted political activity, or, in the worst case, it sets the stage for a future retaliation. The two Jehovahs clearly come down on the side of man being able to recognize natural law as evidenced by the scriptural passage below:

"For the wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness, because the thing which may be known of God is clearly revealed within them, for God revealed it to them. For the unseen things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being realized by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, for them to be without excuse. Because, knowing God, they did not glorify Him as God, neither were thankful. But they became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing to be

wise [correct philosophers], they became fools”
Romans 1:18-22, MKJV

It is pretty clear from the above scripture that man, using his mind, can understand there must be a creator, there are natural laws that govern the universe, and these natural laws are available to the mind of men – if we are to think about them. This would include natural rights as a subset to natural laws and the violation of the natural rights of others causes us to be held accountable by God.

If a nation, tribe, religion, or some other group, or individual were against natural rights and were courageous and honest enough to clearly overtly identify themselves as being against natural rights, the rest of us would know they were dangerous and outside of respectable law. In other words, speaking in terms of an individual, if someone were to come out and say, “I believe I have the right to aggress against your life, to hurt and/or kill you, to steal your property, to enslave you, and to disregard and not perform under any contracts I make with you, then they would mark themselves as a monster and someone to be held completely outside of law. All other good men would turn on that individual or, as the case may be, turn

on that tribe or nation, etc. But, evil has to find a way to live with itself and so the ancient and the modern philosophers have lied to themselves and others by not being so open and honest about the values they live by, or would like to live by. Instead philosophers have wittingly or unwittingly provided intellectual air cover and enabled the unsocial aggressors to hide behind the idiotic belief that ethics are subjective, that reason does not govern in human affairs, there is no cause and effect so we will just have to try it (whatever "it" happens to be at the moment) and see what happens. Other than being irrational and immoral, a further problem with all this is: it is fine to experiment in the natural sciences, but not in the social sciences. In the social sciences experimentation involves experimenting on actual human beings who are all made in the image and likeness of God. Experimentation in the social sciences means that some men will be chopped up and used for fuel and that other men will be chopped up and cooked and eaten by an organic state, writ large. Men's lives will be destroyed by human experimentation at a loss to all of us – not just the current victims of the experimentation.

The philosophers, instead of applying reason to reality and learning from it, have engaged in a widespread rebellion against reason and reality. The rebellion against reason and reality is the new three R's. Now, some of the most critical steps in thinking have been polluted, including:

- * The law of identity has been attacked to the point where philosophers argue about whether a chair in the middle of the room is really a chair.

- * Cause and effect no longer being certain, leading to a questioning and a rejection of natural law and then natural rights. Interestingly, the natural sciences use cause and effect without much criticism from philosophers. The philosophers will just label the conclusions of the natural scientists as a contingent truth, not 100% proven, as it might change in the future. In other words, empiricism can find things that work today, but they might not work tomorrow – you never know.

- * The throwing overboard of natural law and natural rights has led to ethics becoming subjective and now men vote on truth or live like animals seeing if they can get away with

something. This also leads to a lack of a check and control on human parliaments – who want to believe the law is what they say it is.

* Language being polluted as concepts are weakened, i.e., watered down and no longer adequately tied to reality.

* The pollution of language is really a pollution of the ability of a man to think, as we necessarily think using concepts, and if language is no longer clear, neither is thinking. An anti-conceptual mentality is not good for man.

* Context dropping – for example, all men are men and all men need to think and take action in order to live on this earth. And all men have the need for and possess the natural rights of life, liberty, and property, and the derived property right of freedom to contract. And each man owns himself (at the human level) (the two Jehovahs own the universe and everything in it at the macro level). Context dropping leads to the body guys, the empiricists, ignoring the human mind and choices of men as a causative factor of change. Context dropping leads to the mind guys playing language games dissociated

with reality. Context dropping leads to crazy theories and conclusions.

* The attempt, via scientism or behaviorism, to deny man's consciousness as mentioned above. And the fact that the social sciences must use different methods than the natural sciences in order to scientifically understand how the universe works. Correct social science does not use human experimentation on unwilling victims. Man is a causative agent via his choices. Man's choices are not deterministically pre-ordained however much scientism and behaviorism would like to pretend otherwise.

* The attempt to sever the connection between statements of fact (is statements) and judgments of value (ought statements), which is a form of context dropping. For example, since man is alive and needs to stay alive he must think and take action, and any actions he takes must respect the natural rights of others. There is nothing better to put in its place than we ought to respect each other's natural rights even if the ought cannot be proven deductively. It still follows from a combination of inductive and deductive reasoning, which gets us an answer that will work within the context of life

being better than death, and peace and social harmony being necessary to a flourishing life.

* The unproven assertion that science should be value-free is false. Science should support life and it should be bias-free, not value-free. That science should be value-free is an unproven assertion, which is to ironically say, it is a proposed judgment of value.

* The elevation of deductive reasoning, above all other forms of reasoning, and the consequential belittling of inductive reasoning, have led to some unnecessary gaps in the totality of reasoning – for example, the philosophical attack on both is/ought and the philosophical attack on cause/effect. Some things are incapable of deductive proof, that much is true. However, a totality of reasoning encompasses both deductive and inductive forms of logic, and reasoning also involves weighing evidence, e.g., the facts of knowledge (endoxa) vetted by others. We don't have anything better to use than the sun will come up in the east tomorrow, although we cannot prove this deductively. Man has to ascertain axioms, when possible, and man also has to reason to and from working postulates. Both the axioms, (which cannot be refuted without contradiction

in any argument being put forth against them) and also any postulated statement of fact, are premises we can reason from. If a postulate, serving as a working premise, can be improved later by better knowledge, the old working premise can be replaced by the later, better working premise. What else can a man do? Nihilism in reasoning does not help mankind. It destroys mankind. The totality of reasoning includes both inductive and deductive forms of reasoning.

* The idiotic assertion, by some, (shot down by Frege) that logic is psychologically perceived so that instead of actual truth there is only the perception of truth. There are no humans with different operating systems. All men are men. Psychologism is false. It is nonsense.

* The further idiotic assertion that there are multiple forms of logic, i.e., polylogism, which amounts to the Germans having one kind of logic the Russians having another, etc. Fortunately, Wittgenstein destroyed polylogism intellectually, as he clearly pointed out that all thinking is logical, or it is not thinking at all. There are not multiple forms of logic differing from race to race, from tribe to tribe, etc. Polylogism is nonsense.

* The mind-body problem and its attempted solution are killing philosophical thought to this day. Mises correctly pointed out that there is no logical contradiction between the logical structure of the universe and the logical structure of the human mind. The two Jehovahs confirm this by pointing out that they provided a spirit in man to enable man to think (Job 32:8 and other places).

* Unfortunately the tribal mind guys (the witch doctors) and the tribal body guys (the Attila the Huns) are paired together again in the form of a modern intelligentsia/action team. This modern intelligentsia, mostly from the mind guys, provides philosophical, metaphysical, legal, and economic rationales for human experimentation - for the Neo-Platonic Attila the Huns to undertake for "the greater good." It is ancient tribalism on philosophical steroids, tribalism writ large, morphed into an Organic State that eats the people it is supposed to be serving in order to keep its evil system alive. But now the ancient tribe has nuclear and other modern weapons - but so do other tribes. And now ethics is subjective. And now pragmatism would dictate, "Let's try it and see what happens." We have come to the place where

ethical infants have modern weaponry. "Might makes right" has its hands on modern nuclear weapon systems. It is a modern version of ancient Platonism gone crazy with the regular man on the street being used as fuel for a fire that will consume him. Attila and the witch doctor do not even see or recognize individual men. In fact, any individual man who is thoughtful and also a person of virtue is a threat to their joint rebellion against reason and reality. Such a man is called an extremist or worse.

* Various Philosophies Of History have been foisted off on mankind, the worst of which so far has been Marxism. These various Philosophies Of History are false religions and their philosopher-proponent advocates have shown themselves to be false prophets as well. But, people still want to believe in something. Instead of using practical reason and applying it to reality to at least see that there are natural laws and to ascertain that there are natural rights, men want to check their brains at the door and follow some goon of the moment, or some fool of the moment. Men are afraid to think because they do not want to be responsible for their own lives. But if men refuse to think they put themselves into the

position where they have to guess at whom to follow. Emotions and slogans are no substitute for practical reasoning within an objective ethical framework where that thinking is tied to a knowable reality.

Philosophy has played a role in all of the above by gutting the law of identity, questioning the connection between cause and effect, making ethics subjective, etc. It leads the average man to conclude that, "If the experts are not so sure, how can I be sure of anything?" It leads the average man to worry that maybe he cannot trust his own thinking. But men can learn to think clearly and man must think and take action in order to live on this earth.

The intellectual warfare that your author believes Satan has waged has led to an almost complete corruption of philosophy and thought. Some philosophers are not even sure if there is a reality we can know, and any form of metaphysics or religion is basically regarded as a mental illness. Ethics is now subjective. Rationality (thinking) has been shredded. Politics is corrupted. Your author believes that Satan could not be happier.

Our minds have been intellectually poisoned. Men are now very vulnerable to each other in the world they live in. Subjective ethics in a democracy is an unmitigated disaster where some men will be sacrificed to others. A long time ago Job was worried about this.

"...There is no one else to support what I say. You have closed their minds to reason; don't let them triumph over me now."
Job 17:3-4 TEV (Good News Bible)

The Enlightenment was a period of time where reason pushed back against the sillier parts of religion, and many of the scientists of the Enlightenment basically were working to attempt to understand how God ordered the universe. Rationalism, correctly understood, provided answers so long as reason was tied to an objective reality. Pragmatism is fine to the extent that good results are obtained within the context of no man's natural rights being violated. Determinism is fine if by determinism we understand that there is cause and effect in the universe. But, determinism is not fine if we mistakenly believe that an individual man must choose in a certain way due to mysterious forces operating upon him. Determinism is also

not fine if it is paired with some version of a Philosophy Of History.

The spirit of the age (zeitgeist) that followed the Enlightenment was the Romantic Era. The Romantic Era has been a disaster for mankind, for many reasons, the chief of which is the widespread feeling or belief that holds that there is no shortage of resources and there are no limits for man. But there are limits and there is a scarcity of resources, which is where economics comes in. The Romantic Era elevation of emotion and wistfulness and human imagination over practical reason as an attempt to escape from reality is not good for man. Proper emotion and imagination are fine, but they are not a substitute for thinking. And mankind cannot evade reality by wishing it away.

The concept of a ruling elite, telling noble lies to deceive the masses is a corruption of politics and a rebellion against the reality that all men are men. It is modern Platonism supported by a corrupt, sell-out intelligentsia and also supported by a modern military industrial complex. Modern Platonism, with its subjective ethics coupled to modern weaponry will lead to disaster. As God says, in Job:

“He [God] takes away the wisdom of rulers and makes leaders act like fools.”

Job 12:17 TEV

The corruption of language and thought, combined with subjective ethics, disables the ability of men to reach agreement via reasonable arguments and evidence. “Well, that is your opinion.” can now be used to dismiss almost anything. The result is social conflict and sooner or later social conflict always leads to actual conflict. As the Bible warns:

“Do not be deceived, God is not mocked. For whatever a man sows, that he also will reap.” Galatians 6:7, MKJV

The short hand summation of all of the above is that the corruption of philosophy and thought leads to, amongst other things, skepticism, relativism, nihilism, and existentialism. All are catastrophically destructive to a man’s thoughts and his actions. All of them are the results of an intellectual warfare that has been waged against mankind. Philosophy, instead of enriching and helping mankind in his journey through life, is leading to his ruin. That is the true and sad story of

philosophy and its effects on mankind. It is a major part of the reason why your life is hard. It led Ayn Rand, the philosopher and novelist, to have Dr. Hugh Akston, (a character in her book, *Atlas Shrugged*, who was a philosopher), make the incredible comment below:

“It does take an exceptional mind and a still more exceptional integrity to remain untouched by **the brain-destroying influences of the world's doctrines**, the accumulated evil of centuries ...” Ayn Rand, *Atlas Shrugged*

Summary

It is a difficult task to even study the subject matter of philosophy. The field is ancient and there have not just been books written, there have been library shelves full of books written. And so any book on philosophy has to make numerous choices about what to include and what to exclude. The study of philosophy and the writing of this book is one of the most difficult intellectual tasks your author has ever undertaken.

The two Jehovahs were philosophers first and righteous entrepreneurs second. They had to be. They established objective ethical rules

before they established the laws of the natural sciences, mathematics, logic, etc. For man the ethical rules start with the realization that life is better than death; flourishing life is better than existence; each man owns themselves; each man owns the property they originally appropriated from nature; each man needs the liberty to both think and to take action in order to stay alive and to flourish; and each man has the right to trade with other men, i.e., to contract with others for the trading of goods or the performance of services. Because of these core objective ethical principles each man must respect the natural rights of other men, which are life, liberty, and property and to not initiate force or fraud upon others, or their property and to abide by the terms of any contracts voluntarily and knowingly entered into. The two Jehovahs gave mankind the honor of being made in their image and likeness and they gave us the task to use our minds and to have dominion over the earth. Man has to think and take action to live on the earth. And men were supposed to have a relationship with God and to grow in the intellectual and moral virtues throughout their lives. While on this earth they were to treat each other well, i.e., "to love your neighbor as yourself" (Leviticus 19:18 and other

places). And eventually men are to be resurrected to an eternal incorruptible life (1 Corinthians 15).

Satan rebelled against the two Jehovahs (Isaiah 14, Ezekiel 28, Revelation 12 and other places). He did not honor the fact that the two Jehovahs created the universe and everything in it and, thereby, own everything. Satan became, as it were, an anti-philosopher, who hates objective ethics, hates objective truth, hates cause and effect, hates correct thinking, and hates mankind. He hates light because he is darkness. He hates truth because he is a liar. He hates life because he is a murderer. He would like to pretend he somehow created himself and he would like to pretend he is somehow equal to, or better than, the two Jehovahs. He launched what amounts to intellectual warfare to corrupt philosophy, to corrupt thinking, and to corrupt mankind. He evidently corrupted one-third of the angels (Revelation 12:4). As the god of this world (2 Corinthians 4:4), he does many evil deeds for which he hopes the two Jehovahs will be blamed. His attacks on the mind of man and his disruptions of the social cooperation of men have been devastating. But his days are numbered (Revelation 20:1-3 and Isaiah 27:1)

and so are his evil corruptions of philosophy and thought. His attacks on philosophy, on thinking, and on peaceable social interactions are, in reality, an attack on man and an attack against the two Jehovahs.

“And I saw an angel come down from Heaven, having the key of the abyss and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, who is the Devil and Satan, and bound him a thousand years. **And he cast him into the abyss and shut him up and set a seal on him, that he should deceive the nations no more** until the thousand years should be fulfilled. And after that he must be loosed a little time.”

Revelation 20:1-3, MKJV

Man is unique. We are made in God’s image and likeness (Genesis 1:26) and we are to become like Jehovah number two, Jesus Christ (1 Corinthians 15). Man has a need to think correctly and to take action, and man is a social being who needs to peacefully interact and work together with other men in order to successfully live on this earth.

Because man must think correctly he needs to: accurately indentify entities, to differentiate

and integrate knowledge, to abstract concepts, to use words precisely and accurately, to use cause and effect, to understand there are objective ethical principles to live by, and man must be able to communicate clearly to others. He cannot afford to get sidetracked into thinking (or not thinking) that there is a difference between the logical structure of reality and the logical structure of the human mind. He cannot afford to believe there is not a logical structure to reality, that there is not necessarily cause and effect, that there are no natural laws, etc. Throwing out natural law is against logic, removes any check on government, and is against scripture (Romans 1:18-22). He also cannot afford to think there is not a logical structure to the human mind, or that the laws of logic are psychologically perceived (psychologism), or that there are multiple kinds of logic (polylogism). Man cannot get conned into wasting time trying to establish reality without reference to it, i.e., by trying to establish truth only in our minds. And man cannot afford to think that while there is a reality we can never know it because we see the world through a distorting lens that is our own consciousness. We only have one mind and we must use it to understand reality as best we can. What else can we do?

Any attempt to define rules of behavior as being arbitrary or irrational, i.e., subjective because we cannot deductively conclude an ought from an is, is an attack on objective ethics and man needs objective ethics in order to live peacefully and successfully on this earth.

Your author will not rehash what he wrote earlier in "The Corruption Of Philosophy & Thought" section of this book, but suffice it to say the corruption has led to skepticism (we cannot know anything for certain), nihilism (life is pointless and without value, and any moral values are arbitrary and contrived), and existentialism. As previously mentioned in an earlier section of this book:

Nihilism – "... from the Latin nihil, nothing, is the philosophical doctrine suggesting the negation of one or more putatively meaningful aspects of life. Most commonly, nihilism is presented in the form of existential nihilism, **which argues that life is without objective meaning, purpose, or intrinsic value**. Moral nihilists assert that morality does not inherently exist, and that **any established moral values are abstractly contrived**." Wikipedia [Nihilism is

the very essence of anti-life, anti-man, and anti-God.]

Existentialism – “a chiefly 20th Century philosophical movement embracing diverse doctrines but centering on analysis of individual existence in an unfathomable universe and the plight of the individual who must assume ultimate responsibility for acts of free will without any certain knowledge of what is right and wrong or good or bad.” Merriam-Webster [Martin Heidegger in his attempt to discover the nature of being concluded that the important thing is that each of us has a death that is uniquely our own, we are each a being unto death.]

The three R’s now stand for the rebellion against reason and reality. And the effects of the intellectual warfare and the resultant corruption of philosophy and thought is, amongst other things:

Ontology – the study of the nature of being (the study of reality) has been shredded via the attack on the law of identity, the attack on the law of cause and effect, etc.

Epistemology – the establishment of knowledge has been shredded via the analytic-synthetic false dichotomy and also by the opinion that we cannot ever know reality because we view it through the lens that is our mind, etc.

Ethics – is now subjective. There are no objective ethical principles that are recognized, and every man's opinion is set against every other man's opinion with no objective standard to hold men or governments accountable to. Natural law has been thrown out and "is ought" is not allowed as a valid reasoning method. All of this is perfect for the Attilas of the world.

Politics and economics – are determined by majority vote and utilitarianism, instead of objective ethical principles and instead of via understanding that there needs to be one method for the natural sciences and one method for the social sciences. Human experimentation is not necessary and should not be allowed, but without an understanding of the proper scientific method for the social sciences and without the guidelines of natural law, and without objective ethical principles to live by, some men are going to be sacrificed to others. And life on earth could become an actual hell where each man lives in fear of his fellow men because he knows

his fellow men do not think and do not care about ethics. It becomes a "What can I get away with world?" If it goes far enough, the inevitable wars, which will result, could cause the earth to become largely de-populated.

This is particularly true as the Attila of Attilas, the Antichrist, comes onto the scene. He might very well use some form of Philosophy Of History in combination with ethical subjectivism to suspend any semblance of ethical rules. There certainly will be no natural law check on Organic State power. It will almost certainly result in a modern Platonism-gone-wild, might-makes-right-on-steroids dictatorship, ending with an instant admittance into the Evil Hall Of Fame disastrous result. In short, it will be a rebellion against reason and reality for the ages. The two Jehovahs will then say, "Enough," and Jesus Christ will return to the earth (Revelation 19) to put an end to the rebellion, once and for all.

And then the believers in the Bible, such as your author, believe Jesus Christ will establish the Kingdom Of God on the earth and rule it how? Wisely. And wisely means, via correct philosophy, hence the importance of the subject.

“And it shall be, in the last days the mountain of the LORD’s house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow into it. And many people shall go and say, Come, and let us go to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob. And He will teach us of His ways [**correct philosophy and correct thinking and correct action**], and we will walk in His paths. For out of Zion shall go out the Law [instruction], and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem. And He shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more [man must cooperate with other men peacefully].” Isaiah 2:2-4, MKJV

“And all men shall fear, and shall declare the work of God; **for they shall in wisdom think of His doing.**” Psalms 64:9, MKJV

Men will go back to using reason and correct thinking to understand God, to understand nature, to understand themselves, and to work to cooperate with God to fulfill their potential.

In order to do all these things one must have correct philosophy (love of wisdom) and thought. To do all this, apart from God, is not an easy task as the below scripture points out:

“And I gave my heart to seek and search out by wisdom concerning all which is done under the heavens. It is a sad task God has given to the sons of men to be humbled by it.”
Ecclesiastes 1:13, MKJV

If any of us lacks wisdom there is actually a Bible promise of help.

“But if any of you lacks wisdom, let him ask of God, who gives to all liberally and with no reproach, and it shall be given to him.”
James 1:5, MKJV

If a post-modernist philosopher were to be completely honest, before beginning any conversation, before writing a newspaper editorial, before writing a book, or before teaching a university class, and said any of the following, the average men would probably not listen to him – at least not for very long:

“We cannot know reality.” – which is, of course, a statement of knowing.

“We cannot identify anything. Man views what he thinks is reality through the lens that is his mind and this lens must therefore distort reality.” However, to say that we cannot identify is to identify something – in this case the lack of the ability to identify.

“There are no objective ethics. There are only opinions as to what is right and wrong.” Then why should we listen to you? You are, by your own definition, only one man with an opinion.

“Cause preceding effect is an assumption.” Then why does it work so well for the natural sciences and why are you talking or writing to us in an attempt to influence us?

“There are no natural laws that must be. Nature might change tomorrow.” If it does, which it won’t, then man can alter his premises based on the nature that presents itself at that time.

“Reason is and should be a slave to the passions. You cannot use reason to set goals and you cannot use reason to establish premises to reason from. You can only use reason to pick the correct method to achieve

your arbitrarily chosen goals.” Really? I thought there was no cause and effect and so how can reason help me cause a goal my passions picked for me to come into effect?

“Any metaphysics is unproven speculation and is borderline mental illness.” How would the billions of Christians, Muslims, Jews, etc. react to a speaker who was this honest about his BELIEFS as opposed to other people’s beliefs? Just because something is not provable via deductive methods does not mean it is not true – it just means it is not provable deductively.

“Life is pointless. There is no value to it. We are each a being unto death.” Then I guess we should all eat, drink, and be merry for tomorrow we die and that is it.

“Science should be value-free.” This is a statement of value that is not proven – just asserted. It sounds good until you think about it. The reality is that science should be bias-free and science should help man support his life on this earth.

“Inductive reasoning is not usable to firmly establish truth, only deductive reasoning is valid.” The problem with this is that deductive

reasoning cannot be used for everything, e.g., cause and effect and is/ought, the establishment of certain premises, etc. And inductive reasoning can be very useful, e.g., in the natural sciences and also to establish a working postulate – which though not absolutely provable is the best information we have at this time. If better information is available later, we can then, at that time, have a better working postulate. To throw out or minimize inductive reasoning is to deprive man of part of his ability to reason the best he can at the current time. The totality of reasoning includes BOTH deductive and inductive reasoning.

If a philosopher, a writer, a teacher, or anyone were to openly advocate any or all of the above they would have virtually no audience. This is because common sense would tell the average person they would be wasting their time in listening to such a person, or reading anything that they wrote. God actually has a scripture that covers such an intellectual and it is not good:

“Destruction is certain for those who say that evil is good and good is evil; that dark is light and light is dark; that bitter is sweet and sweet is bitter. Destruction is certain for those

who think they are wise and consider themselves to be clever.” Isaiah 5:20, 21, NLT

Your author could go on and on and already has. And your author is sorry that this book on intellectual warfare and the corruption of philosophy and thought was so descriptive and revealing of how far mankind as a whole has fallen from where the two Jehovahs would like for us to be. Fortunately, the two Jehovahs gave us some sound advice that your author will end this book with:

“See then that you walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise, redeeming the time, because the days are evil. **Therefore do not be unwise**, but understand what the will of the Lord is.” Ephesians 5:15-17, MKJV