

A man was thinking and he wondered why ...

individual men and women have not been  
valued, as they should have been.

Further, why is it that ...

“Great spirits have always encountered violent  
opposition from mediocre minds. ...”

Einstein

# Divine Individualism

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](http://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
Divine Individualism Explained	4
Each Person Is Unique	41
Increasing The Importance Of Values	58
The Moral And Intellectual Virtues	81
The Need For Space To Grow	122
The Truthers And The Lovers	138
Government Versus Individuals	182
Religions Versus Individuals	221
Altruism Versus Proper Concern For One's Own Interests	258
Who God Is And How We Can Help Him	331

To Mankind

## **Introduction**

Shortly after the creation of man, extended families and neighbors joined themselves together into tribes and this ultimately led to the formation of kingdoms and governments. Part of the motivation was probably for defensive purposes. Men were afraid to be alone and so grouped together for safety sake. And part of the motivation was likely related to satisfying a sense of belonging, and for cooperative survival efforts - whether hunting and gathering, or otherwise.

The interest in religion, and man's place in the universe, led to competing religious belief systems and this ultimately led to the formation of religious organizations. Men adopted or established religions hoping to secure the "favor of the gods" in this life and also, perhaps, to secure a promise of eternal life due to having the "correct" religious beliefs, practices, and/or membership.

Unfortunately, in many cases, the forming of kingdoms and governments, religions and religious organizations, was also an attempt to somehow seek safety in a collective. For any individual, seeking intellectual or moral safety in



a collective is an attempt to evade the responsibility for having to make one's own life decisions and then to live with the consequences. Regrettably, the leadership elite of collectives does not generally view human beings as unique, valuable, and irreplaceable individuals. Their tendency is to philosophically and morally get to the place where they view human beings as fuel to be used to keep the collective itself functioning. In essence, valuable human beings end up being utilized as fuel and burnt up in order to keep the collective "alive." Governments end up morphing into "Organic States" which eat their own citizens. And sadly, it is also true for many religions, which end up rationalizing the deception of human beings and also other abuses are perpetrated as well. That the rationalization for the deception or other abuses is so that the average man will somehow be spiritually or physically better off does little to change the facts on the ground – that valuable individual lives are being used to fuel the functioning of the collective. Using human beings in an abusive way, in order to fuel a collective's energy requirements, works against the purpose of God for mankind. And it shows how little the collective's leadership elite knows about their own proper purpose and function. Not valuing each person as unique and

irreplaceable, and using people as fuel has had disastrous negative consequences. Countless human beings have been prevented from becoming who only they could have become. Geniuses have been inadvertently assigned to peel potatoes in soup kitchens, or to dig ditches. Valuable irreplaceable lives have been, in effect, wasted. The piper has been and is being paid. This colossal waste of human life has hurt all of us.

God made men free. It had to be so in order to develop character in us. And God gave us dominion over the earth, not each other. The freedom we were given also makes us responsible for our choices. **The main purpose of this book is to explain the purpose and value of human life and to survey how each man and woman can cooperate with God in helping to realize their priceless eternal potential.** There has been and will be opposition as Satan and his evil team have worked against each man and woman reaching their potential. Each person needs to be determined and also patient, with both themselves and with others, as the purpose and the process of God for mankind unfolds.

The information from the pages that follow was gleaned from logical reasoning, the Bible, and from personal life experiences and learning.

As a housekeeping point, the scriptural references, herein, are from the King James Version, KJV, Modern King James Version, MKJV, or New Living Translation, NLT, unless denoted otherwise. Any emphasis, in the scriptural or other quotations, is mine throughout this book.

As an additional important note, I have chosen to write the pages that follow mainly in a conversational style. Having said that, let's get started. I offer for your serious consideration and hopeful edification what I have learned below.

## **Divine Individualism Explained**

The purpose of this section of the book is to explain the title of this book, which is *Divine Individualism*. Sometimes it is easier to start with what divine individualism is not. It is not a new age concept where some combination of one or more of the following is true: each of us is already a god, has an immortal soul, there is an individual path to reincarnation or a higher level of consciousness or non-existence, you

must seek to merge with a christ-consciousness, all paths lead to god, positive thinking leads to "thought creates," etc. Nor is divine individualism where you find yourself by no longer being an individual, such as merging into a spiritual or secular collective. **To find oneself by no longer being an individual is patent nonsense.** And yet spiritual Philosophy Of History advocates, like Hegel, or secular Philosophy Of History advocates, like Marx, advise just such nonsense. Nor is divine individualism a reference to what is sometimes harshly called atomistic individualism or radical individualism, pertaining to philosopher Thomas Hobbes. Hobbes correctly noted that each person was an individual. However his rejection of human beings having a nature set the stage for a couple of very large errors in philosophic thinking, to be discussed below.

Hobbes' atomistic individualism, in correctly noting that each human being was unique, unfortunately rejected that human beings have a nature. For human beings as a whole to have a nature they would have to be classed into their own species, or sub-species – which they are. To Hobbes, this should not be as each human being was, in fact, unique and therefore, evidently, his or her individual species and not a

member of a larger species, or sub-species. Following Hobbes, this led to some philosophers rejecting that reason could discover the laws of nature pertaining to human beings. In their minds you cannot discover something that does not exist. Unfortunately, it was a short step from there to rejecting the laws of nature in their entirety. This was the first error of Hobbes and those who use him as a philosophic link in their chain of thought. To reject that there are laws of nature knowable to man by reason is a disaster for human thought and Hobbes opened that door.

Philosophy Professor Laszlo Versenyi brilliantly observed this is all incorrect:

"If human nature is unknowable then so is human good and it is impossible to talk about human excellence in general. Indeed it is impossible to talk about man as such, since man as such could not even be identified. Barring all knowledge of human nature – that which makes a man a man – the word man would mean nothing and we could not even conceive of man as a definite being distinguishable from all other beings. Consequently anything we might say about man would be necessarily meaningless, including the statement that

human nature as such as [sic – read “is”]  
unknowable to man. Thus the postulate of the  
strict unknowability of man is self-contradictory.  
To the extent that we talk about man we  
obviously hold that his nature is, in some  
respect at least, knowable.”

The second philosophical error was in reasoning that if each human was unique, and there are no laws of nature pertaining to humans, then it is, or could be, every man for himself – a survival of the species pitting each individual man and woman against every other man and woman. After all, if each human being is unique (their own species as it were) and there are no laws of nature pertaining to human beings, then each human must struggle against every other human for food, shelter, etc. Each human’s desires then create their values. Only the individual knows what is right for him or her. Since reasoning pertaining to the nature of humans is not valid, there are now no objective ethical values discoverable by reason to limit our behavior. The conclusions, from this incorrect line of reasoning, are obviously frightening and so this led Hobbes to call for a strong monarchy in order to prevent this human against human chaos. Further, it also ultimately led to philosophers, like Nietzsche. Nietzsche went so

far to postulate 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. All of which are also a disaster for human thought. Regarding Hobbes call for a strong monarchy, author Paul Rosenberg, in his excellent book, *Production Versus Plunder*, comments on Hobbes as follows:

“Hobbes claimed that overwhelming central authority and force were necessary to avoid discord, murder and civil war. Hobbes says that life without government would inevitably lead to conflict, to a ‘war of all against all,’ and that life would be ‘solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.’ To escape this state of permanent war, says Hobbes, all individuals must yield their rights to a sovereign authority for the sake of their protection. And if this Sovereign were to act badly, men must accept it as the price of peace.

Prior to Hobbes, rulers in Europe defended their right to rule by citing the Divine Right of Kings. But with kingdoms failing, a new justification for rulership was required, and Hobbes provided it. This has been the default

philosophy for rulers and their supporters for the past three hundred years.

Hobbes, however, was manifestly wrong. The reasons to say so are many: The flowering of crime underneath government rule, the lack of overwhelming crime where government force is lacking, human kindness, voluntary charity, and many others. The greatest proof, however, is the one that has existed since before recorded time: That men have learned to restrain their impulses, subjecting them to reason because it provides better results."

It should be noted that modern anthropologists classify anatomically modern man as follows:

"The emergence of anatomically modern human marks the dawn of the subspecies *Homo sapiens sapiens*, i.e., the subspecies of *Homo sapiens* that includes all modern humans."  
From Wikipedia

It is correct that men have a nature with certain characteristics discoverable by reason, e.g., Aristotle noted that man was the rational animal and also the social animal. Further, it is correct that there are laws of nature



discoverable by man using reason. Cicero observed that natural law is right reason in accord with nature. Your author concurs. The Wikipedia entry on Homo sapiens sapiens is correct, in that modern man is to be included in its own sub-species, and the ancient Greeks are correct in that we can use reason to learn about that sub-species (Homo sapiens sapiens) and their defining characteristics (rational animal, social animal, etc.). Hobbes is correct in that each individual man and woman is unique. Perhaps the best way to look at it would be to agree that anatomically modern human beings, as a sub-species of Homo sapiens, have characteristics that are discoverable by reason and that each individual is a sub-sub-species of Homo sapiens. In other words, Robert Zachariah Thompson is Homo sapiens sapiens - Robert Zachariah Thompson. This recognizes the unique individuality of Robert Zachariah Thompson while preserving the fact that Robert Zachariah Thompson is, as a human being, a member of Homo sapiens sapiens. And it preserves that fact that the sub-species Homo sapiens sapiens can be studied and conclusions can be drawn about mankind using reason. And this does not open the door to discard natural law in its entirety – in other words, it preserves natural laws of all kinds discoverable by reason.

Philosopher Dr. Tibor Machan sheds some light on the above problem and your author will quote from his *The Moral Case For The Free Market Economy*:

"The actual entity or whatever has a structure, form, or principle that it shares with others of is [sic – read "its"] kind. All that share this principle are classified as members of the same species - they are the same kind of being." ...

"I dub the view I am discussing 'classical individualism' since it is compatible with - although not fully accountable by reference to - Aristotelian classical naturalism, the idea that the nature of something is well grounded in reality." ...

"I think the only plausible view is where the individual and his nature are two aspects of the same being; where you and I and every other being is both an individual and a member of a class, by virtue of sharing certain features with other individuals which are not separable." ...

"Thus, e.g., you and I and millions of others are all human beings, all with various attributes

that the rest also possess. By virtue of these it is warranted to classify us all as human beings. But what we share is not separable from us. It is a certain aspect of our individual selves. These attributes or capacities or features - depending on what we are talking about - can be found in each member of the class (except for the crucially incapacitated or damaged or crippled ones)." ...

"In the kind of individualism that I think makes good sense, both the individuality of something and its membership in a class are of equal significance. There is no dualism and thus no basic, reasonable conflict between the two. My human nature cannot be prior to my existence, but neither can my existence be in some sense prior to my human nature. I am realized in both modes at the same time - in different respects, but at the same time.

One reason this is important is that certain features of ethical and political life, which in many other philosophical systems are kept separate, cannot be separated in classical individualism. Thus in many doctrines - starting with Plato and throughout Christianity as well as Marxism (for the pre-communist period) - **the individual is put in opposition to his own**

**general nature.** In the viewpoint that I am presenting, this opposition cannot be found; my nature and I cannot be in conflict within me because they are not in fact separate things but aspects of the same thing. However, in the Platonic, existentialist, and Hobbesian pictures, these two parts of ourselves will possibly conflict, the general first, the individual second - or vice versa. This means that in principle we could always, in the life of any individual, witness some kind of dichotomy. And then we can ask, should one be more loyal to one's human nature, (i.e., humanity), or to one's individuality, (i.e., interests)?

We find this egoism-altruism conflict throughout the history of modern ethics, pitting our loyalty to humanity against our loyalty to our individuality. One is either a humanitarian or an egoist; one is either anti-social or sacrifices oneself to humanity. **That is a very important and destructive dichotomy** both metaphysically and, thus, ethically and politically.

This dichotomy is full of difficulties, and most of the enemies of market economics and classical liberalism, have been concentrating on a vulnerability stemming from the

dichotomization of one's nature with one's existence. Some are maintaining that our nature is more important and thus we must give up our personal individual interest for the sake of the whole. Others, like many economists, maintain that it is the individual that is more important, and the social is an entire myth. Well, neither of these views seems to me to be either metaphysically or normatively tenable."

It was in reading Machan that your author reacted against his characterization of individualism as being classical – which inspired this book. Your author thought, "When were individuals ever regarded as valuable and treated accordingly?" In other words, "What is classical about individualism?" Individualism should be classic, but is not. Machan, of course, meant classical in the ancient Greek philosopher sense and your author has no serious objection to his efforts in that regard and your author appreciates Machan and his efforts.

Machan did all of us a great service by clearly defining the false dichotomy of loyalty to your nature as a member of Homo sapiens sapiens versus loyalty to your own unique personal interests. In reality we are, at the same time, a human being and a unique

individual. And there are natural laws discoverable by right reason pertaining to the class of beings known as human beings. As Aristotle correctly pointed out, human beings are both rational and social animals, amongst other things. For this book, the nature of something should not be read to mean in regards to Plato's erroneous timeless, changeless, perfect form in another reality.

What has not been properly appreciated is the unique importance of every individual - hence this book. Dr. Machan pointed out the problem very clearly and a lot of it goes back to Plato:

"Historically, the collectivist picture has been terribly influential. Since the time of Plato, the definition of 'man,' i.e., 'human being,' has been deemed as much more important than 'individual human beings.' In Platonic philosophy one vital point is the theory of forms. These are abstract entities - somewhat the way we tend to think of numbers or geometrical figures. They are permanent, unchanging, dependable, things in nature. Unlike you and I who die after a while, and other things that are perishable or corrosive, these universal yet concrete beings - human nature (or humanity),

Love, Justice, Oak, Water, and any other definition of a general idea you could care to think of, are all fixed, reliable, perfect. And these permanent unchanging, perfect things in the realm of ideas are all collective forms - they embody all the individuals that the idea means when invoked by us to think.

In Plato's philosophy and in the philosophies of many subsequent thinkers such a universal idea or definition has a reality that is even more significant than the reality of you and me. In other words, for Platonic and subsequent Platonistically leaning philosophies, the overarching nature or definition – of man has a greater - more significant, more important - reality than the individual human beings who 'participate' in this overarching nature.

What does that mean? That means that before you - and I are recognized as significant beings, the first and foremost significance lies with humanity, with the collective being which subsumes all of us within itself, of which we are just a part. According to this philosophy we are by no means individual entities, beings in our own right, we are only parts of a larger being, a larger individual, collective humanity.

What drops out of course, if you take this line seriously - and almost all philosophers are taking it very seriously - is the significance of your individuality. The collective we, the humanity that that Plato identifies, the more significant aspect of us, does not differentiate amongst us. You and I in the respect to our humanity are identical, we do not differ, in so far as we are human being we are all the same. **Individual differences are of no significance.** If one is convinced that it is this humanity that is important, perfect, stable, fundamental, and you and I are these perishable, corruptible, negligible beings, then of course the thing that is equally negligible, corruptible about us is our individuality, whatever makes us unique. It is our individuality and whatever arises out of it that becomes the victim of such metaphysical collectivism.

The response to the legacy of Plato, one manifest in many philosophies, ethics and politics, both right and left (Hegel, Marx, T. H. Green, Lewis Thomas, B. F. Skinner), is that we are human, but we are essentially individual human beings. We are significantly different from other human beings, from all human beings. That is indeed part of our human



nature, to be different from others, to create in ourselves a unique being, a self-made entity. That is both in harmony with others but is also significantly independent of them. But this difference is completely obliterated in the view that holds that only our common nature is significant, that all that really counts is humanity as a whole – as if there really were some entity of which we all are the cells, the body parts. ... While not many embrace it explicitly, in intellectual circles it is the most influential idea these days, even in the West.”

In reading the above one can readily see why, throughout history, valuable individuals have been sacrificed to various religious and secular collectives. Accepting a false dichotomy, loyalty to one’s human nature, (i.e., humanity) versus loyalty to one’s individuality, (i.e., one’s own interests) and then elevating an aspect of that false dichotomy into a superior reasoning position, (humanity as a whole over individuals), allows for valuable and unique individuals to be routinely sacrificed to collectives.

**Divine individualism starts with knowing who is divine.** And that is God the Father and Jesus Christ, aka God, aka the two Jehovahs (Psalm 110:1, John 1:1, 1 Peter 3:21-22, Titus

2:13, and numerous other places, e.g., Galatians 1:3 and all of the other numerous greetings contained in various epistles of the New Testament).

“In the beginning the Word [the being who became Jesus Christ] already existed. He was with God [the Father], and he was God. He was in the beginning with God. He created everything there is [Ephesians 3:9]. Nothing exists that he didn’t make. Life itself was in him, and this life gives light to everyone. The light shines through the darkness, and the darkness can never extinguish it.”

John 1:1-5, NLT

“So the Word became human and lived here on earth among us. He was full of unfailing love and faithfulness. And we have seen his glory, the glory of the only Son of the Father.”

John 1:14, NLT

The two Jehovahs are the creators and owners of the universe (Genesis 1-2 and many other places). Just like a sculptor owns what he creates, the two Jehovahs created everything and they own everything. They are the life-givers, the healers, and the Saviors of mankind. And, as a particular and special part of their

creation, they created men in their image and likeness and gave them dominion over the earth (not each other). Men were placed into, in essence, a complex incubator called the earth. The two Jehovahs created man's reality.

"Then God said, "**Let us make people in our image, to be like ourselves.** They will be masters over all life - the fish in the sea, the birds in the sky, and all the livestock, wild animals, and small animals." So God created people in his own image; God patterned them after himself; male and female he created them. God blessed them and told them, "Multiply and fill the earth and subdue it. Be masters over the fish and birds and all the animals.""  
Genesis 1:26-28, NLT

The two Jehovahs gave us a great honor in making us after their image and likeness as this shows there is intent on their part to do something special with man. Your author has previously written an entire book on this point entitled, *Honor*, and so will not belabor the point here. Their scientific brilliance is on display in how they made man's intricate and complex physical anatomy – with all of the intricate and inter-acting systems. But they did far more. They went further by giving us a mind that can

think. They did this by adding a spirit component to the human brain that differentiated us from animals in a very empowering way (Job 32:8, Job 38:36, Proverbs 20:27, 1 Corinthians 2:11, and Isaiah 42:5). Man is the rational animal because there is a non-physical component added to our physical brain, which then creates the human mind.

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

Man is quite literally a work of divine art.

Further, the two Jehovahs structured the universe to have a logical structure and gave man’s mind a logical structure so that there is no disconnect between the logical structure of the universe and the logical structure of the human mind. This enables man to be able to use reason to discover the laws of nature and to rationally ascertain objective ethical principles to live by. Man can identify things and learn cause and effect. Man can experience things and use language to share valuable information between individuals and generations. In fact, God criticized mankind in general for not obeying

him and also for not using their minds to do what is correct.

“For the wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness [the New Living Translation has this as: “who push the truth away from themselves”], 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 [the New Living Translation has this: “they began to think up foolish ideas of what God was like”], and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing to be wise [correct philosophers], they became fools [incorrect philosophers]” Romans 1:18-22, MKJV

We are different from the other animals because we were made to look like the two Jehovahs look (Revelation 1:13-15) – only physically speaking, of course. And we can think – which is unlike the other animals. We

had to be able to think so that we can make choices and be responsible for them. The two Jehovahs do not only want us to look like them, they want us to come to the place where we also think and take action like them. In other words, character matters and we need to develop good character. (Your author has an entire book on this character creation process entitled, *Creating Characters With Character*.) To do so requires moral capacity, i.e., freedom to choose. The two Jehovahs made us free (2 Corinthians 3:17, Galatians 5:1, and other places). They had to give us minds and freedom so that we would have the moral capacity and space to choose. Pre-programmed people-bots are just not enough of a creative challenge to the two Jehovahs – and if they pre-programmed men, we would not be like them. They really risked a lot to give both men and angels freedom – with some losses incurred as a result. (Your author has a book devoted to this topic entitled, *The Source Of Evil*). Each man has to come to the place where they know what to value and each man has to have time and space to develop the intellectual and moral virtues – to develop character and to bear fruit as it were. The two Jehovahs also intended that we cooperate peacefully with each other in order to develop spiritually, mentally, and physically – in

other words, they made us to also be what Aristotle would call, social animals.

Because there is social interaction among men there is a need for objective, ethical principles to live by. Using reason, man can learn the importance of respecting each other's natural rights to life, liberty, and property. Your author has an entire book devoted to justice and law entitled, *Why There Is No Justice: The Corruption Of Law*. This book has a lengthy explanation of the logic and reasons for natural rights, the purpose of law, the purpose of government, etc., and so will not belabor natural rights here. Suffice it to say that there is no social theory of violence as violence ignores principles in favor of might makes right. To initiate force or fraud against another human being is wrong, as is not honoring any contracts that were willingly entered into. Anyone who does so is not acting rationally, according to principle. At the present time it could be said that they are not a person with a sound mind.

Continuing with the two Jehovahs and their plan, each man has sinned (Romans 3:23) and is currently under the death penalty (Romans 6:23, Ezekiel 18:4). Normally this would create a very serious and unsolvable legal problem as

the execution of the guilty (all of us) would effectively put an end to the two Jehovahs' most important creation - mankind. Not to be defeated, the two Jehovahs implanted a divine rescue plan. The Word came to the earth as Jesus Christ (John 1:14) and gave his life as a sinless sacrifice for many (Hebrews 9:26, 10:12). Further, Jesus Christ not only died for our sins (for each human being's individual sins) he was also resurrected from being dead for three days (1 Corinthians 15:3-4, Matthew 12:40). Christ's death and resurrection literally created a bridge from death to life, for us, his characters.

"But the fact is that Christ has been raised from the dead. He has become the first of a great harvest of those who will be raised to life again. So you see, just as death came into the world through a man, Adam, now the resurrection from the dead has begun through another man, Christ. Everyone dies because all of us are related to Adam, the first man [because all men have sinned and are under the death penalty for so doing]. But all who are related to Christ, the other man, will be given new life. But there is an order to this resurrection: Christ was raised first; then when Christ comes back, all his people will be raised.



After that the end will come, when he will turn the Kingdom over to God the Father, having put down all enemies of every kind. For Christ must reign until he humbles all his enemies beneath his feet. And the last enemy to be destroyed is death." 1 Corinthians 15:20-26, NLT

"But someone may ask, "How will the dead be raised? What kind of bodies will they have?" What a foolish question! When you put a seed into the ground, it doesn't grow into a plant unless it dies first. And what you put in the ground is not the plant that will grow, but only a dry little seed of wheat or whatever it is you are planting. Then God gives it a new body - just the kind he wants it to have. A different kind of plant grows from each kind of seed. And just as there are different kinds of seeds and plants, so also there are different kinds of flesh - whether of humans, animals, birds, or fish. There are bodies in the heavens, and there are bodies on earth. The glory of the heavenly bodies is different from the beauty of the earthly bodies. The sun has one kind of glory, while the moon and stars each have another kind. And even the stars differ from each other in their beauty and brightness. It is the same way for the resurrection of the dead. Our earthly bodies, which die and decay, will be different when they

are resurrected, for they will never die. Our bodies now disappoint us, but when they are raised, they will be full of glory. They are weak now, but when they are raised, they will be full of power. They are natural human bodies now, but when they are raised, they will be spiritual bodies. For just as there are natural bodies, so also there are spiritual bodies. The Scriptures tell us, "The first man, Adam, became a living person." But the last Adam - that is, Christ - is a life-giving Spirit. What came first was the natural body, then the spiritual body comes later. Adam, the first man, was made from the dust of the earth, while Christ, the second man, came from heaven. Every human being has an earthly body just like Adam's, **but our heavenly bodies will be just like Christ's.** Just as we are now like Adam, the man of the earth, **so we will someday be like Christ,** the man from heaven. What I am saying, dear brothers and sisters, is that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God. These perishable bodies of ours are not able to live forever." 1 Corinthians 15:35-50, NLT

"But let me tell you a wonderful secret God has revealed to us. Not all of us will die, but we will all be transformed. It will happen in a moment, in the blinking of an eye, when the last

trumpet is blown. For when the trumpet sounds, the Christians who have died will be raised with transformed bodies. And then we who are living will be transformed so that we will never die. For our perishable earthly bodies must be transformed into heavenly bodies that will never die. When this happens - when our perishable earthly bodies have been transformed into heavenly bodies that will never die - then at last the Scriptures will come true: "Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is your victory? O death, where is your sting?" For sin is the sting that results in death, and the law gives sin its power. How we thank God, who gives us victory over sin and death through Jesus Christ our Lord!

So, my dear brothers and sisters, be strong and steady, always enthusiastic about the Lord's work, for you know that nothing you do for the Lord is ever useless." 1 Corinthians 15:51-58, NLT

"Beloved, now we are children of God, and it has not yet been revealed what we shall be. But we know that when He [Jesus Christ] shall be revealed, **we shall be like Him**, for we shall see Him as He is." 1 John 3:2, MKJV

“When I [David] look at Your heavens, the work of Your fingers, the moon and the stars which You have established; what is man that You are mindful of him, and the son of man, that You visit him? For You have made him a little lower than the angels, and have crowned him with glory and honor. You made him rule over the works of Your hands; You have put all things under his feet: all sheep and oxen, yes, and the beasts of the field; the birds of the heavens, and the fish of the sea, and all that pass through the paths of the seas. O Jehovah, our Lord, how excellent is Your name in all the earth!” Psalms 8:3-9, MKJV

“God, who at many times and in many ways spoke in time past to the fathers by the prophets, has in these last days spoken to us by His Son, whom He has appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds, who being the shining splendor of His glory, and the express image of His essence, and upholding all things by the word of His power, having made purification of our sins, He sat down on the right of the Majesty on high,

being made so much better than the angels, as He has by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For to which of the

angels did He say at any time, "You are My Son, this day I have begotten Thee?" And again, "I will be to Him a Father, and He shall be to Me a Son?" And again, when He brings in the First-born into the world, He says, "And let all the angels of God worship Him." And of the angels He says, "Who makes His angels spirits and His ministers a flame of fire." But to the Son He says, "Your throne, O God, is forever and ever. A scepter of righteousness is the scepter of Your kingdom. You have loved righteousness and hated iniquity, therefore God, Your God, has anointed You with the oil of gladness above Your fellows." And, "You, Lord, have laid the foundation of the earth in the beginning, and the heavens are the works of Your hands. They shall perish, but You will remain. And they shall all become old as a garment, and as a covering You shall fold them up, and they shall be changed. But You are the same, and Your years shall not fail." 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 [the angels] not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for those who shall be heirs of salvation?" Hebrews 1:1-14, MKJV

"Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard,

lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and if every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward, how shall we escape if we neglect so great a salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by those who heard Him; God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with different kinds of miracles and gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to His own will?

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 [a reference to Psalm 8, quoted above]. 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 [divine individualism], 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 behoved 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 2:1-18, MKJV

“Therefore, holy brothers, **called to be partakers of the heavenly calling** [divine individualism], consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus, who was faithful to Him who appointed Him, ... ”  
Hebrews 3:1-2 MKJV

**Divine individualism is the work of God.**

It says in Ephesians 2:10 “For we are his workmanship ... .” It is the process whereby men are created in God’s image and likeness and given the blessing of a mind. Not only do we have the honor of being made to look like the two Jehovahs (God), we have the further honor of being able to think and to take action on this earth. Through the process of living this life we learn lessons, including hard ones, and we also have some triumphs of achievement. As social creatures, meant for an eternal life, God gave us family and friends to share life with. We have to learn the principles behind getting along with each other, including forgiveness. And in this physical life we are to use the resources of the earth to learn how to manage. And we are to grow in grace and knowledge – grace and knowledge being both



literal and also symbolic of the moral and intellectual virtues. We are to learn who and what to value and to obtain the virtues and to bear fruit from using those virtues. Because all men sin, they need a savior. One has been provided. His name is Jesus Christ. It is beyond the scope of this book to discuss how to become a Christian and there are many such books already written. In very simple terms, one can become a Christian by following the process of Acts 2 and Hebrews 6:

“Then Peter said to them, Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ to [receive] remission of [your] sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the promise is to you and to your children, and to all those afar off, as many as the Lord our God shall call.” Acts 2:38, 39, MKJV

“Therefore, having left the discourse of the beginning of Christ, let us go on to full growth, not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, of the baptisms, of doctrine, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment.” Hebrews 6:1, 2, MKJV

After we are forgiven for our sins and receive the Holy Spirit we are new creatures (creations). We no longer only have a human body and a mind; we also have some of the Holy Spirit of God. And now we walk in the newness of life (Romans 6:4). Similar to how an acorn grows to become an oak tree, a man who receives the Holy Spirit is now on their way to growing to become like Jesus Christ, which process is completed at the resurrection, as mentioned above. A divine individual is on their way to ultimately receiving an incorruptible spirit body and eternal life – while retaining their personality, interests, sense of humor, and irreplaceable uniqueness. All this is divine individualism. It is the gift of the two Jehovahs to mankind. It is the gift of an eternal life worth living because all who complete the process will be beings of good character. They will have the proper values and they will also have the moral and intellectual virtues. And to top it all off the two Jehovahs are going to create a wonderful new heavens and new earth as a great environment for these divine individuals to inhabit, where there will be no more tears or pain (Revelation 21:1-5). At that time, based on what we can know about it, the divine individualism process will have been completed.

"And I saw a new heaven and a new earth. For the first heaven and the first earth had passed away. And the sea no longer is. And I, John, saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of Heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her Husband. And I heard a great voice out of Heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they will be His people, and God Himself will be with them and be their God. And God will wipe away all tears from their eyes. And there will be no more death, nor mourning, nor crying out, nor will there be any more pain; for the first things passed away. And He sitting on the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And He said to me, Write, for these words are true and faithful." Revelation 21:1-5, MKJV

After baptism, Jesus Christ now dwells in a person through the power of the Holy Spirit:

"Therefore we were buried with Him by baptism into death, so that as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father; even so we also should walk in newness of life." Romans 6:4, MKJV

"to whom God willed to make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among

the Gentiles, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory." Colossians 1:27, NASB

"I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me." Philippians 4:13, NKJV

"Therefore we do not lose heart, but though our outer man is decaying, yet our inner man is being renewed day by day."  
2 Corinthians 4:16, NASB

"that He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with power through His Spirit in the inner man;"  
Ephesians 3:16, NASB

"And for this purpose also I labor, striving according to His power, which mightily works within me." Colossians 1:29, NASB

"He who believes in Me [Christ], as the Scripture said, 'From his innermost being shall flow rivers of living water.'" John 7:38, NASB

God the Father's will for you is that he wants to transform you, forming and shaping you into the image of His son, Jesus Christ, and he wants you to bear the fruit of the Holy Spirit in your life:

"For whom He foreknew, He also predestined to become conformed to the image of His Son, **that He might be the first-born among many brethren**; Romans 8:29, NASB

If divine individualism were properly understood, then each man and woman, of all races and ages, would be valued. This is because each individual is literally unique and irreplaceable. This is the topic of the next section of this book so more will not be written about that here. What will be written here is what we can control: **each of us should value our lives and also our potential.** We should love the two Jehovahs because they gave us life, provided a Savior, and provided for the process of divine individualism, which is available to us all. We should love our fellow man because they, too, are all potentially divine individuals. They, too, are made in God's image. They, too, have hopes and dreams and family and friends that are important to them. To sacrifice a unique and irreplaceable human life on a nonsensical, metaphysical or secular collective (and their idiotic projects), is a waste of life and it runs counter to the intentions of the two Jehovahs. Who knows how many geniuses like a Mozart or an Einstein were assigned by a

power elite of some kind to dig ditches or to peel potatoes in a soup kitchen? That this has happened and is happening is a dead loss to all mankind. It is criminal in every way that something could be criminal. It is stupid in every way that something could be stupid. If you author could think of harsher acceptable words, he would use them.

There are many problems plaguing mankind. The world's political, religious, and other systems, along with the grind of life, can make all of us feel, at times, almost sub-human. And this can be particularly true for women and minorities. None of this ought to be. Take the problem of cancer, for example. Cancer has negatively touched, or will touch, the life of almost everyone in some way. Would it not be to the betterment of mankind if all of the minds were available to work on solving the problem, instead of only some of the minds? It leaves your author incredulous as to the Neanderthal thinking of the secular and religious power elite, many of whom will die of cancer, that they would, through one method or another, restrict the freedom or ability of any who would so choose to attempt to solve this horrible problem. Your author picked cancer as just one example. There are innumerable problems to be solved.

To put it in contrived navy vernacular, it should be, "All minds on deck," – not just some of them. All men and all women and all races are made in the image and likeness of the two Jehovahs. And all of us should be free to think and take action to better our own lives and the lives of all mankind. As Dr. Tibor Machan has observed, "... there is no such thing as coerced morally right conduct." In the event individuals are not free to think and take action, systems have been put into place that work against individuality AND against the two Jehovahs AND against life itself. Those systems are against the nature of man and against the two Jehovahs' process of divine individualism and they will come down someday (Revelation 19). No man should have to pay a ransom for his life to other men. The only ransom to be paid has already been paid - by Jesus Christ.

If we stop and think for a minute we can learn an important lesson. The lesson here is one of irony and stark contrast. The lesson is that instead of very valuable, unique, irreplaceable, individual men and women being sacrificed to other men forming some metaphysical or secular collective, aka man's way, God, in the person of the Word, now known as Jesus Christ, sacrificed himself for

each of us. That this actually happened shows for all time the importance of the doctrine and process of divine individualism to the two Jehovahs. **It should also show the importance of divine individualism to every one of us.**

### **Each Person Is Unique**

The fact that each person's DNA, each person's fingerprints, and each person's retinas are distinguishable shows quite clearly, from a biological perspective, that we are all different. We have different voices, shapes, ages, talents, etc. And we each have our own individual body, i.e., we inhabit a separate physical place from everyone else. Each of us also has a personality type and a temperament. Some of our human behavior is evidently genetically pre-disposed, which is not to say that rational and intentional choice cannot override this genetic pre-disposition. At any rate, our genetics are different from everyone else, ergo we are unique. There can be no question regarding our genetic uniqueness.

Each person also has a unique cultural upbringing. This is true even for different siblings in the same family. The oldest child,



the middle children, and the youngest child each have different experiences, even within the same family. Further cultural upbringing variations include language differences, differences in religious training and beliefs, parental beliefs and training differences, formal and informal educational differences, race differences, national and governmental differences, neighborhood differences, travel and experience differences, economic differences, differences resulting from living during different time eras, etc. All of these cultural differences compound onto our genetic differences making each of us even more unique.

As we go through life human beings have the freedom to make choices. These choices are causative factors, which have consequences, and we are responsible for those consequences. We can think and we can take action. Human choice is a causative factor regarding shaping the world we live in, in particular, in shaping our own world (our own life). When presented with a choice, the same human being can choose one way this time and the opposite way at a later point in time. And, when presented with the same basic set of circumstances, different men and women can and do choose differently,

despite being presented with the same choosing alternatives. Human choice is a differentiating feature of human life. This is why there needs to be what is known as methodological dualism for the sciences. The natural sciences rely on the experimental method and the social sciences cannot properly use only such a method because to do so would involve human experimentation. Further, the social sciences have to account for human choice as a causative factor, which the natural sciences do not. Human beings are not particles in motion, moving according to natural scientific laws. As a scientist, to not recognize human choice, and its effects, is non-scientific – because human choice is reality and science should conform to reality. Science should provide men with results that are in accordance with reality. In addition to genetic uniqueness, compounded by cultural differentiators, human choice itself is a further compounding differentiator resulting in even more distinctly unique individuals.

As a person lives out their time on this earth all of the above differences compound over time. Our tastes change over time. As we mature, and this takes time, what we value changes as well. The bottom line result is that for everyone who has ever lived, and for

everyone who ever will live, there is quite literally no one like you. There has never been anyone like you in the past. There is no one like you in the present. There will never be anyone like you in the future. You are unique. We all are. No theory can ever argue away reality and any theory contrary to human uniqueness and individuality is wrong.

Christ used the parable of the talents in his teaching. It is pretty clear that each of us is given different mental and physical gifts, which is to say different talents.

““For the kingdom of heaven is like a man traveling to a far country, who called his own servants and delivered his goods to them. “And to one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one, to each according to his own ability; and immediately he went on a journey.”  
Matthew 25:14, 15, NKJV

Some would argue that the talents referred to above are referring to spiritual gifts. Perhaps. But since both observation and thought clearly show that we are all unique it is quite likely that the different talents include physical and mental talents, too. As for spiritual gifts, they are also clearly spoken of in the Bible.

Two of the most prominent places are Romans 12 and 1 Corinthians 12.

“so it is with Christ’s body. We are all parts of his one body, and each of us has different work to do. And since we are all one body in Christ, we belong to each other, and each of us needs all the others. **God has given each of us the ability to do certain things well**. So if God has given you the ability to prophesy, speak out when you have faith that God is speaking through you. If your gift is that of serving others, serve them well. If you are a teacher, do a good job of teaching. If your gift is to encourage others, do it! If you have money, share it generously. If God has given you leadership ability, take the responsibility seriously. And if you have a gift for showing kindness to others, do it gladly. Don’t just pretend that you love others. Really love them. Hate what is wrong. Stand on the side of the good. Love each other with genuine affection, and take delight in honoring each other.”  
Romans 12:5-10, NLT

Take note of the highlighted passages above that show each of us, when participating in the process of divine individualism, is given different spiritual gifts - enabling abilities - by the two

Jehovahs. We have different jobs to do. Each of us needs **ALL** the others. And we need to recognize the unique and important value of every other and to really honor and love them, not just pretend that we love them. We are all potentially divine individuals, unique and valuable, with different jobs to do. The two Jehovahs do NOT expect us to be the same. They know better.

For those individuals with the Holy Spirit of God, the spiritual gifts received are additional differentiators that further compound our unique individual status. And when one understands the promised future resurrection and eternal life, that is to say, when one understands the promises inherent in divine individualism it becomes clear just how valuable each human being is. We are all future divine individuals if we cooperate with the two Jehovahs in their incredible plan. What a divine individual could accomplish with an eternity of time and no more physical limitations is, at this time, beyond our comprehension.

"And now, dear brothers and sisters, I will write about the special abilities the Holy Spirit gives to each of us, for I must correct your misunderstandings about them. You know that

when you were still pagans you were led astray and swept along in worshiping speechless idols. So I want you to know how to discern what is truly from God: No one speaking by the Spirit of God can curse Jesus, and no one is able to say, "Jesus is Lord," except by the Holy Spirit. Now there are different kinds of spiritual gifts, but it is the same Holy Spirit who is the source of them all. There are different kinds of service in the church, but it is the same Lord we are serving. There are different ways God works in our lives, but it is the same God who does the work through all of us. A spiritual gift is given to each of us as a means of helping the entire church. To one person the Spirit gives the ability to give wise advice; to another he gives the gift of special knowledge. The Spirit gives special faith to another, and to someone else he gives the power to heal the sick. He gives one person the power to perform miracles, and to another the ability to prophesy. He gives someone else the ability to know whether it is really the Spirit of God or another spirit that is speaking. Still another person is given the ability to speak in unknown languages, and another is given the ability to interpret what is being said. It is the one and only Holy Spirit who distributes these gifts. He alone decides

which gift each person should have.”

1 Corinthians 12:1-11, NLT

Beyond the scope of this book, but to help the reader understand, when the Holy Spirit is referred to in noun or pronoun form, as a person, it means either God the Father, or Jesus Christ, or both as the case may be, (e.g., Acts 16:6, 2 Corinthian 3:17). When the Holy Spirit is referred to, implicitly or explicitly, as “power,” it is speaking of the spiritual essence of God or force/power emanating from either God the Father, or Jesus Christ, or both, (e.g., Acts 1:8). The context of the scriptural passage determines the proper understanding of whether “Holy Spirit” means one or both of the two Jehovahs, or their essence and power, as the case may be.

All talents and spiritual gifts are from the two Jehovahs to individual men and women. They are given to specific individuals, not to “society,” or to a “state,” or even to the church as a whole. Individuals associate together to form society. As man is a social animal, not just the thinking animal, individuals will choose to associate and cooperate in order to accomplish things and to enjoy each other’s company. There is nothing about divine individualism that precludes voluntary association for mutual

accomplishment and benefit. In fact, the above passages concerning spiritual gifts show individuals honoring and loving each other and using their talents and gifts in cooperation with each other.

As explained in the previous section of this book, man does have a nature. We are all thinking and acting beings. We are also social beings. And each man has the gift of life from the two Jehovahs. To stay alive each man needs to think and take action. To do so each man needs liberty and property. In other words, man has a nature as the thinking and social animal and each individual man has life, liberty, and property as natural rights. We could not even discuss “man” without acknowledging that man has a nature. Further, there is no social theory of violence. Anyone who advocates violence against others is attempting, as philosopher and novelist Ayn Rand once observed, “the right to violate a right” – which is a non sequitur.

The two Jehovahs determined and established objective ethical principles to live by. Life, the value of life, and the importance of values are key, but they are the subject of the next section of this book, so your author will



write no more about them here. What your author will write about here is this very important point:

Within the context of remaining within objective ethical principles each person is free to be their own unique selves - **without guilt for being different**. Of course you are different. We are all unique. You could not be the same as someone else, even if you wanted to. It is quite literally, Homo sapiens sapiens – Your Name Here - future divine individual. We are to be conformed to the image and likeness of Jesus Christ, not to each other. There is a reason Baskin Robbins Ice Cream Shop has 31 flavors. Different individuals subjectively like and choose different things, and at different times. Our subjective choices are perfectly fine, within the context of staying inside the guidelines of objective ethical principles. And it should go without saying that our subjective choices can and should be guided by reason. There is no one else who can be you, so be yourself, with proper respect and consideration for others.

“For whom He foreknew, He also predestinated to be conformed to the image of His Son, **for Him to be the First-born among many brothers.**” Romans 8:29, MKJV

We are a son or daughter of God, not a creature of the State. We will answer for our own lives and to do that, at the human level, we must own ourselves and have the liberty to be ourselves. No collective can answer for our lives, in place of us. We cannot delegate any authority or responsibility to any collective, religious or secular, to do so.

“But hearing that He had silenced the Sadducees, the Pharisees were gathered together. Then one of them, a lawyer, asked, tempting Him and saying, Master, which is the great commandment in the Law? Jesus said to him, You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like it, You shall love your neighbor as yourself. On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets.” Matthew 22:34-40, MKJV

The reasons for the first great commandment are pretty obvious. We should love the two Jehovahs because they created and sustain all things; for their perfect minds and character; because they made the earth and gave us life, including the honor to be made in

their image; for providing mankind with a Savior, the promise of a future resurrection, etc. What your author wants to emphasize here, however, is the "love your neighbor as yourself" commandment. First, we have to respect and love ourselves, or we cannot love others to a very high level. If we do not love ourselves, it does the two Jehovahs no good to command us to love others to that very low level. It logically follows, then, that part of fulfilling that command is to actually love one's self. If we do love ourselves, and appreciate that we have divine individual potential, then we can and should value others, who also are made in the image and likeness of God. Those others are also potential divine individuals. Those others also have natural rights. Those others also have hopes and dreams that are important to them. Those others are also unique and irreplaceable individuals. Those others should be loved, too.

It is true that many of those others are currently not exhibiting the ethical behavior that shows they care about the moral and intellectual virtues. It is true that many of those others do not value or choose properly – disregarding both their own life and also the lives and property of others. Divine individualism, to many, is more of a potential, than a reality at this time. The

Bible can give us some longer-term perspective here:

“For God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have everlasting life. For God did not send His Son into the world to condemn the world, but so that the world might be saved through Him.” John 3:16, 17, MKJV

“For one will with difficulty die for a righteous one, yet perhaps one would even dare to die for a good one. But God commends His love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.” Romans 5:7, 8, MKJV

Divine individualism gets off to a bad start in that the entirety of the human race initially rejects the two Jehovahs and their perfect value system. For a time, the human race seems determined to only do what does not work and cannot work. Fortunately, the two Jehovahs are long-term thinkers, love us, and are determined. They provided a Savior for mankind, though we were all sinners (bad people), and once one decides to participate in their divine individualism process they grant forgiveness to us. And they also give the Holy Spirit to help the divine individualism change process along.

As previously mentioned, there is no one else who can be you, so be yourself, with proper respect and consideration for others. To be your best self you must learn what to value and you should also work to obtain and use the moral and intellectual virtues so that you will obtain the best possible results for your life. The subject of values forms the topic for the next section of this book, and the subject of virtues forms the topic for the section after that, so no more will be written, here, about either of those important topics, except this: as we learn to value more correctly, and as we obtain and use the virtues, we will also come to value others made in God's image. Then we will be able to better fulfill the second great commandment, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself."

Sometimes the bad decisions and failures of our past cause us guilt and shame. In this regard, all human beings are in the same hole-laden boat (Romans 3:23). Guilt and shame are two of Satan's best weapons as he attempts to thwart the divine individualism plans of the two Jehovahs. It is important to not let guilt and shame prevent us from starting and following through with the process of divine individualism.

Perhaps that is why repentance, public acknowledgment of sin, is at the beginning of the Acts 2:38 conversion process. Each of us is afraid others will find out how bad we have been, will find out the mistakes we have made, etc. By repenting and acknowledging our sins we take the weapons of guilt and shame out of Satan's hand. Once we confess that we are a sinner in need of a Savior there is no further harm involved in that knowledge becoming public because we made it public ourselves. There is life after failure. Your author wrote a previous book entitled, *Fixer Upper People*, in part explaining how to start over and rebuild.

Sometimes well-intended people believe in the philosophical doctrine known as determinism. This doctrine is decidedly false, but beyond the scope of this book. It has to be false because the two Jehovahs gave both men and angels free will and angelic and human choices help write the future, along with the two Jehovahs' choices. The two Jehovahs reserve the right to intervene at any time, but generally they do not. Job 23:13-14 is sometimes used to attempt to show that God has a plan for every life – meaning a detailed and specific plan. This is not true. Job was a unique person chosen for a unique task – which is the two Jehovahs'

prerogative. Your author has written a book on this topic entitled, *Why Job Suffered: The Real Story*. Other than using Job to make a number of points, they likely did not plan his entire life, only intervening into parts of it in a most profound way.

“Nevertheless, his [God’s] mind concerning me remains unchanged, and who can turn him from his purposes? Whatever he wants to do, he does. So he will do for me all he has planned. He controls my destiny.”  
Job 23:13, 14, NLT

Another scripture that determinists frequently cite is the passage of Jeremiah 29:11, where it appears to indicate that: “God has a plan for you.” In this case it is clear, from reading all of Jeremiah 29, that God is speaking to the Jews who were carried away captive to Babylon – in other words, God had a national plan for them. In no way can this be logically extended to show that God has a specific individual physical plan for every life.

Another housekeeping point, as we wind toward the close of this section of the book, is that some philosophers actually contend that we are not really individuals because we all learn

from each other. Really? Who did Sir Isaac Newton learn from when he formulated the laws of motion and universal gravitation and who did he learn from when he invented (discovered) the core principles of calculus? Geniuses do not learn from others, they disregard others in order to make an advance. To try and deny individualism, even at the secular level, takes convolutions and distortions of the grossest magnitude. As previously mentioned, if a theory attempts to deny reality it is the theory that needs to be discarded. Any such theory, in flagrant disregard of reality, is surely not science or truth.

Three of the seemingly simple, but definitely harder, life questions to answer are: "Who am I?" and "Where should I go" and "What should I do?" There is a wide range of options available to us all. It takes time and usually a lot of trial and error to find one's path in life. It also takes determination. Even if the world is bad, your world can be good. It depends on the choices you make. Making good choices depends on the values you hold and the virtues you obtain and use. While on the way to finding out the answers to the above questions for ourselves it would be wise to allow others time to also answer those questions for themselves. What is



clear is that we are all unique individuals. What is further clear is that the two Jehovahs are offering us the chance to participate in their divine individualism process. Only you can be you. There is no one else to take your place. You are invaluable. You are priceless.

## **Increasing The Importance Of Values**

Your author has previously written an entire book on values entitled, *Values, Choices & Consequences*. The main point of the book is that the values you actually hold will determine the choices you make and then those choices will have consequences that you and others must live with. Since this is the case it is very important that each person consider what it is that they value, as a chain reaction is going to be set off based on those values. That chain reaction will lead to either positive or negative consequences that are very real. This section of this book will include a very brief summary of some of that material, plus a few new camera angles.

For all of its pluses and minuses, one thing is indisputable about the Industrial Revolution – productivity greatly increased. In fact, it skyrocketed. This skyrocketed productivity

enabled many more people to live on the earth – more human lives were possible. Further, this skyrocketed productivity greatly increased the standard of living for many. This section of the book contends that because we are all potentially divine individuals that what is really needed for mankind is for the importance of values to skyrocket in each person's mind. If the correct values were held then the correct choices would be made and this would lead to flourishing lives. And your author means flourishing lives in the all-encompassing sense of the phrase, e.g., spiritually, mentally, emotionally, and physically speaking.

One of the funniest and unfortunately truest statements your author has ever heard, while listening to a sermon, was this point-blank statement from a preacher friend of his: "Hell ... is other people." Your author burst out laughing, but then later thought about the trueness of the statement. My friend is unfortunately correct. Hell is other people. But, why is this true? The reason this is largely true is because most other people do not consider what it is that they value and the implications of holding to those values. Most people think in a very narrow range. They do not adequately consider the results that will occur, to

themselves and others, based on making choices from their value system. They do not think long-term. They think short-term. They do not see the unseen, but real effects that will come to pass in the long-term. And they do not see the effects their choices will engender toward other people. They live for the range of the moment, being happy with food, sex, and entertainment. And because they have never been taught the social science chain reaction sequence:

Values → Choices → Consequences,

they have not learned how important it is to consider just what it is that they value and what the likely effects of holding those values will be, over time, to both themselves and others.

As a concrete example of a value, consider the shortened versions of both the eighth commandment, "thou shalt not steal," and the ninth commandment, "thou shalt bear false witness (do not lie)." A moment's thought will reveal that the value behind both of these commandments is honesty. If a person is honest they will not steal and they will not lie. If they do not believe that honesty is a value to live by, then they will steal and lie at some point

in their life. When they steal it will hurt others. When they get caught it will hurt themselves, as they will likely have to make restitution, go to jail, have a criminal record, etc., as the case may be - depending on the circumstances of the theft and the legal system of the society they live in. All these negative physical consequences almost pale into insignificance at the IMMEDIATE DAMAGE to the person's own character - whether they get caught or not. They will certainly get caught by the two Jehovahs as revealed by the below two scriptures (your author could have quoted dozens of scriptures to make this point, but refrained from so doing as it is obvious that no human being is going to fool the two Jehovahs):

"The LORD's searchlight penetrates the human spirit, exposing every hidden motive."  
Proverbs 20:27, NLT

"And I saw the dead, the small and the great, stand before God. And the books were opened, and another book was opened, which is the Book of Life. And the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works."  
Revelation 20:12, MKJV

Philosopher and novelist Ayn Rand wrote along the lines of value as being: that which one acts to obtain (because you value it), or acts to keep once one has obtained it. Most dictionary definitions are similar to what the Dictionary program on your author's Macbook contained: value = "the importance, worth, or usefulness of something"; values = "one's judgment of what is important in life," or "a person's principles or standards of behavior." All of the above are fine for our purposes.

Most people do not consider the likely possibility that the two Jehovahs were philosophers first, even before they were creators and artists. They almost had to be as correct philosophy is the love and study of wisdom and has to do with establishing: ethical standards to live by, what constitutes knowledge, the laws of logic, the laws of identity and cause and effect, etc. There is no question, at least in your author's mind, that the two Jehovahs established objective ethical standards and then deliberately chose to live by those perfect standards, without deviation. The objective ethics comes first, if not timeline-wise, then in importance - before the two Jehovahs formulated all of the natural scientific and mathematical laws and before they actually

created the universe, the earth, and mankind. The two genius minds in the universe are very clear on the importance of values. Values are far more important than science and technology. Values are far more important than physical things – even the universe itself. The two Jehovahs can always make another universe, but their own character and their own minds are the most important things in existence, now or ever. Values and virtues come first. Everything else follows on from there. The virtues will be the subject of the next section of this book. For a more thorough discussion of philosophy, the reader is invited to read a previous book, written by your author, entitled: *Intellectual Warfare: The Corruption Of Philosophy And Thought*.

As previously explained, the reason values come first is because they set off a social science chain reaction leading to consequences that effect everyone and everything. A natural scientist of chemistry knows that under certain conditions, combining element B with element C (perhaps with a known catalyst) will generate, over a defined period of time, a chemical reaction of X. Other chemists can duplicate the X reaction. The results of most chemical reactions are already known. No knowledgeable chemist is surprised by the results. In this

regard the natural sciences are ahead of the social sciences, but they don't have to be.

If people were taught and knew the social science chain reaction sequence: values -> choices -> consequences, and if they cared about their own lives and the lives of others, they would think about the values they hold. The values they actually hold are the starting point for the quality of life for all of us. The two Jehovahs are point blank in telling mankind what value is the most important of all:

"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

"The thief does not come except to steal and to kill and to destroy. I have come so that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." John 10:10, MKJV

Life is the primary value because only the living can value. If you are dead, your values, whatever they were, no longer exist. Life becomes the primary value and sets the context for the choice of everything else, including other

values. Choosing life involves, by necessity, also choosing an entire set of other things necessary for life itself – a package of other values, as it were. Physically speaking, choosing life also means acknowledging liberty as a value because in order to choose life you had to be free to choose. Everyone else also has to be free to choose, so other peoples' liberty, too, must be acknowledged and respected. Spiritually speaking, liberty is also necessary because the two Jehovahs do not want people-bots who have been programmed to always make the correct choice. A pre-programmed choice is not morality. If we were pre-programmed to choose, one way or another, then no one could take the credit for morality, or the blame for immorality. Spiritually speaking, we are free and free to choose, but we cannot use that liberty to do evil:

“And the Lord is that Spirit; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.”  
2 Corinthians 3:17, MKJV

“For, brothers, you were called to liberty.  
Only do not use the liberty for an opening to the flesh, but by love serve one another.”  
Galatians 5:13, MKJV



It is beyond the scope of this book to discuss the subject matter of the natural rights of all men (life, liberty, and property), but because life is the ultimate value and life as a value entails a package of other follow-on values, your author will do a very brief summary. For a more complete discussion the reader is invited to read a previous book, written by your author, entitled: *Why There Is No Justice: The Corruption Of Law*. Each man needs to sustain his own life and therefore needs the liberty to both think and to take action to sustain their life. It does no man any good to only think about having something to eat. He also has to take the action of producing something to eat or something that others value in trade so he can trade for something to eat. In short, each man also needs to obtain and use property in order to stay alive. And, at a minimum, each man owns himself – he has a property right in himself. This is at the physical level. The two Jehovahs are the original appropriators (Creators), owner-operators of the universe and therefore own everything and everyone.

“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

Whether spiritual or physical, there is no social theory of violence. If anyone or any being, e.g., Satan the Devil, advocates violence, theft, or fraud, they are advocating a "might makes right" pseudo-philosophy. Your author writes, "pseudo-philosophy," because there is no wisdom in advocating violence and philosophy is inherently self-defined as the love of wisdom. The Bible refers to Satan as the god of forces (Daniel 11:38). It also refers to him as a murder and a liar (John 8:44) and a deceiver (Revelation 12:9). Advocating might makes right simply means an eternity of warfare with no peace ever. "Peace" under such a scenario simply means an interlude where there is time to scheme the next coup or assault, or to reload, or where the losers are ground into an enslaved or tortured existence where death would appear to be a blessing. Peace under a "might makes right" scenario means, "do what we say" (be a slave) "and we won't kill you." The goon of the moment (the dictator) has to constantly live in fear of being deposed and would install an angelic-control, or people-control system of oppressing even those who were supposedly on the goon's team. With no objective ethics to

guide anyone by, and no natural rights being acknowledged or respected, it is literally every being for themselves. "What can I get away with?" becomes the operating mode. There is no long-term thinking. It does not do a creative, moral, and thoughtful person any good to try and build something that would enhance life because it will just be taken away from them. The great minds retire from the scene. It is hell on earth, or hell in the universe. Your author wrote "angelic-control" above because evidently Satan rebelled and one-third of the angels followed him in his rebellion (Isaiah 14:12-14, Ezekiel 28:13-16, and Revelation 12:3-4, 7-9).

Satan, the original sinner (Ezekiel 28:15), became a murderer and a liar. In essence, he became the author of values that lead to death. Satan's "might makes right," "the winners write the history" value system produces pain, suffering, fear, instability, and death.

"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

“Did not abide in the truth,” above, means not abiding in the correct value system that leads to life and flourishing life. The correct value system, the one that leads to life, is the value system of the two Jehovahs, as spelled out in their word, the Bible, as truth:

“Sanctify them through Your truth. **Your Word is truth.**” John 17:17, MKJV

Those who believe in and follow Satan’s corrupt death-generating value system will not be allowed to live on into eternity. They will be put to death. No man has an immortal soul so death literally means non-existence. They will no longer be. This is why the subject of values is so important. One can either learn the importance of values, pick the two Jehovahs’ value system and learn to live by it, or one can pick the value system of Satan and die by that choice – die for all eternity. Satan’s value system literally produces hell on earth for a time, followed by eternal death.

“Now the works of the [corrupted] flesh [corrupted by Satan’s values] are clearly revealed, which are: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lustfulness, idolatry, sorcery,

hatreds, fightings, jealousies, angers, rivalries, divisions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkennesses, revelings, and things like these; of which I tell you before, as I also said before, that they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Galatians 5:19-21, MKJV

"He who overcomes will inherit all things, and I will be his God, and he will be My son. But the fearful, and the unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, will have their part in the Lake burning with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." Revelation 21:7, 8, MKJV

"Blessed are they who do His commandments [choose and live by the two Jehovahs' value system], that their authority will be over the Tree of Life, and they may enter in by the gates into the city. But outside [dead outside] are the dogs, and the sorcerers, and the fornicators, and the murderers, and the idolaters, and everyone who loves and makes a lie." Revelation 22:14, 15, MKJV

"Behold, all souls [lives] are Mine. As the soul of the father, also the soul of the son, they are Mine [as the Creators, the two Jehovahs

own everyone]. The soul that sins, it shall die."  
Ezekiel 18:4, MKJV

"The soul that sins, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, nor shall the father bear the iniquity of the son. The righteousness of the righteous shall be on him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be on him." Ezekiel 18:20, MKJV

The Ezekiel 18:20 scripture points out that we are each responsible for our lives. We cannot hide behind our parents, our teachers, our religion, our government, or any other collective, etc. We are each individuals. We are either going to thoughtfully adopt and live by the only objective, ethical value system that leads to life, or we are not. There is only one value system that leads to life – the value system of the two Jehovahs. Any value system violating the life, liberty, or property of another puts us squarely into the position of having adopted a social theory of violence – which social theory of violence has us participating in envying, theft, lies, fraud, murder, etc. It has us adopting the way of pain, suffering, angst, and death. In other words it has us adopting the value system of the author of such things, Satan the Devil.

Do you want to Live or Die? That is the question. **If you pick Life** you have chosen the side of the two Jehovahs, the creators of life, and the creators of flourishing life. **If you pick Death**, you have chosen the side of Satan. You will experience pain, suffering, angst, fear, and ultimately both you and Satan will die. So will everyone else who adopts his evil death-generating value system.

"In that day the LORD with His great and fierce and strong sword shall punish the sea-monster, the darting serpent [clearly a reference to Satan], the sea-monster, that twisting serpent; and He shall kill the monster in the sea." Isaiah 27:1, MKJV

"The last enemy made to cease is death."  
1 Corinthians 15:26, MKJV

If the last enemy to be destroyed is death itself, and if Satan is the enemy, which he clearly is, whose value system generates death, which it clearly does, it logically follows, in light of Isaiah 27:1 and other scriptures, that Satan himself will be killed.

"Since then the children have partaken of flesh and blood, He [Jesus Christ] also Himself likewise partook of the same; that through death [Christ was dead for three days when he came to this earth to die for mankind] **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." Hebrews 2:14, 15, MKJV

Satan is going to be destroyed. His fallen angels are going to be destroyed. All men who willfully choose Satan's death-generating value system are going to be destroyed. The above and below passages of scripture could not be more clear:

"Do not be deceived, God is not mocked. For whatever a man sows, that he also will reap. For he sowing to his flesh will reap corruption from the flesh [death per Galatians 5:19-21]. But he sowing to the Spirit will reap life everlasting from the Spirit." Galatians 6:7-8, MKJV

Those who choose to participate in the two Jehovah's process of divine individualism must choose the two Jehovahs' life-generating value system and reject Satan's death-generating



value system. It is as simple as that. This is because the social science chain reaction sequence is:

Values → Choices → Consequences

It is quite literally the choice between divine individualism and death. Collectives are not offered eternal life. Only individuals are offered eternal life. There is no membership in any collective that will get you eternal life. You will either choose Life, which includes picking the only value system that can generate life ... or, you will choose Death, which includes picking the value system that generates pain, suffering angst, and death. Not picking Life means picking Death by default. You must value and actively choose Life.

As Aristotle observed, all things move toward their end, in accordance with their nature, e.g., an acorn will grow into an oak tree and only an oak tree. Either an acorn grows into an oak tree, or it does not grow at all and dies. And, as Socrates evidently pointed out, to be means to be something. All men are made in the image and likeness of God (Genesis 1:26-28). To be a man means to be made in the image and likeness of God. We can think and we have free

moral agency. We can choose. Using some analogous artistic license, your author contends that each physical man (and woman) is like an acorn – a potential. And our potential is to grow into a divine individual with eternal life (1 Corinthians 15 and many other places). Either we will grow into a divine individual or we will be like the acorn that did not make it. We will die. And death is our enemy, so we must choose life and what leads to life. Life and all it entails is the most important value.

How can anyone rationally and non-hypocritically advocate life for themselves, but not for others? How can anyone advocate liberty for themselves, but not for others? How can anyone advocate property for themselves, but not for others? They cannot. Further, no one has the right to actually violate a right. If they do so they have chosen to start the next war. One of the interesting, but unfortunate, things pertaining to war is that war always leads to the exact opposite of the natural rights of man, per the Table below. We were to have dominion over the earth, not each other (Genesis 1:26-28). Since all men are men ( $A = A$ ) and men do have a nature (which nature requires natural rights), while at the same time being unique individuals, it is

important and necessary for all men to have their natural rights recognized and respected.

War leads to:		Social Harmony leads to:
Death		Life
Slavery		Liberty
Property destruction		Property
		aka the Natural Rights

In simple terms, the social science sequence leading to peace, which is necessary for both life and flourishing life, is as follows:

Justice → Social Harmony → Peace → Life

Justice is a necessary means to social harmony and is also constitutive (a constituent part) of what social harmony means. The same thing holds for social harmony and peace. Social harmony is a means to peace and is also constitutive of what peace means. The same thing holds for peace and life. Peace is a means

to life and flourishing life and is constitutive of what flourishing life means. At the physical level justice can include an element of restitution for wrongs committed. And social harmony includes repentance and forgiveness. At any rate, any attempt to establish Life by following a lying, thieving, murderous, warring path is doomed to failure - hence, once again, the importance of values. If a dictator, or local individual goon, or anyone else advocates the right to violate a right, they are illogical and immoral. They will also end up becoming a victim of their own lack of values. Even a powerful dictator is not safe as they are surrounded by unethical others. And any others, who also believe that there are no objective ethical principles to live by, will simply bide their time until they feel they are strong enough to overthrow the thug of the moment and then strike that thug when they feel the opportunity is right. The main point is that: **might makes right destroys all it comes into contact with.** This is true, even concerning the strongest for the moment, and it is eventually true even for Satan himself – the goon of all goons.

All of this is why morality is always practical and why morality is always rational. Any

attempt to rationalize why morality is not the correct course of action only sets the stage for the advocator of such a view to be correctly viewed by others as unprincipled. (Perhaps they would be regarded as practical, depending on the circumstances, but still unprincipled.) Once one is viewed by other unprincipled men as unprincipled, one is also viewed as dangerous, and one is now targeted to be dealt with – if not now, then later. All of this sets the stage for fight after fight, and war after war, resulting in well-deserved deaths. There is no rational, moral, creditable, or practical social theory of violence. None has ever been philosophically offered because any man who actually attempted to do so would be seen for the intellectual and moral monster that they are. Even when doing evil, men wish to pretend to be good and they wish others would regard them as good. Thugs want to be loved, too, – even if they don't deserve it.

This is why most dictators, and other professional monsters, try to find ways to engage in moral and intellectual nihilism, which is to say, they try and get rid of absolute standards, or pretend there are no absolute standards. Sellout pseudo-intellectuals are the apologist dupes who help them. Knowingly or

not, goons and their apologists are all Satan-inspired. Satan is the author of lies and murder (John 8:44). Intellectual and moral nihilism are just two of Satan's many devices (2 Corinthians 2:11). He has many others. The observers of mankind, the two Jehovahs, are neither fooled, nor amused. Your author's book on philosophy covers more detail regarding the corruption of thought and ethics, so nothing more will be written here.

What we value is what we believe in; what we believe has worth. It is what we will try for and uphold, what we want to achieve and maintain. Values are a person's principles, or standards of behavior. Choosing life as the priority value causes us to consider the core values that enable life, like the previously mentioned honesty, justice, social harmony, and peace, etc. To try and list all other values in this short book is not possible. The reader can start reading the Bible and other great books on the subject and go from there knowing that values, choices, and consequences are a social science causal chain sequence connected in that order. Even though the world is crazy, our own personal world can be as good as humanly possible if we obtain the correct values and then choose correctly.

Life is important to start with and flourishing life (abundant life John 10:10) expands the concept and value of life even further. Flourishing life involves health and fellowship with family and friends and the two Jehovahs themselves. Flourishing life includes love. We should love the two Jehovahs, love ourselves, love life, and love each other (Matthew 22:36-40).

“He [Jesus] said to him [a lawyer], What is written in the law? How do you read it? And answering, he said, You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your strength, and with all your mind, and your neighbor as yourself. And He said to him, You have answered right, do this and you shall live.” Luke 10:26-28, MKJV

“keep yourselves in the love of God, eagerly awaiting the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ to everlasting life.” Jude 1:21, MKJV

Flourishing life also involves each one of us becoming a better person. This is important because we are with ourselves wherever we go. We cannot run from our own minds, or our own character. That being said, it is important to

obtain the moral and intellectual virtues, which is the subject for the next section of this book.

## **The Moral And Intellectual Virtues**

The fact that the two Jehovahs loved us first and God the Father sent the Word (Jesus Christ, John 1:1-14) on a divine rescue mission (John 3:16-17) is the starting point, not the ending point. Just as it can be said that when we arrive at our destination we have reached **the end** of our journey, so the word "end" in the below scripture means to be like Christ.

"For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness for everyone who believes."  
Romans 10:4, MKJV

In this verse the word "law" can also be translated as principle and throughout the Bible the word "Torah" (law) means instruction (Deuteronomy 4:44 as one example). We are to be instructed to be like Christ, who is righteous. The 1851 Murdock New Testament translation has it more clearly stated:

"For Messiah is the aim of the law, for righteousness, unto every one that believeth in him. For Moses describeth the righteousness,



which is by the law [instruction], thus: Whoever shall do these things, shall live by them.”  
Romans 10:4-5, Murdock New Testament

When each of us starts the process of divine individualism, by repenting of our sins, getting baptized, and receiving the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:28, Hebrews 6:1-2), our sins are forgiven and we get a fresh start. But we are to grow from there. We are to grow to become like Christ.

“And this until we all come into the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a full-grown man, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ;”  
Ephesians 4:13, MKJV

“But **grow in grace and in knowledge** of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. To Him be the glory, both now and to the day of eternity. Amen.” 2 Peter 3:18, MKJV

The process of becoming like Christ involves growing **in grace and knowledge**. Grace encompasses the moral virtues and knowledge encompasses the intellectual virtues.

“Finally, my brothers, whatever things are true, whatever things are honest, whatever

things are right, whatever things are pure,  
whatever things are lovely, whatever things are  
of good report; **if there is any virtue** and if  
there is any praise, **think on these things.**"  
Philippians 4:8, MKJV

It is very easy to read over some very  
important things mentioned in the Bible because  
the Bible is a complex and living book written by  
the two supreme minds in the universe. "If  
there is any virtue ... think on these things," is a  
lifetime of work for all of us. Grace is shorthand  
for the moral virtues and knowledge is  
shorthand for the intellectual virtues. In  
addition to grace, love also could be  
representative of the moral virtues  
(1 Corinthians 13:1-13).

"Let love be your highest goal, but also  
desire the special abilities the Spirit gives ..."  
I Corinthians 14:1 NLT

Once we start on the divine individualism  
process we must change what and how we  
value, which was the subject of the previous  
section. As we do this, the things that are  
important to us will change. We will literally  
think differently. Once we think differently we  
will choose differently. And our new and

improved choices will result in better consequences. Our lives and the lives we come in contact with will be improved. Once we change our value system the next step is to become like Jesus Christ and since Jesus Christ has ALL of the moral and intellectual virtues we should seek to obtain them as well. The below passage from 2 Peter speaks directly to an incredible number of very important concepts, including all of this:

"Grace and **peace** be multiplied to you through the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord, according as His divine power has given to us all things that pertain to life and godliness, through the knowledge of Him **who has called us to glory and virtue**, through which He has given to us exceedingly great and precious promises, so that by these **you might be partakers of the divine nature**, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust. But also in this very thing, bringing in all diligence, filling out your faith with virtue, and with virtue, knowledge; and knowledge with self-control, and with self-control, patience, and with patience; godliness, and with godliness, brotherly kindness, and with brotherly kindness, love. For if these things are in you and abound, you shall not be idle nor

unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he in whom these things are not present is blind and cannot see afar off and has forgotten that he was purged from his sins in times past. Therefore, brothers, rather be diligent to make your calling and election sure, for if you do these things, you shall never fall. For so an entrance shall be ministered to you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ."

2 Peter 1:2-11, MKJV

One of the first things the above passage mentions is grace, representing the moral virtues. Then it mentions peace. As previously mentioned there is no social theory of violence and peace is necessary for flourishing life. The opposite of peace leads to death, slavery, and destruction. Peace is part of the value package that comes with choosing life as the ultimate value (Deuteronomy 30:19). A short while later the passage mentions: "according as His divine power has given to us **all things that pertain to life and godliness.**" God's divine power gives us things that pertain to life because life is the ultimate value. Only the living can value. Death is the enemy, the end. Peace is part of the "all things that pertain to life." Life is more worth living if one is a virtuous person, or

perhaps better said, actively involved in the process of becoming virtuous. All of us have a lifetime of work to do and will be ultimately healed of where we fall short (our flaws) at the resurrection. At any rate, it takes possessing and using the virtues to have a flourishing life.

This is why “godliness” is mentioned next. Godliness means having the moral and intellectual virtues because the two Jehovahs have all the virtues. The two Jehovahs are perfect and we are to become like them. “Therefore be perfect, even as your Father in Heaven is perfect.” (Matthew 5:48, MKJV)

The next key concepts, your author would like to focus on from the above passage, mention being called to glory and being called to virtue – to partaking of the divine nature. We are all unique individuals and are being called to go through a process where we work toward becoming like Jesus Christ – whose divine nature possesses and uses all of the moral and intellectual virtues. This is a principle reason why this book is entitled *Divine Individualism*. We are to participate with the two Jehovahs in the process of divine individualism so that we can become like them - **ultimately having the divine nature.**

The next highlighted concept from the above passage is that it is not enough to have only faith. We are to fill out our faith by obtaining virtue.

The passage then lists some, (not all), of the virtues as examples of the virtues we should strive to obtain and use. Some of the virtues listed in this passage are: knowledge, self-control, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and love.

And then the passage continues with a few additional important concepts. One point is that if you have the virtues then you won't be idle, as it takes a lot of hard and thoughtful work and practice to obtain and use the virtues. Another is that if you have the virtues you will not be unfruitful, so the concept of possessing and using the virtues is tied to bearing fruit. Then the above passage contains a warning, which is that if you are not in the process of obtaining and using the virtues you are blind (intellectually) and cannot see far off (a short-term thinker). And then the Bible mentions that if you are obtaining and using the virtues you will never fall. The New Living Translation has verse 11 interestingly worded:

"And God will open wide the gates of heaven  
for you to enter into the eternal Kingdom of our  
Lord and Savior Jesus Christ."  
2 Peter 1:11, NLT

There is an incredible amount of information  
pertaining to life, values, virtues, and fruit in  
just this one passage of scripture from 2 Peter.

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary  
defines virtue in the following ways (emphasis  
theirs, not all of their definition is included below  
– only what your author felt was relevant to the  
subject at hand):

"1a conformity to a standard of right: MORALITY  
1b a particular moral excellence  
3 a beneficial quality or power of a thing  
5 a commendable quality or trait: MERIT  
6 a capacity to act: POTENCY  
7 chastity ... "

The ancient Greeks are known for the  
concept called "unity of virtues," - in particular  
Aristotle and the Stoics, amongst others. Unity  
of virtues means that the virtues mutually  
adjust and determine each other. For example,  
love is adjusted and determined by wisdom and

patience in order for all to be brought into balance. Once they were all mutually determined and brought into balance then a wise, loving decision, could be made at the right time. Kindness and understanding might further adjust love, wisdom, and patience so that the decision could be kindly communicated and also explained in an understandable way. If any one of the moral or intellectual virtues listed above were missing the result would not be as good. Something would be lacking in the decision itself, or the motive, or the timing, or the relationship with the one being communicated to would be unnecessarily injured, etc. This is the concept of unity of virtues in action.

Unity of virtues can also be held to mean that without possessing ALL of the virtues one does not really possess even the virtues one has. This is because those virtues that are missing are not available to help adjust and determine those virtues one does possess. Hence, one is not yet virtuous (at least not fully). This is a much harder take on the subject, which your author will attempt to illustrate with a short analogy. A car has numerous key constituent components. If any one of the key constituent components were missing, one might say you almost have a car,



but not quite. For example if an almost car was missing an engine most everyone would say you don't have a car. The same thing would hold for some of the other key constituent components, for example, a steering wheel, four tires, a transmission, a body, a windshield, brakes, etc. If we were driving a car down a steep and potentially treacherous mountain road we would need to control our speed on the descent. If we went to step on the brakes, in order to control our speed, and the brakes did not function we could be badly hurt, or even killed. The unity of virtue doctrine would say that without self-control you don't have and possess the virtues, hence you are not yet a virtuous person. In our car analogy, without brakes we could be hurt or killed. In the hardcore unity of virtue definition of "virtuous," without self-control we are not virtuous because without self-control being present to help mutually determine and adjust the other virtues something gravely deficient is lacking and hence we are not yet virtuous. Balance and moderation are important keys to being virtuous. Without self-control you clearly don't have balance and moderation. The virtues balance and moderate and help to determine each other. We have to have something in order to use it, and all of the virtues are needed

from time to time, hence the unity of virtues concept.

For human beings this hard-core take on the unity of virtues can be discouraging because we are all lacking in certain things. We have to keep in mind that obtaining and using the virtues is a lifelong process and it takes time. But the two Jehovahs know this and allow us time and moral space (freedom) to grow. They are perfect, which means they possess and use all of the intellectual and moral virtues. Because they have all of the virtues and because they know and understand the context of any situation, their judgments are perfect and they are perfect:

“As for God, His way is perfect. The word of the LORD is tried. He is a shield to all those who seek refuge in Him.”  
2 Samuel 22:31, MKJV

“As for God, His way is perfect; the word of the LORD is tried; He is a shield to all those who trust in Him.” Psalms 18:30, MKJV

“He is the Rock; His work is perfect. For all His ways are just, a God of faithfulness, and without evil; just and upright is He.”

Deuteronomy 32:4, MKJV

“And yet if I do judge, My judgment is true; for I am not alone, but I and the Father who sent Me.” John 8:16, MKJV

“Therefore you are to be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.”  
Matthew 5:48, NASB

The word “perfect” in Matthew 5:48 means “having reached its end” – which is the idea behind the Romans 10:4 verse quoted at the beginning of this section. We are to have the right values and grow in the virtues so as to become like Jesus Christ. Then we will make the right decisions and take the right actions at the right time and we will get good results, too.

The Bible reveals the two Jehovahs expect us to bear fruit. And, as previously mentioned, the passage from 2 Peter 1:2-11 linked bearing fruit with having the virtues. The passage did so in a negative way by implying that if we lack the virtues we will be unfruitful (verse 8). There are numerous other scriptures regarding bearing fruit and your author will quote a few of them below:

"I am the true vine, and my Father is the gardener. He cuts off every branch that doesn't produce fruit, and he prunes the branches that do bear fruit so they will produce even more. You have already been pruned for greater fruitfulness by the message I have given you. Remain in me, and I will remain in you. For a branch cannot produce fruit if it is severed from the vine, and you cannot be fruitful apart from me.' 'Yes, I am the vine; you are the branches. Those who remain in me, and I in them, will produce much fruit. For apart from me you can do nothing.'" John 15:1-5, NLT

"But the fruit of the Spirit is: love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faith, meekness, self-control; against such things there is no law." Galatians 5:22, 23, MKJV

It should be noted that the Galatians 5 passage, above, is probably the most widely quoted passage on what the fruit of the Spirit is. However, it is not a complete list. To find other virtues, not mentioned therein, one has to look throughout the rest of the Bible. For example, most of the above virtues would be considered moral virtues. We must look elsewhere to find the also important intellectual virtues, which are also fruit of the Spirit. Below are several

passages of scripture touching on the some of intellectual virtues, e.g., wisdom, judgment, understanding, and knowledge:

“For the LORD gives wisdom; out of His mouth come knowledge and understanding.”  
Proverbs 2:6, MKJV

“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;”  
Proverbs 1:1-3, MKJV

“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

**“For let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus,”** Philipians 2:5, MKJV

The Proverbs 1:1-3 passage mentions justice and judgment, both of which could be categorized as intellectual virtues, and also uprightness. Without understanding the context of a situation, which requires knowledge of the facts and logic and understanding, it is not

possible to give a correct judgment. And it also takes wisdom to render a correct judgment, so even if one understood the context of the situation perfectly, but lacked wisdom to know what to do, the judgment would not likely be correct. Without a correct judgment you will not have justice. And without justice you will set the stage for the next fight or war. Further, without the intellectual virtues, how will one know what is right in the first place – in order to be able to behave morally, i.e., to engage in upright behavior? There is a unity of virtues and the two Jehovahs have all of them. And that is why their judgments are correct. They have the right motives, the right understanding of the context of the situation, the patience to render judgment at just the right time, the wisdom to decide correctly, and the character and power to act, as appropriate, to get the correct result. And we are to become like them, hence the need for obtaining and using all of the virtues. The point-blank statement, contained in Philippians 2:5, to “let this mind be in you which also was in Jesus Christ,” should forever establish the point that obtaining the intellectual virtues is important. It is clearly NOT just speaking about having the love of Christ. Christ reprimanded the Pharisees who thought they were so correct as follows:

“Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you pay tithes of mint and dill and cummin, and you have left undone the weightier matters of the Law (principles), judgment, mercy, and faith. You ought to have done these and not to leave the other undone.”  
Matthew 23:23, MKJV

At a minimum, judgment is an intellectual virtue. At a minimum, mercy is a moral virtue. Faith could be said to be both an intellectual virtue, because one believes something correct intellectually, e.g., recognizes the two Jehovahs as God and the Bible as their word, and faith could be said to be a moral virtue, in that we are a positive person who will not give up – even to the end. In reality, there is a unity of virtues. They act together to mutually determine and adjust (balance) each other. And, in final reality, there is unity of virtues in the person of the two Jehovahs – who we are to become like.

Psychology studies the human mind and behavior. And psychology has come to learn that thinking tends to be practical and directed to some form of problem solving. When we engage in thinking we are trying to understand a situation more clearly so we can make decisions

that will make things better. Psychology has come to understand that thinking is sort of a built-in self-improvement program. Perhaps the two Jehovahs designed the human mind just this way. At any rate, thinking and the intellectual virtues are very important.

It is a mistake to attempt to define something (or someone) by emphasizing only one of an entity's constituent parts, or over-emphasizing a particular constituent part. A constituent part could be said to be a distinguishable but inseparable aspect of an entity. Many people, if pressed, would probably identify the engine as the most important part of a car. Perhaps others would identify the body, or the tires. No one your author knows would attempt to actually define a car by only one of its constituent parts. This is because the constituent parts, together, form what is known as a car. If you take away a key constituent part of a car, e.g., the engine, you no longer have a car. You have an almost car. The car is not an engine. The car has an engine, or it is not a car.

Some well intentioned, but factually incorrect, Christians attempt to define God as love. This is intellectually tantamount to saying,



"The car is an engine." The reasons some Christians say, "God is love," is because God is clearly motivated by love and the Bible actually says that God is love.

"The one who does not love has not known God. For God is love." 1 John 4:8, MKJV

Further, the Bible implies that love is the most important thing.

"There are three things that will endure - faith, hope, and love - and the greatest of these is love." 1 Corinthians 13:13, NLT

When the Bible says that three things will endure it is not a complete list. Wisdom will surely endure. Many good things will endure. And when the Bible, on the surface, seems to define God as love, we have to be careful and to think – to use wisdom to gain understanding. For example, the Bible makes many "God is" statements, amongst which are the following:

"for also, "Our God is a consuming fire." Hebrews 12:29, MKJV

Is love "a consuming fire"? Clearly it is not - at least in the sense it is commonly used. Tough love, maybe.

"He who has received His testimony has set his seal to this, that God is true."  
John 3:33, MKJV

"And this is the message which we have heard from Him and declare to you, that God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all."  
1 John 1:5, MKJV

The truth is that God is love. He is also wisdom. He is also mercy. He is also faithful. He is also patient. He is also a consuming fire to his enemies. God cannot be defined by only one constituent part of who and what he is. God is all in all. The below scripture helps to make your author's point:

"that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give to you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him, the eyes of your understanding being enlightened [all intellectual virtues], that you may know what is the hope of His calling, and what is the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints, and what is the surpassing

greatness of His power toward us [divine individualism throughout], the ones believing according to the working of His mighty strength which He worked in Christ in raising Him from the dead, and He seated Him at His right hand in the heavenlies, far above all principality and authority and power and dominion, and every name being named, not only in this world, but also in the coming age. And He has put all things under His feet and gave Him to be Head over all things to the church, which is His body, the fullness of Him who fills **all in all**."  
Ephesians 1:17-23, MKJV

There is a unity of virtues. The unity of virtues, in their fullest sense, resides in the persons of the two Jehovahs, who we are to cooperate with in becoming like them, which is to say, perfect. Perhaps it would make more sense to say, God is love, but he is not only love. He is every other virtue, too. He fills all in all.

As an example of where virtues can mutually determine and adjust each other, or perhaps override each other – depending on circumstances, let us consider the destruction of the flood in Noah's time (Genesis 6:6-7 and Genesis 7). Allowing your author a little literary license, what likely happened was something

along the lines that justice and prudence (practical reason) or perhaps wisdom, took over from patience and love. In essence, wisdom and justice told love and patience to stand down and get in the back seat as they were going to drive for a while.

Christ came to teach us that life, and all that comes with it, is the most important value and to cooperate with the two Jehovahs to obtain the moral and intellectual virtues. This is so that the life we have would not just be an existence, but ultimately also an abundant life.

“The thief does not come except to steal and to kill and to destroy [This is a reference to Satan as a murderer and a liar, John 8:44]. I have come so that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.”  
John 10:10, MKJV

Each of us is with ourselves wherever we go and whatever we do. A large part of the answer to the question “How should I live?” is to live virtuously. To live virtuously benefits us now and it will also benefit us eternally.

“For bodily exercise profits a little, but godliness is profitable to all things, having

promise of the present life, and of that which is to come.” 1 Timothy 4:8, MKJV

By becoming a better person, the whole world is improved. Many people bemoan the state of the world and would like to change it. In actuality, however, the only sure way any one of us can change the world for the better is to become a better person ourselves. Other peoples’ decisions and behavior are not under our control. There is good news in this and bad news in this. The good news in this is that changing ourselves is under our control because the two Jehovahs have given us the freedom to choose. The bad news in this is that it is a lifetime of thoughtful and disciplined and sometimes hard work. The character change inside us from learning to value correctly and from obtaining and using the virtues is a permanent beneficial change. As we participate in the divine individualism process, God’s Holy Spirit helps us to make changes in our lives, for the better. In due time, we shall be rewarded for our efforts to bear fruit (exhibit the virtues).

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

“For the Son of man shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels, and then He shall reward each one according to his works.”

Matthew 16:27, MKJV

“For this cause we do not faint; but though our outward man perishes, yet the inward man is being renewed day by day. For the lightness of our present affliction works out for us a far more excellent eternal weight of glory, we not considering the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are not lasting, but the things which are not seen are everlasting.”

2 Corinthians 4:16-18, MKJV

“And all of us have had that veil removed so that we can be mirrors that brightly reflect the glory of the Lord. And as the Spirit of the Lord works within us, we become more and more like him and reflect his glory even more.”

2 Corinthians 3:18, NLT

“But you, O man of God, flee these things and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, and meekness.”

1 Timothy 6:11, MKJV

Theologian Edmund A. Optiz had a brilliant paragraph in his book, *The Libertarian Theology Of Freedom*, about the responsibility each of us has to change our own lives, which is work enough:

“Many men are collectivists without being aware of it because collectivism seems to be taken into one’s pores from the ideological fog of our times. Most men argue only about the degree of collectivism they are willing to embrace, few are willing to eject every trace of it from their thinking. Opposition to collectivism starts only when it dawns upon an individual that he has enough trouble running his own life and being a steward of his own energy, and that he has no mandate from society [or the State] or from God to run another’s life against that person’s will. Men are creatures of God, not creatures of other men. ...”

Later in his book, speaking at the human level, Optiz adds:

“... the difficulties we can cope with are not problems so much as they are opportunities; we grow in stature as we encounter the things that brace themselves against us. World problems won’t be solved by the world; they will be

broken down and solved, it at all, by persons. Problems of the individual can be solved only by the person concerned, each one seeking such help as he deems necessary.”

We usually tend to love someone else because they have similar values and because that other person has obtained and uses a number of the virtues. In other words, we value someone else for the virtues they exhibit. By becoming more virtuous we will tend to like ourselves better. Your author completely understands that each of us starts out as a sinner – a person not only lacking virtues, but also behaving even worse than that, in a negative manner. And sometimes either shame or the fear of being found out for our past bad behavior limits our going forward. This is probably why repentance and public confession is the first step toward becoming a divine individual. It removes fear of being found out and shame as two of Satan’s weapons against personal development. Saul became the Apostle Paul (Acts 9). A mass murderer changed to become an almost fearless Apostle. That was a big change. We each have to remember that God loved us first - when we were sinners (John 3:16). And God does not want to condemn anyone (John 3:17). Once you repent of your



sins and start participating in the divine individualism process your sins are forgiven and you stand before God uncondemned (Romans 8:1). God is looking at a much later time period. At a minimum, he is looking to when we will be changed at the resurrection (1 Corinthians 15). Each of us, even after a lifetime of attempting to obtain and use the virtues, to bear fruit as it were, will still be lacking in something or another at the time of our death. Your author believes each of us will be healed at the resurrection, likely of different things, as we are all different. Our bodies will not only be changed to a spiritual body, we will be like Jesus Christ and we will be able to see him as he is (1 John 3:2).

“So also the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, “The first man, Adam, was made a living soul,” the last Adam [Jesus Christ] was a life-giving Spirit. But not the spiritual first, but the natural; afterward the spiritual. The first man was out of earth, earthy; the second Man was the Lord from

Heaven. Such the earthy man, such also the earthy ones. And such the heavenly Man, such also the heavenly ones. And according as we bore the image of the earthy man, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly Man [not just how we look, also our character – what we value and the virtues]. And I say this, brothers, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does corruption inherit incorruption.”  
1 Corinthians 15:42-50, MKJV

Since corruption cannot inherit the kingdom of God and since we will inherit the kingdom of God, we will not be corrupt – at that time. Until then, we all have some work to do – a lifetime of work to do.

It has been said that self-love is a positive trait, but only in a virtuous person (not in a non-virtuous person). When the two Jehovahs command us to love your neighbor as yourself it says a lot (Matthew 22:39). When we begin to practice this we don't have too many of the virtues, or at least not as many as we should have. At this moment in time we have to be far-reaching in our thinking, like the two Jehovahs. We have to love our life and our potential as divine individuals. We can then love other's lives and their potential as divine

individuals. Later, as we actually change our value system and start to obtain and use the virtues we have a greater love for ourselves – we like ourselves better. Our love grows. And as we see this process unfold in ourselves we know it can happen for others, too. Our love for them grows. Ultimately all of us must be healed at the resurrection.

As Romans 1 mentions, man can learn a lot of things just by using his mind - by thinking – and he should:

“since what may be known about God is plain to them [men], because God has made it plain to them. For since the creation of the world God’s invisible qualities - his eternal power and divine nature - have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made [being understandable from nature using reason], so that men are without excuse. For although they knew God, they neither glorified him as God nor gave thanks to him, but their thinking became futile and their foolish hearts were darkened. Although they claimed to be wise, they became fools” Romans 1:19-22, NIV

Many thinkers and writers have understood that men are individuals, should value life, and

live according to the virtues. Secular philosopher Tibor Machan wrote a book entitled, *Classical Individualism: The Supreme Importance Of Each Human Being*. In it he made the following observations and points:

"... Aristotle, for example, understood a person to have the capacity to make moral choices and thus to be personally responsible for becoming or failing to become virtuous, for flourishing or failing to do so. When he distinguished between the intellectual and the moral virtues, he argued that moral virtue involves choice. ..."

"Social engineering is, ... not a genuine prospect for solving human problems – only education and individual initiative can do that."  
" ... All the social engineering in the world ... will not create morally good persons."

Machan credits Immanuel Kant with the contribution that "ought implies can." In other words if it is said we ought to do something it is implicit that we are actually able to do it (we can do it). Machan then makes the compound point that:

"Based on the insight in Kant's motto – as well as in Aristotle's observation that 'the virtues are modes of choice or involve choice' and 'it is in our power to be virtuous or vicious' – we can see that any effort to credit or discredit persons for good or bad behavior, ... would amount to a meaningless gesture without free will."

"... I will argue that when someone is morally evil – and only someone, an individual, can be such, via both commission and omission – that person is being irrational. ..."

"... each person is the volitional author of his or her significant conduct. ..."

"But perhaps the most unusual aspect of being a thinking animal is that we live largely by choice, not by reflex and instinct, since forming ideas is not automatic. Thinking is a mental process that one must initiate – it does not just happen. The idea that human beings have free will means that their thinking and, thus, their actions are self-produced. It is also the foundation of their moral nature – their individual responsibility to do the right thing and avoid doing the wrong thing, to be good."

" ... Aristotle called the basic goodness of human beings the exercise of right reason. ..."

Machan pointed out that Shakespeare's Hamlet's "To be or not to be?", once answered in the affirmative (to be), brings into play an entire set of rational principles necessary for life, ergo: "The principles, or virtues, that are the heart of the Aristotelian practical reason, or prudence, are what we all ought to put into effect."

Machan clearly believes in allowing for men to make their own decisions and to experience the results, both positive and negative, as he observes: "Protecting people from their own evil will perpetuate the evil, because their failures will not come back to teach them lessons." Your author concurs, as it is necessary for men in training to become like the two Jehovahs to make judgments of value and choices based on those judgments. The feedback loop, of the results of those choices, help develop us as people. All of us learn many things from experience. And some people seem to only learn from experience – which is sad, because the core principles of life are not that complicated, once they are explained.

Machan also observed:

"... Herbert Spencer was right when he observed, 'The ultimate result of shielding men from the effects of their folly is to fill the world with fools.' A sign of our imperfection is that we keep returning to the failed effort to perfect one another by means of coercion."

Paul Rosenberg, philosopher and author, wrote an interesting book entitled, *Entropy & Divinity*. In his book he pointed out that psychologist Abraham Maslow "was among the first of the psychologists to focus his effort on especially healthy people, and try to understand what made them better. ..." Rosenberg included the following summation, from Maslow, of the fuel that self-actualizing people required in order to live healthily and happily, quoted in its entirety, below (with different formatting):

"Truth, and not dishonesty

Goodness, rather than evil

Beauty rather than ugliness or vulgarity

Wholeness and internal harmony, rather than forced associations

Aliveness, not mechanization

Uniqueness, not uniformity

Completeness, rather than fractured things

Justice and balance, not injustice and imbalance

Simplicity, not unnecessary complexity

Richness, not environmental impoverishment or sameness

Effortlessness, not strain

Playfulness, not grim, humorless, drudgery

Self-sufficiency, not dependency

Meaningfulness, rather than arbitrariness"

Paul Rosenberg's Vera Verba Publishing also published an excellent book entitled, *Aristotle In English: The Nicomachean Ethics, A paraphrase Edition*, by Manuel Nunez. In this short and powerful, 100-page book, Rosenberg and Nunez make Aristotle's insights readily available to anyone willing to read and think about them.



Your author will sometimes "quote their paraphrase," but mainly himself paraphrase some of the interesting things he learned from Aristotle through reading this book (apologies to Rosenberg and Nunez in advance):

"Happiness is an activity," not just a feeling or a disposition. Happiness is an end in itself.  
"Happiness is found ... in virtuous activities," as the happy life is a virtuous one and "a virtuous life requires exertion."

"If we define happiness as activity in accordance with virtue, It is best that it should be in accord with the highest virtue. The highest virtue will be the best thing that is in us. And the best thing in us (and that which makes us human) is reason, which guides us."

To the good person the most desirable activity is one that is in line with virtue.

A flourishing life is happy and pleasant.  
"Pleasure completes life."

It is both rational and will make us happy if we become virtuous. We should obtain and use both the intellectual and the moral virtues and

we should be productive. We should be virtuous and obtain virtuous friends.

"Life is an activity, and each person is active about those things, and with those abilities he loves the most."

We should "live according to reason" with excellence and virtue. "... the winners are the people who not only have excellent character, but also effectively demonstrate it by the actions they take."

"The happy man lives well and does well."

"There are two kinds of virtue: The intellectual. The moral."

"It is clear that moral virtues are not found in nature, since natural things do not form habits that are contrary to their nature. Only humans do this."

"... where virtues are concerned, we do have to practice them first before we can have them."

"Moral virtue is destroyed by both deficiency (lack) and excess." Moderation is a key to virtue. Moderation is what is reasonable (in

accord with right reason). For example, instead of courage, a man might either lack it because he is fearful, or have too much courage and then his over-confidence gets him into trouble. Another example is instead of proper pride, one is overly humble (lack) or filled with vanity (excess). Proper pride is rightfully claiming merits consistent with one's character, abilities, and achievements. Overly humble is lacking the virtue of proper pride, (dishonestly self-abasing). Vanity is going too far in the other direction.

Knowledge is not enough. " ... where virtues are concerned, we do have to practice them first before we can have them." " ... truly moral purposes must be things that we actually pursue with our actions, rather than merely think about."

"Moral virtue is a habit which we exercise when it comes to the choices we make."

"By choosing what is good or bad we are people of a certain character. Whereas the opinions we hold do not affect our character."

"So, if our purposes in life are to be proper and moral, the reasoning behind them must be

correct (logical), and the desires behind them must be correct (morally sound)."

Purpose is what drives us to take moral action. Reason provides us the means to take moral action. In essence, we can think and we can take action and if what we think about is moral and we then take the action that is moral we will have purposed and done correctly.

"Purpose is what we desire, based upon what we have carefully thought about and considered."

"Purpose may ... be defined as reason that desires, or desire that then reasons."

"Purpose obviously only applies to present or future events, since the past is done and cannot be changed."

Some of the moral virtues are courage, liberality, temperance (the middle ground with regard to bodily pleasures), proper pride, truthfulness, being friendly, modesty, righteous indignation, generosity, good temper, justice, fairness, discipline, affection, etc.

"Temperate people enjoy the things that they should enjoy, and in proper moderation."

The intellectual virtues are things that guide us in our actions and in the comprehension of the truth.

The senses are important to man, but not enough. The animals have senses.

Man is the thinking animal and must reason.

"How do prudent people determine the best course of action in any given situation? Simply by always having the goal of well-being in mind. With this goal to guide them, they tend to make the right decisions and take the time to deliberate their actions in light of the available facts."

Some of the intellectual virtues are intelligence, prudence (practical reason), knowledge, good judgment, intuitive reason, etc.

"... judgment, intelligence, prudence and reason - tend to flow in the same direction. ... All of these things relate to the ability to discriminate between the good and the bad, and how to apply knowledge of the good to a proper course of action."

When someone has the moral and the intellectual virtues combined they tend to think about the right thing, and then they actually do the right thing, in the right way, at the right time in order to get a good result. This takes practical reason and wisdom and is part science and part art.

"... virtue is that state of character that makes a man good and makes him do his work well."

"Virtue is the state of character concerned with a person's choice. It is exercised in moderation, and is determined by a rational principle."

"A virtuous person wishes to live with himself, and he does so with pleasure, since the memories of his past acts are delightful and his hopes for the future are good, and therefore pleasant. His mind is well stocked with subjects of contemplation. And he is happy and sad with himself more than anyone else."

"Wicked people seek for people [to] spend their days with, and often do not like themselves. The bad person does not seem to be amicably disposed even to himself, because there is nothing in him to love."

"Death is the most terrible of all things; for it is the end, and nothing is thought to be any longer either good or bad for the dead."

"To die to escape from poverty or love or anything painful is not the mark of a brave person, but rather of a coward; for it is softness to flee from what is troublesome, and such a person endures death not because it is noble, but to flee from evil."

"Now there are three grounds on which people show affection: 1) Friendships based on usefulness. 2) Friendships based on pleasure. 3) True or perfect friendship." ... "Perfect friendship is the friendship of people who are good and virtuous." Number three allows for a permanent friendship, but this kind of friendship is rare, because such people are rare.

Your author could go on and on, but the basic point of quoting the Romans 1 Bible passage, along with Machan, Maslow, and Rosenberg and Nunez's paraphrasing of Aristotle, shows that the basic principles of a good life are knowable by reason. The hard part is to obtain and use the moral and intellectual virtues. This takes a lifetime of work and practice because it truly is part science and part

art. It is a lot of work to become a better person.

God says "And you shall be holy men to me" (Exodus 22:31, Ephesians 5:27, Colossians 1:22 and other places). In order to be holy one must ascertain what is right (the intellectual virtues) and then do what is right (the moral virtues).

All of us would like to have good people in our lives. Your author wants people in his life who have integrity, ability, and passion, amongst other things. To put it simply, if someone has integrity, ability, and passion your author does not care what race, sex, background, etc., are involved. They are welcome. However, in order to have good people in our lives requires that we ourselves become a good person. We must do so in order to have fellowship with the Father and the Son, the two Jehovahs, and also fellowship with other good people. Even secular Aristotle realized that lasting friendships, based on virtue, were rare - because such people are rare. Virtuous people with the right value system are rare. That is the problem. And that is the problem that the two Jehovahs, with their divine individualism program solve - over time. They do so one unique individual at a time, starting



with each one of us when we choose to cooperate with them. To solve the lack of virtue problem takes time and space to grow – which is the subject of the next section of this book.

## **The Need For Space To Grow**

Each one of us is literally unique, as previously documented in an earlier section of this book. When your author was thinking about this, almost two decades ago, he realized something quite important – and hopefully profound.

As each one of us lives our life we learn and grow. Sometimes we grow from being taught. Sometimes we grow from the hard work of thinking. Sometimes we grow from making decisions for ourselves and experiencing the results. And sometimes we grow from others making decisions, which consequences flow over into our lives. Experience is not necessarily the best teacher, but it is an effective teacher most of the time. At any rate, each of us learns and grows. This growth takes time.

If your author was to pick on you, dear reader, and asked you a simple question, the answer you would be forced to give would not

have such simple implications. Here is the question: Have you learned anything in the past five years? If you answer, "No," your author is going to have to wonder about you. The truth is the correct answer to the above question is, "Yes." You have learned many things in the past five years. All of us have. It is almost impossible not to learn as we go along living our lives. Your author is going to presume you correctly and honestly answered the above question, "Yes."

Since you answered in the affirmative, above, it is indisputable that you are smarter than you used to be. The current you knows more things, is wiser, and has more experience to draw from. There is simply no question you are smarter than you used to be, when compared to what you knew only five years ago. If we were to extend the question to asking if you had learned anything in the past ten years, the difference in knowledge and experience would be even more dramatic. Your author is being charitable in only asking for a five-year difference for comparison purposes.

Now for a follow-up second question, which has several different iterations: Would it be fair for you to categorize the person you were, only

five years ago, as ignorant? Would it be fair for you to categorize the person you were, only five years ago, as stupid? Would it be fair for you to categorize the person you were, only five years ago, as evil? Your author purposely chose some loaded words for the second question, because people do this to each other all the time - to other people who do not agree with them.

Your author will now switch from you, dear reader, to a fictitious Mr. Smith. Here is the problem for anyone, let us say Mr. Smith, who categorizes others as being ignorant, stupid, evil, or any other derogatory term, for disagreeing with him. Mr. Smith does not even agree with himself from only five years ago. We know this for a certainty because Mr. Smith admitted he had learned numerous things, and had numerous life experiences, over the past five years. The Mr. Smith of today knows more than the Mr. Smith of only five years ago. With all this in mind it is possible, but unlikely, that Mr. Smith would call the Mr. Smith of five years ago ignorant. It is possible, but even less likely, that Mr. Smith would call the Mr. Smith of five years ago stupid. It is almost a certainty that Mr. Smith would NOT call the Mr. Smith of five years ago evil. Now it gets worse for Mr. Smith.

The Mr. Smith of today **disagrees** (at least in some respects) with the Mr. Smith of five years ago, despite the following: 1) they have the exact unique DNA; 2) as children they were raised identically; 3) they have the exact educational backgrounds (unless Mr. Smith continued his formal education in the past five years); 4) they have the exact vocational backgrounds, excepting only the past five years; 5) they have the exact same personality type and temperament; and 6) other than the past five years they have the identical life experiences. The Mr. Smith of today is almost an identical match to the Mr. Smith of only five years ago, and yet the Mr. Smith of today knows more and has more experience. There is literally no one on earth, whom Mr. Smith could ever hope to meet, who would be so identically matched with Mr. Smith as a former version of himself - in our example, the Mr. Smith of just five years ago. **And yet they disagree.**

What are the implications of all this? Many. At one time, or another, most of us have fallen victim to setting the impossible goal, leading to an epic quest, that we are going to find people who completely agree with us. This epic quest to achieve the impossible goal can take many forms. It can take the form of a quest for a

mate, who completely agrees with us; or a church, who has all of the doctrines just right; or a boss, who sees things the exact same way we do; or a friend, who is in almost complete intellectual agreement with us. Please forgive your author for the bluntness of what comes next. Unfortunately, all of these quests are a mission for a fool. The reason they are a mission for a fool is because the fool does not realize that he himself, or she herself, is continuing to grow – and therefore is a moving intellectual target. Going back to Mr. Smith, he does not agree with himself, from only a few years ago, despite being virtually identical to his former recent past self. How reasonable is it for any of us to expect to find someone who completely agrees with us? And if we did, why should they completely agree with us when we are still learning, meaning we do not know everything there is to know, meaning we are not the intellectual standard that others should aspire to? Not one of us is currently, or ever will be, the intellectual standard that others should aspire to!

“**A snipe hunt** is a type of practical joke that involves experienced people making fun of credulous newcomers by giving them an impossible or imaginary task. ... The snipe hunt

may be assigned to a target as part of a process of hazing.

A snipe hunt is a specific type of "wild-goose chase", where a person embarks on an impossible search. ...

The origin of the term is a practical joke where inexperienced campers are told about a bird or animal called the snipe as well as a usually preposterous method of catching it, such as running around the woods carrying a bag or making strange noises such as banging rocks together. ... Real snipe (a family of shorebirds) are difficult to catch for experienced hunters, so much so that the word "sniper" is derived from it to refer to anyone skilled enough to shoot one. ...” Quoted from Wikipedia [emphasis mine]

For any of us, the idea that we will ever meet someone we completely agree with **is the intellectual snipe hunt of all time.**

Compared to only a few years ago, we don't even agree with ourselves. How can we expect others to completely agree with us? And if we want the room (the intellectual space) and the time to grow intellectually, how can we deny these same things to other men? If we do, we are hypocrites. All men are men. All of us need

time and space to grow intellectually – and also morally.

Properly understood, each of us is supposed to grow toward having the mind of Christ, not the mind of a “know-it-all,” the know-it-all’s demeaning opinion to the contrary. The two Jehovahs are the intellectual standard we are to aspire to, not each other.

“For let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus,” Philippians 2:5, MKJV

“For the LORD gives wisdom; out of His mouth come knowledge and understanding. He lays up sound wisdom for the righteous; He is a shield to those who walk uprightly. He keeps the paths of judgment, and guards the way of His saints. Then you shall understand righteousness and judgment and honesty, every good path.” Proverbs 2:6-9, MKJV

There is more to be learned than any of us can learn, in a lifetime. Just because we will never completely meet this very high standard, does not excuse us from working and thinking toward it. As housekeeping point, nothing in this section of the book should be taken to mean that there is not absolute truth. There is. We

just will not learn all of it while human. Once we are resurrected, and have our incorruptible spirit bodies, we will also have more brilliant minds, we will see Christ face to face, and he can teach us "the rest of the story." With an eternity of time, and healed incorruptible minds, learning will not be some big problem. As a further housekeeping point, your author is not saying that we should not be using our minds now, just because we will not learn or know it all now. We have to use our minds to be fully human. We are, as Aristotle would say, the rational animal. We have to both think and take action to live on this earth and the better we think, the better our actions will be. And as a further housekeeping point, your author is not saying that criminals should go free because they need to space to grow. If someone crosses the line and commits a crime then their intellectual space to grow might be inside a jail cell, where they will have plenty of time to think.

As a further discussion point, one of the important errors, regarding the sciences, is not understanding that the natural sciences need one method for establishing truth, while the social sciences have to account for human consciousness and choice, and so need a



different method. The fancy name for this is methodological dualism. Human consciousness and choice is not a very welcome guest in the natural sciences. Natural scientists would like to one day reduce all biology to chemistry and all chemistry to physics and then to be able to explain away human choice as a causative factor. This is known as scientism. They will never succeed because there is a non-physical component, the two Jehovahs added to the brain of man, in order to enable the human mind to think (Job 32:8, 38:36, Isaiah 42:5, Proverbs 20:27, 1 Corinthians 2:11, and Zechariah 12:1). The natural sciences have the unexplainable problems that: 1) the same person, when presented with seemingly identical choices, will choose one way one time and a different way another time and 2) that different human beings, when presented with the same decision option, choose differently. Baskin Robbins has 31 ice cream flavors for a reason. Sorry. That's the way it is. None of this is explainable via the natural sciences and never will be. Concerning scientism, the natural scientists are point-blank wrong, concerning human choice as a causative factor. And that's what the natural scientists get, for excluding from reality the two beings that created the reality we live in - the two Jehovahs.

Since each of us wants the space and time to grow, and since we are to love others as we love ourselves, then we need to give other people the space and time to grow, too. It is not love to demand, from others, that they intellectually agree with you – especially when, as you grow, you are in the process of disagreeing with yourself. We should be kind to others and give them time. If men were fruit, it could be said that none of us is ripe yet.

Sometimes churches, and definitely governments, try to shield their members / citizens from having to make decisions. “Check your brain at the door. We, the power elite, will think for you.” To shield someone from making decisions is to remove from them one of their best and necessary human development paths. Each person needs to think, take action, and to experience the consequences. This is how, over time, good judgment is developed. The know-it-alls of the world do not have the right to preempt the development of good judgment, in other men, by making their decisions for them. If a know-it-all were to actually try and do so, it would show just how little that know-it-all really knew. In point of fact, the two Jehovahs appreciate the potential for each unique man to

come to the place where they repent, change their value system, and start to develop the moral and intellectual virtues. We must also grant this to each other. There are Biblical warnings if we do not.

“Therefore you are without excuse, O man, everyone who judges; for in that in which you judge another, you condemn yourself, for you who judge do the same things. But know that the judgment of God is according to truth on those who practice such things. And, O man, the one judging those who do such things, and practice them, do you think this, that you shall escape the judgment of God? Or do you despise the riches of His kindness, and the forbearance and long-suffering, not knowing that the kindness of God leads you to repentance? But according to your hardness and your impenitent heart, do you treasure up wrath for yourself in a day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God, who will render to each according to his works;” Romans 2:1-6, MKJV

If there was ever a scriptural passage that shows we need to non-judgmentally give each other the space and time to grow, the above is it – complete with threatening warning from God if we do not. A clarifying point to the above is

that we can and must judge between good and evil, between the holy and the profane, but we are not to condemn others – especially if it is God himself who is giving those currently evil time to repent, time to change.

“Woe to those who call evil good and good evil; who put darkness for light and light for darkness; who put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter!” Isaiah 5:20, MKJV

“Judge not, that you may not be judged. [Judge not in a condemnatory way. We do each have to learn to judge between evil and good in order to choose good so as to be both moral and intelligent.] For with whatever judgment you judge, you shall be judged; and with whatever measure you measure out, it shall be measured to you again. And why do you look on the splinter that is in your brother’s eye, but do not consider the beam that is in your own eye? Or how will you say to your brother, Let me pull the splinter out of your eye; and, behold, a beam is in your own eye? Hypocrite! First cast the beam out of your own eye, and then you shall see clearly to cast the splinter out of your brother’s eye.” Matthew 7:1-5, MKJV

As the Matthew 7 passage shows, and as was discussed in the previous section of this book, it is a lifetime of work for each of us to obtain and use the moral and intellectual virtues. Doing so should be our focus, not finding fault in others.

A further discussion point is the very clear message of Romans 14, where we are to patiently allow others to grow, even when we know they are wrong! The subject matter, in the example given, is evidently vegetarianism, which some believe in, even though the Bible is full of scriptures showing it is all right to eat certain kinds of meat (Leviticus 11, Deuteronomy 14). But the subject matter could be any topic where one man knew more than another man – at that point in time. The more knowledgeable man, though knowing more, has certain responsibilities to respect the less knowledgeable man and to not harm him, or judge him in a condemning way.

“And receive him who is weak in the faith, **but not to judgments of your thoughts.** For indeed one believes to eat all things; but being weak, another eats [only] vegetables. Do not let him who eats despise him who does not eat; and do not let him who does not eat judge him who eats, for God has received him. **Who are**

**you that judges another's servant?** To his own master he stands or falls. But he will stand, for God is able to make him stand. ... But why do you judge your brother? Or also why do you despise your brother? For all shall stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, "As I live, says the Lord, every knee shall bow to Me, and every tongue shall confess to God." So then **each one of us will give account concerning himself to God.** Then let us not judge one another any more, but rather judge this, not to put a stumbling-block or an offense toward his brother. ... But if your brother is grieved with your food, **you no longer walk according to love.** Do not with your food destroy him for whom Christ died. Then do not let your good be spoken evil of, for the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. For he who serves Christ in these things is well-pleasing to God, and approved by men. So then **let us pursue the things of peace,** and the things for building up one another."  
Romans 14:1-4, 10-13, 15-19, MKJV

Author and philosopher, Paul Rosenberg, wrote a book entitled, *Entropy & Divinity*. In his book he mentioned various topics that needed to be thought about and re-valued. One of

those topics he thought needed to be re-valued downward was the idea of "unity." Your author believes he meant this idea at the human level and quotes him below:

"Very large collectives like states and religions feature a Unity Ideal. This is the idea that if we could all submerge our individuality and be completely unified, our problems would wither away and the solutions to life's difficulties would simply spring up. This is a philosophy suited to insects. The unity ideal is a spiritualized dream of getting something for nothing. It is a false god, and trains men to be infantile and needy."

The actual fact is that all men lose if one man does not develop – either intellectually or morally. Whatever that man could have contributed is a dead loss, both to him and to society. And no man can develop if he submerges his individuality into a collective.

Some people feel guilty about what they did not know in the past. If you feel this way, it is patently unfair to yourself. No man knows what he does not know, including your past self. That is the human condition. And no one makes it through the minefield of this life completely

unscathed. We have to let go of the past and move forward. To put it into economic terms, the past is a sunk cost. The sunk cost is over, but your volition, your ability to choose and your will, should be determined by future aims, not past sunk costs. You still have time to grow. You still have time to change for the better. Even if this world is crazy, you can change your own world to be good, and the way you do that is to start making the correct decisions. And you can only do that one decision at a time. And you can only do that going forward. The only thing you have control over, dear reader, is your own decisions – decisions of the present and future. You do not have control over the past and you do not have control over other people's decisions. Your better choice can interrupt what would otherwise have happened – particularly in your life. And this is why your world can be better, even if the rest of the world seems crazy. Broadly understood, your next decision can make the entire world a better place – if you choose correctly, though it may only be incrementally better as you are only one person among many. And your good choices will make your own personal world more than incrementally better. So choose correctly going forward, because that is all any of us can do.



If we remember the lesson, from the earlier part of this section, it was that trying to find others who completely agree with us is a mission for a fool. It is the intellectual snipe hunt of all time. This ironically escapes a class of people whom your author calls the "truthers." The truthers are one of the stars of the next section of this book. Until then, we should remember that all of mankind, including ourselves, needs the space and the time to grow.

### **The Truthers And The Lovers**

There seems to be two types of people who involve themselves in a search for God and/or the correct religion. Your author will categorize them as "the truthers" and "the lovers." This is not to say there are not other types of people who seek God, only that these two types are going to be found in almost any local congregation. Both the truthers and the lovers have their strengths and weaknesses.

The truthers are so designated because they are on a quest for the truth and this quest for the truth usually leads them to try and find the ultimate meaning of life. The ultimate meaning of life must be found by finding the life-givers,

the two Jehovahs, that is to say, God. Some of the truthers end up as skeptics or agnostics. They are not who your author is writing about, in this section of the book. The truthers your author is writing about are those who are on a life mission to try and find whom the correct God is and also what the correct religious practices (formula) are to please him. They are the thinkers looking for definitive answers and closure on an important topic affecting us all. The truthers want to know what THE program is and how they can get in on it. What the correct steps to follow are, are very important to the truthers. The truthers want to be included on the inside of THE correct program. The truthers want to know and use what they regard as "inside information." It is very important to the truthers to be correct – especially on a matter as important as eternal life, or eternal death. It could almost be said that, for truthers, truth trumps all.

The lovers are interested in God for a different reason. They are usually intuitive feelers. Sometimes they are thinkers who feel. In either case, they are much more intuitive than the truthers and they act accordingly. Because they are much more intuitive than the truthers your author will sometimes refer to

them as “intuitives.” The lovers want to feel a sense of belonging. They want to love and to be loved. The details and the facts are not as important to them as their relationship with God, their relationships with people, and all of the feelings pertaining to those relationships. The lovers want to know who God is and how to have a personal relationship with him. The dictionary program, which comes with your author’s Macbook, defines intuitive as follows:

“intuitive ... adjective

using or based on what one feels to be true even without conscious reasoning; instinctive: I had an intuitive conviction that there was something unsound in him.”

Reasoning is much less important to the lovers. It is not that the lovers do not reason. Nor is it that the lovers do not have good minds. They just emphasize a different approach to God and religion than the truthers do. Feeling secure and warm and fuzzy is important to the lovers, much less so to the truthers. The relationships are what are important to the lovers.

The lovers can and do think and the truthers are capable of showing love, but they are

distinct and different in their approach to God and religion, hence your author's observation and designation. Both approaches have their strengths. And both approaches have potentially catastrophic weaknesses.

Truthers will tell you things like, "Love is the keeping of the commandments." And generally they will say it in a totally cold and almost heartless manner - as if they have the point-blank formula for love - because the Bible seems to speak directly on point concerning this topic. They get their truther's love formula from a couple of scriptures:

"Love works no ill to its neighbor, therefore love is the fulfilling of the law."  
Romans 13:10, MKJV

"By this we know that we love the children of God, whenever we love God and keep His commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments, and His commandments are not burdensome."  
1 John 5:2, 3, MKJV

To a truther the "love problem" is forever solved. You take one cup of flour, a tablespoon of baking soda, some salt, etc., and presto -

there is love. All you have to do now is to find what the commandments of God are, and then you keep them perfectly, and then there will be love. It is a truther cookbook recipe for love. The truthers provide much thanks to God who provided the recipe, and in only one airtight sentence. There are obviously more than a few problems with this formulaic approach to love. Just like the well-intentioned intuitive is incorrect, if they actually think that when the Bible says, "God is love" that it really means, "God is only love," the truthers are also incorrect if they think that, "love is only keeping the commandments of God." Both approaches have the same inherent problem. Both approaches are trying to define God, or love, with only one of its constituent parts. As explained in the virtues section of this book, the two Jehovahs have ALL of the intellectual and moral virtues, not just some of them. God is wisdom and love and every other good thing. God is not just love. Unfortunately for a truther, any time a truther is wrong there is some irony in their being wrong. The truthers, ironically, intellectually misfire when they think that the very broad, **relational subject of love** can be defined into the constituent part of keeping some rules very carefully – as if rule keeping could somehow make someone love you, or as if

rule keeping could actually generate love in your heart for someone else. One truther your author knows is alone in the world despite the fact that he keeps the commandments of God very carefully, to the best of his understanding. Your author is quite certain that many truthers are all but alone in the world – even if they do have some family and a few friends, or a church group they fellowship with. They are alone in the world of their formulaic, truth-seeking mind. It does not have to be so. Whenever an attempt is made to define someone, or something, by only one of its constituent parts, error is forthcoming. Both the truthers and the lovers are incomplete. At this time neither the truthers, nor the lovers have the mind of God (Philippians 2:5). Both are lacking important constituent parts of the mind of God.

The dictionary, on your author's Macbook, has this definition for love:

“love ...  
noun

1 **an intense feeling of deep affection:**  
babies fill parents with intense feelings of love |  
their love for their country.

- a deep romantic or sexual attachment to someone: it was love at first sight | they were both in love with her | we were slowly falling in love . ...
  - a great interest and pleasure in something: his love for football | we share a love of music.
  - affectionate greetings conveyed to someone on one's behalf.
  - a formula for ending an affectionate letter: take care, lots of love, Judy.
- 2 **a person or thing that one loves**: she was the love of his life | their two great loves are tobacco and whiskey. ...

verb [ with obj. ]

feel a deep romantic or sexual attachment to (someone): do you love me?

- like very much; find pleasure in: I'd love a cup of tea, thanks | I just love dancing | [ as adj., in combination ] (-loving): a fun-loving girl. ..."

Because we come to recognize that the two Jehovahs are our Creators, our Saviors, our life-givers, the authors of logic, math, the natural sciences, the social sciences, art, perfect in character, and every other thing that is good (James 1:17), we will (hopefully) choose to love them. And because we will come to have deep feelings for them we will want to please them

and so we will be good guests in their universe and live by their rules – which is to say we will keep their commandments. Because we recognize all men are men and that all men have the natural rights to life, liberty, and property, we will respect those other men, as they are also made in the image and likeness of God. Ergo, we will keep the commandments of God pertaining to other men. Doing so shows intelligence, and respect for God, and it shows respect for others' natural rights. But this does not mean that we love people we do not even know. Respecting that others are also made in God's image and that others also have hopes and dreams that are important to them and that others have natural rights, that are necessary for their lives, is only a first and very basic step. It will be later that we actually get to know those others and then, if those others have the moral and intellectual virtues, and those others have the right value system, we will love them at that time – for their values and their virtues and their other good traits like personality and sense of humor, etc. Right now, keeping the commandments of God toward others honors God, and shows respect for mankind (who are also made in the image and likeness of God) and leaves the door open to future love. For the moment, it is more like potential love. One



thing is for certain. Keeping rules is not love. It is an aspect, and a constituent part of love, to respect others' natural rights. It is not a deep-seated feeling of affection when you don't even know the other person YET. It is a step toward future love and it shows oneself as lovable for doing the right thing for the right reason.

The Pharisees carefully kept the commandments of God. Notice what Jesus Christ observed about them, pertaining to love. First, notice that it is beyond dispute that the Pharisees carefully kept the commandments of God, and then notice the Luke 11:42 passage:

"For I [Christ] say to you that unless your righteousness shall exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, you shall in no case enter into the kingdom of Heaven." Matthew 5:20, MKJV

"But woe to you, Pharisees! For you tithe mint and rue and every herb, **and pass over** judgment and **the love of God**. You ought to have done these, **and not to leave the other undone**." Luke 11:42, MKJV

Christ clearly said, when putting the above two scriptural passages together, that the Pharisees carefully kept the commandments of God. They

even counted out small portions of herbs so as to carefully tithe on them. They kept the commandments of God. And yet, Christ said that not ONLY should they be keeping the commandments of God, they pass over judgment (ironically, a lot of truthers are lacking in good judgment, as Christ said the Pharisees were) AND they pass over "the love of God." Ergo, if love is ONLY the keeping of the commandments of God, how is it that Christ reprimanded the Pharisees, who carefully kept the commandments of God, for passing over the love of God? Clearly there is more to the love of God than just keeping the commandments. Psalm 119:172 mentions that " ... all Your commandments are righteousness." With that in mind, please further consider this point-blank scripture on the topic of love:

"In this the children of God are revealed, and the children of the Devil: everyone not practicing righteousness is not of God, **also he who does not love his brother.**"  
1 John 3:10, MKJV

The Bible is very clear that love is MORE THAN just keeping the commandments of God. In the scripture above, the children of God are revealed as those who both practice

righteousness, aka keeping the commandments of God, AND those who love their brothers. At this time your author profusely apologizes to the truthers for ruining their little love formula. Their "love is the keeping of the commandments of God" box has a hole in it and love fell out. Don't laugh too hard though, lovers. As previously pointed out, your "God is love" box also has a hole in it, where God's other virtues fell out. The two Jehovahs killed everyone on earth, except eight people, at the time of the flood (Genesis 7). God is more than love and love is more than rule keeping. Sorry. That's the way it is. When the truthers get around to opening their formulaic love box - it is empty and so are many of their lives. When the lovers get around to opening their "God is love" box, it might not be empty, but it certainly isn't completely full, either.

Moving on, the truthers have likely followed the Acts 2:38 and Hebrews 6:1-2 conversion formula specifications so as to make sure they are forgiven for their sins and have received the Holy Spirit. After a lifetime of attempting to ascertain the truth, and to (as perfectly as possible) precisely keep the commandments of God, they are waiting for the next big formulaic occurrence, the resurrection (1 Corinthians 15).

While waiting for the resurrection, there is no time like the present for the truther to embark on a (pun intended) self-appointed, mission-from-God. The self-appointed, mission-from-God is to correct all of the incorrect doctrines of the church (ekklesia). They do so in the truther attempt to gain the divine favor of God, which is a very useful lever to have and to use as the truther attempts to make their way through the minefield of a very tough world. If enough truth can be pieced together, and then the doctrines and the prophetic understanding of the church can somehow be corrected (to be what the truther then knows), then divine favor is all but a certainty and life will be good. Interestingly, the truther understanding of doctrine and prophecy also tends to end up being, in many cases, intuitive. Many truthers are intuitives, or more intuitive than they realize. This is because the Bible as a whole speaks to different people in different ways - and at different times. And also because prophecy is a tough topic, particularly concerning timing. This does not stop the truther from trying to determine prophetic truth, however. In the truther's estimation, their current opinion (guess) is simply better than others' opinions (guesses). All that is necessary is for everyone else to listen to the truther's careful reasoning and agree. If

anyone does not agree, with the truther's current understanding, woe is unto him or her. The fact that the truther does not even agree with him or her self, from only a few years ago, will not stop the truther in their quest for intergalactic precision and correctness. Unfortunately, many times, the truther's point of view is that it is a shame that so many other people are so clueless.

What is truly amazing to your author is that many truthers evidently believe that the time when everyone else should know something is that exact moment in time when the truther has just learned something new. Because the truther has just advanced their personal knowledge, all of humanity has made a big advance. Everyone should move in lock step with the truther's current and (ironically) now corrected understanding of a matter. Your author parenthetically mentions "ironically" because how is it that the truther himself did not know such an important point previously? Once again, all that is necessary is that humanity, or at least a local congregation, move in lockstep with the truther and then there will be peace and harmony.

One of the first things a truther will do, when they meet someone, is to give them an intellectual litmus test. They do this to see if the other person is worthy of their time and attention, or to see if a body of fellow religious believers is worthy of their attendance and fellowship with them. And to see if a pastor is worthy of being listened to. While there is nothing wrong with discerning good and evil (Hebrews 5:14), or other aspects of truth, the truther does not seem to understand this important truth: at some point, in any extensive litmus test, everyone will fail – including the truther. And if the two Jehovahs gave any one of us a litmus test, including any truther, we would certainly fail at some point in the test.

Truthers do not seem to understand either John 3:16, or John 3:17:

“For God so loved the [non-commandment keeping people of the] world that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have everlasting life. For God did not send His Son into the world to condemn the world, but so that the world might be saved through Him.” John 3:16, 17, MKJV

If love is only the keeping of the commandments of God, and the world is full of sinners who do not and were not keeping the commandments of God, then how is it that God could love the world when the world, being full of sinners, was truther-definitionally not worthy of love? In other words, the love of God went beyond whether someone was keeping the commandments of God, because the people of the world were clearly sinners who were not keeping those commandments. But God loved the people of world anyway. How does that fit into the truther love formula? It clearly does not - because the love of God is beyond rule keeping. God the Father and Jesus Christ clearly want **a future relationship** with these sinning people and so God the Father sent Jesus Christ on a divine rescue mission – so he would not have to condemn them. To miss the truth of this is to miss one of the central points of the entire God and Man storyline.

As pertains to John 3:17, a lot of truthers seem to almost root for God to condemn sinners and punish them. This is a dangerous attitude toward others to have, because the truther's negative judgment tends to fall quite hard on anyone who does not agree with them, which is almost everyone else. John 3:17 clearly shows

that the two Jehovahs do not want to have to condemn anyone and neither should a truther – if a truther is really trying to be like them. This is especially so since the truther of today will not pass that same truther’s future litmus test. It is very dangerous to have such a judging and condemnatory mindset, as made plain by many scriptures, including the Matthew 7:1-5 scripture previously quoted, and the Romans 2 passage quoted again for emphasis below:

“Therefore you are without excuse, O man, everyone who judges; for in that in which you judge another, you condemn yourself, for you who judge do the same things. But know that **the judgment of God is [ironically] according to truth on those who practice such things.** And, O man, the one judging those who do such things, and practice them, do you think this, that you shall escape the judgment of God? Or do you despise the riches of His kindness, and the forbearance and long-suffering, not knowing that the kindness of God leads you to repentance? But according to your hardness and your impenitent heart, do you treasure up wrath for yourself in a day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God, who will render to each according to his works;” Romans 2:1-6, MKJV



"For he who has shown no mercy shall have judgment without mercy, and mercy exults over judgment." James 2:13, MKJV

A particular point of irritation, to your author, is when a truther makes a blanket and harsh, judgmentally negative, statement. Truthers, conscious or not, seem to constantly sit in negative and condemnatory judgment of other people – including people they do not even know. Your author has heard many truther pronouncements, such as: "The body of Christ (Ephesians 4:4-16) needs to repent because they are Laodicean in attitude (lacking in zeal toward God, Revelation 3:14-22)." There are a number of moral and intellectual problems with statements of this kind. Number one: Jesus Christ is the head of the church (ekklesia) (Ephesians 5:23), not the truther. Number two: unlike Jesus Christ, who is the head of the church and actually does know who is in the church, the truther does not even know who is actually in the church (ekklesia). The truther could not name everyone by name. Furthermore, the truther does not really know the people that he could actually name. Number three: it is a foolish and shameful thing to judge a matter before one hears it (Proverbs 18:13).

Since the truther is pronouncing a harsh judgment on people he does not even know, people who have never had a hearing before him, he is guilty of what is mentioned in Proverbs 18:13. Number four: Jesus Christ is the judge, not the truther (see Romans 14 below). Number five: because the truther does not actually know the people he is harshly judging, the truther is, in point of fact, and once again, ironically, IGNORANT!

“But why do you judge your brother? Or also why do you despise your brother? For all shall stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, “As I live, says the Lord, every knee shall bow to Me, and every tongue shall confess to God.” So then each one of us will give account concerning himself to God. **Then let us not judge one another any more**, but rather judge this, not to put a stumbling-block or an offense toward his brother.”  
Romans 14:10-13, MKJV

To not put an offense toward a brother in Christ would seem to preclude making harsh and cruel statements, especially condemnatory or negatively judgmental statements toward them – including statements made via the Internet. Your author has a theory (opinion), which you,

dear reader, are free to accept or reject, as to at least one of the reasons why many truther statements are harsh, callous, unconstructive, and downright hurtful. It is because that, consciously or not, deep down inside, the truther believes that: **if his statement is true, then he has immunity** for any follow-on consequences, however negative. The truthers believe speaking the truth, even in the wrong way, or at the wrong time, gives them immunity. It does not. A simple reflection back to the playground would suffice to dispel this stupidity and every truther, if they thought about it, should know it. But, ironically, they don't think about it. For our playground proof, let us suppose that Johnny's mother was ugly and fat. And let us suppose that Billy told Johnny just that, "Your mother is ugly and fat." Is there anyone reading this who would actually believe that the truth of the spoken words would provide immunity from what was sure to happen next? Where your author grew up, there is going to be a fight. And Billy would quickly learn that truth does not offer immunity to words cruelly and unnecessarily spoken. The truth does NOT provide immunity for the relationship damaging consequences of what is said.

“But I say to you that every idle word, whatever men may speak, [or print on the Internet] they shall give account of it in the day of judgment. For by your words you shall be justified, and by your words you shall be condemned.” Matthew 12:36, 37, MKJV

“If I had the gift of prophecy, and if I knew all the mysteries of the future **and knew everything about everything**, but didn’t love others, what good would I be? And if I had the gift of faith so that I could speak to a mountain and make it move, without love I would be no good to anybody.” 1 Corinthians 13:2, NLT

When we speak, we should speak the truth in love. Interestingly enough, speaking the truth in love usually will provide at least some immunity to the speaker.

“But that you, **speaking the truth in love**, may in all things grow up to Him who is the Head, even Christ;” Ephesians 4:15, MKJV

Why are many truthers alone, or virtually alone? The Bible sheds some light on this and even instructs the body of Christ to shun abusive people. Unfortunately, many truthers do not see that they are abusive to others. This

is probably because they think that truth provides immunity to them while they are on their self-appointed, mission-from-God. At any rate, they are many times alone and the Bible seems to concur that they deserve to be.

"What I meant was that **you are not to associate with anyone who** claims to be a Christian yet indulges in sexual sin, or is greedy, or worships idols, **or is abusive**, or a drunkard, or a swindler. **Don't even eat with such people.**"  
1 Corinthians 5:11, NLT

In psychology, it is known that there are different attachment styles. If someone has what is known as an "avoidant attachment style," because they have experienced and suffered from long-term rejection, (usually as a child pertaining to the parental relationship or lack thereof), many times they will develop an unhealthy protective shell around their heart. If it becomes extreme, it negatively affects the person's ability to feel or show concern for others. Perhaps this has happened to some truthers, because it seems as though many truthers almost have a shell around their heart. Though usually intelligent, many truthers are lacking in emotional IQ. They are out of balance and lacking in the moral virtues that would help

complete them. They lack empathy for others, which is why so many of their statements, though true, or believed by them to be true, are hurtful. Whether they have an avoidant attachment style or not, your author does not know, but in many cases, they are alone.

Per the Romans 14 passage above, we each will have to give an account for our lives. Further, we each have a lifetime of work that is necessary in order to obtain and use the moral and intellectual virtues. Sometimes the truther's seemingly easy way out is to tear down others instead of building himself up, but this foolish approach still leaves the abuser lacking in the virtues. The truthers tend to emphasize the intellectual virtues because this is where they are the most comfortable. But the moral virtues are equally necessary due to the concept of unity of virtues. The virtues work together to mutually adjust and determine each other. When the moral virtues are lacking, e.g., love, the communication of truth can be harsh and cold – with poor results. Even if the truthers thought they possessed something really important to share with others, to not communicate that important information in such a way as to give it the best chance of positive results is, quite frankly, foolish. And foolish is,

ironically, lacking in intellectual virtue. The truth is, we all have more work to do reforming ourselves than we can do in our lifetime and we don't have the time to sit around and judge other people. If we do, we will personally fail, due to not having the moral virtues, and we will be alone. No one will want to be around us. In life, the really hard thing to do is to reform oneself. This is true for both truthers and for lovers.

One of the central problems that truthers face is that life is not formulaic. Yes, there is logic and math and physics, but there is also art and music and beauty. There are natural sciences and social sciences. The social sciences have to account for human consciousness and also human choice as a causative factor. And, since people are unique, they think differently - including differently from the truther. This drives the truther crazy. How could people be so stupid as to not be able to see what the truther is now able to see? The truther thinks that the information, which led him to his most recent important conclusion, is readily available for others to know as well. Other people must be fat, dumb, lazy, and stupid not to get it. And why does Baskin Robbins have 31 flavors when they only need one, the truther favorite? What

a waste of ice cream. Alas, unfortunately for the truther, life is part art and part science. A precious loving daughter, singing and skipping through a field, holding some flowers she has just picked, does not fit into a math formula. There is no syllogism to explain why she is so innocent and happy. Life is not formulaic. Love is not just keeping the commandments of God. And here is a very central and intellectually crushing blow to any truther who wants to remake others into the truther's image: Since the two Jehovahs, aka God, whom the truther believes he understands far better than "those common men," decided to give all men free will and all men time to grow, how is that the truther (on a self-appointed mission from God) has decided that all other men should choose ONLY THE WAY THE TRUTHER WOULD? Is the truther, advocating God's "correct way," in conflict with what the two Jehovahs actually did? Yes, he is in such a conflict with them and he is too intellectually clueless to know it. The truth is: the truther, on a self-appointed mission-from-God, is in conflict with what the two Jehovahs are actually doing – which is to give all men free will and time to grow – to give all men freedom to choose for themselves. And all men have so much time and so much freedom and then the time is up and then the freedom is up



and then we each have to answer for our lives, including the truther.

The relational aspect of our life journey is something that most truthers need to learn, to remember, and to work on.

“For whom He foreknew, He also predestinated to be conformed to the image of His Son, for Him to be the First-born among many brothers.” Romans 8:29, MKJV

“Therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, **put on tender feelings of mercy, kindness**, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering,” Colossians 3:12, MKJV

Once the truthers find the balance of the other virtues they will be far happier and will likely not be so all alone. They might even come to the place where they can greet one another with a holy kiss (Romans 16:16, 1 Thessalonians 5:26, 1 Corinthians 16:20, 2 Corinthians 13:12, 1 Peter 5:14):

**“Greet all the brothers with a holy kiss.”**  
1 Thessalonians 5:26, MKJV

"Greet one another with **a kiss of holy love.**  
Peace be to you, all those in Christ Jesus.  
Amen." 1 Peter 5:14, MKJV

Your author hit the truthers pretty hard, but they are not the only ones with a problem. What about the lovers? Is their approach in harmony with the Bible, and will it yield for them the results they are hoping for? The short answer is, "No." The lovers are pretty good with relationships, certainly better than the truthers are, but the lovers have a long way to go themselves. The lovers intend well, but in life good intentions are not enough. It is almost a certainty that if the world were turned over to most lovers they would, with good intentions, destroy it - including many men made in God's image. They would not mean to, but they would.

As a concrete example, illustrating the above, your author has heard numerous mothers say something along the lines of, "I only want what is best for my child." They believe and say this because most all mothers, at least the good ones, love their children. Some of those same mothers then advocate Socialism as a political system. They evidently do not realize that Socialism has been

intellectually demolished almost 100 years ago, it cannot work in practice, and it destroys men's lives. It would destroy their own child's life if their child had to live under it. So why would a loving mother, who really believes she only wants what is best for her child, then advocate for a political system that will destroy her child's life (and her grandchildren's lives)? The answer is that the loving mother is lacking in intellectual virtue. She does not know what political system to advocate for and she feels or believes that Socialism would somehow be good. It would not. And her feelings, or intuitions, or beliefs do NOT change the laws of social science. She is a lover who is lacking knowledge and understanding and wisdom. She is lacking in the intellectual virtues. And due to the unity of virtues, her motherly love, when not adjusted by knowledge, will yield a well-intentioned but disastrous result. And then she will likely cry out to God to help save her from the consequences of her own foolish advocacy. We are to have dominion over the earth, not each other. Socialism is a system of dominion over each other. Your author used a loving mother for the example, but the same holds true for loving fathers.

Jesus Christ, when he was on this earth, had to live a sinless life so as to qualify to be the Savior of mankind. Your author is pretty certain he faced daily challenges. Further, he had at least several defining moment-of-truth episodes. One of his moment-of-truth episodes was his crucifixion and what led up to it. Another was his earlier temptation by Satan after fasting 40 days and nights. What Jesus Christ actually did, in response to one of Satan's tests, intellectually crushes the lover, good intentions are enough, approach to life for all time. The Satan testing and tempting Christ story is found in Matthew 4 and Luke 4. Your author will quote the Matthew version of the story:

"Then the Devil took Him up into the holy city and set Him upon a pinnacle of the Temple. And he said to Him, If you are the Son of God, cast yourself down. For it is written, "He shall give His angels charge concerning You, and in their hands they shall bear You up, lest at any time You dash Your foot against a stone." Jesus said to him, It is written again, "You shall not tempt the Lord your God."  
Matthew 4:5-7, MKJV

Jesus Christ did not do what Satan told him to. Jesus Christ did remember to yield to and obey

God the Father. Realizing both of those things, and their importance, is a usual response to the above passage of scripture. But, what else happened? To answer that question we have to think for a minute. And what else happened is very important to understand pertaining to the above, Jesus Christ versus Satan, epic battle. **Jesus Christ did not cast himself down. He did not let go!** Why was it that Jesus Christ did not let go? It is because there is a law of gravity. Jesus Christ was not supposed to die at that moment in time and he would have, if he let go. Jesus Christ knew about the law of gravity because he was one of the two Jehovahs who created it (Ephesians 3:9). **Jesus Christ, even while under duress from Satan, affirmed natural laws by not jumping, or letting go!**

Natural laws include the natural sciences (laws of nature) and the social sciences (including ethics, natural rights, and economics) and logic and mathematics, etc. Natural laws are discoverable using reason. If anyone, lover or truther or balanced, does not understand the laws of the natural sciences, or the laws of the social sciences, etc., they will have many more problems in life than otherwise. But, the situation is far worse than that – it is far worse

than inflicting harm on oneself due to ignorance. This is because it is promised that those completing the divine individualism process will be given positions of authority and rulership (ostensibly to help others), per the Revelation passage quoted below. It is a serious matter to be substantially clueless intellectually. One could easily, once given power, advocate and install policies that inadvertently destroy the very people one was supposed to be helping. Saying, "Oops," and having good intentions, does not excuse the damage that was inflicted on real people and their lives. Accidental, well-intentioned destruction is still destruction. Because this is true, if Christ does not heal the lack of intellectual virtues at the resurrection, he will have to teach those not understanding the laws of the social sciences THE TRUTH prior to granting them authority and power. Otherwise, the lovers are dangerous to the very people they mean to love. Jesus Christ knew and respected natural laws and he will expect those representing him, using his authority and name, to do the same. He already confirmed natural laws, even while under duress from Satan. Possession and use of the intellectual virtues does matter. Truth matters. Truth matters when making decisions because choices have consequences.

"And I saw thrones, and they sat on them, and judgment was given to them. And I saw the souls of those who had been beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the Word of God, and who had not worshiped the beast nor his image, nor had received his mark on their foreheads, nor in their hands. And they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years."  
Revelation 20:4, MKJV

For Jesus Christ to give judgment to resurrected divine individuals they must ... know how to judge. To know how to judge requires understanding the context of the situation. To know the context of the situation requires facts and logic. It requires piecing together what really happened in order to gain understanding. Facts, logic, knowledge, understanding, and then the wisdom to decide/judge are all intellectual virtues. If a lover has not developed the intellectual virtues how can they judge? They cannot. The lovers' good intentions will not be enough. The lovers' warm, best wishes toward all will not be enough. Without the possession and use of the intellectual virtues, to mutually adjust and determine the moral virtues, one will not be judging the way the two Jehovahs would have judged. Any such

judgment will be lacking and likely hurtful – not intentionally hurtful, but hurtful nonetheless. The love and good intentions of the lovers do not provide them immunity from the consequences of their judgments and actions. To think it would is silly. This is the lovers' blind spot. It is similar to the truthers' blind spot of thinking that they have immunity for relationship-shattering comments they make to others, if their comments are true. The lovers' good intentions will not prevent them from reaping what they sow (Galatians 6:7).

Most lovers are not so intellectually lacking that if a beggar asked them for money, but the beggar was poorly dressed and sitting right outside a liquor store, they would give it to him. While having feelings of compassion for him, they would likely understand that the beggar was in a begging situation because the beggar was an alcoholic. And so most lovers would be wise enough to not give the beggar money. Maybe they would give him a sandwich, but not money. If so, it is to the lover's credit because they used wisdom. Unfortunately, many life situations are not so clear cut and easily identified and the intellectual virtues really come into play then. But even in this relatively simple life situation it took understanding the context of



the situation (facts, logic, and understanding required, intellectual virtues) to know what was wise (intellectual virtue) to do and what was not wise to do. Love was moderated and adjusted by wisdom.

In a local church situation the lovers and the truthers find each other. The lovers are feelers and, many times, intuitives. What will happen if there is a local church decision to be made, and the various intuitive lovers are praying about the decision, and then each one shares the answer they believe they received from their prayer. What if some of the lovers favor "yes" and some of the lovers favor "no"? Each **believes** and **feels** like the answer they got back from their prayer was correct. Both groups cannot be right. Either the "No's" are correct, or the "Yes's" are correct, but not both. So, who is correct? At this point, in order to resolve the impasse, there has to be an appeal to some impartial and rational standard – reality has to be ascertained. In other words, there is an appeal to use reason and facts and logic to better understand what to do – all of which entail the intellectual virtues. Ironically, the two groups of intuitive feelers are stuck with using truth principles to resolve the matter and come to a decision.

Sometimes your author has noticed believers in Christ, particularly lovers, checking out mentally by using Isaiah 55:8-9 as a conversation-ending platitude:

“For My thoughts are not your thoughts, nor your ways My ways, says the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are My ways higher than your ways, and My thoughts than your thoughts.” Isaiah 55:8, 9, MKJV

It is true that God’s thoughts are higher than ours, but this does not mean that we should not ourselves think. The Bible is full of such admonitions to do so (Proverbs 1 and many other places). We have to learn how to think in order to become like Jesus Christ, who has all the intellectual virtues.

Another much misused lover platitude is, “We live in a fallen world.” This is a reference to Adam and Eve getting kicked out of the Garden of Eden (Genesis 3). While it is true that mankind has been kicked out of the Garden of Eden, and it is true that we live in a fallen world, what remains true, nonetheless, is that man must LIVE in this fallen world. We do not have the option of sitting around and speaking

escape-from-reality platitudes like “God’s thoughts are higher than our thoughts” and “We live in a fallen world” and then hoping for miracles to make it through life. This is an incorrect lover emphasis and a hope that someone else will do the work to provide. To live in this fallen world means man has to THINK and to take ACTION – not, NOT THINK and hope that either God or someone else solves the problems. As previously pointed out, to live in this world and to do what God said, which is to have dominion over the earth, requires learning the natural laws and complying with them. It requires learning and using truth concepts and principles of identity (identify things), learning and using cause and effect, logic, math, principles of engineering, social science truths, etc. While God may have said his thoughts are higher than man’s thoughts **he also said to have dominion over the earth** so we do having thinking power enough to do what God said, and we must think to the best of our ability. A lot of lovers basically sit around and wait for God or someone else to solve the problems, while they bemoan the fact that we live in a fallen world.

Many lovers want to change the world for the better. It hurts their hearts to see men

suffering. Intuitively, they feel like they ought to do something to make the world a better place and their feelings that they should do something are pretty strong. They conceive of projects that would help needy others. These projects will cost money – usually a lot of money. Unfortunately, many times, they do not have much money themselves. So they need other peoples' money to implement their well-intentioned plans. When they go to raise the money they have a hard time understanding why it is not so easily forthcoming. "If only other people could see what we see and would give us money we could alleviate human suffering, or at least work toward that end." The capital is not forthcoming because, many times, these well-intentioned people could barely set up and run a roadside lemonade stand - much less know what it actually takes to change moral, philosophic, legal, and economic conditions to benefit the human condition. In other words, they do not know what it would really take to actually solve the problem by getting to the source of it and eliminating the cause(s) so far less people are suffering. Their lack of understanding of the natural laws, and what it takes to generate surplus capital to fund such relief efforts, make them unsuitable candidates to actually champion such an effort.

If they do receive some funding it will never be enough. There will be problems, expected and unexpected, and things never go according to plan. When they don't, when their admittedly well-intentioned efforts run into the unyielding buzz saw of reality, they are, predictably, cut to shreds. They FEEL hurt. They are confused. "Why didn't God bless our efforts? Why is no more money forthcoming? Now we understand better what really has to be done ... but we are out of money. Can't people see how much we care?" It is easy to care – with other peoples' money. The well-intentioned, warm and fuzzy lover-feelers are at a loss. They are at a loss because they have never done the hard, thoughtful work to learn the natural laws. They are at a loss because they actually do not know what it would take to change the human condition for the better. They can only treat the symptoms of problems and not the actual causes. Their lack of the intellectual virtues betrays themselves, their well-intentioned efforts, and the people they could have helped. It is very easy to be charitable, if you are allowed to spend other peoples' money – until it runs out. The truth is that most of the problems of the world are compound problems. They are compound because there is usually a lack of character involved (moral defects), coupled with

a lack of knowledge concerning the social sciences and/or the natural sciences (intellectual defects). Money is not going to solve either kind of problem. It can only treat the symptoms, which is as far as many lovers can see. The unyielding buzz saw of reality does not care about good intentions. And warm and fuzzy, caring feelings are no substitute for actually knowing the laws of the social and natural sciences, management principles, organizational principles, etc. The Bible, itself quite harsh at times, drives home the point of the importance of obtaining the intellectual virtues in order to help avoid the below scenario:

“Some people ruin themselves by their own stupid actions and then blame the LORD.”  
Proverbs 19:3, TEV (Good News Bible)

Many lovers just want to feel the freedom of being in Christ. Good for them. How about this scripture?:

“And you shall know the truth, and **the truth shall make you free.**” John 8:32, MKJV

Lovers need to also be aware that sound doctrine is very important. It is not the only

thing that is important, but it is important to the two Jehovahs, and to the lovers themselves:

“For the time will be when they will not endure sound doctrine, but they will heap up teachers to themselves according to their own lusts, tickling the ear. And they will turn away their ears from the truth and will be turned to myths.” 2 Timothy 4:3, 4, MKJV

Lovers want to worship the Father and Jesus Christ because they love and appreciate them. God is love (1 John 4:8, 16) and lovers want to be like God. Lovers want good relationships with others. Again, good for them:

“But the hour is coming, and now is, when **the true worshipers** shall worship the Father **in spirit and truth**, for the Father seeks such to worship Him. God is a spirit, and they who worship Him must worship in spirit and in truth.” John 4:23, 24, MKJV

“He who blesses himself in the earth shall bless himself in **the God of truth**. And he who swears in the earth will swear by **the God of truth**; because the former troubles are forgotten, and because they are hidden from My eyes.” Isaiah 65:16, MKJV

Notice that the God of love is also the God of truth. God is complete.

There are a lot of scriptures the lovers probably need to give a bit more emphasis to:

"Therefore stand, having your loins girded about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness" Ephesians 6:14, MKJV

"And He said, Take heed that you are not deceived, for many shall come in My name, saying, I AM! Also, The time has come! Do not go after them." Luke 21:8, MKJV

"Jesus said to him, I am the Way, **the Truth**, and the Life; no one comes to the Father but by Me." John 14:6, MKJV

"**Sanctify them through Your truth.** Your Word is truth." John 17:17, MKJV

If the scripture said, "Grow in grace OR knowledge," which it does not, the lovers would pick grace and the truthers would be forced to also pick grace, but would actually be more comfortable if they could pick knowledge. Grace is emblematic of the moral virtues and



knowledge is emblematic of the intellectual virtues. What the actual scriptures says, however, is the below:

“But **grow in grace and in knowledge** of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ [who has all of the moral and intellectual virtues in one being]. To Him be the glory, both now and to the day of eternity. Amen.” 2 Peter 3:18, MKJV

In many places in the Bible truth and mercy are linked. They have to be. The two Jehovahs cannot make  $2 + 2 = 7$  because some people are not good at math and they do not want those people to feel bad. There are absolute standards. The truth is, no human being meets them. All of us are deficient in different virtues. And all of us have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God (Romans 3:23). None of us is sinless and the fact that each of us is a sinner brings us under the penalty of death (Romans 6:23). No human being has the complete package of all of the moral and intellectual virtues. No human being completely understands all of the laws of the natural sciences. No human being completely understands all of the laws of the social sciences. But, the two Jehovahs cannot lower the standards because of all this. What they can

do, they did. They provided mercy. To the truth of the standard they added mercy. Mercy and truth are linked. They have to be, or we are all dead. A Bible software search for "mercy" (or "grace" or "kindness") AND "truth" revealed over 30 matches. If the two supreme minds of the universe link the concepts of mercy and truth, 30 times or so in the same scripture, it cannot be an accident. And it is not. They are inseparably linked. Below are a few examples of those scriptures:

**"Mercy and truth have met together;**  
righteousness and peace have kissed each other." Psalms 85:10, MKJV

"But You, O God, are God full of pity, and gracious, long-suffering, and rich in mercy and truth." Psalms 86:15, MKJV

"All the paths of the LORD are mercy and truth unto such as keep his covenant and his testimonies." Psalms 25:10, KJV

"Let not mercy and truth forsake you; tie them around your neck; write them upon the tablet of your heart;" Proverbs 3:3, MKJV

Truthers need to understand that the truth is: they need mercy. Lovers need to understand that truth is probably far important than they have heretofore realized. The Proverbs 3:3 scripture, above, interestingly admonishes us to also write truth “upon the tablet of your heart.” The reason the section of this book dealing with the moral and intellectual virtues preceded this section is to help set the stage to show that mercy (a moral virtue) and truth (an intellectual virtue) must be together – not separate. The only complete beings in the universe, the two Jehovahs, themselves refuse to be defined by only one of their constituent parts. This is why the Bible identifies God as being love and also God as being truth. And what both truthers and lovers need to understand is they will not be given power to judge and rule until they can judge the way the two Jehovahs do. This goes for everyone else, too. As for now, Christians receive a portion of the Holy Spirit, which gives us a relatively small amount of spiritual power. The reason it is a small amount is probably because we cannot currently be trusted with more. The Holy Spirit also helps us by giving us love (the moral virtues) and a sound mind (the intellectual virtues). As time goes by we are to grow toward becoming like Jesus Christ, our example. For now, we are given some spiritual

empowerment to help us change to become like him. The below scriptures show the more complete picture for both the truthers and the lovers:

“For God has not given us the spirit of fear, but of power **and of love** and of **a sound mind**.” 2 Timothy 1:7, MKJV

“[love] does not rejoice in unrighteousness, but rejoices with the truth,”  
1 Corinthians 13:6, NAS95

“Grace will be with you, mercy and peace from God the Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love.”  
2 John 1:3, MKJV

Not all who seek God are only either truthers or lovers. There are more balanced people, too. And there are truthers with a heart and there are lovers who also think and have sound minds. Your author thought these two fairly common types of God-seekers provided relatively easy foils with whom to make a point. Writing with LOVE, the TRUTH is: all of us need to grow in grace (the moral virtues) and knowledge (the intellectual virtues) because none of us is even remotely complete at this

point in time. There is a lifetime of work ahead for each of us. The truthers can learn about relationships and affection from the lovers and the lovers can learn reasoning skills and the sciences from the truthers. To do so would be far better than for the truthers to give up on relationships and people - and for the lovers to give up on reason and thinking. The truth is, reconciliation is both a critical relationship concept and also a truth concept:

“And all things are of God, who has reconciled us to Himself through Jesus Christ, and has given to us the ministry of reconciliation [not condemnation]; whereas God [the Father] was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, not imputing their trespasses to them, and putting the word of reconciliation in us.”  
2 Corinthians 5:18, 19, MKJV

## **Government Versus Individuals**

Your author has written several previous books, as part of a series of books, explaining why your life is hard. Three of the books in that series concern the different, but related, subjects of philosophy, law, and economics. Philosophy encompasses ethics, knowledge, metaphysics, logic, and how we think, amongst

many other things. Law and our legal system set the stage for justice, social harmony, and peace, or the lack thereof, and the legal system also sets the stage for economics. Economics covers thinking and acting man, and the economizing of scarce resources, amongst many other things. Sometimes not understood, the subjects of philosophy, law, and economics go together and each must really be studied in order to gain the social science inter-connections that exist in reality. With all that said, this provides your author with the difficult task of touching on the wide-ranging subject of government in this short section of the book. Since the overall context of this book is the two Jehovahs' divine individualism, only aspects of government can be covered here. A much more detailed discussion of law and government are in the three book philosophy-law-economics series mentioned above. For the reader's convenience, your author's book on philosophy is entitled: *Intellectual Warfare: The Corruption Of Philosophy And Thought*. Again, for the reader's convenience, your author's book on law is entitled: *Why There Is No Justice: The Corruption Of Law*. And your author's book on economics is entitled: *Economic Fallacies Versus Rational Thought*.

The main purpose of this section of the book is to explain how virtually every type of government in human history has worked against the two Jehovahs, and also has worked against mankind. Some possible exceptions, to this rather broad statement, are the ancient government of the Israelites, while Moses was alive, and also during portions of the period of Joshua and the judges, and perhaps while David was king. Early America could also be considered an exception. That virtually every government, known to man, has worked against God is ironic. This is because virtually every type of government ever devised seeks both moral standing, via some philosophic or legal rationalization, and also seeks divine favor. Without some rationalized moral standing, and without the hoped for divine favor, it is too much work for the power elite to keep the government stable and the citizenry in check.

The social science causal chain sequence, of justice – social harmony – peace – life, is important for a wise and good government to understand. Justice is both causal to social harmony and is a constituent (necessary) part of social harmony. Social harmony is causal to peace and is a constituent part of peace. Peace

is causal to life and is a constituent part of a flourishing life. Further all men are men ( $A = A$ ). All men must think and take action in order to live on this earth. All men must obtain and use property in order to stay alive. Staying alive is only a minimal standard. Men need even more than subsistence property to flourish on this earth and to blossom as men - which is to say to have an abundant and flourishing life.

Each man, at the human level, owns himself and he owns his time. Your author is aware that the two Jehovahs own everything, but they have chosen to give us our lives and told us to have dominion over the earth, not each other. We will have a bit more to say about this, later, when we come to Jesus Christ's words on government. For now, each man has the God-given natural rights of life, liberty, and property. Even if a man is poor, he owns himself and his time. And he can build from there.

The purpose of government, properly understood, is to secure each man's natural rights. Natural law, knowable by reason, ordained by the two Jehovahs, subordinates all governments to moral law (Romans 1:18-19). Government should be strictly limited (small) with very narrowly defined functions. One of



those proper functions is the collective organization of the individual right of self-defense. Government should catch the bad guys and make them pay restitution in order to help establish justice. Government might also be required to help organize, with citizen help (the citizens form the army), national defense against a foreign aggressor. Government can also adjudicate contract disputes, but arbitrators can also perform this task without much, if any, government involvement. The government cannot give to one man what it first does not take from another. If the government does take from one man, in order to give to another, then the government itself is causing a lack of justice. With all this said, if the government goes beyond doing what it is best able to do, secure justice and provide defense, and it gets involved in things that it cannot and should not do, e.g., the economy, it becomes a harm and a hindrance to its own citizens.

Most governments do not know their proper limited function, which is to say, they are ignorant. Or, governments do not care about staying within their proper functions. They rationalize ways to grow beyond their proper functions, which is to say, they are evil. Your author is sorry to report that virtually all

governments are either ignorant or evil, usually both. A large government correlates to weak citizens and this ultimately leads to a collapse of that nation. Groups of citizens, who gain control of the government and use it to exploit their fellow men, are not absolved from their covetousness and theft because government magically absolves their corrupt acts. Governments are subject to natural laws, including economic laws, whether they want to be or not.

Your author's book on law, *Why There Is No Justice: The Corruption Of Law*, has a section on tribalism and the mindset associated with it. Because most of the world is tribal, your author quotes some of the core paragraphs below:

"One can argue about what tribalism means and entails. To someone educated in the West, tribal practices and beliefs seem primitive. But, a large part of the world is tribal to this very day; hence the constant lack of trust and conflicts in various parts of the world. A hallmark point of a tribal mentality is that ethnic, cultural, language, geographic, or religious ties trump principles and reason. It is, quite literally, collective group membership over: individuals, principles, and rational

thought. The tribe's way is right based on tradition, ethnicity, language, geographic location, intuitively received religious beliefs, etc. Rather than giving weighty consideration to universal natural laws, objective rational ethical principles, and personal dealings between individual men, tribal beliefs and practices rule. Tribal members, in essence, trade individual personal growth and development for safety through group membership.

The history of the world is filled with examples of inter-tribal warfare. Rationalizations for this include: fighting over scarce resources, attempting to settle border differences, payback for long-standing inter-tribal feuds, attempting to preserve language, culture, or religion, etc.

The core of the problem with tribal thinking is, many times, an anti-conceptual mentality involving significant errors in thinking. Not all tribes are guilty of all of the below, and this is not a book on anthropology. Nevertheless, since a lot of the world is tribal, it must be noted that some of the more important errors in tribal thinking are:

1. Believing that in any exchange there is a winner and a loser so it is important to try to get more than you give when trading.
2. A 'might makes right' mentality where you must conquer before being conquered.
3. Wanting something for nothing so instead of producing what you can and trading for what you want, an attempt is made to just take what others have produced.
4. Not understanding there are natural laws and natural rights and that individual men and women are important in their own right. The tribal group, as a collective, is more important than the individual members. If deemed necessary by the tribal leaders, individual members become disposable, i.e., they can be human fuel for the tribal fire.
5. Being afraid of reality and not knowing how to deal with it. This comes out in various religious practices designed to attempt to appease 'the gods' in some strange or anti-human way.
6. Static thinking in the sense that change is likely to be viewed as an enemy.
7. Members of other tribes or groups cannot be trusted.
8. Outside ideas attempting to penetrate into the tribe cannot be trusted.

Nathaniel Branden, author and psychotherapist, evidently coined the term, 'Witch Doctor,' for the tribal religious leader and 'Attila' for the tribal boss man. Ayn Rand popularized and made famous these characterizations of the two main anti-conceptual mentality leaders of most tribes. In the next paragraph your author paraphrases some of the characterization of the Witch Doctor. Then, in later paragraphs, your author provides a paraphrased characterization regarding Attila, along with further characterizations about the Witch Doctor.

The Witch Doctor has intuitive feelings and beliefs which, (more likely than not), are not in accord with reality. The Witch Doctor wants his feelings and beliefs to somehow trump reality. He uses induced or actual guilt over tribal members who then need special religious ceremonies to be in good standing with both 'the gods' and the tribe. The Witch Doctor helps the tribal leader, Attila, maintain order through spiritual control over tribal members. The Witch Doctor asserts superior supernatural guidance, vis-à-vis his fellow tribal members. The Witch Doctor is typically a concrete perceptual feeler, not an abstract conceptual thinker, hence the categorization of anti-conceptual mentality from

Branden and Rand. The Witch Doctor tends to perceive information concretely and process it reflectively, i.e., how do they feel the new information will affect them and other tribal members. Truth tends to become whatever makes you feel better.

The Bible warns Gentile converts about not going back to strange tribal religious practices, which is worshipping gods that are not gods:

‘But then, indeed, not knowing God, **you served as slaves to those not by nature being gods**. But now, knowing God, but rather are known by God, how do you turn again to the weak and beggarly elements to which you desire to slave anew?’ Galatians 4:8, 9, MKJV

‘For all the gods of the nations are idols; but the LORD made the heavens.’  
Psalms 96:5, MKJV

‘They [the Israelites] did not destroy the nations as the LORD commanded them; but were mixed among the nations, and learned their works [and laws]. And they served their idols, which were a snare to them. Yea, **they sacrificed their sons and their daughters to demons**, and shed innocent blood, even the

blood of their sons and of their daughters, whom they sacrificed to the idols of Canaan; and the land was defiled with blood.'

Psalms 106:34-38, MKJV

Characterizing Attila, he is the tribal leader. In all likelihood he is an action-oriented warrior-thug who will do whatever he considers necessary to maintain his rule and protect his tribe. Attila is a perceptual, concrete-bound, man of action. Concepts and theories are of no great use to him, hence his designation as having an anti-conceptual mentality. He perceives information concretely and then he will process that information by taking action and seeing what happens. If valuable individual men die it does not so much matter because death is part of life and the safety of the tribe and his own personal rule are considered paramount. Truth is whatever works. If his actions offend other tribes and set the stage for the next war, so be it. The conceptual limitations of rational and objective ethics, natural rights, or long-term thinking do not much matter to him. He must take whatever action he considers necessary now in order to safeguard his own rule and his tribe. Attila thinks force and fraud and war are practical. If one of his plans goes wrong, he will just try

something else to, once again, see what happens.

If tribe members will just 'check their brain at the door' then Attila, supported by the Witch Doctor, will keep them safe. Traditions, in the form of memorized rules of behavior, are designed to maximize the well being of the tribe. A tribe member violates them at his/her own peril. Catch phrases and emotional slogans are utilized as an attempted substitute for thinking. However, all actions have consequences, even collective tribal actions. There is no escape from reason, responsibility, and reality – not even with a 'tribe membership in good standing card.' The Witch Doctor's faith (beliefs) is no match for reality and neither is Attila's force.

Attila conquers and rules over those members of the tribal society, who have the brains, courage, work ethic, and ability to be productive. The Witch Doctor, as priest or philosopher, provides Attila with an intuitive rationalization for his actions and tribe members with a justification for their servitude to the tribal collective. Attila keeps the Witch Doctor safe from reality. The Witch Doctor delivers the people to Attila for slaughter, if necessary.



The Witch Doctor needs the tribe members to believe that he has a superior intuitive inner voice to 'the higher reality' and the Witch Doctor needs the tribe members' obedience to his shamanisms. If he has to use deception or fraud to convince 'the misguided,' so be it. Attila needs men who take orders. He needs human cannon fodder. If a war is deemed necessary, even one waged against Attila's own people, so be it.

Tribalism, in whatever form, is a rebellion against reason and reality. Tribalism kills men made in God's image and has, for the moment, largely thwarted God's purpose in creating mankind. Most tribal members, though not physically dead yet, are lacking in the intellectual and moral virtues. They have been trained to respond to catch phrases and emotional slogans, which inculcate loyalty to the tribe, instead of to truth and universally applicable right principles. An individual tribe member is expendable.

Those educated in the West can laugh at tribalism, but even most of Europe has always been tribal. And the ideological aspects of tribalism are to be found in Statism everywhere, which Statism is really tribalism writ large."

In your author's law book is also an important section on kings. Because much of world has also experienced governments by kings, your author will quote a number of core paragraphs below:

" ... God originally wanted Israel to be ruled by a judge using known laws. When the people rejected Samuel, they were really rejecting God. And the people were asking to be governed like the other nations, who had kings. What the Israelites did not realize, or care about if they realized it, was that a king-headed government is a government that is set up for war and not for peace. But war shreds man's natural rights and destroys all of the things that enable life.

'And Samuel told all the words of the LORD to the people who asked a king of him. And he said, This will be the privilege of the king who shall reign over you. He shall take your sons and appoint them for himself, for his chariots, and his horsemen. And they shall run before his chariots. **And he will appoint commanders over thousands, and commanders over fifties, and some to plow his ground and reap his harvest, and make his weapons of war and weapons for his chariots.'**

1 Samuel 8:10-12, MKJV

'And we shall be, also we, like all the nations, **so that our king may judge us and go out before us and fight our battles.**'

1 Samuel 8:20, MKJV

The above two scriptural excerpts are excellent prophecies of the type of society that kings rule over, which is a feudal society. A feudal society, headed by a king, is a society structured for war making, which is exactly what the above scriptures foretell. As a concrete example of this, your author below quotes one of the main authorities on English law, Sir William Blackstone, from his *Commentaries On The Laws Of England In Four Books, Volume 1*:

'Upon the Norman conquest **the feodal law** [feudal law] was introduced here [England] in all its rigour, the whole of which is built on a military plan. I shall not now enter into the particulars of that constitution, which belongs more properly to the next part of our commentaries; but shall only observe, that, in consequence thereof, all the lands in the kingdom were divided into what were called knights' fees, in number above sixty thousand; and for every knight's fee a knight or soldier,

miles, was bound to attend the king in his wars,  
for forty days in a year; in which space of time,  
before war was reduced to a science, the  
campaign was generally finished, and a kingdom  
either conquered or victorious. By this means  
the king had, without any expense, an army of  
sixty thousand men always ready at his  
command.'

Of course, it is actually worse than the above  
because in a feudal society, set up for war, no  
one is ever really safe. If invading armies come  
to kill, enslave, burn cities, etc., in one country,  
it is only a matter of time before retaliation  
occurs in their country. Men's lives are literally  
wasted because an entire nation is set up for  
war making. It was a 'kill before you are killed'  
and a 'might makes right' and a 'winners write  
the history' mentality. Perversely, war, which  
leads to death, was considered a way of life."

Even worse than tribes and kings, is today's  
"Organic State." Today, most governments on  
earth have morphed into organic states. The  
legal and economic systems are so unnatural  
and perverted that it will surely ultimately end in  
disaster. Your author quotes from a section of  
his previously mentioned law book, below:

" ... At any rate, as the two Jehovahs predicted long ago, men that hate us rule over us [Leviticus 26:17] and we have, for the moment, lost our natural rights.

How this all got accomplished legally is likely through a process where the old Law Merchant, laws between traders, their lenders, their shippers, their investors, etc., got combined with common law and then statutory law. At this point in time common law has basically been excised from the legal system and divine law and natural rights are substantially disregarded. The government creditors, with the government granted 'right' to create money, have bought the legislatures and thereby the legal system. Judges now rule for creditors (the government creditors) and against debtors (aka citizens, the co-guarantors of the government debt). In other words, by a perversion of what government leaders are supposed to do, which is to safeguard their citizens' natural rights, instead of pledging them for what looked like an easy source of new government funding, there has been a turning upside down of law, justice, government, and natural rights. Now citizens have the 'right' and the 'liberty' to obey the organic state government and the real rulers of that government, the government's creditors.

And speaking of perversion, in law, words have precise definitions. The way positive statutory law is crafted is many times purposely linguistically deceitful. Definitions to ordinary language words are changed and also hidden in strange places in the statutes, so that a careless reading of the statute deceives the reader. Only the attorneys, some members of the legislature, some staff members, and the government creditors know where the real definition has been placed into the statute. Instead of everyone knowing what the rules are it perverts the law into a coded maze, not for the uninitiated. It is deception, fraud, and a perversion of the worst kind. The government creditors and their knaves now control the legal system and the monetary system of the world. With the banking and legal systems already under their control they can buy, or effectively control, the media, the educational system, the militaries, mercenaries, and anything else they think will help them enslave mankind and take it all for themselves. All this is what God was referring to in Isaiah 10:1:

'Woe to those who decree unrighteous decrees, **and to the scribes who write toil;**'  
Isaiah 10:1, MKJV

Attorneys have become, for the most part, representatives of the government creditors and the courts have become a wealth transfer mechanism. The judges, paid by government, rule, over time, for expanded government power and against natural rights. It has been frequently said and is usually true that 'The policies of the monarch are always those of his creditors.' And this saying includes all forms of government. With control of the legal system the government creditors can license, regulate, tax, restrict labor, restrict property usage through zoning, etc. The people are now controlled for government creditor benefit. If the citizens understood why their life was hard, and if the citizens were also moral, neither of which is likely true, they would probably rise up against both the government leadership team and the government creditors in an attempt to regain their natural rights. But people do not understand why their life is hard. They complain about their life being hard, but they do not understand why it is so. Wanting something for nothing always has its price and that price will be paid. In this case the wanting something for nothing started with a king wanting a bigger government that he could pay for. But it also includes members of the governmental leadership team wanting big government with

its created jobs of status and privilege. And many run-of-the-mill citizens want a big government dispensing government benefits, which, of course, have to be taken from Peter before they can be given to Paul.

The government creditors have created and installed an elaborate legal system and banking system which functions as a trapper's net to catch men and to take their property and their energy from them. This was all described, long in advance, by the two Jehovahs in Habakkuk:

'Therefore the law has become helpless, and justice does not always go forth. For the wicked entraps the righteous; therefore justice goes forth, being perverted.' Habakkuk 1:4, MKJV

'Must we be strung up on their hooks and dragged out in their nets while they rejoice? Then they will worship their nets and burn incense in front of them. 'These nets are the gods who have made us rich!' they will claim.' Habakkuk 1:15, 16, NLT

Your author believes it likely that at least some of these very worldly government creditors are actually in league with Satan to take over the earth and deliver it to him. Satan



cannot destroy or hurt the two Jehovahs. He tried that and failed already (Isaiah 14:13-15). So Satan would now like to destroy men and/or enslave men made in God's image as a means to do it to God in effigy. All this is leading up to the final rebellion described in Revelation 13. ... The two Jehovahs long ago anticipated that the rich men government creditors of the earth would do all they have done and the two Jehovahs have a prophecy specifically for them. Perhaps this is a partial fulfillment, in principle, against those who encumber men's lives and property as recorded in Nehemiah 5:1-13, particularly the curse recorded in verse 13. At any rate, they are in trouble as they have been painted with divine radar and are as good as dead.

'Because you have said, We have made a covenant with death [a covenant with Satan], and we have made a vision with hell [a joint plan with Satan to enslave men and take over the world]; when the overwhelming rod shall pass through [of correction from God], it shall not come to us; **for we have made lies our refuge, and we have hidden ourselves under falsehood,** therefore so says the Lord Jehovah, Behold, I place in Zion a Stone for a foundation, a tried Stone, a precious

Cornerstone [Jesus Christ, King of Kings and Lord of Lords], a sure Foundation; he who believes shall not hurry. Also I will lay judgment to the line, and righteousness to the plummet; and the hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies, and the waters shall overflow the hiding place [the rich men have prepared a hiding place(s)]. **And your covenant with death shall be wiped out, and your vision with hell shall not stand**; when the overwhelming rod shall pass through, **then you shall be beaten down by it.**’ Isaiah 28:15-18, MKJV”

If a government has become corrupted and perversely enlarged, to where it is now considered an out-of-control organic state, then there is the implication, via using the term “organic,” that it is alive. And if the organic state government is alive, it raises the question, “What does it eat to stay alive?” **The unpleasant and obvious answer is: men made in God’s image.** Governments, whether tribal, monarchial, or the modern organic state government, eat individual men in order to stay alive. Some men are chopped up and used as fuel and other men are chopped up and eaten. And this is why governments and their power elites have made themselves enemies of the two Jehovahs. Whatever clever or evil

rationalizations are used on the citizenry, to justify this egregious misuse of government power, the two Jehovahs are NOT fooled and they are not happy. Throughout history, human governments have always exceeded their bounds. They have always used valuable individual men as fuel to sustain themselves. Satan is behind it all, as he wants to see men destroyed and enslaved. Sadly, because mankind as a whole does not understand divine individualism, many men actually cooperate with Satan in his idiotic and evil rebellion. An entire Psalm warns the end-time governments of the world that they are in direct opposition to the two Jehovahs and their divine individualism process:

“Why do the nations rage, and the peoples meditate on a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers plot together, against the LORD and against His anointed, saying, Let us break their bands in two and cast away their cords from us. He who sits in the heavens shall laugh; the LORD shall mock at them. Then He shall speak to them in His anger, and trouble them in His wrath. Yea, I have set My king on My holy hill, on Zion. I will declare the decree of the LORD. He has said to Me, You are My Son; today I have begotten You.

Ask of Me, and I shall give the nations for Your inheritance; and the uttermost parts of the earth for Your possession. You shall break them with a rod of iron; You shall dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel. And now be wise, O kings; be instructed, O judges of the earth. Serve the LORD with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and you perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled in but a little time. Blessed are all who put their trust in Him." Psalms 2:1-12, MKJV

The kings and governments of the world are instructed to yield to God the Father and to his son, Jesus Christ, who is coming to rule the entire world (Revelation 19). You cannot rebel against the two supreme beings in the universe and thumb your nose at them and get away with it. The two Jehovahs created and own everything (Isaiah 42:5, Ephesians 3:9, Genesis 1 - 2 and many other places). They are the owner-operators of the universe. They get to establish the rules. All of us are guests in their universe. If we want to be good guests, we acknowledge them and what they are doing. We live by their rules. And we cooperate with them in what they are doing – for our purposes, the process of divine individualism. If any government, or a group of men, or any

individuals think that they can fool the two Jehovahs, they are deluded. If the kings, or the power elite controllers of the governments of this world, think they can chop up men and use them for both fuel and food, and think that this is somehow all right with the two Jehovahs, when the two Jehovahs' workmanship are unique and valuable men, they are crazy and/or evil. It would be like walking into an outstanding and famous sculptor's studio and picking up his sculptures and then smashing them onto the ground and then expecting the sculptor not to take action in retaliation. Individual men, potentially divine and eternal individuals, are the two Jehovahs' workmanship. Notice how the New Living Translation has it:

"For we are **God's masterpiece**. He has created us anew in Christ Jesus, so that we can do the good things he planned for us long ago."  
Ephesians 2:10, NLT

The power elite behind governments has been painted with divine radar and they are as good as dead. Being painted with human radar and targeted would be scary enough. Perhaps a human missile would somehow miss. The two Jehovahs do not miss. They devoted two entire chapters of the Bible (Jeremiah 23 and Ezekiel

34), amongst other places, pertaining to criticisms stemming from destroying their divine individual masterpieces, portions of which are excerpted below:

“I will send disaster upon the leaders of my people - the shepherds of my sheep - for they have destroyed and scattered the very ones they were expected to care for,” says the LORD. This is what the LORD, the God of Israel, says to these shepherds: ‘Instead of leading my flock to safety, you have deserted them and driven them to destruction. Now I will pour out judgment on you for the evil you have done to them. But I will gather together the remnant of my flock from wherever I have driven them. I will bring them back into their own fold, and they will be fruitful [they will learn to have the moral and intellectual virtues] and increase in number. Then I will appoint responsible shepherds to care for them, and they will never be afraid again. Not a single one of them will be lost or missing [notice how each individual is important to God],’ says the LORD. ‘For the time is coming,’ says the LORD, when I will place a righteous Branch on King David’s throne. He will be a King who rules with wisdom. He will do what is just and right throughout the land. And this is his name: ‘The LORD Is Our

Righteousness.’ [This is a reference to Jesus Christ returning and ruling over the earth to safeguard his masterpieces.] In that day Judah will be saved, and Israel will live in safety. ‘In that day,’ says the LORD, ‘when people are taking an oath, they will no longer say, ‘As surely as the LORD lives, who rescued the people of Israel from the land of Egypt.’ Instead, they will say, ‘As surely as the LORD lives, who brought the people of Israel back to their own land from the land of the north and from all the countries to which he had exiled them.’ Then they will live in their own land.”  
Jeremiah 23:1-8, NLT

“Then this message came to me from the LORD: ‘Son of man, prophesy against the shepherds, the leaders of Israel. Give them this message from the Sovereign LORD: Destruction is certain for you shepherds who feed yourselves instead of your flocks. Shouldn’t shepherds feed their sheep? You drink the milk, wear the wool [shear the sheep], **and butcher the best animals** [accomplished independent-thinking men are always a threat to the state and to any organized religion], but you let your flocks starve. You have not taken care of the weak. You have not tended the sick or bound up the broken bones. You have not gone looking for

those who have wandered away and are lost. Instead, **you have ruled them with force and cruelty**. So my sheep have been scattered without a shepherd. They are easy prey for any wild animal. They have wandered through the mountains and hills, across the face of the earth, yet no one has gone to search for them.'

'Therefore, you shepherds, hear the word of the LORD: As surely as I live, says the Sovereign LORD, you abandoned my flock and left them to be attacked by every wild animal. Though you were my shepherds, you didn't search for my sheep when they were lost. You took care of yourselves and left the sheep to starve. Therefore, you shepherds, hear the word of the LORD. This is what the Sovereign LORD says: **I now consider these shepherds my enemies**, and I will hold them responsible for what has happened to my flock. [Try getting out of that one, hence your author has mentioned they are painted with divine radar and as good as dead.] I will take away their right to feed the flock, along with their right to feed themselves. I will rescue my flock from their mouths; **the sheep will no longer be their prey** [no more organic states, and no more abusive churches].'" Ezekiel 34:1-10, NLT



Since time immemorial tribal leaders have paired with religious leaders in order to, in essence, jointly rule over the tribe members. Human governments have followed this pattern for millennia. Your author has heard religious leaders, whom we come to in the next section of this book, try and characterize Jeremiah 23 and Ezekiel 34 as pertaining to secular governmental leaders. Of course, secular governmental leaders view the prophetic divine warnings as pertaining to the religious leaders. Since the tribal leader and the religious leader have always ruled together, this is logically wrong. Further, it is Biblically wrong, which is a particularly pathetic comment on any religious leader's reasoning skills to not know and understand this. Perhaps they do understand this, but are too corrupt or ashamed to acknowledge it. A powerful passage of scripture, directly from Jesus Christ's own mouth, traps BOTH governmental and religious leaders for all time:

"Then the mother of James and John, the sons of Zebedee, came to Jesus with her sons. She knelt respectfully to ask a favor. 'What is your request?' he asked. She replied, 'In your Kingdom, will you let my two sons sit in places of honor next to you, one at your right and the

other at your left?' But Jesus told them, 'You don't know what you are asking! Are you able to drink from the bitter cup of sorrow I am about to drink?' 'Oh yes,' they replied, 'we are able!' 'You will indeed drink from it,' he told them. 'But I have no right to say who will sit on the thrones next to mine. My Father has prepared those places for the ones he has chosen.' When the ten other disciples heard what James and John had asked, they were indignant. But Jesus called them together and said, 'You know that in this world kings are tyrants, and officials lord it over the people beneath them. **But among you it should be quite different.**' ... " Matthew 20:20-26, NLT

By using the decidedly negative example of this world's kings and government officials, and how they lord it over the people beneath them, Jesus Christ both identified and explicitly condemned their practice. This effectively identifies governmental secular leaders as being tied to Jeremiah 23 and Ezekiel 34 as governmental leaders are types of shepherds. However, in addition, Jesus Christ forbade this type of sheep-brutalizing organizational structure for the church (ekklesia, called-out ones, aka the body of believers). This point-blank identification and condemnation of such an

organizational structure effectively ties church leaders into Jeremiah 23 and Ezekiel 34 – if they have such a church structure, or if they are organic state apologists (accomplices). No intellectual rationalizing or wiggling is going to get either abusive and cruel governmental leaders, nor abusive and cruel religious leaders out of the dilemma they have foolishly put themselves into – which is to say, they have made themselves the enemies of God the Father and of Jesus Christ. **You cannot destroy their divine individual masterpieces and think you can get away with it.** You cannot. The two Jehovahs are not going to be taken in - either by secular governmental leaders attempting to point the finger at religious leaders, or religious leaders attempting to point the finger at governmental leaders, both thinking they will safely deflect blame away from themselves. They are both guilty of the same crime against the brutalized individuals and against the two Jehovahs and they will both be held accountable. **Both have actively destroyed potentially divine masterpieces.**

Beyond the scope of this book, there is always a governmental leadership team. It is usually composed of approximately the same cast of characters. It would normally include

any number, or all, of the following: executive leaders, legislators, judicial leaders, religious leaders, lawyers, bankers, leading businessmen, leading academics, etc. Because they are unwilling to submit themselves to the limitations pertaining to the proper functioning of government, they cross the line and start using men as a fuel source to keep their governmental fire going. They do this instead of safeguarding men. And since they usually feel that their tribe, or their government, or their religion is correct, ironically and sadly, they usually end up in this place:

**".. But an hour is coming that **everyone who kills you will think that he bears God service.**" John 16:2, MKJV**

Thinking they are serving God, they are actually making God their enemy, because they are destroying God's workmanship – his individual masterpieces.

Governments have assigned men to peel potatoes in soup kitchens, to dig ditches, to build public monuments, and other wasteful tasks, etc., who could otherwise possibly: have discovered a cure for cancer, found new ways to harness energy, learned how to grow more and

better food, figured out how to build safer, less expensive, and better shelter, etc., etc., etc. There is no telling where mankind would be if these countless lives had not been wasted. Left free, men would have worked on solving important problems. Left free, men would have worked more effectively to find ways to increase the standard of living for all. Instead, bureaucrats who cannot even manage their own lives attempt to tell geniuses what to do. Geniuses, of course, will not ask permission to use their minds from anyone – especially a bureaucrat, who is their intellectual inferior. Producers find themselves having to ask for permission to produce from men who could not run a lemonade stand. Instead of government costing a relatively insignificant amount of money, e.g., ten percent, it costs 50 percent, or more, plus government debt on top of that - which forever acts as a drag on the producers.

The government further works against the two Jehovahs by creating a dependent class of citizenry, those permanently receiving welfare. The recipients of such aid will not develop to their full potential. They will not learn to use their minds and to take the actions necessary to be productive and useful citizens. They will not develop properly as human beings. Another

class of welfare recipients, not usually thought of, are the pseudo-entrepreneur businessmen, whose only or main business comes from using political connections to get government contracts. By taking from Peter to pay Paul, the government inserts itself into the economy, to the detriment of all. Resources are diverted into unproductive programs and monuments and men's lives are wasted and ruined as a result. Instead of the productive people possessing what they produced, and then spending the proceeds as they see fit, the government takes 50 percent or more of what is produced and then politically diverts the spending to what the governmental leaders desire. The societal spending pattern gets distorted. Worse than that, lives are ruined, both the honest producers (who are stolen from) and the tax-receivers, who are corrupted. All of these things work against the two Jehovahs and their divine individualism program. Instead of cancer being potentially cured, and a for certain higher standard of living, we have slogans and propaganda and monuments and public relations spin and corrupted citizens.

What the government leaders need to understand is that they have no right to violate a right. There is no right to enslave, or to

destroy, or to kill, or to lie, or to steal. The two Jehovahs will be explaining this to the government and religious leaders in a very unmistakable way – hopefully in the very near future. Whenever anyone claims the right to violate a right, however cleverly rationalized, they are putting themselves outside of ethics, outside of logical thought, outside of what is truly practical, and onto Satan’s anti-God team. Principle and truth have been abandoned. Now, it is “might makes right,” which comes from the god of forces – Satan. The Daniel 11 scripture, below, is likely referencing the end-time anti-Christ.

“For you are the children of your father the Devil, and you love to do the evil things he does. He was a murderer from the beginning and has always hated the truth. **There is no truth in him.** When he lies, it is consistent with his character; for he is a liar and the father of lies.” John 8:44, NLT

“He [a likely reference to the anti-Christ] will not regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women, nor regard any god. For he shall magnify himself above all. But in his place **he shall honor the god of forces**; and a god whom his fathers did not know, he shall honor

with gold and silver, and with precious stones and desirable things.” Daniel 11:37, 38, MKJV

If one believes in might makes right, and one believes in lies in order to manipulate, one is now serving Satan, the god of forces. Human governments have almost always used lies and force and threats and humans for fuel in order to sustain themselves and maintain their power. And they are going to pay for it. None of their symbols (like flags), slogans (like land of the free and home of the brave), songs (like national anthems), national monuments (like a pyramid), etc., will enable them to prevail against the real God. Brainwashed citizens, being patriotic to unprincipled might makes right, lying evil, are going to find out that it is not going to end any better for them than it did for German citizens in World War II. Governmental leaders, who are ethical infants, now have their hands on the controls of modern weaponry. As philosopher-historian-economist Dr. Murray Rothbard once observed, “Unbridled power makes the world a slaughterhouse.” Potentially divine individuals are going to physically die. The governmental leaders do not see individual, unique men, who have hopes and dreams and who are potentially divine individuals. They only see collective man.



Individual men are like cells in a body to them. They routinely sacrifice individual men to the collective, to their organic state. Philosopher Dr. Tibor Machan, in his book, *Classical Individualism: The Supreme Importance Of Each Human Being*, has the following illuminating passage [emphasis mine throughout]:

“In contrast to individualism, even loosely conceived, collectivism amounts to the view that some *grouping* of individuals is of primary – though by no means exclusive – value in politics and law. Here family, tribe, clan, neighborhood, religion, race, sex, nation, and humanity are candidates for what takes political priority. Collectives do things, cause what is worthwhile in human life, are to be blamed for what is wicked, and most of all require loyalty from us at every turn. Within this framework, the individual is, basically, a cell in the larger whole of, for example, society or humanity – which Karl Marx called an ‘organic whole’ or ‘organic body.’ Or, as Auguste Comte, another advocate of collectivism [and coiner of the word ‘sociology’], puts it:

‘Everyone has duties, duties towards all; **but rights in the ordinary sense can be claimed by none.** ... The only principle on which Politics

can be subordinated to Morals is that individuals should be regarded, not as so many distinct beings, but as organs of one Supreme Being."

Comte believes that politics cannot be subordinated to morals unless individual men, who have no rights, are regarded only as parts of one Supreme Being (Collective Man). This point of view is why the followers of the roughly Satan to Plato to Plotinus to Hegel to Comte to Marx philosophy thought chain, see no individual men. Marx believes that there is a Collective Man, an organic body, which is why if a cell of a body has to die to keep the body alive it is no big thing – unless you are the one who was sacrificed to this fictitious and nonsensical Collective Man false god. That either Comte or Marx could be considered scientists is beyond the pale for your author as they are completely clueless to the correct methodology of the social sciences. To not see individual men, in favor of a false-god Collective Man is idiotic. Individual cells in a body do not have minds, they do not make choices, and they do not set goals, choose means and take individual actions – all based on human choice to achieve those individual goals. Cells in a body do not behave this way. Again, that Comte or Marx could be given the designation scientist is beyond your author.

False secular prophets would be a far more accurate designation. When individual men are ruled and lorded over, it steals from them the best part of their being.

When an individual buys into organic state slogans and willingly subordinates himself to that organic state, or an organic state leadership elite undertakes policies which perpetuates the ongoing existence of the organic state, then valuable, unique, potentially divine individuals are needlessly sacrificed to both the secular false god of the organic state and unwittingly, to the actual false god of forces, Satan. Governments, when doing so, waste the very lives they were supposed to safeguard. This is a large part of the problem why mankind ends up with castles and monuments instead of quality human beings. Those very precious wasted lives will have to be accounted for to the two Jehovahs. It is not too much of an exaggeration, if at all, to note that everywhere throughout the world, for all prior and current time periods, it has been **governments versus individuals**, instead of strictly limited and principled governments safeguarding individual natural rights and protecting valuable individual men. Governments have bullied and pushed their way into the two Jehovahs' divine sculptor

studio and literally smashed into pieces the two Jehovahs' masterpieces - uniquely valuable, individual men.

## **Religions Versus Individuals**

Intuitive religious leaders tend to have various and sundry ideas about how to make the world a better place. They tend to call their own intuitive ideas – the work of God. Sadly, with irony and pun intended, they are on **a self-appointed mission from God**. They almost always forget, if they ever even knew, the real work of God:

“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

Proper religion is supposed to help each individual man and woman of God become that divine masterpiece of integrity, ability, and passion that would please the two Jehovahs. Instead, the world's religions have committed the same basic error that secular governments have always made. They have used valuable and unique human beings as fuel for their religious fires. In substance, and in essence,

religions chopped up men – and some of the men were used to fuel a fire, which was used to cook other men, who were eaten. Or, they left the men alive, but then sheered them like sheep. **They mistook God's masterpieces for farm animals.** To use human beings as fuel for a fire and food for the religious leaders, all the while attempting to do some intuitively inspired pseudo-work of God is not just irony. It is working for Satan, who hates men, and against the two Jehovahs, who love men. Your author says, "pseudo-work," because the real work of God is divine individualism. In doing their self-appointed pseudo-work they are burning up God's masterpieces.

Let us say, by way of analogy, that the two Jehovahs had an art studio, with beautifully sculpted woodcarvings. And let us further say, for our analogy purposes, that each beautifully sculpted woodcarving represented a unique and valuable and irreplaceable human being – one of God's masterpieces. Would any religious leader, or religion as a whole, if they understood divine individualism, dare to enter the two Jehovahs' art studio, seize some woodcarvings, and then use those sculptures as firewood? Your author is guessing, "No." But, if any dared to do so, they would be literally burning up the

masterpieces of the two Jehovahs. All too often, throughout human history, this is the actual work that religion has accomplished – working for Satan and against God. And that is why this section of the book is entitled, “Religions versus individuals.”

“Men never do evil so completely and cheerfully as when they do it from religious conviction.” Blaise Pascal

Per the Matthew 20:20-26 discussion, in the previous section of the book, Jesus Christ criticized both secular leaders and any religious leaders who mimic them, or apologize for them, at the same time. Any who engage in the destruction of individuals are working for Satan and not the two Jehovahs.

The correct attitude of a religious leader should be to, not only shepherd the 99 in a flock who are doing fine, but to go out of the way to find and safeguard the temporarily lost individual. The individual is not to be disregarded, or regarded as insignificant, or regarded as an acceptable loss, or used as fuel for a fire. He is to be sought after, found, and helped. This is a completely different mindset from what most religions engage in. Most

religions regard individual men as disposable, like one cell in an entire human body. They do not grieve over the loss of a single unique and irreplaceable individual man. Jesus Christ thought differently, correcting this misconception, per the following:

“For the Son of man [Jesus Christ] has come to save that which was lost. What do you think? If a man has a hundred sheep and one of them strays, does he not leave the ninety and nine and go into the mountains **and seek the straying one?**” Matthew 18:11-12, MKJV

Whether someone has good intentions, or not, their choices and actions will have consequences. Those consequences will affect the lives of real people. Your author mentioned religious leaders (or individuals trying to persuade others) who are on a self-appointed mission from God. These intuitives are sometimes quite sincere, but if they are wrong then their actions have negative consequences in the lives of those foolish enough to follow them. God’s plan is written down and is not going to change. Your author has previously written a book containing this point, amongst others, entitled: *What Now?* If a religious intuitive comes along and abuses the people he

is supposed to be shepherding, or if a religious intuitive comes along and speaks their own words, then the Bible has the below warning:

"My heart [Jeremiah] is broken because of the false prophets, and I tremble uncontrollably. I stagger like a drunkard, like someone overcome by wine, because of the holy words the LORD has spoken against them. For the land is full of adultery, and it lies under a curse. The land itself is in mourning - its pastures are dried up. For the prophets do evil and abuse their power. 'The priests are like the prophets, all ungodly, wicked men. [This is clearly a specific reference to religious leaders.] I have seen their despicable acts right here in my own Temple,' says the LORD. 'Therefore, their paths will be dark and slippery. They will be chased down dark and treacherous trails, where they will fall. For I will bring disaster upon them when their time of punishment comes [They have made God their enemy because of their wickedness and abuse of power]. I, the LORD, have spoken! 'I saw that the prophets of Samaria were terribly evil, for they prophesied by Baal and led my people of Israel into sin. But now I see that the prophets of Jerusalem are even worse! They commit adultery, and they love dishonesty. They encourage those who are



doing evil instead of turning them away from their sins. These prophets are as wicked as the people of Sodom and Gomorrah once were.' Therefore, this is what the LORD Almighty says concerning the prophets: 'I will feed them with bitterness and give them poison to drink. For it is because of Jerusalem's prophets that wickedness fills this land. This is my warning to my people,'" says the LORD Almighty. 'Do not listen to these prophets when they prophesy to you, filling you with futile hopes. **They are making up everything they say.** They do not speak for the LORD! [Intuitives with passion on self-appointed missions from God.] They keep saying to these rebels who despise my word, 'Don't worry! The LORD says you will have peace!' And to those who stubbornly follow their own evil desires, they say, 'No harm will come your way!' 'But can you name even one of these prophets who knows the LORD well enough to hear what he is saying? Has even one of them cared enough to listen? Look! The LORD's anger bursts out like a storm, a whirlwind that swirls down on the heads of the wicked. The anger of the LORD will not diminish until it has finished all his plans. In the days to come, you will understand all this very clearly. 'I have not sent these prophets, yet they claim to speak for me. [They are either intuitives who

are incorrect, or liars.] I have given them no message, yet they prophesy. If they had listened to me, they would have spoken my words and turned my people from their evil ways.’ Jeremiah 23:9-22, NLT

“I have heard what the prophets said, who prophesy lies in My name, saying, I have dreamed, I have dreamed [In other words, the Lord has given me a word]. How long shall this be in the heart of the prophets who prophesy lies? But **they are prophets of the deceit of their own heart,**” Jeremiah 23:25-26, MKJV

It is clear that the above passage is in reference to religious leaders. It is also clear that some of these men are evil and some of them are sincerely confused, ergo, “they are prophets of the deceit of their own heart.” These intuitives really think they have a message from God, but their own heart is deceived and they do not know it. Whether the religious leader is evil, abusive, or deceived does not really matter – in this sense - any who follow them are in for negative consequences.

“And the word of the LORD came to me, saying, Son of man, prophesy against the shepherds of Israel. Prophesy and say to them,

So says the Lord Jehovah to the shepherds:  
Woe to the shepherds of Israel who feed themselves! Should not the shepherds feed the flocks? You eat the fat and clothe yourselves with the wool; you kill the fat ones, but you do not feed the flock. You have not made the weak strong, nor have you healed the sick, nor have you bound up the broken. You have not brought again those driven away, nor have you sought that which was lost; but **you have ruled them with force and with cruelty.** And they were scattered for lack of a shepherd. And they became food to all the beasts of the field, when they were scattered. My sheep wandered through all the mountains and on every high hill. Yea, My flock was scattered on all the face of the earth, and none searched nor sought for them.

Therefore, shepherds, hear the word of the LORD: As I live, says the Lord Jehovah, surely because My flock became a prey, and My flock became food to every beast of the field, because there was no shepherd. Nor did My shepherds search for My flock, but the shepherds fed themselves and did not feed My flock; therefore, O shepherds, hear the word of the LORD. So says the Lord Jehovah: Behold, I am against the shepherds, and **I will require My flock at**

**their hand**, and cause them to cease from feeding the flock. Nor shall the shepherds feed themselves any more; for **I will deliver My flock from their mouth, and they will not be food to devour.**” Ezekiel 34:1-10, MKJV

“Is it a small thing to you to have eaten up the good pasture, but you must trample the rest of your pastures with your feet? And to have drunk of the clear waters, but you must foul the rest with your feet? And My flock, they eat what your feet have trampled, and they drink what your feet have fouled. So the Lord Jehovah says this to them: Behold I Myself will even judge between the fat lamb and the lean lamb. Because you have thrust with side and with shoulder, and have pushed all the weak with your horns until you have scattered them to the outside, therefore **I will save My flock**, and **they shall no more be a prey**. And I will judge between lamb and lamb. And I will set up one Shepherd over them, and He shall feed them, My servant David. He shall feed them, and He shall be their Shepherd. And I the LORD will be their God, and My servant David a ruler among them. I the LORD have spoken. And **I will make a covenant of peace with them, and will send the evil beasts out of the land.** And

they shall dwell safely in the wilderness and sleep in the woods." Ezekiel 34:18-25, MKJV

The references to the religious leaders eating men and sheering them (financially) could not be any plainer. Further, there is a direct tie in to Matthew 18:11-12 where the shepherds were supposed to seek out the lost individual, but did not and they were supposed to take care of the main portion of the flock, but they did not do that either. Your author was not making up the fact that religions eat men (see Ezekiel 34:10 above) and use them as fuel for their intuitive fires. It is the point of view of the two Jehovahs, who are not amused. The religious leaders seem to end up "eating the good pasture" and by the time the average man pays all their governmental taxes and religious tithes and offerings they do not have much left to take care of their own needs. But God says he is going to place a future king over his people, a resurrected David, who will have a shepherd's heart and who will actually care about individual sheep, i.e., potentially divine individuals. Also, God in the person of Jesus Christ will reign over all the earth (Isaiah 2:1-5 and other places). Kings and religious leaders will no longer be allowed to use men as fuel for building their grandiose monuments, castles, and cathedrals,

or any other dictator-like or intuitively-inspired projects which waste men's lives.

When your author travels to Europe he is amazed to see that seemingly each town has two main buildings that remain – a castle and a large cathedral, or church building. The castle is symbolic of the secular waste of life, including wars. And the grandiose church building is symbolic of the religious waste of life. A good part of the lives of thousands of valuable individuals was poured out onto the ground to build these monuments. If governments and religions knew their proper place and function then the lives of precious men would not have been wasted in their construction.

Your author has nothing against the construction of a necessary government building. And your author has nothing against the construction of a place of worship IF the materials and labor were donated, similar to the construction of the Tabernacle in ancient Israel. However, if the labor or materials are coerced physically, it is wrong. And if the labor or materials are spiritually or mentally or emotionally coerced (via a false promise of heaven or a false warning about hell), it is wrong. If a building is really needed then the

community can come together and build it for the right reasons, at the right scale, and any such building can be administered for the good of the community – not just for the secular or religious leaders of a community. If men's lives are commandeered, physically or psychically, to build it, then it is wrong. Your author believes that the two Jehovahs are more interested in smaller government/religion and bigger people. You will not get big people if most of their lives are coerced and wasted in building monuments, including the ongoing costs of the annual maintenance for those monuments.

The two Jehovahs know that culture can transmit values, principles, language, and accumulated knowledge, amongst other things, and so a good culture can really assist in people development. They attempted to give the ancient Israelites a culture that would enable men to flourish and develop. Unfortunately, the ancient Israelites failed God, themselves, and all mankind. In your author's previously mentioned book, *Why There Is No Justice: The Corruption Of Law*, there is an entire section on *Divine Law*. It is beyond the scope of this book to go through all of it, but your author will excerpt several paragraphs below:

"God originally gave divine laws to Israel, in a codified form, through Moses at Mount Sinai. And when the people came into the land they were to be judged by these known rules by a judge, or judges. If the people followed the rules it would go well with them and there would not be much work for the judge to do. If the people did not do well then there would be too much work for the judge(s) to do and it would not go well with them. The blessings and cursings associated with keeping or not keeping divine laws are elaborated in Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28. One of the more point blank curses is found in Leviticus 26:18: '... **those who hate you shall rule over you.**' All of the curses are terrible and it would have been much better for Israel to keep the divine laws and to not ask for a king.

The Israelites each got a portion of land to own, other than the Levites and priests. But the Levites received a tenth of the increase from the land and the priests received a tenth of what the Levites received (Numbers 18). And the Levites did receive some cities and a limited amount of land around those cities (Numbers 35). In essence, the people received free land in exchange for giving a tenth of the increase from the land to the Levites. And the people paid a



small annual Tabernacle tax or Temple tax as the case may be (Exodus 30:13). God knows that taxes cost men their lives and he kept the burden small, and contingent on increase. Each Israelite further received a little bit more land than he normally would have because the Levites did not receive an allotment of land, other than their cities. And the Levites and priests provided Tabernacle services, counseling services, educational services, [and judicial services], etc., as part of their receiving the tithe. The nation did not have a huge welfare system and corresponding costly bureaucracy to administer it. The family land likely functioned as the societal economic shock absorber. If an individual experienced hard times he could always return home to the family land and be taken care of. The nation did not have a standing army to be paid for. **The government was small and there were known rules.** Every seven years, in addition to ongoing training, the people were to have the law read to them at the fall feast. The citizenry knew what the rules were.

'And Moses commanded them, saying: At the end of seven years, at the set time of the year of release, in the Feast of Tabernacles, when all Israel has come to appear before the LORD your

God in the place which He shall choose, you shall read this law before all Israel in their hearing.’ Deuteronomy 31:10, 11, MKJV” ...

“In a prior book, *Intellectual Warfare: The Corruption Of Philosophy And Thought*, your author explained that the two Jehovahs had some limits and problems in communicating with mankind in general and with the Israelites in particular. And the limitations they faced have led to confusion and criticism regarding people’s understanding of the wisdom and also the fairness of divine law. There is no conflict between reason, justice, and divine law, but the two Jehovahs have faced these numerous challenges in dealing with mankind and mankind’s perception of them. For the reader’s ease and benefit your author shall share a summary of those limitations and problems below:

1. Evil comes about because angels and men make bad choices, which bad consequences the chooser is responsible for – not the two Jehovahs.
2. There is a state of war in the universe and in a state of war communication and actions taken are outside normal.

3. Satan is the current 'god of this world,' (2 Corinthians 4:4), 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 limitations the two Jehovahs faced, along with the constant rebellion of the ancient Israelites, give critics of divine law what they perceive as a field day. However, this criticism is at the critic's own peril. Even if the two Jehovah's were not rational and objective in their formulation and communication of the divine laws, which is not true, (see limitations above), the critics still have no place to hide. This is because the doctrine of original appropriation gives the two Jehovahs ownership and ultimate control, once completely asserted, over the entire universe and everything and everyone in it. So even if the two Jehovahs' divine law pronouncements were their own opinion, which is to say subjective, their divine laws, once made plain to mankind, become

objective facts, i.e., rules for all of us to live by. **We are all guests in their universe.** If we want to be good guests we will follow the 'house rules.'

'For so says the LORD the Creator of the heavens, He is God, forming the earth and making it; He makes it stand, not creating it empty, but forming it to be inhabited. I am the LORD, and there is no other.'  
Isaiah 45:18, MKJV

A further observation pertaining to divine law is that each man had private property as a gift from the two Jehovahs. This gave each man what, Tibor Machan, the philosopher, would characterize as his own 'moral space.'

Contrasting with divine law, most other cultures wasted human lives building various monuments. Generally this occurred as kings, backed by priests, built these monuments and structures that are literally a waste of men's lives. Whether slaves built them, or taxes paid for them, all such monuments to grandeur have cost innumerable human lives. Per Ayn Rand, they are mausoleums in substance, if not in actuality. The two Jehovahs did not build monuments when dealing with the ancient

Israelites. For example, when it came time to build the Tabernacle an offering was taken up from the people to build it. Those who were willing to contribute gave and the Tabernacle was built. No slaves or oppressive taxes were used to build it (Exodus 35)."

Religious culture was supposed to be transmitted from generation to generation. The purpose of religious culture is for it to be useful in building up and developing people, because the real work of God is divine individualism. To the extent that any religion, instead, uses unique irreplaceable individual men as fuel for their fire they are working against God and making the two Jehovahs their enemy. And they will pay for it. Each person currently participating with the two Jehovahs in their divine individualism process has a portion of their Holy Spirit in them and they are individually regarded as a temple of God. The warning, given in 1 Corinthians 3:16-17, is given toward the individual themselves AND toward any others who are thinking of destroying one of God's masterpieces.

"Don't you know that you yourselves are God's temple and that God's Spirit lives in you? If anyone destroys God's temple, **God will**

**destroy him;** for God's temple is sacred, and you are that temple."

1 Corinthians 3:16-17, NIV

Neither the individual person themselves, nor any religion in the name of any God, is to defile or hurt individuals. If they do, God says, they shall be destroyed. To put it in modern vernacular, you cannot expect to go busting into the art studio of the two Jehovahs and destroy their masterpieces and expect that nothing will happen to you. What will happen is both very just and very ironic. Per the scripture above, the destroyers will be destroyed, but the broken masterpieces will be resurrected back to life (1 Corinthians 15). When religions or loony, misguided intuitives rationalize the misuse and cruel abuse of valuable individuals, directly against God's will, it reminds your author of some of the words from an old Jim Croce song - these foolish men are "tugging on superman's cape" and "spitting into the wind" when they directly work against the two Jehovahs by hurting individual men.

"Don't be afraid of those who want to kill you. They can only kill your body; they cannot touch your soul [life]. Fear only God, who can

destroy both soul and body in hell [eternal death].” Matthew 10:28, NLT

One of the main purposes of a good culture is to inculcate the value system pertaining to life. In a good culture men are to live according to virtue. Religion is supposed to teach morality, morality being a code of conduct, or principles concerning the distinction between right and wrong or good and bad behavior. If any religion does not know what to value, its code of morality will be antithetical to the two Jehovahs, to life, and to the individuals it is supposed to be serving. This is because the two Jehovahs, life, and individuals made in their image are what is important. When religious leaders, or secular leaders, who both are supposed to be cultural leaders, rationalize the destruction of individual men, or rationalize the wasting of substantial portions of individual lives, they either do not know their job, or are evil. The consequence of their not knowing their job or being evil and not caring about doing their proper job, is that individuals are destroyed – in substance, if not in actuality.

Men are to be taught by religious leaders to know the difference between the holy and the profane and to live holy lives. This means men

must be taught to value properly. God, life, the package of values that come with life, the importance of each individual person, the divine individualism process, and the acquisition and use of the intellectual and moral virtues are all supposed to be the central part of a good culture with good religious leadership. For the most part, throughout human history, this has not happened. Religions have failed mankind, which is why this section of the book is titled "Religions Versus Individuals." Religions do not understand what the two Jehovahs are really doing. They do not understand the divine individualism process. Instead, the religious leadership rationalizes ways of keeping the religion itself going, without much regard for individual lives. But, there is no divine authority for any religion, or for any self-appointed religious leader, to use men as fuel for any religious fire. The below scripture has a very harsh take on religious leaders who steal from and kill men. Take note that you can also effectively, not literally, kill men by taking away their freedom, and/or their time, and/or their money. God even says the corrupt religious leaders do it on purpose:

"The priests are like a gang of robbers who wait in ambush for a man. Even on the road to



Shechem they commit murder. And they do this evil deliberately." Hosea 6:9, TEV (Good News Bible)

In many cases religious leaders rationalize that their members should tithe to them. Basically, to tithe means to pay ten percent. Evidently not realizing the self-contradiction, sometimes they start out their money-plea messages with a passing reference to Zechariah 4:6 "... Not by might, nor by power, **but by my Spirit,**" - and then they ask for money. However they decide to ask for tithes, they ask for them despite the fact that tithing was part of a system where each family, Levites excluded, received free land. As quoted above, the Levites, as God's designates, would receive ten percent of the increase from the land. The Levites would then give ten percent of the ten percent they received to the priests. This meant that the priests therefore received one percent of the increase from the land (10% of 10% = 1%). No religious leaders (of the modern era) can honestly say: 1) we are in the land of Israel; 2) they provide education and judicial and other such services to the people, i.e., services that modern secular governments provide; 3) they are physical Levites; or 4) that they participated in a God-ordained and directed

process where each family was given free land. Tithing is part of a system and that system is not in place today. No family gets free land. Your author will attempt to further help these intuitive, self-appointed on a mission-from-God, non-clear thinkers out just a little bit. The MOST that any honest religious leader could say is that they provide spiritual training today. They do not provide any secular governmental services and there is no free land given to each family. Even being charitable, the most that rationalizing and spiritualizing religious leaders could argue, is that they are fulfilling the role of a priest in providing religious instruction. Even if we were to charitably accept such an argument the religious leaders have to face this, unpleasant for them, fact: They would only be entitled to one percent of any increase, not the ten percent that many of them rationalize and preach. The priests only received one percent of the increase, not ten percent. Sorry, that's the way it is.

In actuality, the Bible does speak about the proper supporting of a true and good religious leader. At the same time, it also shows what the attitude of the religious leader should be toward both the people and the support:

"Or is it only Barnabas and I who have no authority to cease working? Who serves as a soldier at his own wages at any time? Who plants a vineyard and does not eat of its fruit? Or who feeds a flock and does not partake of the milk of the flock? Do I say these things according to man? Or does not the Law say the same also? For it is written in the law of Moses, 'You shall not muzzle the mouth of the ox treading out grain.' Does God take care for oxen? Or does He say it altogether for our sakes? It was written for us, so that he who plows should plow in hope, and so that he who threshes in hope should be partaker of his hope. If we have sown to you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal [physical] things? If others have a share of this authority over you, rather should not we? But we have not used this authority, but we endured all things lest we should hinder the gospel of Christ. Do you not know that those who minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? And those attending the altar are partakers with the altar. Even so, the Lord ordained those announcing the gospel to live from the gospel." 1 Corinthians 9:6-14, MKJV

Paul, a great religious leader, worked as a tentmaker at times so as not to financially, or

otherwise, burden a local congregation (Acts 18:3, 1 Corinthians 4:12, 2 Corinthians 11:7-9 and other places). Many other men, who actually care about individual people, donate their time to pastor and do other works of religious benefit for their fellow men. If a man is doing a good spiritual work, then individual men and women can decide, without being coerced, to support such an effort, including a reasonable salary package. Coercion can be in many forms, whether by spiritual threat, or false arguments, etc. Any such attempted coercion can be safely ignored as the two Jehovahs, throughout their word, show that they love individual men and will deal with those who abuse them later. The attitude of a religious leader should be like Paul, who took pains not to abuse the people he was serving.

Many religious leaders directly state, or imply, that if other people are not under their authority then those others are not in good standing with God – or, are even in bad standing with God. That Matthew 20:20-26 speaks against religions being set up in an authoritarian manner is problem number one with this point of view. The great religious leader's point of view directly contradicts Jesus Christ, his supposed boss. Another big problem

with this point of view is ironic. It is ironic because the great religious leader is taking a position that directly contradicts the Bible. In short, the great religious leader is a clueless, Biblical illiterate, in direct opposition to his supposed boss, Jesus Christ. In addition to the **seven** churches mentioned in Revelation 2-3, there is the below passage of scripture which shows that no one man even knows who is in the body of called out ones, the ekklesia, aka the church:

"I am the Good Shepherd [Jesus Christ, the divine head of the church]. The Good Shepherd lays down His life for the sheep [the correct pastoral religious example]. But he who is a hireling and not the shepherd, who does not own the sheep, sees the wolf coming and leaves the sheep and runs away. And the wolf catches them and scatters the sheep. The hireling flees, because he is a hireling and does not care for the sheep. I am the Good Shepherd, and I know those that are Mine [but no one man knows them all], and I am known by those who are Mine. Even as the Father knows Me, I also know the Father. And I lay down My life for the sheep. And **I have other sheep who are not of this fold**. I must also lead those, and they shall hear My voice, and there shall be one flock,

one [divine] Shepherd [who actually does know who all of the sheep are and where they are].”  
John 10:11-16, MKJV

Many religious authorities believe that what God wills is correct and man's duty is simply to listen to and then obey divine revelation. They beat up on anyone who would think about principles and how to apply them – especially if such an application goes outside the strict letter of the law. (Christ had many fights with the Pharisees regarding this point, e.g., in Matthew 12 and 23.) In other words, man ought to obey God. This is man's ethical duty - end of story. Ethical principles can only be given to man by supernatural revelation. This is man's only way to know ethical or religious truth. This is what is known, philosophically speaking, as fideism. Merriam-Webster's Dictionary defines fideism as “reliance on faith rather than reason in pursuit of religious truth.” There is, however, one big problem with fideism. It is not Biblical. And God himself would disagree with it. This is not to say that man should not listen to divine law and to obey God. We should do so. It is to say that the below passage in Romans 1, has God telling men they could have used their minds and discovered natural laws and known what to do – at least to some extent. In other words,

man can use reason to learn ethical principles. The believers in fideism probably mean well. However, strictly understood, they are wrong.

“since what may be known about God is plain to them [men], because God has made it plain to them. For since the creation of the world God’s invisible qualities - his eternal power and divine nature - have been clearly seen, being understood [using reason] from what has been made [nature], so that men are without excuse. For although they knew God, they neither glorified him as God nor gave thanks to him, but their thinking became futile and their foolish hearts were darkened. Although they claimed to be wise, they became fools” ... Romans 1:19-22, NIV

To these misguided religious leaders anyone using their own minds to apply eternal, rational principles to the dynamic conditions of life is a threat. After all, this might lead to “their” flock doing the same – which is to say thinking and acting for themselves - even, dare your author say it, without formal religious hierarchy permission. In actuality, the two Jehovahs need men to think and take action and learn lessons so as to develop good judgment, which is one of the weightier matters of the law:

“Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you pay tithes of mint and dill and cummin, and you have left undone the weightier matters of the Law, **judgment, mercy,** and faith. You ought to have done these and not to leave the other undone.”  
Matthew 23:23, MKJV

If any religious leaders make the arrogant decision to think for “their” flock, they are actually, once again, working against the two Jehovahs. The two Jehovahs gave man a nature, and part of that nature is we are the thinking animals. Part of the life value package is that men have to both think and to take action in order to be able to live on this earth, in order to have dominion over it. The Bible does not give religious leaders the authority or command to think so that other men do not have to. All men have to think. If any religious leader thinks otherwise, they betray their own very poor thought process and they, once again, put themselves into opposition to the two Jehovahs and their divine individualism process.

There is a post-millenarianist point of view that Christians should take over the world for Christ. Philosopher, historian, and economist,



Dr. Murray Rothbard, in his excellent treatise, *Economic Thought Before Adam Smith*, explained the idea of this view, fairly succinctly:

“Seemingly tiny divergences in premises often have grave social and political consequences, and such was true of disagreements among Christians on the apparently recondite question of eschatology, the science or discipline of the Last Days. Since St Augustine, the orthodox Christian view has been amillennialist, that is, that there is no special millennium or Kingdom of God in human history except the life of Jesus and the establishment of the Christian Church. This is the view of Catholics, of Lutherans, and probably of Calvin himself. The ideological or social conclusion is that Jesus will return to usher in the Last Judgment and the end of history in His own time, so that there is nothing that human beings can do to speed the Last Days. One variant of this doctrine is that after Jesus's return He will launch a thousand years of the Kingdom of God on earth before the Last Judgment; in practical terms, however, there is little of a significant difference here, since Christianity remains in place, and there is still nothing man can do to usher in the

millennium. [Rothbard is saying that the real difference that matters, for his and our discussion purposes, is with the post-millennial views. See below.]

The crucial difference comes with chiliastic ideas such as those of Joachim of Fiore, where not only was the world coming to the end soon, but man must do certain things to usher in the Last Days, to prepare the way for the Last Judgment. These are all post-millennial doctrines, that is, that man must first set up a Kingdom of God on earth as a necessary condition either for Jesus's return or for the Last Judgment. Generally, as we shall see further in the Protestant Reformation, post-millennial views lead to some form of theocratic coercion of society to pave the way for the culmination of history." ...

The idea of the theological coercion of society is a bad one. It leads to faith plus force. And now, instead of a ministry of reconciliation, you have "ethical warriors," or "ethical manipulators," or political animals. You have religions trying to gain control of governments, or working in league with governments. Governments have power. Government is organized force. If your goal is going to be an

attempt to force a change in world conditions, to usher in the millennium, you might “need” to force any who do not listen to your religious arguments to submit - via governmental force, if necessary. If all this goes far enough, it can actually lead to religion leading the way to the death or enslavement of all who are different. At the human level this is bizarre, sets all against all, and will not work. And bizarre as all this may sound, many people actually believe in it. They believe it, even though there are numerous Bible scriptures showing otherwise – meaning that Christ will return to rule for 1,000 years at the beginning of a 1,000 year time period (Revelation 20:4,6). Your author does not want to dwell on this. What your author does want to point out is that instead of a ministry of reconciliation, the post-millenarianist doctrine has some Christians wanting to take over the world for Christ – using force, if necessary. Other religions are also guilty.

“And all things are of God, who has reconciled us to Himself through Jesus Christ, **and has given to us the ministry of reconciliation**; whereas God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, not imputing their trespasses to them, and putting the word

of reconciliation in us."  
2 Corinthians 5:18-19, MKJV

Faith plus force is a far different cry from a ministry of reconciliation. If one truly understood the two Jehovahs, and their "choose life" command, with all that entails, then they would not be out trying to use force to uphold the principle of life. Satan is the god of forces. The two Jehovahs are the two supreme intellects, the two beings with perfect moral character, and the two most powerful (forceful if necessary) beings in the universe. In dealing with other beings they use force as a last resort, not as the initial attempt. The banner of Christ is a ministry of reconciliation. Reconciliation is part of social harmony. Using force starts wars, and war is anti-life. As previously explained, the social science causal chain sequence is:

justice -> social harmony -> peace -> life

When Jesus Christ drafted Saul, and turned him into the Apostle Paul, Paul explained to King Agrippa exactly why Jesus Christ drafted him:

"But rise and stand on your feet, for **I have appeared to you 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

You cannot further God’s efforts by adopting Satan’s tactics. Faith plus force (of any kind) will fail – at the human level, which is the level we are at.

Perhaps the most classic example of intuitive religious failure (from their point of view) was the killing of Jesus Christ – which was an example of faith plus force in action. The governmental and religious elite leadership team was comprised of the usual groups of people, including the Chief Priest, the Pharisees, the Sanhedrin, scribes, elders such as lawyers, business leaders, bankers, etc., (Matthew 26, John 11 and many other places).

“And one of them, Caiaphas, being the high priest of that year, said to them, You do not know anything at all, nor do you consider that it

is expedient for us **that one man should die** for the people, and not that the whole nation perish. And he did not speak this of himself, but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation; and not for that nation only, but also that He should gather together in one the children of God who were scattered abroad. Then from that day they took counsel together that they might kill Him."  
John 11:49-53, MKJV

And so the great intuitive leaders (some intuitive truthers, some passionate intuitive lovers) commenced to plot and kill Jesus Christ (an individual) so as to protect their religion. They did so in the name of God. The only problem was, these great spiritual leaders did not know that the man they were killing was their God. Jesus Christ was the God of the Old Testament – the God these spiritually clueless leaders supposedly served. Please compare 1 Corinthians 10:1-4 with 2 Samuel 22 and other scriptures like Deuteronomy 32:4:

"and all [the ancient Israelites] drank the same spiritual drink; for they drank of the spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ." 1 Corinthians 10:4, MKJV

"He is the Rock; His work is perfect. For all His ways are just, a God of faithfulness, and without evil; just and upright is He."  
Deuteronomy 32:4, MKJV

The intuitive giants, upholding and supposedly worshipping their great God, unwittingly killed him. And while God the Father worked it all for good (Romans 8:28), this was faith plus force at its most ironic.

"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. But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, which God has hidden, predetermining it before the world for our glory; which none of the rulers of this world knew (for if they had known, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory)." 1 Corinthians 2:6-8, MKJV

It was literally, "he who kills you thinks he does God service" at its all-time most ironic.

Your author could go on and on, but what is the point? Force means just what it always does, which is, "Do what we say or we will hurt or kill you!" Anyone who thinks that faith plus force is the way of the two Jehovahs, when the

two Jehovahs are the life-givers in the universe, is a clueless truther, or a clueless intuitive. They do not have even the remotest idea of what the two Jehovahs are really doing, which is divine individualism. And that is why they kill irreplaceable and uniquely valuable individuals, in God's name, actually believing they are doing the work of God. And that is why they engage in lies, half-truths, and outright fraud as their way to uphold the truth, which is the truth as they see it, not as the two Jehovahs teach.

Basically the entire history of mankind's religions is a history of faith plus force, or faith plus manipulation. This is because Satan, in his battle with the two Jehovahs, has deviously maneuvered to get religions to use his lying, murderous tactics (John 8:44), or to outright worship him (2 Corinthians 4:4). Instead of a positive culture of life, along with the correct values, combined with individual men being respected and free so they could cooperate with the two Jehovahs in their divine individualism process, we have religions versus individuals.



## **Altruism Versus Proper Concern For One's Own Interests**

Your author wants to begin this section of the book by defining altruism and then selfish, including the roots of selfish, so there is some precision in meaning when using these terms. As there is not any meaningful controversy in regards to the definition of either altruism, nor for the definition of selfish, almost any dictionary definition will be fine for our purposes. To remind the reader, any emphasis is mine throughout.

From the dictionary that comes with the Macbook computer:

“altruism |ˈaltroʊˌizəm| noun

the belief in or practice of disinterested and **selfless** concern for the well-being of others ...”

From Wikipedia's entry for Altruism:

“Altruism or selflessness is the principle or practice of concern for the welfare of others. It is a traditional virtue in many cultures and a

core aspect of various religious traditions, though the concept of 'others' toward whom concern should be directed can vary among cultures and religions. Altruism or selflessness is the opposite of selfishness.

Altruism can be distinguished from feelings of duty and loyalty. Altruism is a motivation to provide something of value to a party **who must be anyone but one's self**, while duty focuses on a moral obligation towards a specific individual, (e.g., a god, a king), or collective, (e.g., a government). Pure altruism consists of sacrificing something for someone other than the self, (e.g. sacrificing time, energy or possessions) with no expectation of any compensation or benefits, either direct, or indirect, (e.g., receiving recognition for the act of giving).

Much debate exists as to whether 'true' altruism is possible. The theory of psychological egoism suggests that no act of sharing, helping or sacrificing can be described as truly altruistic, as the actor may receive an intrinsic reward in the form of personal gratification. The validity of this argument depends on whether intrinsic rewards qualify as 'benefits.'

The term altruism may also refer to an ethical doctrine that claims that individuals are morally obliged to benefit others. Used in this sense, it's usually contrasted to egoism, which is defined as acting to the benefit of one's self."

... "Religious viewpoints ...

Most, if not all, of the world's religions promote altruism as a very important moral value. Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, Jainism, Judaism and Sikhism, etc., place particular emphasis on altruistic morality."

Now for some dictionary definitions of "selfish."

"selfish |'selfiSH| adjective

(of a person, action, or motive) lacking consideration for others; ... " Macbook dictionary

"1: concerned excessively or exclusively with oneself: seeking or concentrating on one's own advantage, pleasure, or well-being without regard for others 2: arising from concern with one's own welfare or advantage in disregard of others ..." Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary

The Oxford Modern English Dictionary has one definition of selfish as “lacking consideration for others; concerned chiefly with one’s own personal profit or pleasure:”

Political scientist and advisor to rulers, Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527), famous for writing one of the most influential works of political philosophy ever written, *The Prince*, condemned the pursuit of private [self] interest as “corruption.” The state has followed such thinking, before and after, but with renewed self-righteous vigor post-Machiavelli.

The modern definitions of selfish are loaded with pejorative descriptors. These pejorative descriptors make sure that anyone foolish enough to advocate looking out for their own interests will be labeled as “selfish,” which is to say they are condemned as a bad person. This troubled philosopher Ayn Rand, and so your author guesses that she attempted to redefine selfish based on a combination of the root words “self” and “ish.” This seems like a logical conclusion, anyway. Rand redefined (or attempted to properly define) selfish as: **“concern with one’s own interests.”**

From thefreedictionary.com "self" is defined as follows:

"self (slf) n. pl. selves (slvz)

1. The total, essential, or particular being of a person; the individual. ...
2. The essential qualities distinguishing one person from another; individuality. ...
3. One's consciousness of one's own being or identity; the ego. ...
4. **One's own interests**, welfare, or advantage. ..."

"ISH -ish1

1.  
a suffix used to form adjectives from nouns, with the sense of 'belonging to' (British; Danish; English; Spanish); 'after the manner of,' 'having the characteristics of,' 'like' (babyish; girlish; mulish); 'addicted to,' 'inclined or **tending to**' (bookish; freakish); 'near or about' (fiftyish; sevenish).

2.  
a suffix used to form adjectives from other adjectives, with the sense of "somewhat," "rather" (oldish; reddish; sweetish)."  
Quoted from dictionary.reference.com

"ish ... -ish

#### Definitions

suffix forming adjectives

1. of or belonging to a nationality or group ⇒ Scottish
2. (often derogatory) having the manner or qualities of; resembling ⇒ slavish, prudish, boyish
3. somewhat; approximately ⇒ yellowish, sevenish
4. **concerned** or preoccupied **with** ⇒ bookish"

Quoted from Collins English Dictionary online version

If we were to combine the Collins English Dictionary definition of "ish" (concerned with), with the thefreedictionary.com's definition of "self" (one's own interests), we get Rand's definition of selfish.

To your author's amazement, there is no single word in the English language, (at least that your author is aware of), that has, as its definition: "concerned with one's own interests," or "tending to one's own interests." This is unfortunate, and your author is not inclined to

attempt to coin one. Rand made a valiant attempt to redefine or clarify "selfish" as having such a meaning, but the attempt has largely failed. The fact of the matter is the use of the word "selfish" has such a commonly accepted negative connotation that your author believes any attempt to use it in a potentially positive and more correct way is doomed to failure. Ergo, your author will refine Rand's definition a little bit and use an entire phrase to make his meaning clear. Instead of using the corrected Rand definition of "selfish," your author will use the phrase: proper concern with one's own interests. Or, sometimes your author will use the phrase: "properly tending to one's own interests," or something of that ilk.

That in the entire English language there is not one single word, which has as one of its definitions: "properly tending to one's own interests," or "proper concern with one's own interests" is a shame – and likely not an accident. Satan is the god of this world (2 Corinthians 4:4) and he has corrupted philosophy, language, and thought. This corruption of philosophy, language, and thought is part of how he deceives the whole world (Revelation 12:9). Your author has previously written an entire book on this, entitled:

*Intellectual Warfare: The Corruption Of Philosophy And Thought*, so not much more will be written of this corruption here, other than a few points. When language gets corrupted, thought gets corrupted. When thought gets corrupted, decisions get corrupted. When decisions get corrupted, improper actions are taken – with the predictable negative results. Beyond the scope of this book, the previously mentioned Machiavelli redefined “virtue” to be any quality that helps a prince (ruler) keep his state. And, as previously mentioned, Machiavelli essentially redefined corruption as pursuing one’s private self-interests. Such acts, among others, were part of why many considered him a “preacher of evil.”

Once words are redefined, and those redefinitions come to be commonly accepted, the redefinitions are almost impossible to dislodge. Usually the common acceptance occurs without too much active thought on the part of the populace, perhaps as a result of state-sponsored, or religious-sponsored school system inculcation. Nevertheless, the harm from the commonly accepted corrupted definition affects real people and their lives. Reality, not clever definitions, always has the last word, without exception.



In essence, what proponents of altruism have done, or utilized, is the following: 1) define "selfish" as being bad – in all cases; 2) define altruism as the opposite of selfishness; 3) then conclude that altruism is therefore good – despite the fact that premise one is not established – just defined; 4) ignore the logical fallacy of attempting to establish the "good" as simply being the opposite of "bad"; 5) insist that altruism, now presumed (defined) to be the good (but not proven), be adopted by religions and governments and individuals as a moral code – which moral code they should try to live by; 6) do not explain exactly how it would be possible for any man NOT to have proper concern for his own interests; and 7) ignore, or rationalize, the negative result of human beings being used as fuel for various collective fires. All of the above, we shall see, is bound up with the destructive doctrine of altruism. It gets worse.

Along with the destructive doctrine of altruism, and there being no proper word to define being properly concerned with one's own interests, there are further big problems coming from and associated with the commonly accepted notion of duty. A careful reading of the Wikipedia definition of altruism contained

statements that belie the problem. Your author will requote the two sentences concerning "duty" from the Wikipedia entry for "altruism" below:

"Altruism can be distinguished from feelings of duty and loyalty. Altruism is a motivation to provide something of value to a party who must be anyone but one's self, while duty focuses on a moral obligation towards a specific individual, (e.g., a god, a king), or collective, (e.g., a government)."

"duty ... Definitions noun

(plural) -ties

a task or action that a person is bound to perform for moral or legal reasons

respect or obedience due to a superior, older persons, etc ⇒ filial duty

the force that binds one morally or legally to one's obligations" Quoted from Collins English Dictionary – online version

One big problem with the modern concept of duty is that the emphasis or focus on duty is from the individual toward the collective. The other big problem comes from regarding either governments or religions as superior to individuals. In other words, the collective is

regarded as superior to the individuals comprising it. This is true whether the collective is a god/religion (moral duty), government/king (legal duty), or any other collective that an individual might be a part of. Individuals do have duties toward God and toward proper government. Your author does not argue this point. What is out of balance, and which the prior two sections of this book attempted to point out, is that government has a duty to individuals and that religion has a duty to individuals. **Duty goes both ways, from individual to proper religion and proper government AND from proper religion and proper government toward individuals.** And once one understands that what the two Jehovahs are really doing is the process of divine individualism, any error on emphasis should not be toward wiping out valuable and irreplaceable, unique individual lives. In other words, proper government has an important duty to safeguard the natural rights of individual citizens and to stay within its proper bounds. And proper religion has a duty to help individuals choose to adopt the correct value system and also to help individuals learn to gain and to use the moral and intellectual virtues. Any sacrificing of individuals, as fuel for any collective fire, is wrong and works against both

the individuals involved and the two Jehovahs themselves. Ironically, properly understood, it also works against the collectives themselves.

While the error of a wrong concept of duty has been around since tribalism, and extends all of the way forward to modern religions and governments, the main modern philosophical foundation for a wrong concept of duty could be attributed to Immanuel Kant, the German philosopher who lived from 1724 – 1804. Kant tried to define duty and morality along the lines of: the individual is acting morally only when they suppress their natural inclinations and feelings and does that which they are supposed to do. Ergo, doing one's duty is doing something that one is not normally inclined or willing to do. They do it because they have a moral obligation that must be fulfilled. A person is seen, per Kant, to be moral when they act from a sense of duty. Morality comes to be bound up with the motive behind the action. A moral action is an act that is done out of a respect for duty. If someone does something out of fear, or social pressure, it does not count as a moral act. Morality, per Kant, is very closely bound up with one's duties and obligations. Kant gets even more complicated because he further differentiates actions that are

“in accord with duty” (not considered moral) versus actions that are done “from duty” (considered moral). A person, who acts from an inclination of duty, rather than understanding the nature of duty, is not acting morally. To further explain all of this is beyond the scope of this section of the book. What is not beyond the scope of this section of the book is to understand that, in the modern era, there is an emphasis on governments and organic states over individuals (governments versus individuals). Also, there is an emphasis on religions over individuals (religions versus individuals). In the modern era, in addition to governments and religions, there are, in essence, secular religions, like Socialism, and also various metaphysical and secular Philosophies of History, and many other collectives – all vying to be able to use valuable human beings as fuel to keep themselves going. **They each need a rationale for being regarded as moral**, even though they are sacrificing men and using them as fuel for their various fires.

Philosopher-apologists for the doctrine of altruism, and for these various collectives, have generally combined, or used, the following elements, in some form, to generate their

version of altruism – altruism being the modern rationale for human sacrifice: the Kantian emphasis of morality being motive based and being bound up with duty, including acting against one's natural inclinations; the concept of duty being improperly emphasized as being from the individual toward the collective – (never the collective's duties toward the individual); the idea that the collective is superior to the individual, ergo it is owed duty; Machiavelli's (and others') definition of it being corruption to be concerned with one's private self-interests; all possible definitions of the word "selfish" being pejorative, making selfish definitionally bad; the word selfish no longer, or perhaps ever, having at least one suitable meaning of "the proper concern for one's own interests"; altruism being presumed and defined to be the good because it is the opposite of the selfish bad; and altruism becoming, in effect, its own moral code. The above has been morphed into the doctrine of altruism, where "altruism is a motivation to provide something of value [sacrifice a value] to a party who must be anyone but one's self." And now, **after that intellectual-philosophical sausage factory**, per the doctrine of altruism, individuals who only want to peacefully and productively tend to their own interests are regarded as immoral. They

are regarded as immoral, in part, because altruism apologists add the further straw man that an individual who is unwilling to be sacrificed to others must therefore be intent on sacrificing others to himself. This is patently a straw man, and logically and empirically false, as there are many individuals who just wish to live peaceful and productive lives without being sacrificed to others and without others being sacrificed to them.

The result of the above is that altruism has become the moral philosophy used to rationalize the organic state government eating its own citizens. The proper purpose and scope of government is now out the window. The result is also, per Wikipedia and common knowledge, that "most of the world's religions promote altruism as a very important moral value." Modern religions, instead of understanding the two Jehovahs' divine individualism process and therefore upholding the value of each individual person, unwittingly, thinking they do well, advocate for altruism. This puts modern religion in a position where it cannot effectively oppose bad government. After all, both governments and religions are operating from their version of the doctrine of altruism. In the worst-case scenario, religion actually apologizes for bad

government, and makes itself guilty. The doctrine of altruism is used to denounce as selfish anyone who would actually dare to think and take actions for their own benefit – (selfishness). This is true even when those doing so do not violate the natural rights of their fellow men and even when those doing so honor their contracts and live peacefully and productively among their fellow men. Altruism is used to rationalize collective power over individuals. It is used to rationalize and excuse modern **human sacrifice** – in lives wasted, if not in lives actually taken. Altruism is used to rationalize people control and it is used to rationalize using humans as fuel for various collective fires. The collectives, particularly the power elite that leads any collective, needs some method or form of moral suasion so these “leaders” can live with themselves and also convince their followers that human sacrifice is good. It is not.

Interestingly, Kant also held the following: **“It is a duty to maintain one’s life.”** And here, Kant is correct. All living entities, particularly creatures, have natural inclinations they follow in order to stay alive. This is according to the laws of nature.



Kant is, of course, famous for his categorical imperative, quoted from *Philosophy Made Simple* as: "So act as to treat humanity, whether in thine own person or in that of any other, in every case as an end withal, never as a means only." A proper example of this, in application, is that all men should be equal before the law.

Your author, however, wants to get back to Kant's observation that "it is a duty to maintain one's life." Life is the senior value of all values because without life the individual is not around to value anything else. Dead men do not value anything. The altruism-believing followers of Kant tie up morality with duty and duty with service to a collective. In so doing, they have intellectual problems – one of which is fatal. One intellectual problem, in using Kant's concept of duty, is that they do not seem to notice they are picking and choosing among Kant's various concepts pertaining to duty. Whether they are intellectually aware of it or not, they are using Kant's concepts of duty as either a core part of their altruism doctrine, if not as foundational to it. And this is a big problem for them – because Kant contradicts himself pertaining to duty. They do not seem to notice that Kant's concepts of duty are contradictory, and in adopting them,

they have drilled a hole in the bottom of their intellectual boat. It is true an individual has a duty to maintain their life and it is true that each individual, including the one thinking, should regard all men, including themselves, as an end, not only as a means. It is in accord with nature (natural law), and it is within natural rights, that a man both thinks and takes action in order to be productive so as to sustain his life. But all of this is impossible to reconcile with acting morally, if by moral, it is meant that one does things out of duty, but duty allows for no natural inclinations toward oneself. Kant and his followers contradict themselves in that men are supposed to miraculously suppress their natural inclinations and feelings and do that which they are supposed to do, that which they have a duty to do – to sacrifice themselves to others, particularly to official collectives. But, evidently unknown to Kant, and certainly unknown to his altruistic followers, **it is not possible to act (correctly so, by inclination, according to nature) to maintain one's life at the same time one has a duty to take the action of sacrificing one's life.** This is against logic, against the laws of nature, is not socially scientific, and sets up a "moral" code that is impossible to practice. All of this is intellectually fatal to altruism – even before we get to the further problem that

**altruism is also unbiblical.** Some social scientists advocate for altruism, evidently not realizing that altruism requires self-sacrifice to all others, particularly collectives, against one's natural inclinations to stay alive. Your author would contend that it is not scientific to advocate anything that is clearly against the laws of nature, which altruism surely is.

The much larger and fatal intellectual problem for the altruism apologists is that they have a contradiction proper - and this contradiction proper is at the very heart of what it takes for a man to live on this earth. The contradiction proper comes from maintaining (or not noticing) that an individual has a duty to stay alive, while at the same time maintaining that the same individual has an obligation to sacrifice himself, as a duty, to others, particularly collectives.

If Kant were still alive, whether Kant could provide an intellectual soft landing for himself is highly doubtful. Kant's followers have no soft landing. They have had to pick and choose what to accept and what to leave behind from Kant's various concepts of duty. And what they have rationalized is an unscientific and illogical

contradiction. What they have rationalized is just plain wrong.

Kant's categorical imperative is held in high regard, but it added nothing of substance to human knowledge. Centuries ago, the Bible said it far more simply:

" ... you shall love your neighbor as yourself. ..." Leviticus 19:18, MKJV

What is considered good should always take into consideration the context of the situation. The first section of this book was written to establish the context of the human condition. A very brief recap is in order. The two Jehovahs created and own the universe. Amongst other things they are scientists, mathematicians, and engineers who created the earth as a special environment for man, who was made in the image and likeness of God (the two Jehovahs are God). They are philosophers, creators (entrepreneurs), and artists. Possessing the correct values, they devised rational objective ethics and are righteous – they always do the right thing at the right time in the right way. They have all of the intellectual and moral virtues and are complete. They gave man a special honor in making us in their image and

likeness. Mankind as a whole has a nature. Man is both a rational animal and a social being. Each individual man and woman is unique – sort of a sub-species to Homo sapiens sapiens (anatomically modern man). Each man and woman needs the time and space to grow. By participating in the two Jehovahs' divine individualism process, each man and women can ultimately receive an incorruptible eternal existence with a spirit body. With all of this, context-setting, very brief overview in mind, the two Jehovahs forever vetoed the idiotic idea that any man should be sacrificed to any other man, or group of men. While many scriptures could be cited, the two Jehovahs, at a minimum, clearly did so when they said the following:

“And God said, Let Us make man in Our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the heavens, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over all the creepers creeping on the earth. And God created man in His image; in the image of God He created him. He created them male and female. And God blessed them. And God said to them, Be fruitful, and multiply and fill the earth, and subdue it. And have dominion over the fish of

the sea and over the fowl of the heavens, and all animals that move upon the earth."  
Genesis 1:26-28, MKJV

"Master, **which is the great commandment in the Law?** Jesus said to him, You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like it [because each man is made in God's image], **You shall love your neighbor as yourself.** On these two commandments **hang all the Law and the Prophets.**" Matthew 22:36-40, MKJV

The above two scriptures tell us that we have been honored to be made in God's image and likeness. They tell us to have dominion over the earth, but not each other. They tell us to love God, the two Jehovahs. They tell us, by implication, that we are to love ourselves as human step one. AND they tell us to then love others as we love ourselves as human step two. Loving the two Jehovahs, loving ourselves, and loving others is a choice we are to make. "As we love ourselves" is an equality of loving and regard for – **it is an equality of interests** – not a sacrificing of ourselves to others, or others to ourselves. And they tell us that all of the rest

of the law (and prophets) hang on the two great laws. In other words, this means that all of the rest of the Bible should be read and understood in the context of these two great laws. All the rest of the man-to-man Biblical laws should be read and understood in the context of loving others as you love yourself. Clear scriptures should be used to interpret less clear scriptures. And what is very clear is that the two Jehovahs have issued a DIVINE VETO over the idea of men being sacrificed – whether it is individuals being sacrificed to a collective or criminal individuals attempting to sacrifice other individuals to themselves. Human sacrifice is unbiblical. It has to be because the two Jehovahs' intent is the exact opposite - which is divine individualism. **Altruism has been divinely vetoed** – not upheld.

All of the apologists, and their rationalizations of altruism, come up short. They come up short due to logical contradiction, as a man cannot have a duty to maintain his life at the same time he has a duty to sacrifice his life. A man cannot do both at the same time. They come up short because the two Jehovahs have divinely vetoed their doctrine of human sacrifice. They come up short because their doctrine could never work in actual practice – it

is not in accord with reality. There will be a discussion of this last point near the end of this section of the book. And they come up short, despite the word games and illogical presumptions utilized in their attempt to crown altruism as moral king. Their king has no intellectual clothes on.

It will not help the advocates of altruism to narrowly define selfish so that selfish is always bad and then setting their doctrine of altruism as the opposite of selfish. To narrowly define selfish, so that anyone who attempts to maintain his life, as all must, by showing a proper concern for and a proper tending of his own interests, is now regarded as a bad person, will not help them in the end. In the end word games and bad philosophy do not beat reality. Reality always has the last and best word. In the end, the two Jehovahs are going to overtly assert their authority over all things, including all men, and each will have to answer for their lives (Romans 14:12). Those who have rationalized human sacrifice using the doctrine of altruism and those who have actively worked against divine individualism might find themselves in for a rather rude awakening.



The idea, and the Biblical command, of loving your neighbor as yourself has the implication of an equality of interests, NOT a sacrificing of interests. Each man must have a proper concern for their own interests and each man must therefore respect the necessity of other men properly tending to their own interests. There is an equality of interests because all men are men, i.e., "A = A." All men have equal natural rights to life, liberty, and property. All men are to be equal before the law. All men have the need to think and take action so they must be free to think and take action. This is because it is a requirement of life that men be free to obtain and use property in order to maintain their life on this earth. All men are unique individuals who have the opportunity and the obligation to participate with the two Jehovahs in their divine individualism process. This forever vetoes the notion that "the good" is sacrificing either others to yourself, or yourself to others. Loving your neighbor as yourself is an equality of interests scenario - not a greater than, or a less than scenario. Altruism has been divinely vetoed a long time ago.

As previously mentioned, it is a correct principle to interpret a less clear scripture in the

light of a very clear scripture. And there are a number of very clear scriptures, in addition to the above, which touch on the subject of man living on this earth and having dominion over the earth, not each other.

Exodus 20:13 upholds the principle of life, as does Deuteronomy 30:19. Exodus 20:15 upholds the principle of honesty and forbids stealing what does not belong to you - not just other men's property, but also including other men's lives. Exodus 20:16 forbids the bearing of false witness, and so upholds honesty. Exodus 20:17 forbids envy, and upholds private property rights. Numbers 26:55 and Numbers 33:54 show that each family was supposed to be given some land, and so, once again, upholds private property rights.

Philippians 4:8-9 has several interesting and point-blank concepts:

"Finally, my brothers, whatever things are true, whatever things are honest, whatever things are right, whatever things are pure, whatever things are lovely, whatever things are of good report; if there is any virtue and if there is any praise, **think on these things**. Do those things which you have also learned and received

and heard and seen in me. And **the God of peace** shall be with you.”  
Philippians 4:8, 9, MKJV

Men are to think on what is honest, true, and right - not on how to enslave, trick, corrupt, and use their fellow men. A further interesting concept is that the true God is described as “the God of peace.” Peace is necessary for life, as has been previously explained. The true God is a God of peace, who upholds life, and who is using the process of divine individualism to give life. And that life will ultimately be an abundant and flourishing one (John 10:10). This is in contrast to Satan, the god of forces (Daniel 11:38), who believes in human sacrifice – human sacrifice in the modern era being excused and rationalized in the name of the doctrine of altruism.

“Therefore, my beloved, as you have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, **cultivate your own salvation** with fear and trembling.”  
Philippians 2:12, MKJV

This scripture does not say, “Join a collective, sacrifice yourself to it, and then you will be safe as the collective will absolve you of the guilt for

all of your sins.” In other words it does not say that membership in the correct collective will gain you salvation. Salvation is a divine individualism process – for everyone.

Another very clear scriptural admonition, which fits perfectly well, with your author’s “proper concern for one’s own interests” phraseology, is as follows:

“This should be your ambition: to live a quiet life, **minding your own business** and working with your hands, just as we commanded you before. As a result, people who are not Christians will respect the way you live, and you will not need to depend on others to meet your financial needs.” 1 Thessalonians 4:11-12, NLT

“No matter how much a lazy person may want something, he will never get it. A hard worker will get everything he wants.” Proverbs 13:4 TEV, (Good News Bible)

“For even when we were with you, we commanded you this, that if anyone would not work, neither should he eat.” 2 Thessalonians 3:10, MKJV

“Good people leave an inheritance to their grandchildren, ... ” Proverbs 13:22, NLT

It is not possible to leave an inheritance to your grandchildren, and by implication your children, if you do not have access to the private property and capital you have accumulated throughout your lifetime. It goes without saying that there would be no wealth available; to leave to your progeny, if every time someone achieves something they must then, sacrifice it to others. There would be nothing left to leave.

All of the above scriptures are very clear. Another clear Biblical example is the parable of the talents (Matthew 25:14-30). In it, the man with one talent was told he should have put his talent to the money exchangers so the master could have at least earned interest on the talent so entrusted.

Another very clear scripture is as follows:

“So then **as we have time**, let us work good toward all, especially toward those of the household of faith.” Galatians 6:10, MKJV

There is an implication from all of the above, and particularly in light of the Galatians 6:10

verse, that we should care about others and try to help them ... as we have time. As a first priority, we have to maintain our own lives - ergo, **have a proper concern for our own interests** (1 Thessalonians 4:11-12). Others should do the same. If we are fortunate, and in the nice situation of having a real surplus, both in terms of time and money, then we can use that surplus to hopefully help others.

It should be noted that there are some clear Biblical considerations concerning voluntary charity.

“Do not withhold good **from those who deserve it** when it’s in your power to help them. **If you can help your neighbor now**, don’t say, ‘Come back tomorrow, and then I’ll help you.’” Proverbs 3:27, 28, NLT

First, there is the idea that charity is local, as in “your neighbor.” This idea is further narrowed to “those who deserve it.” This means that the potential charitable giver likely personally knows the potential charity recipient as the giver is making a judgment about whether they deserve the help. Perhaps they are lazy and do not work and so they do not deserve the help. There is a further condition being, “when it is in your

power to help them.” This means that there is a judgment, a financial assessment, as to whether the potentially giving person or family can afford to help the potentially receiving person or family. Charity is local, intelligent, and has conditions. The person in need does NOT have an unconditional mortgage on the lives of other men – especially if the person in need is lacking in the moral or intellectual virtues they should possess. In regards to the Matthew 25 scripture, below, it should be noted that in certain ancient prisons, many times, the prisoner had to rely on family and friends to receive enough food to eat and items of clothing or blankets to be able to stay warm. Modern Western prisons are different today.

In addition to the above, **need seems to be narrowly prescribed**, per the following:

“But godliness with contentment is great gain. For we brought nothing into the world, and it is clear that we can carry nothing out. But having food and clothing, we will be content.” 1 Timothy 6:6-8, MKJV

“If a brother or sister is naked and destitute of daily food, and if one of you says to them, Go in peace, be warmed and filled, but you do not

give them those things which are needful to the body, what good is it?" James 2:15-16, MKJV

"For I was hungry, and you gave me food; I was thirsty, and you gave Me drink; I was a stranger, and you took Me in; I was naked, and you clothed Me; I was sick, and you visited Me; I was in prison, and you came to Me."  
Matthew 25:35, 36, MKJV

Abraham was and is the father of the faithful, and yet he slept in a tent – he did not have a permanent house (Hebrews 11:9).

Each Israelite was to go outside and gather manna in Exodus 16.

In Matthew 23:23, judgment is mentioned as one of "the weightier matters of the law." Each individual needs to develop the intellectual virtues and to have empathy for his fellow man and love for them. It takes time to develop good judgment. A friend of your author's father taught him this statement: "You cannot put an old head on young shoulders." Developing good judgment takes time, the freedom to make your own choices, the freedom to earn and spend money, etc. Mistakes will be made, but their



cost is negligible compared to an under-developed human being.

“For, brothers, **you were called to liberty**. Only do not use the liberty for an opening to the flesh, but by love serve one another. For all the Law is fulfilled in one word, even in this, “You shall love your neighbor as yourself.””  
Galatians 5:13, 14, MKJV

We were called to liberty, not the slavery of altruism – where other men’s unending “needs” have a permanent first mortgage on all of our property and our time. We were called to liberty and so were all other men. And we are to serve one another. How do we serve one another? The answer is within the context of what follows, loving your neighbor as yourself. There is no way altruism can get around any of the scriptures above, even when they have misguided religious apologists attempting to help them, which is the subject of what follows.

There are various scriptural passages, usually taken out of context, or interpreted outside of the clear scriptures cited above, that are used to Biblically argue for altruism – incorrectly so. Your author will discuss many of them below.

In Romans 12, 1 Corinthians 12, and other places, the Bible makes mention that each of us receives spiritual gifts upon the receipt of the Holy Spirit. This was discussed in the *Each Person is Unique* section of this book. Romans 12:4 points out that we all do not have the same function and Romans 12:6 points out that we have "gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us." Ergo, we need to be humble enough to recognize it if someone is better than us at something and admit it and be glad for it. What they are doing is also important for the body of Christ, the ekklesia. Honesty is also a principle, though, so if someone is not good at something, and we are, we should not pretend that they are better than us - in that instance. None of us can be good at everything. This is the meaning of Philippians 12:3 below:

"Let nothing be done through strife or vainglory, but in lowliness of mind let each esteem others better than themselves [IF they are better than us at something]."  
Philippians 2:3, MKJV

Interestingly, the New Living Translation, in Philippians 2:4, has almost the exact conceptual delineation of your author's "proper concern for

one's own interests" and "loving your neighbor as yourself":

"Don't think **only** about your own affairs, but be interested in others, too, and what they are doing." Philippians 2:4, NLT

Each of us must think about our own affairs, because there is no one else to do it. But we should not think only about our own affairs, because other people have hopes and dreams, too. Other people have talents and gifts, whose use is important to them, and all of us, too.

Another misunderstood and misused passage of scripture is Romans 15:1-2. The confusion stems from the chapter division between Romans 14 and Romans 15. The main subject of Romans 14 is along the lines of some people knew it was Biblically all right to eat certain kinds of meat and some people did not think it correct to do so. Even though those who correctly understood that it is all right to eat certain kinds of meat (Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14), the Bible advocated being careful not to offend the vegetarians (Romans 14:15, 21). The offense would be worse than tolerating their incorrect understanding – something our truther friends should remember.

It is against this backdrop that the discussion continues in Romans 15.

“We may know that these things make no difference, but we cannot just go ahead and do them to please ourselves. We must be considerate of the doubts and fears of those who think these things are wrong. We should please others. If we do what helps them, we will build them up in the Lord.” Romans 15:1, 2, NLT

The same basic idea is found in 1 Corinthians 10:24-33, this time in relation to meat possibly offered to, or slain, in the service for idols:

“All things are lawful to me, but not all things profit [not all things are profitable for me to do - this is not a discussion of profit in the economic sense of the word]. All things are lawful to me, but **not all things build up**. Let no one seek his own, but each one another's [spiritual well-being is being discussed here, not physical well-being]. Eat whatever is sold in the meat market, asking no question for conscience' sake; “for the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness of it.” If any of those who do not believe invite you to a feast, and if you are disposed to go, eat whatever is set before you, asking no questions for conscience' sake. But if anyone says to you,

This is slain in sacrifice to idols, do not eat for the sake of him who showed it, and for conscience' sake; "for the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness of it"; **conscience, I say, not your own, but the other's.** For why is my liberty judged by another's conscience? For if I by grace am a partaker, why am I evil spoken of for that for which I give thanks? Therefore whether you eat or drink, or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God. Give no offense [to their conscience, as that is not profitable spiritually speaking - it does not build them up, but tears them down], either to the Jews, or to the Greeks or to the church of God; even as I please all men in all things, not seeking my own profit, but the profit of many, so that they may be saved." 1 Corinthians 10:23-33, MKJV

The idea is not to offend others who are weaker spiritually, as that is not profitable. We should not offend others' conscience so that they may be saved spiritually. Paul, the writer here, made sure he did not seek his own profit (eating meat he knew was all right to eat), but the spiritual building up (profit) of those weaker in the faith. The "let no one seek his own, but each one another's" part of the passage has nothing to do with the Biblically vetoed doctrine of altruism. It

has to do with not offending each other and building each other up spiritually.

Along the same lines of helping one another spiritually, is another passage commonly misused, in particular the "bear one another's burdens" portion of Galatians 6:1-2:

"Brothers, if a man is overtaken in a fault, you the spiritual ones restore such a one in the spirit of meekness, considering yourself, lest you also be tempted. Bear one another's [spiritual is the context] burdens, and so you will fulfill the law of Christ." Galatians 6:1-2, MKJV

The New Living Translation has Galatians 6:1-2 translated as follows:

"Dear brothers and sisters, if another Christian is overcome by some sin, you who are godly should gently and humbly help that person back onto the right path. And be careful not to fall into the same temptation yourself. Share each other's troubles and problems, and in this way obey the law of Christ." Galatians 6:1-2, NLT

The 1 Corinthians 12 passage of scripture, pertaining to spiritual gifts and also the analogy

of the members of the ekklesia forming the body of Christ, is pertaining to each member recognizing the value and importance of each other. It falls within the context of loving your neighbor as yourself. The NIV has verse 25 as follows:

“so that there should be no division in the body, but that its parts should have equal concern for each other [love your neighbor as yourself].” 1 Corinthians 12:25, NIV

The discussion pertaining to Philippians 2:3-4, quoted earlier, further clarifies the meaning “... that the members should have the same care for one another” (MKJV) portion of 1 Corinthians 12:25.

Another potentially misunderstood passage of scripture is the “love does not seek her own,” passage from 1 Corinthians 13:5. As pointed out throughout this section of the book, each of us is forced to properly tend to our own affairs. The New Living Translation clarifies the potential confusion quite nicely:

“... **Love does not demand its own way.** ...” 1 Corinthians 13:5, NLT

Love cannot demand its own way because others must be loved as one loves oneself. Other people have hopes and dreams and ideas, too. The "love does not seek her own" could also be clarified by understanding that an omitted word is intended. The omitted word is "only". Love does not seek [only] her own. This corresponds to the Philippians 2:4 passage:

"Don't think **only** about your own affairs, but be interested in others, too, and what they are doing." Philippians 2:4, NLT

Another passage of scripture commonly used, to attempt to establish Biblical altruism, is found in 2 Corinthians 8:7-14:

"Since you excel in so many ways - you have so much faith, such gifted speakers, such knowledge, such enthusiasm, and such love for us - now I want you to excel also in this gracious ministry of giving. I am not saying you must do it, even though the other churches are eager to do it. This is one way to prove your love is real. You know how full of love and kindness our Lord Jesus Christ was. Though he was very rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, so that by his poverty he could make you rich. I suggest that you finish what you started



a year ago, for you were the first to propose this idea, and you were the first to begin doing something about it. Now you should carry this project through to completion just as enthusiastically as you began it. Give whatever you can according to what you have. If you are really eager to give, it isn't important how much you are able to give. God wants you to give what you have, not what you don't have. Of course, I don't mean you should give so much that you suffer from having too little. I only mean that there should be some equality [pertaining to need, see verse 14 below]. Right now you have plenty and can help them. Then at some other time they can share with you when you need it. In this way, **everyone's needs will be met.**" 2 Corinthians 8:7-14, NLT

"So then **as we have time**, let us work good toward all, especially toward those of the household of faith." Galatians 6:10, MKJV

There are a number of points to be made regarding what Paul was advocating in the two passages quoted above. First, the context is helping another church in need. Need was previously shown to be minimally defined, mainly having to do with food and clothing. Second, these are the members of one church

area seeing the members of another church in need and so they initiated a charitable project of their own accord – not because someone put a gun to their head, including a “spiritual gun.” Paul urges them to follow through with it. Third, Paul was not saying they had to give, but they would show their love if they did. Fourth, Paul makes allowance for the personal judgment of each person as to whether they actually had surplus to give. This would be in consideration of properly tending to one’s own interests, which would include obeying the Biblical command to leave an inheritance to your children and grandchildren. It might also be a personal judgment not to empty: an education fund, a roof repair fund, a medical emergency fund, a personal retirement fund, a fund to take care of aging parents, etc. And clearly you should not give so much that you end up suffering. Fifth, Paul pointed out that, in the future, it was possible the roles might be reversed. Sixth, none of this demonstrates that the needy church had a legal or a moral lien on any surplus from the giving church. All of the giving was voluntary and self-initiated – taking personal judgment into account.

What many people do not understand is that the best “charity” one can provide is a job to

another. This helps reestablish the person as a productive contributing member of society and helps them to be able to provide for their needs and the needs of their family. To provide a job, however, requires the capital fund with which to pay wages. If available capital is depleted, then there is no wage fund with which to pay laborers. Socialism, based on altruism, destroys societal capital. Indiscriminate giving wipes out personal capital. Charity with judgment, to voluntarily assist with genuine human need, fits within the Bible. **Charity without judgment is outside the Bible.** Charity without judgment wipes out societal capital (the capital belonging to the individuals comprising society added together). And when societal capital is wiped out, everyone is poor, and we go back to riding horses and digging with our hands. Virtually no jobs can be offered because there is nothing to pay the workers with. And this would not fulfill the Biblical admonition for each man to work with his own hands, etc. Since capital enables greatly expanded production, through the use of tools and machinery, etc., wiping out capital lowers production. With lower production there are less people able to live on the earth. And less people living on the earth is Satan's goal. This goes against the divine individualism plan of the two Jehovahs. Further, charity without

judgment usually ends up actually hurting the recipients of the attempted charitable good work. It leads to reinforcing: not obtaining an education, not working, not making good decisions, not developing one self, etc., - all of which are contrary to divine individualism.

Another passage, related to the 2 Corinthians 8 passage, is found in 1 John 3:16-18:

"By this we have known the love of God, because He [Jesus Christ] laid down His life for us. And we ought to lay down our lives for the brothers. But whoever has this world's goods and sees his brother having need, and shuts up his bowels from him, how does the love of God dwell in him? My children, let us not love in word or in tongue, but in deed and in truth."  
1 John 3:16-18, MKJV

The New Living Translation has verse 17:

"But if anyone has enough money to live well and sees a brother or sister in need and refuses to help - how can God's love be in that person?"  
1 John 3:17, NLT

There are a number of points to be made pertaining to this passage of scripture. When John speaks of "we ought to lay down our lives for the brothers" he is mainly speaking spiritually, in the same way as 1 Corinthians 12, Romans 12, etc., mean. Jesus Christ, the example given in verse 16, used his spiritual gifts, which were many, to teach, to heal, to miraculously feed people, and he laid down his life in a one-time special spiritual sacrifice for us all. He did not accumulate a lot of money and then give it away to the poor. We each have spiritual gifts and talents and abilities. We are to use them to help the body of Christ – and all mankind. We are to esteem the gifts of each other as important and meaningful to both the body of Christ and the person with the gift. We are to love and respect each other. When it gets down to material possessions it is clear that one must have them to give, one must exercise charity with judgment, and that "need" is fairly narrowly defined in scripture. The "enough money" qualifier, in verse 17, requires personal judgment on the part of the giver. If a brother in Christ really has a need for food to stay alive and clothing to wear to stay warm it is an exercise of love to help them. And, because we love other people and would want the same help

if we were the ones in actual need, we help them.

Properly understood, none of the “usual suspect” Bible verses establish anything even remotely close to altruism as a Biblical doctrine. The Bible cannot contradict itself. And there are numerous clear passages of scripture to show that each of us must properly be concerned for our own interests. We should do so without disregarding the also important interests of others. The Bible clearly allows for charity with judgment – and commends it. The Bible pretty clearly and narrowly prescribes qualifying charitable need. What is even worse, for the Biblically illiterate advocates who rationalize for altruism, is that: the two Jehovahs DIVINELY VETOED ALTRUISM. They did so throughout the Bible, but, in particular, when they clearly laid down law #2, “love your neighbor **as yourself.**” Human sacrifice is out. Personally initiated charity with judgment is in.

God the Father and Jesus Christ should not give up their universe to Satan, who wants it, because keeping it would be considered as “selfish.”

How about one last attempt to advocate for Socialism, based on altruism, from the Bible? Your author previously handled this one in his book on economics, entitled: *Economic Fallacies Versus Rational Thought*:

**“The Acts 4 Socialism for the church fallacy** - Some who do not understand economic laws use the early church experience, summarized in Acts 4:32-37, to ‘show’ that God wants Socialism for the ekklesia (commonly known as the church). Doing so they ignore the private property and division of labor that is detailed throughout the entirety of the rest of the Bible – including a continuation of the Acts 4 story in Acts 5. Socialism has already been demolished intellectually and not much more need be said of it. Acts 4, along with other scriptures, does reveal that, early on, the Apostles incorrectly believed that Jesus Christ would be returning to the earth in the short term. Because of this incorrect belief the early ekklesia made a decision to not focus their attention on mundane physical things and to give themselves to prayer, to building each other up in the faith, and to speaking the words of life to the people. Ergo, they chose to sell off their physical possessions and consume the proceeds. Of course, at the point of time

pertaining to Acts 4, the Apostles were wrong on this matter. Christ still has not returned (Revelation 19), almost 2,000 years later. The Apostles, filled with the Holy Spirit, made the wrong decision. And Jesus Christ, the head of the ekklesia (Ephesians 5:23), allowed them to make a bad decision and to experience the negative consequences. Acts 4 and 5 clearly show it was within the rights of a church member to sell their private property and donate the proceeds for communal living, or not. As former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher astutely observed and expounded, 'The only problem with Socialism is that sooner or later you run out of other people's money.' And then the party is over and you have to get back to work and rebuild – only this time on more lasting principles. (Your author is writing physically here, not spiritually). Acts 4 does not show that the Bible advocates Socialism. It just shows that the early Apostles were wrong on a spiritual matter (Christ returning in the near future) and a temporal matter (regarding consuming their capital in communal living) and that Jesus Christ, the head of the church, allowed it."

Why altruism cannot possibly work in actual practice has been the subject of numerous



writings. For example, Socialism, which is based on altruism, has been intellectually demolished for over 90 years. Dr. Ludwig von Mises, the great Austrian economist, wrote a book entitled, *Socialism*, which intellectually crushed it. Your author's previously mentioned book on the subject of economics has an extensive section on that demolition, so no more will be written here. In that same book, your author pointed out the importance of seeing the unseen. Seeing the unseen means to understand the effects of policies and decisions on all groups and all time periods, not just one person or group in the immediate near term.

Because advocates for human sacrifice (which altruism calls for) do not see the unseen, they do not understand the following causal sequence chain. Many people are lacking in the moral virtues and/or the intellectual virtues. Many people have the wrong value system. They have what economists call a very high time preference – meaning, they are short-term thinkers. They do not find a way to obtain an education. They do not save funds for emergencies, or for other purposes, because to save funds means to forgo expenditures today. Spending money today is fun and results in immediate pleasure. The thought that one

might need funds tomorrow, for some known or unknown purpose, does not sufficiently occur to them. Ergo, the short-term thinkers tend to live hand to mouth, or they spend right up to their disposable income level - buying houses that are larger than they need and can really afford. They do the same thing pertaining to cars, etc. If something goes wrong and they lose a job, or some other bad thing happens to them, they have no financial reserves. To them, they have "needs." The fact that most of them put themselves into that position by poor quality thinking and choices is not something that occurs to them. It is beside the point to them. Some of the people who think and act this way find themselves "in need," even when the overall economy is doing well. When there is an economic downturn, errors are exposed, and many people now find themselves "in need." These people really do not want to sell their houses and downsize, or move into apartments. They do not want to sell cars and possessions. They would like it, if at all possible, for someone else to pay their bills. They would like to find a way, if possible, to be able to continue to live beyond their prudent means. And since there are more short-term thinkers than long-term thinkers there is always going to be more "human needs" than available capital. But,

capital is necessary for growth and cannot be consumed lightly – especially if that capital consumption is used to, effectively, reinforce negative human behavior. Capital consumption also discourages positive human behavior, because why should a long-term thinker produce and save if their savings is only going to be taxed away by the government and redistributed to those who did not produce the wealth?

If altruism were a viable and socially or legally enforced doctrine, then the productive, saving, long-term thinking members of society would be called upon, (tax levied upon), to pony up capital that would be redistributed to those who “needed” outside help. Once this capital redistribution, usually in the form of money, was redistributed, it would be almost immediately consumed. This is easier to understand if instead of thinking about capital in the form of money the reader thinks of the societal savings being all in the form of food (just to help make the point). The surplus food would be consumed and be gone, including, if it went far enough, the seed corn for next year’s crop. The societal savings would be dissipated. The producers have much less incentive to produce going forward as their surplus is taken away from them and given to non-producers so they

can eat. The societal savings being dissipated is the unseen. When the savings from “the rich” are consumed there is no capital fund with which to hire workers. Not having a capital fund with which to hire workers and provide jobs is also the unseen. Instead of savings being available to perform production processes that take longer and produce more in the long term, everything starts shifting to immediate consumption-oriented production. Even worse, the producers are not as motivated to produce extra. If it all goes far enough, that society has to start over at a devolved level. And since using capital to provide sustainable jobs is a far better way to help a man than giving him funds, which he immediately consumes, all of society devolves downward. Once the capital of a society is consumed employment is further reduced making things even worse. The destroyed capital and the resulting destruction of jobs and the societal devolution are the unseen results of altruism attempting to be practiced. The other unseen result of altruism is the destroyed human beings who are taught that they get to eat even if they do not think or work/produce and who are taught that they can get away with not being moral. In a certain sense, this is parallel to the lack of wisdom of giving money to an alcoholic. It perpetuates the

very problem that is destroying the person. This is why Biblical charity is charity with judgment, not a first mortgage on the lives of producers by the non-producers. The good intentions of the “progressive,” “feel-gooders” does not change the facts on the ground that that society would not only not progress, it would devolve.

That altruism is unsound theoretically and also cannot work in practice has been shown in numerous ways by many social scientists, some of whose thoughts will be detailed throughout the rest of this section.

Ayn Rand, philosopher and novelist, was a particularly harsh and effectual critic of altruism. She used logic and prudence (practical reason) in her very effective attacks. Your author will sometimes quote her, and will sometimes paraphrase some of her more salient observations pertaining to altruism, below. And your author will intersperse and add on some of his own comments as well. Many of her thoughts are detailed in her book, *The Virtue Of Selfishness*. As previously mentioned, her definition of selfishness was “concern with one’s own interests,” and she always advocated a rational selfishness – not an irrational or destructive selfishness. Your author believes

she titled her book in such a way as to deliberately pick an intellectual fight with the proponents of altruism - which proponents do not fare very well in the outcome of that intellectual fight:

- Altruism is an intellectual package deal. The package deal is 1) what are values and 2) who the beneficiary of values should be. Altruism holds that an action taken for others is good, but an action taken for one's own benefit is bad. Ergo, the beneficiary of an action is the criterion of moral value. The practical result from this is that morality (which is a code of values and principles to live by – to guide man's choices and actions) becomes man's enemy. This is because if concern for one's own interests is bad, and the nature of man is such that he has to be concerned with his own interests, through thinking and acting in order to stay alive, then a man's desire to live is bad. If so, then man's life itself is bad. Your author is paraphrasing all this and points out that since all men are men ( $A = A$ ), how is it logical that other men's lives are good, but mine is somehow bad? At the nature of man level, we are the same. All men are men.

- "Altruism permits no concept of a self-respecting, self-supporting man – a man who supports his life by his own effort and neither sacrifices himself nor others. It means that altruism permits no view of men except as sacrificial animals ..., as victims and parasites – that it permits no concept of benevolent co-existence among men – **that it permits no concept of justice.**" Your author would point out that in matters of productivity, justice requires proportionality, not equality. The Bible concurs when it says that each shall be rewarded according to their works, not rewarded equally (Matthew 16:27).
- The concept of selfishness needs to be redeemed. This is why Rand defined it as "concern with one's own interests." Each man has a right to a moral existence. And each man should always act in regards to their own rational self-interest. Attempting to satisfy the irrational desires of others, and also attempting to satisfy any of one's own irrational desires, is not a wise course of action and obviously not rational. A wise and rational course of action is to show the proper concern for one's own interests.

- Ethics, as part of philosophy, deals with discovering the proper code of values for men to live by. Philosophers tried to break ethics away from God, but they did so in such a way that they, in essence, substituted society for God. However, since society is composed of individuals, it is really a power elite ("gang in power") that makes the actual decisions for that society. And, if the power elite of a society gets to decide what is right and what is wrong, they can pursue their whims unchecked by rational and objective ethical principles. Reason (natural law) and God (divine law) have long since been discarded. The power elite (gang in power) is allowed to pursue their whims, at the expense of everyone else – as "the everyone else" is sacrificed in an attempt to attain those whims. Your author has observed that the power elite of virtually every society engages in human sacrifice and needs some type of intellectual and moral cover so they can live with themselves and convince their followers that the course of action pertaining to human sacrifice is good, or "for the common good." Rand points out that, since none of this is rational, the sellout philosophers have decided that reason itself has failed and that ethics lays outside of reason – ergo no



rational ethics can evermore be defined. This begins, and accelerates, what Rand characterizes as "the descent into hell." What Rand (no fan of religion) did not realize is that God predicted all of this a long time ago. "He takes away the wisdom of rulers and makes leaders act like fools." Job 12:17 TEV, Good News Bible. Further, "You have closed their minds to reason; don't let them triumph over me now." Job 17:4 TEV, Good News Bible

- Rand points out the negative consequences of not thinking and not acting morally. She does so by observing that men are free not to think, but they cannot escape the consequences of not thinking, which is destruction.
- Rand points out that altruism is impossible to practice and therefore cannot be a moral code in accord with reality. It is impossible to practice because each man must think and each man must take action in order to produce enough to sustain their life. Entities, including human beings, act for their own good in order to preserve their own life. It must be so, or all would die. Your author has previously pointed out the inherent

contradiction (conflicting duties) contained within altruism. It is not possible to act on the duty to sustain your life at the same time that one is acting on "the duty" to sacrifice oneself to others. Rand clearly notices the contradiction and proclaims that altruism, as a "moral" code is irrational and impossible to practice. And since a moral code is supposed to be all about the values and principles pertaining to guiding man's choices pertaining to what is good for man and what is bad for man, a moral code with an inherent contradiction cannot be correct. Altruism is, in fact, irrational and incorrect. It is also impossible to practice, which makes it further incorrect. Rand blasts accepting any such code of "irrational values impossible to practice." If one accepts such a moral code, and then finds it impossible to practice, now one incurs the penalty of unearned guilt. By "unearned guilt" she is not saying accepting the wrong moral code is without guilt and consequences.

- Rand observes that no society can be of value to a man's life - if the price of membership in that society is the surrender of his life. The proper tending to one's own interests does not have to (nor should it)

entail the sacrificing of others to oneself. Most people who have carelessly, or thoughtlessly, accepted altruism as a doctrine seem to assume that if a man is unwilling to be sacrificed to others, against his will, that he intends to sacrifice others to himself – in other words, a kill or be killed jungle scenario.

- Rand notices that desire cannot be the basis for any ethical standard. If it were, the desire of one man to produce and the desire of another man to steal what the first man produced would be of equal ethical validity, which is nonsensical.
- Altruism “regards man as a sacrificial animal and that he has no right to exist for his own sake.” Your author has previously pointed out that the organic state feeds off of this doctrine by then feeling morally justified in using human beings as food to be used to keep the organic state alive. Many religions have also adopted what amounts to an organic entity method of dealing with their members, also eating men as fuel to keep their religious fire burning bright. Wittingly or not, altruism is the ism used to rationalize or emotionalize the organic state or organic

religion mentality. But, using their fellow men as human sacrifices is clearly against the two Jehovahs' divine individualism process. Altruism is outside the context of the two Jehovahs' created reality and desire for mankind.

- Rand observes an interesting and powerful causal chain sequence of events. She does so by pointing out that if self-sacrifice is a virtue, then the rational man must do violence to his own rational judgment. He must reverse the order of his personal hierarchy of values and turn against his own consciousness, which is to say it is to have internal conflict and to turn against his own life. Her reasoning sequence is somewhat as follows. To have to sacrifice one's happiness is to sacrifice what one properly desires; to sacrifice what one properly desires is to sacrifice what one values; to sacrifice what one values is to sacrifice one's own judgment and mind; and to sacrifice one's mind is to sacrifice, in effect, one's life. Your author would add, if you cannot be yourself, within the context of the two Jehovahs' rational and objective ethics, then what is the purpose of living? The two Jehovahs gave each man free will and uniqueness, but instructed that

each man love God and love their fellow men as they love themselves. The two Jehovahs allowed for each man to be unique; to engage in both objective and subjective value judgments; in other words, to be different and whole. No man can be whole if he has to spend his entire life sacrificing parts of himself to others, including people he does not even know. This would involve sacrificing everything he wants and believes in to anyone other than himself. It is an inherent contradiction. It is human sacrifice. Altruism comes from the being that loves human sacrifice. Altruism is Satan inspired. "But I say that the things which the nations sacrifice, [including human beings' lives and resources] they sacrifice to demons and not to God. And I do not desire that you should have fellowship with demons. You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons; you cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and of a table of demons." 1 Corinthians 10:20, 21, MKJV

- Rand points out that an irrational moral code is one that is set in opposition to man's nature, is set in opposition to reality, and is set in opposition to what man needs to do in order to survive on this earth. To accept

such an irrational moral code, such as altruism, is to force men to choose between what is commonly accepted as moral and what is practical and necessary to live, e.g., to think and to take action and to produce and to save for the future and to properly tend to one's own needs – versus – sacrificing their life by attempting to live it for anyone other than oneself. This forces man to also have to choose between his own happiness and what is commonly, but incorrectly, accepted as virtue (self-sacrifice). And it forces man to choose between altruistic idealism and becoming successful. All of the above is a lethal and false dichotomy that tears a man apart. This lethal, altruism-inspired, dichotomy forces a man to choose between performing the actual thoughts and actions that he knows are necessary to sustain his life, or being considered good by others – good because he is considered a solid self-sacrificing member of society and therefore held to be worthy of being allowed “to live” in that society. Rand poignantly observed that the defenders of the altruistic morality excuse men for not completely sacrificing themselves (otherwise they would literally be dead). They, in effect, say that they do not expect men to be

completely "moral"; they "expect them to smuggle some self-interest into their lives. We recognize that people have to live, after all." Rand wryly concludes that therefore "Hypocrisy is to be man's protector against his professed [chosen] moral convictions [code]." Your author would point out that any moral code that has hypocrisy engrained into it is a disaster - an inherent self-refuting contradiction, in and of itself.

- Your author thought he might offer the following analogy. If a man's personal hierarchy of values is item one, item two, then item three, he would normally take action to achieve item one. To strengthen the analogy, let us further add that item one is a personal need for the man, as is item two, but item three is to help someone else do something. If, inspired by altruism, however, he thought about and then re-ordered his originally desired personal hierarchy of values to be item three in the first position, item two remaining in the second position, and item one falling to third position; because he does not want to be considered "selfish," then he has an impossibility loop problem. The impossibility loop problem is that when he re-ordered item

number three upward to the first position he did so because he thinks he will get something from so doing. Perhaps he thinks he will gain social acceptance by neighborhood, church, or government. At any rate he has changed his personal hierarchy of values to gain some form of social accommodation or acceptance – at the minimum to avoid criticism. But how can he take action if his new item one gains him something? That would be selfish and altruism is the opposite of selfishness. How can he actually practice his chosen moral code? No matter how he chooses, for self, or for society, he has a personal reason for so choosing. If he chooses for self, he sustains his life on the earth. If he chooses to sacrifice himself, he receives social approval, at a minimum. Acting to achieve social approval is selfish. Because selfish has come to be definitionally bad and altruism, defined as the opposite of selfishness is, ergo, supposed to be definitionally good, how can the dilemma be resolved? It cannot. It cannot because any time a man takes action to achieve item one on his personal hierarchy of values he is acting to achieve what he considers his interests are, ergo, by common vernacular, he is acting selfishly.



- Rand observed that if a man accepted altruism as a moral code, he would end up suffering from a lack of self-esteem. This is because trying to determine how to sacrifice his life, at the same time he has to do things to sustain it, would result in inner conflict, which would then torment him. He will lose respect for others because mankind as a whole will somehow be ethically entitled to sacrifice him to their collective whims. This would lead to a view of existence tantamount to a nightmare, leading to a lethargic indifference to ethical principles - because the ethics he has accepted as valid, the self-sacrifice of altruism, has failed him.
- Rand observed that altruism's human sacrifice belief system erodes from people's minds the concept of an individual human being. People start to think collectively, particularly political leaders. "Hence the appalling recklessness with which men propose, discuss and accept 'humanitarian' projects which are to be implemented by political means, that is, *by force*, on an unlimited number of human beings." ... It results in the corrupt idea of "human lives no object." ... It "means that the interests of

some men are to be sacrificed to the interests and wishes of others.” If these political leaders did not have the moral sanction of altruism they would not dare try and get away with it. “All public projects are mausoleums, not always in shape, but always in cost.”

- Rand also observed that there is a deviant kind of individualism where the individual is irrational – against himself and others, too. They engage in irrational behavior that is either defiant, or destructive – following their whims and sometimes attempting to impose them on others. Your author should not have to make clear, but will, that such a person is not currently cooperating with the two Jehovahs in their divine individualism process.
- Rand also observed that altruism is anti-mind, anti-man, and anti-life. It has never been possible to preach an evil notion (such as human sacrifice) on the basis of reason. It must have a mystic base and sanction. Altruism leads to slavery, the lack of justice, and human misery. If taken far enough it leads to the Dark Ages all over again. Your author would clarify and note that the mystic

base and sanction could come from either an incorrect religious concept, or an incorrect religion / bad metaphysics, or from a corrupted philosophical thought process, or rationalization.

Edmund Opitz in his, *The Libertarian Theology Of Freedom*, had an astute observation:

“An incalculable amount of harm has been done by those who have gone forth to reform society. As a matter of fact, there is no way of reforming society except by making individuals better. And no one can make individuals better except the individual himself. If you want to be a reformer – reform yourself. That will keep you busy for a while and lend encouragement to others. Then, when there are significant numbers of transformed individuals, society will be reformed – but not before.”

Auguste Comte, father of Sociology, and the coiner of the word altruism, was an advocate of collectivism:

“Every one has duties, duties towards all; but rights in the ordinary sense can be claimed by none ... The only principle on which Politics

can be subordinated to Morals is that individuals should be regarded, not as so many distinct beings, but as organs of one Supreme Being."

Ergo, men are not individually important. They can be sacrificed to the organic state collective (the Supreme Being) because they have no individual rights. It is moral for the power elite of the organic state to sacrifice individual human beings to keep "collective man," in the form of the organic state, alive. The only human right is the collective state "right" to sacrifice us to itself. All of this came from the man who is credited with founding the social science of sociology and with coining the word altruism.

From economist Tom Sowell: "I have never understood why it is greed to want to keep the money you have earned, but not greed to want to take somebody else's money."

Dr. Ludwig von Mises, in his book, *Socialism* (which intellectually demolished Socialism), had this to say about a contrived system of ethics – contrived because it did not get good results and did not fit into the world as we know it:

"Moral behavior is the name we give to the temporary sacrifices made in the interests of

social co-operation, which is the chief means by which human wants and human life generally may be supplied. [Mises is referring to a properly functioning limited government here, where a small sacrifice from each citizen in the short-term provides long-term good results for all.] All ethics are social ethics. ... To behave morally, means to sacrifice the less important to the more important by making social co-operation possible.

The fundamental defect of most of the anti-utilitarian [when Mises uses the word utilitarian he means that which gets a good result] systems of ethics lies in the misconstruction of the meaning of the temporary sacrifices which duty demands. They do not see the purpose of sacrifice and the foregoing of pleasure, and they construct the absurd hypothesis that sacrifice and renunciation are morally valuable in themselves. They elevate unselfishness and self-sacrifice and the love of compassion, which lead to them, to absolute moral values. The pain that at first accompanies the sacrifice is defined as moral because it is painful – which is very near asserting that all action painful to the performer is moral.

From the discovery of this confusion we can see why various sentiments and actions which are socially neutral or even harmful come to be called moral. ... There thus arises a negative utilitarianism: we are to regard as moral that which benefits, not the person acting, but others. An ethical idea has been set up which cannot be fitted into the world we live in. Therefore, having condemned the society built up on 'self-interest' the moralist proceeds to construct a society in which human beings are to be what his ideal requires. He begins by misunderstanding the world and its laws; he then wishes to construct a world corresponding to his false theories, and then calls this the setting up of a moral ideal.

Man is not evil merely because he wants to enjoy pleasure and to avoid pain - in other words, to live. Renunciation, abnegation, and self-sacrifice are not good in themselves. To condemn the ethics demanded by social life under Capitalism and to set up in their place standards for moral behavior which - it is thought - might be adopted under Socialism is a purely arbitrary procedure."

Philosopher Tibor Machan astutely observed that the apparent conflict between an

individual's need to act in their own interest, in order to stay alive, need not put them into conflict with all other men. This is because that same individual is also a part of mankind. In other words, that unique person has both individuality and also shares a general nature with all other men. Altruism and collectivism try to exploit this real dichotomy by pitting egoism against altruism and painting egoism as bad. This is unnecessary, however, and counterproductive. Further, as has been pointed out, above, going down this road is a disaster for man. As Machan points out in his, *The Moral Case For A Free Market Economy*:

" ... my nature and I cannot be in conflict within me because they are not in fact separate things but aspects of the same thing. However, in the Platonic, existentialist, and Hobbesian pictures, these two parts of ourselves will possibly conflict, the general first, the individual second - or vice versa. This means that in principle we could always, in the life of any individual, witness some kind of dichotomy. And then we can ask, should one be more loyal to one's human nature, (i.e., humanity), or to one's individuality, (i.e., interests)?

We find this egoism-altruism conflict throughout the history of modern ethics, pitting our loyalty to humanity against our loyalty to our individuality. One is either a humanitarian or an egoist, one is either anti-social or sacrifices oneself to humanity. That is a very important and destructive dichotomy both metaphysically and, thus, ethically and politically."

The egoism-altruism conflict comes about, in large part, because there is a lack of understanding concerning the true context of the human situation. The true context of the human situation is that each man and woman is made in the image and likeness of God and has the opportunity to participate with the two Jehovahs in their divine individualism process. Understanding that we are to love our neighbor as ourselves resolves the egoism-altruism potential conflict. Each man is to have a proper concern for their own interests AND to respect the natural rights of other men as they have a proper concern for their own interests. The two Jehovahs gave such a "love your neighbor as yourself" command, in Executive Summary form, without explaining all of the detailed implications of it. Your author has attempted to explain some of those important implications.



In giving this command they divinely vetoed, in advance, altruism. They had to because of their divine individualism process. Since each man and woman are unique and valuable, and since there is literally no one who could ever take their place, to sacrifice such a one, via altruism, runs directly contrary to the two Jehovahs' divine individualism process.

Your author did not intend to write such a long section, pertaining to altruism, but it is such a caustic, irrational, and catastrophic doctrine that it was necessary to do so. To briefly summarize, some of the main points are: 1) altruism has been divinely vetoed by the two Jehovahs; 2) altruism has an inherent internal conflict and logical inconsistency whereby the duty of a man to stay alive is put into conflict with a supposed duty to humanity to sacrifice himself. Tibor Machan eloquently explained this by showing that "my nature and I cannot be in conflict within me because they are not in fact separate things but aspects of the same thing." In other words there is a constitutive reasoning error involved; 3) the Bible does not uphold altruism and the scriptures that are usually used to attempt to show that it does are either taken out of context, or are unclear scriptures that should be correctly interpreted in the light of

other very clear scriptures; 4) altruism cannot possibly work in practice; 5) altruism was coined as a word and rationalized as a doctrine to attempt to provide intellectual and moral cover for Socialism and other philosophies of history that regard individual men and women as cells of Collective Man - Collective Man being important and individual men and women being disposable; and 6) understanding that we are to love our neighbor as ourselves resolves the egoism-altruism potential conflict. Each man is to have a proper concern for their own interests AND to respect the natural rights of other men as they have a proper concern for their own interests.

### **Who God Is And How We Can Help Him**

"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 (Genesis 1-2 and Ephesians 3:9, not quoted, and 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 results would be. How all of the forces of physics and astronomy fit together is a mystery to man, not God. Some might believe that 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 your author. 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 brand new 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 their 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. And angels and men have to learn what that standard is or they cannot choose 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. Stars are a reference to angels in the scriptures below:

“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 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 so maybe they just formulated their divine nature into rational and objective moral laws. It just seems more logical



to your author that they thought about how they would live and then, 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. They have the correct set of values and live by them. And only after that did they formulate all of the schools of thought necessary to create the universe and only then did they go on to create the actual universe. In other words, Philosophers with perfect integrity first, Entrepreneurs and Artists, second. Further, in additional human words, the two Jehovahs have

the completeness and perfect balance of all of the moral and intellectual virtues – the unity of 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

Many of the philosophers and scientists of The Enlightenment were, at least partly, 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 many scriptures where truth and mercy appear in the very same scripture. In fact, truth and mercy appear to be linked. 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 section of the book is entitled "Who God Is And How We Can Help Him." We are now in a position to handle the "Who God is" part of

that title. The two Jehovahs (God) are righteous philosophers, entrepreneurs, and artists. They have the correct values, possess the entire set of the intellectual and moral virtues, possess perfect character and judgment, and they are righteous creative artistic entrepreneurial geniuses. They created, and are the original appropriator, owner-operators of the universe. It is an honor for mankind to be made in their image and likeness. They are right. They are rational. And their way of doing things works to produce life, including flourishing life. They are the Creators and sustainers of life.

Satan, on the other hand, is immoral and amoral, both – and certainly not righteous. He is irrational, not logical. And his ways produce strivings and envyings, wars, pain, suffering, and death – all the opposite of life, and especially the opposite of a flourishing life. *Satan the amoral* believes in lies and murder and war. He is the god of forces (Daniel 11:38). He believes and acts upon might makes right. As previously mentioned, might makes right ultimately destroys any who choose to engage in it (Matthew 26:52).

The contrast between the two Jehovahs and Satan could not be greater. It literally is a contrast between righteousness and evil. It literally is the contrast between true philosophers who are rational (logical) versus a corruption of thinking that is irrational (illogical). It literally is a contrast between life and death. It literally is a contrast between flourishing life and a tortured existence. It literally is a contrast between intricate creative artistry and senseless destruction.

As previously mentioned, the correct social science causal chain sequence is values, choices, and then consequences. To refine this a bit further, the following can be utilized:

Correct Values →  
Balanced use of Intellectual & Moral Virtues →  
Correct Choices →  
Good Consequences / Results

Understanding that man has a nature at the Homo sapiens sapiens level enables us to establish a few core observations and principles. Man is a thinking animal. Man is a social animal. All men need the use of life, liberty, and property in order to stay alive and to do what the two Jehovahs have told them to do,

which is to have dominion over the earth, not each other. In other words, all men have the natural rights of life, liberty, and property.

War, throughout history, has caused death, slavery, and the destruction of property. Human interactions that result in friction and conflict break social harmony. And the lack of social harmony can, if not resolved, ultimately lead to war. Previously, in writing a different book, your author thought about war as he was thinking about natural law and natural rights. And your author realized that war is the extreme opposite of social harmony and peace. And this thinking process helped your author to realize why war is so very detrimental to human beings. Please take a look at the chart below, in order to see the difference between war and peace. Please read the left hand side "War" column all the way down first and then note each entry's opposite notation in the right hand side "Peace" column.

War leads to:		Peace Allows for:
Death		Life
Slavery		Liberty
Property destruction		Property
		aka the Natural Rights

The importance of social harmony and peace are revealed in the genius of the Creator God. First, the Creator God told us, throughout the Bible, to live in peace and social harmony, e.g., to love your neighbor as yourself and to seek peace and pursue it (Psalm 34:14, 1 Peter 3:11). Even the way that the Creator God phrased it, below, speaks to social harmony and peace. Notice it only took five key words, in both cases, to get the job done.

"Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt **love thy neighbour as thyself**: I am the LORD." Leviticus 19:18, KJV

"Let him turn aside from evil and do good.

Let him **seek peace and pursue it.**"

1 Peter 3:11, MKJV

Second, he put the natural rights of man into the laws of nature in such a way that men could discover the laws of social harmony by simply using our reasoning ability. Man, after all, is the rational being. No man wants to have his life taken from him, or to be enslaved (or partially enslaved), or to have some of his property stolen or destroyed. It turns out that "loving your neighbor as yourself" encompasses respecting other men as men, and therefore respecting their God-given and natural rights of life, liberty, and property. And when all men actually respect each other's natural rights then there will finally be social harmony, peace, and prosperity.

Putting it simply, another very important social science causal chain sequence is as follows:

Justice → Social Harmony → Peace → Life

While justice is sort of a minimum for social harmony to be possible, forgiveness and reconciliation are extremely useful as well. Your author has previously written a book on the



subject of forgiveness entitled, *The Matthew 18 Paradox: Solved*.

The importance of social harmony and peace are critical for life. Properly understood, justice is a constituent part of social harmony, social harmony is a constituent part of peace, and peace is a constituent part of flourishing life, and life is the ultimate value. Social harmony and peace are so important to life that the Biblical message, particularly from Jesus Christ on, is a ministry of reconciliation.

"And all things are of God, who has reconciled us to Himself through Jesus Christ, and has given to us the ministry of reconciliation [not condemnation]; whereas God [the Father] was in Christ **reconciling** the world to Himself, not imputing their trespasses to them, and putting the word of **reconciliation** in us."

2 Corinthians 5:18, 19, MKJV

The two Jehovahs are in the process of reconciling the people of the world to them. And they are undertaking their greatest creative and artistic work to date (at least what can be known to us at this time), which is to ultimately create divine individuals. To do so they are using their divine individualism process. **But**

**they need our help!** That they need our help is counterintuitive, but the reason this is so is because of a choice they themselves made – and are sticking to. Your author has previously written about this in his book on law entitled, *Why There Is No Justice: The Corruption Of Law*. The pertinent section is as follows:

“One big difference between the natural sciences and the social sciences is there is no choice as an element of causality in the natural sciences. Electrons do not choose to leave one atom and go to another. Gravity does not decide to function as a force. A planet does not choose which sun to orbit. Men (and angels) choose. So does God. All these choices have consequences. As choices are made, other choices get made and the future unfolds in a linear fashion. Time is linear. The future is not predetermined. The future will occur based on choices that are made by those who are able to choose. The two Jehovahs gave free will to angels and men. Evidently one-third of the angels chose to rebel against them (Revelation 12:4-9). And man, from Adam on down, has also rebelled against them. The Israelites originally chose to cooperate with them, but then rebelled. Because the two Jehovahs gave angels and men a certain amount of freedom

and also a certain amount of time even they, based on the choice they made, cannot force an angel's or a man's mind. This is why it is so important for men, in particular, and also the good angels, to cooperate with the two Jehovahs. Otherwise, we can frustrate their purposes for us and frustrate what they would actually like to accomplish - versus what they have had to settle for.

It is widely assumed that God (the two Jehovahs) is omniscient. And omnipotent. And sometimes it is also assumed that God is omnipresent. Your author disagrees, at least pertaining to the sloppy way the 'three Omni's' are normally used.

If something is knowable then God knows it – if he chooses to. If something is not knowable then no one knows it, including God. For example, as previously mentioned above, the future is not yet written. The future depends on choices that God, angels, and men make. Since the future is not yet written, because all the choices that make up the future have not been made, no one knows the future. God does reserve the right to prophecy and to intervene using his free choice to cause an event to occur, but God does not force a man's mind, or an

angel's mind. As regards the natural sciences, logic, mathematics, and other fields not involving choice, your author believes God knows all. Quoting from Wikipedia:

'There is a distinction between:

inherent omniscience - the ability to know anything that one chooses to know and can be known.

total omniscience - actually knowing everything that can be known.

Some modern Christian theologians argue that God's omniscience is inherent rather than total, and that God chooses to limit his omniscience in order to preserve the free will and dignity of his creatures.' Your author agrees.

As regards omnipotence, Wikipedia nicely quotes author C.S. Lewis on the matter (from Lewis's *The Problem Of Pain*) [emphasis mine]:

'His Omnipotence means power to do all that is intrinsically possible, not to do the intrinsically impossible. You may attribute miracles to him, but not nonsense. This is no limit to his power. If you choose to say 'God can give a creature

free will and at the same time withhold free will from it,' you have not succeeded in saying anything about God: meaningless combinations of words do not suddenly acquire meaning simply because we prefix to them the two other words 'God can.' ... It is no more possible for God than for the weakest of his creatures to carry out both of two mutually exclusive alternatives; not because his power meets an obstacle, but because nonsense remains nonsense even when we talk it about God.'

Your author does not believe that God is omnipotent in terms of overriding a man's free will. Ergo, a man can change, for the good or the bad (Ezekiel 18) and God will let the man choose. God cannot force men or angels to be moral and then turn around and maintain that we are anything much better than people-bots or angel-bots.

Omnipresence does not have much to do with this section of the book, but your author felt like including a brief discussion of it here, anyway, as it kind of goes with the first two 'Omni's.' Wikipedia defines it as follows:

'Omnipresence or ubiquity is the property of being present everywhere. This characteristic is

most commonly used in a religious context, as most doctrines bestow the trait of omnipresence onto a superior, usually a deity commonly referred to as God by monotheists, as with God in Christianity. This idea differs from Pantheism, which identifies the universe and divinity; in divine omnipresence, the divine and universe are separate, but the divine is present everywhere ...'

Your author does not agree with omnipresence as it is sloppily used as God evidently has a spirit body (1 Corinthians 15:35-50, Genesis 1:26, and Revelation 1:14-15). Further, while there is no doubt God can likely go anywhere at the speed of thought, he evidently has a place he resides (Revelation 4:2 and other places). Further, omnipresence gets difficult to explain or understand, e.g., if God is everywhere does that mean he is inside Satan?

The point of this discussion regarding omniscience, omnipotence, and omnipresence is this: It is important for men and angels to use their free will to cooperate with the two Jehovahs, i.e., God. Otherwise, even one little man can, for a time, literally frustrate the eternal God the same way a child can frustrate a parent. God gave us divine law as instruction in

order to help us to learn to become like God so we can ultimately become holy and resurrected to eternal life (1 Corinthians 15) [divine individualism] and to be able to live in a new heaven and new earth (Revelation 21 and other places). Is that such a bad thing?

To the extent that the Israelites did rebel and frustrate God he threw them off the land. As previously mentioned, the Israelites wanted a king and they wanted to order their lives like the nations. So God gave them laws that were not good for them, aka the laws the other non-Israelite nations came up with. In speaking about the ancient Israelites and their children, God said:

'But their children, too, rebelled against me. They refused to keep my laws and follow my instructions, even though obeying them **would have given them life.** And they also violated my Sabbath days. So again I threatened to pour out my fury on them in the wilderness. Nevertheless, I withdrew my judgment against them to protect the honor of my name among the nations who had seen my power in bringing them out of Egypt. But I took a solemn oath against them while they were in the wilderness. I vowed I would scatter them among all the

nations because they did not obey my laws.  
They scorned my instructions by violating my Sabbath days and longing for the idols of their ancestors. **I gave them over to worthless customs and laws that would not lead to life.** I let them pollute themselves with the very gifts I had given them, and I allowed them to give their firstborn children as offerings to their gods - so I might devastate them and show them that I alone am the LORD.  
Ezekiel 20:21-26, NLT'''

The two Jehovahs have made the choice to give other contingent beings, men and angels, free choice. As such they are now limited in how they can accomplish things. This is because either a man's, or an angel's, choice can now frustrate God – for a time. As such, the two Jehovahs are subject to the logic of action when dealing with contingent beings. They are so subject because men are their workmanship (Ephesians 2:10) and because they have decided to use the divine individualism process to achieve their goal of bringing divine individuals to fruition. At the human level the great Austrian economist, Dr. Ludwig von Mises, coined the word praxeology to explain the science of human action and he then proceeded to expound the logic of action



and its consequences. The results were that the science of economics was set onto a more proper and lasting foundation. Mises, though, limited praxeology to human action, specifically excluding God. Your author will quote from his epic, *Human Action*, on this point:

“In order to avoid any possible misinterpretation of the praxeological categories it seems expedient to emphasize a truism.

Praxeology, like the historical sciences of human action, deals with purposeful human action. If it mentions ends, what it has in view is the ends at which acting men aim. If it speaks of meaning, it refers to the meaning which acting men attach to their actions.

Praxeology and history are manifestations of the human mind and as such are conditioned by the intellectual abilities of mortal men. Praxeology and history do not pretend to know anything about the intentions of an absolute and objective mind, about an objective meaning inherent in the course of events and of historical evolution, and about the plans which God ... is trying to realize in directing the universe and human affairs.”

Mises was correct regarding human action, (praxeology), and your author covered this in his economics book, *Economic Fallacies Versus Rational Thought*, so not much more will be written here. Your author believes that Mises thought that that goal setting and means choosing and taking action to make things better were meaningless to a God who could will a better environment into existence. In other words, why, from Mises point of view, would an omnipotent God need to take any action? If God were omniscient he would know what he wanted and if he were omnipotent he would have already taken whatever action was necessary to have things just the way he wanted them. With those premises, the question arises: What action is possible to such a God? Mises thought no action was possible to such a being. Why even think about it? To Mises, no action, in the praxeological sense, is possible to such a being. And so Mises did not attempt to extend praxeology to God.

On this point Mises was wrong. Mises, genius of geniuses that he was, did not really understand the Bible. He did not understand what God was really doing. He did not understand that God is bringing to fruition divine individuals using the process of divine

individualism to do it. What is important to realize is that Mises was wrong in this sense: The logic of action, of setting goals and choosing means to achieve them, does apply to God when God is dealing with contingent beings that possess freedom of choice. It does not apply to God when God is dealing with the natural sciences, as the natural sciences do what God wants when God wants it done. God can command whatever he wants to command into existence (Genesis 1). However, God cannot force a mind with free will to obey him, or to love him, etc., otherwise he would have people-bots, or angel-bots. Praxeology is defined as "the study of human action and conduct." Since it is so defined to be human action, in that sense one cannot extend praxeology to the God level - the level of the two Jehovahs. In the substantive sense, however, and lacking a better word to put in its place, your author does so extend praxeology\* (praxeology with an asterisk) to the God level.

God cannot force us to cooperate with him in the divine individualism process. God cannot force us to choose life and the package of values that come with it. God cannot force us to obtain and use the moral virtues, i.e., to be moral. God cannot force us to obtain and use

the intellectual virtues. As Ayn Rand observed, "if men are not open to reason, all one can do is to leave them to the consequences of their choices." Experience is a brutal teacher.

"Behold, I am the LORD, the God of all flesh.  
Is there anything too hard for Me?"  
Jeremiah 32:27, MKJV

Just because God asks a question in a bold and intimidating way does not mean the answer is "Yes." Some men will ultimately frustrate the two Jehovahs purpose for them and they will have to be put to eternal death (Matthew 10:28, Ezekiel 18:4, Romans 6:23, Revelation 21:8, and other places).

Because the logic of action extends to the two Jehovahs, when dealing with contingent beings, **it is very important that each of us cooperate with them.** Not cooperating with them can literally frustrate their good intentions toward us. It can literally keep us, through divine miracle, from achieving the following:

"Behold, I speak a mystery to you; we shall not all fall asleep, but we shall all be changed; in a moment, in a glance of an eye, at the last trumpet. For a trumpet shall sound, and the

dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall all be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. But when this corruptible shall put on incorruption, and **when this mortal shall put on immortality**, then will take place the word that is written, "Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is your sting? O grave, where is your victory?" The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God who gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."  
1 Corinthians 15:51-57, MKJV

There are a number of profound points to be found in the above passage. Eternal life has victory over death. Life, and all of the other package values that come with choosing life, is affirmed. Further, a mortal can become immortal. Further, corruption (in thought and deed) can become incorruption. In other words, not only will we be changed from mortal to immortal, we will no longer be lacking either the intellectual or the moral virtues. We know this because our thoughts will no longer be corrupted and our actions will no longer be corrupt. At the resurrection we will be miraculously healed of what we are lacking and each of us is lacking in different and various

things. Truthers will have love. Lovers will have intellectual virtues. This is not to say we should not strive to be balanced now. It is just a reality that no human being grows enough to be considered anywhere near complete in this life. The two Jehovahs can heal at the resurrection and in this sense they are not limited.

For now, we can frustrate them. For now, the two Jehovahs allow: religious stupidity, governmental stupidity, angelic stupidity, human stupidity, philosophical stupidity, legal stupidity, economic stupidity, bad men, bad angels, and other bad things. They allow this because they gave contingent beings, men and angels, freedom of choice. Historically, many of their choices have been bad, with evil and hurtful consequences.

How can we help the two Jehovahs? By cooperating with them in their divine individualism process. Can we frustrate them (and each other) if we do not? Yes ... for a while ... until the judgment, when all must answer for how they have spent their freedom and their time. In regards to the consequences of bad choices, the two Jehovahs do help those who love them, now, as follows:

“And we know that all things work together for good to those who love God, to those who are called according to His purpose.”  
Romans 8:28, MKJV

“Called according to his purpose,” means those who are participating with them in and according to their divine individualism process.

Aristotle basically solved the permanent versus change philosophical problem by noting that something (or someone) will progress to its ultimate end based on its nature. In other words, an acorn will become an oak tree, if it grows to fruition, or it will die and not make it. Each individual man will ultimately grow (growth including being healed at the resurrection) to become a divine individual ... if he/she cooperates with the two Jehovahs in their divine individualism process. This is the answer to the question: Why are we here? The Executive Summary is to become a divine individual.

Evidently one-third of the angels ever created have rebelled against the two Jehovahs.

“How you are fallen from heaven, O shining star, son of the morning! You have been

thrown down to the earth, you who destroyed the nations of the world. For you said to yourself, 'I will ascend to heaven and set my throne above God's stars [angels]. I will preside on the mountain of the gods far away in the north. I will climb to the highest heavens and be like the Most High.'"  
Isaiah 14:12-14, NLT

"And the word of the LORD came to me, saying, Son of man, lift up a lament over the king of Tyre [a reference to Satan], and say to him, So says the Lord Jehovah: You seal the measure, full of wisdom and perfect in beauty. You have been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was your covering, the ruby, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the turquoise, and the emerald, and gold. The workmanship of your tambourines and of your flutes was prepared in you in the day that you were created. 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 [probably a reference to the planets]. You were perfect in your ways from the day that you were created, until iniquity was found in you. By the multitude of your goods they have filled your



midst with violence, and you have sinned. So I cast you profaned from the height of God, and I destroy you, O covering cherub, from among the stones of fire.” Ezekiel 28:11-16, MKJV

“And another sign was seen in the heavens. And behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns and seven crowns on his heads! And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven [evidently one-third of all angels followed Satan in his rebellion], 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 12:3, 4, MKJV

There was an angelic rebellion and it is ongoing. Your author does not know whether the two Jehovahs were surprised, or not, but it is pretty likely they were very disappointed. To give created angelic beings life and then have one-third of them turn around and charge your throne in an attempt to depose you and take over the universe is very sad. And, as usual, bad choices set off a chain reaction of bad consequences. Your author has previously written a book on the subject of evil, and the angels’ role in it entitled, *The Source Of Evil*, and so will not write more here. What is

sometimes overlooked, however, are a few other scriptures pertaining to the angels.

"God does not trust his heavenly servants;  
he finds fault even with his angels."  
Job 4:18, TEV, Good News Bible

"Why, God does not trust even his angels;  
even they are not pure in his sight."  
Job 15:15, TEV, Good News Bible

Your author does not know if the above two scriptures are ONLY in reference to the one-third of the angels who participated in the rebellion, or if the above two scriptures apply to all of the angels. After all, if the wisest and most beautiful of them, the one who sealed the measure actually rebelled – what about the rest of them? Perhaps, over time and testing, the good angels have God's confidence in them restored. At this time, it is not knowable to humans. What is knowable to humans is this:

"But one testified in a certain place [Psalm 8], 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. ... ""  
Hebrews 2:6-8, MKJV

If the two Jehovahs do not trust the angels, and man is lower than the angels, then one does not have to think very hard to know that man has some things he must do to obtain the two Jehovahs' trust. What some of those things are, are explained in the following paragraphs.

One of the first things we can do is to correctly understand the context of the situation. The context of the situation is explained throughout the Bible. Genesis 1-3 sets up a lot of this context. Men are created beings and we were given the honor to be made in the image and likeness of God, the two Jehovahs. We were to have dominion over the earth, not each other. All men have sinned (Romans 3:23) and have brought themselves under the death penalty (Romans 6:23, Ezekiel 18:4). A Savior was provided in the person of the Word become flesh, Jesus Christ (John 1:1-17, John 3:16). There is a process to go through to have your sins forgiven and to be reconciled to God (Acts 2:38, Hebrews 6:1-2). And the result is that we are justified by faith (Romans 4:3, Romans 5:1-2), through God's

grace, and have peace with God. We are saved by faith. We are rewarded for our works. And we are encouraged and told that it is good work to seek for glory and honor and an incorruptible eternal life:

"who will render to each according to his works; indeed to those who with patience in good work are seeking for glory, and honor, and **incorruptibility, everlasting life.**"

Romans 2:6-7, MKJV

We can seek for an incorruptible eternal life and it is good work to do so.

Once we understand the context of the situation, we can and should choose to cooperate with the two Jehovahs in their divine individualism process. Doing so will not earn us salvation, but, in reality, it is the only credible (life giving) option available to us, and it will make things go much easier. It only stands to reason that we should reject the might makes right practices of the god of forces, Satan. We should do what the two Jehovahs said to do, in Deuteronomy 30:19, and to consciously adopt life and the package of values that come with it. In doing so we will be moving ourselves toward God and away from Satan. As we obtain more

of the moral and intellectual virtues we will become better people and make better decisions.

Within the context of staying within the rational and objective ethics of the two Jehovahs, we can embrace our individual uniqueness. **We have an obligation to become who only we can become AND to become the best unique individual that we can be.** We have to give each other, and ourselves, the space and the time to grow. As we are growing we will sometimes have setbacks, but we are no longer under condemnation (the death penalty). This means that we can grow, over time, with confidence:

"There is therefore now no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit." Romans 8:1, MKJV

As we participate in and cooperate with the two Jehovahs, in their divine individualism process, we will receive their help in the form of their Holy Spirit living within us and helping us to make progress. The fact that their Holy Spirit is within unique human beings is part of the reason why your author chose to coin the

phrase "divine individualism." The other main factor was consideration of the result of the process: incorruptible unique individuals with eternal life.

"Or do you not know that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit in you, whom you have of God? And you are not your own,"  
1 Corinthians 6:19, MKJV

"And now you also have heard the truth, the Good News that God saves you. And when you believed in Christ, he identified you as his own by giving you the Holy Spirit, whom he promised long ago. The Spirit is God's guarantee that he will give us everything he promised and that he has purchased us to be his own people. This is just one more reason for us to praise our glorious God."  
Ephesians 1:13-14, NLT

"being confident of this very thing, that He who has begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ [the day of the return of Jesus Christ - the resurrection],"  
Philippians 1:6, MKJV

We need to cooperate with the two Jehovahs, in their divine individualism process,

for three main reasons: 1) the divine individualism process is what we were created to go through, like an acorn growing into an oak tree; 2) they will not force our minds or hearts and so ultimately, our cooperation is a required part of the process; and 3) it is the only way to receive eternal life – the alternative being eternal death.

Everyone has made bad choices and experienced the negative consequences. The good news is **there is life after failure** - as a variety of scriptures affirm:

“O LORD,’ I prayed, ‘have mercy on me [King David]. Heal me, for I have sinned against you.” Psalms 41:4, NLT

“To every thing there is a season, and a time for every purpose under the heavens: a time to be born, and a time to die; a time to plant, and a time to pull up what is planted; a time to kill, and a time to heal; a time to break down, and a time to build up;” Ecclesiastes 3:1-3, MKJV

“if My people, who are called by My name, shall humble themselves and pray, and seek My face, and turn from their wicked ways, then I

will hear from Heaven and will forgive their sin and will heal their land."

2 Chronicles 7:14, MKJV

Since there is life after failure, and the two Jehovahs' goal is a ministry of reconciliation (2 Corinthians 5:19), if you have made mistakes you can: recognize them, admit them, repent, and change. Your life going forward can be different and better. You do not have to be a prisoner of your past.

Your author thinks that many truthers (with necessarily incomplete truther formulas) and also many intuitives seek to somehow capture or influence God for their side. They want to capture God for their side in order to be able to use God to change things to be the way they want them. They want to use God as a lever to move something they cannot move by themselves. The truthers sometimes tend to use a truth formula as a proper plea, almost like a lawyer would in a courtroom. The intuitives are more likely to count on their relationship with God and an emotional invocation. Many times, both are disappointed with the results. There is certainly nothing wrong with proper prayerful petitions to God and your author concedes that there are many things that only



God can do. None of this is the subject of this paragraph. The subject for this paragraph is the identification of a possible problem concerning the approach and particularly the emphasis. The emphasis on trying to capture God, and use him as a lever to change the world, is likely backward from what God is looking for. We should choose to cooperate with God, in the divine individualism process, and become better people so that instead of us trying to use God as a lever, God can use each one of us as a lever.

By going through the divine individualism process you will be able to obtain an answer to a question that is central to you ... Who am I? The two Jehovahs created you unique, and gave you permission to live, and to use your talents and abilities.

Evil men, out of control governments, loss-of-perspective religions, bad religions, gangs, and other assorted menaces can make your life very hard and prevent you from enjoying many things. They have wasted so much, of so many men's lives, that we will never know what might have been accomplished for the human race were it not for their lack of intelligence, lack of good character, and their hurtful actions.

However, what no one can permanently take away from you, is any of the following:

Your achievements

Your character

Your mind

Your personality

Your sense of humor

Your family and your friends – assuming they, too, participate with the two Jehovahs in their divine individualism process.

Satan, and those angels and men who follow him, might use either death, or the fear of death to coerce you, but please be reminded of the following scriptures:

“Because God’s children are human beings - made of flesh and blood - Jesus also became flesh and blood by being born in human form. For only as a human being could he die, and only by dying could he break the power of the Devil, who had the power of death. Only in this way could he deliver those who have lived all their lives as slaves to the fear of dying. We all know that Jesus came to help the descendants of Abraham, not to help the angels. Therefore, it was necessary for Jesus to be in every respect like us, his brothers and sisters, so that he could

be our merciful and faithful High Priest before God. He then could offer a sacrifice that would take away the sins of the people. Since he himself has gone through suffering and temptation, he is able to help us when we are being tempted." Hebrews 2:14-18, NLT

"Therefore, holy brothers, **called to be partakers of the heavenly calling** [divine individualism], consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus, who was faithful to Him who appointed Him, ... "  
Hebrews 3:1-2 MKJV

Satan can influence collectives to use men as fuel for their fires, but he cannot take away the two Jehovahs' resurrection promise:

"A Psalm of David. The LORD is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The LORD is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?" Psalms 27:1, MKJV

"Behold, I speak a mystery to you; we shall not all fall asleep, but we shall all be changed; in a moment, in a glance of an eye, at the last trumpet. For a trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall all be changed. For this corruptible must put on

incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. But when this corruptible shall put on incorruption, and when this mortal shall put on immortality, then will take place the word that is written, "**Death is swallowed up in victory.**" 1 Corinthians 15:51-54, MKJV

In the "Increasing The Importance Of Values" section of this book, it was previously mentioned that Satan is going to be destroyed. His fallen angels are going to be destroyed. All men who willfully choose Satan's death-generating value system are going to be destroyed (Revelation 21:8). There is no social theory of lying, or theft, or violence, or murder, or war. It is only fitting and just that the god of forces is forcibly destroyed. It is further just and fitting that the last enemy to be destroyed is death (1 Corinthians 15:26), and death is what Satan's values and ways produce. Might makes right destroys everyone and everything it touches.

If we refuse to consider the correct context of our situation, and if we refuse to look beyond the immediate now, we will not know the value and importance of what the two Jehovahs have offered to us. We run the risk of being the acorn that does not grow into the oak tree. We

run the risk of missing out on our individual uniqueness being developed and asserted in a constructive manner. We run the risk of missing out on an incorruptible eternal life.

Right now, your author would have to echo Ayn Rand's lament: "It takes years, if ever, to accept the notion that one lives among the not-fully-human; it is impossible to accept that notion in one's youth." The reason that men sometimes appear as not-fully-human is because they have rejected the two Jehovahs and are not participating with them in their divine individualism process. They have adopted the wrong value package and lack the virtues.

Rand had a further lament, which was along the lines of: "Nobody builds sanctuaries for the best of the human species." In the final analysis Rand will be wrong, because the two Jehovahs have promised to do so. And this is important to understand because all men of good will want to believe and know that there will be a place for them.

The Bible promises that the two Jehovahs will some day create a new heaven and a new earth, in essence, a new universe. An entire

new universe, complete with a brand new earth, more than qualifies as a nice sanctuary. They further promise that there will be no more death, or sorrow, or pain.

“And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be **no more death,** neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away. And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write: for these words are true and faithful.” Revelation 21:1-5, KJV

“And **every curse will no longer be**; but the throne of God [the Father] and of the Lamb [Jesus Christ] will be in it, and His servants will serve Him.” Revelation 22:3, MKJV

“Let not your heart be troubled. You believe in God, believe also in Me. In My Father’s house are many mansions; if it were not so, I [Jesus Christ] would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you to Myself, so that where I am, you may be also.”  
John 14:1-3, MKJV

God the Father and Jesus Christ are preparing a sanctuary. They are preparing a sanctuary for the very best of the human species, for those men and women who cooperate with them in their divine individualism process. The end result is that each one of us will become one of their divine masterpieces – unique, individual and incorruptible, with eternal life:

“For we are **God’s masterpiece.** He has created us anew in Christ Jesus, so that we can do the good things he planned for us long ago.”  
Ephesians 2:10, NLT