

The Great False Debate, Science vs. Religion

An enthusiastic proponent of creationism has built a full-scale replica of Noah's Ark, complete with built-in dining tables and large picture windows overlooking a scenic harbor in Schagen, Netherlands. Will he be fueling more than his own pocket with his grandiose icon to a great debate between science and religion?

The Great False Debate, Science vs. Religion

By Greg Gouradian, aka Grigori Rho Gharvey, etc, et al...

A dear friend from high school, and we do mean *high* school, sent us an amusing email containing pictures of a replica of Noah's Ark constructed in the Netherlands by an advocate of a Christian doctrine of creation.

This new ark measures up to the biblical proportions described in the old testament, but the builder's motives may not measure up to the hype he will almost certainly cash in on.

Where the animals' stalls on the upper decks should be this new ark has dining tables next to large picture windows overlooking a scenic harbor.

It looks like the only animals boarding this new-age version of Noah's Ark two-by-two will be people on dinner dates. This new ark will almost certainly be going into business as a tourist restaurant.

The builder stands to make a small fortune on his investment.

As for the builder's faith in their alleged god's creation, we prefer to try to take a middle-of-the-road approach...

We know how the big-bang theories work, we know how steady-state theories work, and we know how creation theories work.

As we see it, all three families of theories about how everything in the universe began may really be equally valid, and not at all mutually exclusive of one another. It is sad, really, how so many of the proponents of any of these three groups of theories will insist that their own pet theories are the only truth, exclusive of all other theories.

If you aren't familiar with the older steady-state theories, they were the leading scientific theories for how the universe came into existence before evidence accumulated that pointed to the big-bang theories. From our points of view both sets of theories are true; furthermore, as we see it, creation theories actually help explain how all three of these theoretical viewpoints can be equally valid.

The Great False Debate, Science vs. Religion

Steady-state theories say that matter is created and annihilated all the time, on a regular basis. The regular basis bit is the 'steady' part.

There is even physical evidence for the perpetual creation and annihilation of matter; how that evidence became overlooked or ignored when the big-bang theories became more popular seems a bit strange. However, it only seems strange until we examine how human minds work and understand that some of our confusion about how the physical properties of our universes work may be more the fault of how we think about them than a fault with how we measure or record the physical properties of the universes that we observe.

The whole issue of creation vs. evolution is part of this debate because many people seem to profit from or enjoy maintaining a perception that religion and science must be at war.

It may be the case that some religious people sincerely feel threatened by the opinions purported by scientists; such people may sometimes seem too reactive or too defensive when attempting to debate these issues.

Some people may even behave in an actively hostile manner in response to feeling threatened. Many faithful people may really see themselves at war with science with regard to theories about how the universe is created, or how various species of plants or animals may appear to have evolved.

However, to presume that the entire field of knowledge collectively known as religion is fairly or truthfully characterized by the points of view of those religious people who try to represent themselves as authorities on such matters is a potentially hazardous false premise.

Characterizing the alleged conflict between science and religion as a war serves all sides of these debates by making their opposing issues more dramatically or emotionally appealing to members of the general public whose predispositions may already make them more inclined to agree with one side or another in this great false debate.

There are political and sociological reasons why it is advantageous to maintain an illusory, false presumption that a state of war exists between science and religion. Human minds are easily misled into making such precariously predicated presumptions; particularly presumptions based on patterns of perception that heavily rely upon either-or principles of duality or exclusivity.

Human minds are uncomfortable when they believe there is something they should know that they have no authentic knowledge of. Most people prefer to believe they know the truth, regardless of the actual truth content of whatever 'truths' they may choose to hold above all other alleged truths.

The Great False Debate, Science vs. Religion

Without a consistent belief that they know the truth most people may tend to feel insecure.

People with a vested interest in their own peace-of-mind often fall into the trap of making false presumptions, especially when there is a pre-existing history of earlier false presumptions that has a strong cultural presence. These culturally established histories can be irrationally misused for fictitious, seemingly logical validations of an individual's personally chosen beliefs.

Such doctrinal supports are fictitious validations because they are tautological arguments, arguments that refer to themselves for evidence of their own validity.

Creationism, for example, may be seen in one context as only a story used to help people overcome their fears of not knowing all the answers by explaining the origins of the universe to them in terms they will probably understand, in terms they may often find more easily acceptable because of the weight of authority of past generations of believers.

Is there really any literal truth to the biblical story of creation?

We strongly doubt it; however, we do not discount the possibility that there may be both literal and metaphorical truth to some parts of any or all creation myths regardless of whether these myths are scientific or religious in nature.

In one sense, we doubt Christian creation myths may be true simply because so many other cultures have very different creation stories. Why should any one culture have an exclusive lock on the truth?

More than likely, there is metaphorical truth to all creation stories; possibly all creation myths may converge somehow to point in the direction of something that may be a truer story of how our universes were created.

Alas, too many people only want to validate stories that support their own personally chosen collections of beliefs. Therefore, each culture appears threatening to other cultures because the truths each culture chooses to uphold often appear to be in conflict with the purported truths of other cultures.

The conflict over creationism or the origins of the universes, a conflict that is part of a larger context of conflicts between science and religion, exists, in part, because of a cognitive habit of perceiving things in dualistic or exclusive terms.

Dualism is a process whereby we contrast things in our minds to try to get a clearer understanding of them.

The Great False Debate, Science vs. Religion

The most extreme contrasts of any subject are typically considered to be polar opposites. Unfortunately many people choose to mistakenly characterize polar opposites as also being mutually exclusive.

When it comes to truth, this means that lazy minds will want to accept one truth exclusively of all others. Not all polar opposites are mutually exclusive pairs; we suspect that most are not. However, when it comes to how people often prefer to regard what they believe to be true, most people fall into the presumption that their own beliefs are true, and then extend this false presumption to conclude that any conflicting beliefs must necessarily be false.

Considering things in terms of the co-existence of apparently opposite properties takes a lot more cognitive effort than does the process of choosing to accept one truth and then invalidating all other optional truths that appear to disagree. It is a hell of a lot easier to operate your mind by using an exclusivity principle borrowed from duality paradigms than it is to consider the complex inter-relationships of many partial truths such as those found in metaphors or allegories.

Consequently, cognitive laziness exists on all sides of any debate; this plays a big role in maintaining an attitude that there must be a war between science and religion because most people learn to prefer simple, routine shortcuts in their cognitive processes, regardless of the validity of their adopted truths.

Politics also plays a big role in maintaining publically accepted alleged truths.

The cultures of some faiths appear to rely on common sense more than doctrine, while the cultures of some other faiths may seem to rely more on doctrine than common sense. In particular, this appears to typify the differences between eastern and western religions, even though they all see themselves favorably.

The faiths of the western holy trinity (Judaism, Christianity, and Islam) all appear to rely on doctrine more than common sense, regardless of how far-fetched their doctrines may seem to be to people from different faiths.

The social expense of maintaining a culture based on what some people may regard as patently false premises can be enormously high. Islam, Judaism, and Christianity may pay part of that high overhead price by making themselves open to criticisms that their doctrines may sometimes appear to be irrational.

Why would they choose to pay such a high price?

In part, their choices have to do with maintaining their cultural investments. They have deep investments in supporting their doctrines; a huge amount of cultural inertia, so staying the course often appears far cheaper than making any changes, particularly if those changes are likely to appear equally irrational.

The Great False Debate, Science vs. Religion

In part, cultures are motivated to pay a heavy overhead price for a doctrinal approach that may seem to fly in the face of common sense because their extreme positions have political advantages. For one thing, their doctrinal approaches make it easier to identify people who have been successfully culturally conditioned or brain-washed into being a true believer and people who might seem to be radical free-thinkers; people they may regard as a threat.

Also, a doctrinal approach is benefits by false affirmation. Member of religious cultures can point to their holy of holies, a Bhagavad-Gita, Talmud, Quran, Bible, or other tome sanctified by their authorities, to say, "Look, it says so right here!"

This approach is great for lazy minds; no thinking is required (or desired). If their holy scriptures say something is true then it must be true.

Not.

Part of the problem is that free-thinking minds are dangerous. Training people not to think but instead to blindly accept is critical to most western cultures and their religions; this may also be true of many or most eastern cultures.

Western governments have a vested interest in supporting church doctrines, overtly or covertly, because when people are successfully brainwashed not to think critically in one area of their lives, the habit of non-critical thinking may be easily, and more importantly, habitually applied to many other areas.

Non-critical thinking is comforting, it is seductive; it can deceive people into believing they are thinking for themselves when really they are only parroting what they have been trained to allege to believe. Therefore, regardless of whether they take a liberal or conservative approach to their local politics, many lazy-minded people who choose to adopt religious doctrines inadvertently condition themselves to be conservative supporters of their own governments as a consequence. It doesn't really matter which sort of religious or political opinions people hold, so long as they participate and believe they are supporters.

The doctrinal approach is actually reasonably easy to maintain in terms of social costs if you know the right tricks to manipulate the minds of the general public. Because a doctrinal approach requires people to lay aside their common sense, their rational minds need outlets. The allegedly rational discussion of irrational questions is one of the best ways to go about sublimating the needs of an irrational populace to make them appear more rational to themselves.

Debates about whether or not our governments are in collusion with extra-terrestrials or terrorists are good examples of 'rational' debates of issues that many people might dismiss as irrational. The perception of a war between science and religion, when viewed from this context, is seen to be another

The Great False Debate, Science vs. Religion

example whereby the public's need to appear rational to themselves may be sublimated by debating an irrational question.

The question being debated is not irrational simply because one of the many opinions put forth might really be both true and exclusive of all the other opinions; instead, the question debated is irrational because the premise *that only one side can represent the truth* is false.

The three major sides of the issue of Creationism vs. Big-Bang vs. Steady State need not be mutually exclusive. Only our own lazy-minded preferences for deliberately, albeit mistakenly, seeing things in black-and-white, either-or terms of mutually exclusive beliefs, helps make any position in this debate appear to be rational to its own proponents.

Because applying rational processes of debate to irrational questions is often very entertaining, it is relatively easy to manipulate people to maintain their own brainwashing by inveigling them into joining in these pointless, interminable pseudo-debates. This helps reduce the social overhead expenses of maintaining convenient fictional truths through a doctrinal approach by placing more of the upkeep expense upon the minds and bodies of the participating true believers.

Are any of the many sides of the creationism debate in any way genuinely exclusive of any or all others? We are pretty sure they are not. However, proponents of each side of these debates find it convenient to keep the question firmly locked into a false premise that their own believers must have an exclusive lock on the truth, a truth that necessarily invalidates all other competing beliefs.

Either-or is a much less expensive cognitive approach than is the and-maybe-and- maybe-and- maybe... approach.

Successful brainwashing typically requires a powerful emotional investment to help motivate the subjects to maintain their own brainwashing. From the points of view of believers in doctrines of any stripe, even scientific doctrines, it doesn't really matter which emotions are manipulated to help motivate true-believers, the important thing is the *intensity* of the emotion involved.

A person might like to think that attractive emotions such as peace, love, joy, or gratitude should have equal standings, as emotional motivators, with suspicion, fear, anger, or hatred, however it turns out to be far easier to manipulate hostile, 'negative' emotions for the purposes of social conditioning.

Love, compassion, gratitude, or joy may be considered far more personal or private emotions, while suspicion, fear, anger, and hatred are emotions that people seem to share more easily, especially with complete strangers.

The Great False Debate, Science vs. Religion

This makes the social cost of a doctrinal approach heavier for true-believers and lighter for any alleged 'authorities' trusted with maintaining their true believers' doctrinal beliefs. The cost is higher to the believer because it is easier to manipulate large masses of people with negative emotions, and those negative emotions can cause harm to the people who are manipulated to feel them.

Consequently, religions, states, and other large social institutions often develop a deeply vested interest in keeping their subject populations in a constant state of anxiety by promoting a perpetual state of suspicion, fear, anger, or hatred.

Suspicion, fear, anger, and hatred take a heavy toll on human health in many dimensions, physiologically, socially, economically, ecologically, politically, and so forth... This toll on human health helps maintain states of anxiety that are continuously manipulated by social organizations to train people to maintain their own suspicion, fear, anger, and hatred on their behalf.

Negative reinforcement is a powerful and sickening social conditioning tool. Sickening negative reinforcement can initiate a self-perpetuating spiral of dangerous cognitive and emotional habits that may become a runaway condition within which the trend to become sicker accelerates.

An accelerating sickening trend can more easily turn into a viciously revolving, downwardly spiraling trend leading to the total collapse of an entire social system and its constituent members; for instance, the fate of the Nazi socialist movement in the previous century. Individually, many people may experience this sort of collapsing wave front on a microcosmic scale ahead of a collapse of the macrocosmic wave front that may develop into the complete collapse of their current social order and all of its' related, publicly-maintained infrastructures.

While it is possible that this sort of collapse process may avoid a complete disaster, the risk that the general public may experience a complete collapse of their social systems and their physical infrastructures may seem very high.

A partial collapse of segments of public infrastructures and other social systems tends to benefit the designated authorities responsible for maintaining political and religious doctrines; people faced with the collapse of their social or economic infrastructures may more reliably fall back upon their faith or cultural conditioning in times of severe stress, thereby reinforcing their beliefs with strong emotions.

It is important to remember that all social systems acquire a great deal of inertia with regard to their means and objectives; it is typically very difficult to deliberately or rationally change how societies function or maintain their morale.

One of the destabilizing influences presently accelerating a potential breakdown of social structures everywhere, at this time, is the accelerating evolution of

The Great False Debate, Science vs. Religion

communication tools, particularly the global internet, but also schools, libraries, cell phones, camcorders, faxes, etc...

As an antigen, as a way of slowing down the viral spread of foreign ideas that may destabilize local social orders, some regions may want to shut down internet access and other social media to try to reduce their vulnerability to culture shock. However, by the time the threat posed by the social media can be addressed too much damage may already have been done.

Information and disinformation only increase, so censoring or shutting down social media infrastructures may already be too late in many or most cases.

Another antigen against the impact of conflicting information spread by social media is the deliberate or delusional proliferation of false information.

Information may often only appear to be a threat if it appears to be reliable.

Many social institutions may deliberately proliferate a deluge of false information to obscure any purported truths to their own advantage.

The truth is already far stranger than many people are prepared to believe, however anything anyone might seriously regard as the truth will tend to blend into the confusion of competing information or disinformation alleged to be truths so that any or all potentially reliable information appears suspect because of its association with popular lies.

Whatever the truth may really be is not something that anyone can ever define for anyone other than for themselves. Each person may do their best to try to describe the truth in their own eyes, however each person may only ever judge for themselves what they will choose to believe is true.

The pursuit of any truth is a something of a con game.

The purpose of the con-game aspect of the pursuit of truth is to train people to think illogically, but at the same time believe they are being logical.

It may really be the case that no one can know the truth about anything, not even a supposed truth about themselves.

However, many people find it intolerable to believe that they most likely do not really know what is true. Nearly all people appear to have been conditioned to be afraid of not knowing what the alleged truth may be.

The elusive nature of the truth appears to make it far easier to adopt a commonly held popular belief in whatever the truth may be purported to be, regardless of its

The Great False Debate, Science vs. Religion

genuine truth-value, rather than risk admitting to ourselves that we may not really know what the truth may really be.

We learn to agonize ourselves over the details of specious arguments, debating various truths that may often be desperately, feverishly upheld, in order to keep ourselves distracted from the frightful possibility that neither ourselves nor anyone else can ever really know the truth.

While it may be impossible to define a genuine universal truth of any sort, it is always possible to define an opinion of the truth as we see it for ourselves.

An opinion about what the truth may be may be all that any person is capable of expressing without resorting to sly or aggressive tactics that may ultimately amount to no more than a pack of lies espoused to maintain a fiction that they are the wise and knowledgeable masters of their own destinies.

In our opinions, all people will always be the masters of their own destinies.

We do not need to know what is true in any universal sense in order to achieve our greatest ambitions, fulfill our fondest dreams, or manifest our hearts' desires.

For all of these things each person's private, personal truths should be enough.

We therefore advise that you do not surrender your own personal truth whatever it may be. Instead, uphold your truth *to yourself* at all times. However, we also advise you to respect the truths of all others at all times; you never know what you may learn.

The more we learn, individually and collectively, the more we empower ourselves to define better worlds; we learn to empower ourselves to heal our lives and to share our healing with everyone we love.

The tendency for people to drive their social and physical infrastructures to collapse is better understood today than it may ever have been in the past. We may now be better prepared to prevent future collapses, and be better prepared to mitigate the consequences of our current issues.

We may now be ready to make a better world for all of us together with no one left behind.

Enjoy!

Love, Grigori Rho Gharvey

aka the Grigs, Greg Gourdian, Chameleon, Roger Holler, et al...

BIO:

Hello Reader,

We have been collectively known by the name Greg Gourdian for the purposes of publishing our articles. We perceive ourselves as a group of people spanning many worlds and universes; we seem to cohabitate many bodies, however we appear to have only one body here in this world we share with you now.

We worked with the general public as a psychic reader for a little over four years from 1981 to 1986.

Much of our written work has been channeled; however we must often admit that we have no idea to whom the many voices of our channeled works may belong.

We have many strange tales to tell regarding our spiritual journeys. We try to tell our tales in a humorous, engaging, or entertaining manner.

In high-school we channeled for classes in metaphysics & parapsychology, and attempted to teach classes in sociology and psychology.

We are still emerging from the closet in regard to being a collective of many people inhabiting what appears to be a single body in the context of the world we appear to share with you. Our current written works reflect this emerging change in self-perception by adopting plural forms of reference to ourselves that may not always be used consistently, particularly in our older work.

Using plural forms of self-reference helps us to develop a greater awareness of ourselves as a collective of individuals, as well as conveying to other people how we perceive ourselves.

We hope you will understand if we may sometimes sound awkward or conceited as a consequence of making this adjustment in how we refer to ourselves.

Our collective's primary beliefs share the ideals that justice is best served by not judging, and that love and liberty should be shared equally by everyone.

Namaste