

Chapter 4: Seeking Wisdom

In life it is our ability to question, which guides us to seek the truth in all things. However in order to seek the truth we must tune our minds into another frequency as previously mentioned. It is our desire to question life itself that demonstrates our desire to tune in to the correct frequency required to understand the truth. We must be willing to see beyond all of the information we have received from society. We must remove from our minds all of the second hand opinions which we have assimilated from our peers, and begin to question the truth behind their statements.

This is the very point where people can become divided. Our own personal desires can influence the knowledge that we can understand. Consider the person who seeks status and power. They tune their thoughts to seek the ways of society, conduct and ambition. They may never consider questioning the origin of life because their determination to succeed is more important to them.

I have always been more concerned with understanding the nature of existence, things that we cannot see or comprehend, philosophy and spiritual thought more than my career and social status. This separates me from those who seek status and power. Those people will happily consider the teachings provided by science as fact simply because it aids their social status to appear educated. However those who desire to know the truth and to seek true wisdom have the ability and desire to question the logic and plausibility behind these and all teachings.

Is it completely correct to consider that the life and the universe itself came into existence by chance? That the complexity and design of this planet alone just happened to form this way? Could we prove this to be completely true? Of course not. However our understanding of this depends upon our mindset. Are we seeking easy answers that conform to our desires or are we seeking the truth?

The Bible states that God created the Earth and the Universe. This is difficult to perceive, as our traditional comprehension of God seems a little narrow minded. Most people would conjure images of a large bearded face and the universe being formed by giant hands. After all, this is the exact example, which is portrayed to us by television. This imagery creates a sense of falseness when we consider the true complexity and beauty of this world and the universe. However. Does this stereotype cause us to dismiss the creation of the universe by God? Or does it allow us to consider the possibility that this explanation is more complex and meaningful than we have ever considered?

Consider the mindset of Evolutionary thought versus that of a Creationists point of view. If we consider the possibility of the creation of the earth by God it is difficult for us to comprehend how a being may have created this, as we cannot perceive any physical evidence to justify this claim. Therefore an evolutionary mind would consider that all things came into existence by chance, i.e. it just happened to work out this way and everything fell into balance. This is where wisdom supersedes knowledge. If we consider both arguments we can see that perhaps the creationist view may need to be expanded. As it will be discussed later, the Bible states that God is spirit. A spiritual being with no physical form. Therefore how could a spiritual being create? Or how could we perceive His physical presence?

If we consider the complexity of our ecosystem, and the species on this planet and ponder how all things come into balance and how everything appears to be cyclic in nature, i.e. weather systems,

planetary orbits and the growth of life itself and how every system supports each other to sustain life. We as living beings are incorporated into this existence and as a result of this we may not be able to consider how it was created, but the more we examine this system, the more apparent it becomes that there may be a consciousness behind all that we perceive. It is entirely possible that God, as a spiritual being formed life, the universe and this very planet through His consciousness, by designing and implementing all that we see in ways which we could not perceive.

Consider how scientists smash atoms using particle accelerators. If we were inside the accelerator we would be able to perceive this event taking place. However we would be unaware that there was a conscious being causing these events to take place. Therefore as we exist inside the universe it becomes more difficult to consider its creation unless the creator himself told us of His existence. This causes us a dilemma, as it may be impossible for us as physical beings living within the universe to fully interact with the spiritual creator being who created it. Therefore this leaves all knowledge of Him open for debate. Hence faith.

The philosophy of science would cause us to disregard the consideration of a creator because we have no complete proof. However the person who has wisdom must understand that this consideration must not be eliminated simply because we cannot satisfy ourselves by validating it using scientific methods. The truly wise person could not disregard the teachings of the Bible, as there is a possibility that they may be the truth. The truly wise person is prepared to consider the origin and validity of its teachings before accepting or rejecting them. Therefore we will not seek to be like other people in this world who never consider these issues, who simply accept the teachings of other people, and second hand opinions, which have no basis in truth, and we will choose to examine the teachings for ourselves and satisfy our own curiosities.

Wisdom teaches us that if something is true, and that truth can threaten peoples way of life or core beliefs, those people, who are threatened, will attempt to remove the truth using as many different methods as possible. For example if there is one truth then there must be many lies, where there are lies there also exists hidden agendas. From the beginning of Christian history religious institutions have emerged, which have taken the words of the Bible and misquoted them for their own evil gain. Consider the crusades, witch burning, and persecution of the Jews. Also consider how the scriptures themselves were communicated in Latin for many years, which caused only well educated people to be able to understand them, while other less fortunate people were left in ignorance, simply conforming to a rituals they did not understand or comprehend. This is an offensive system of control that unfortunately still exists today. Not forgetting the thousands of people on this earth today who are persecuted, some even to death for their beliefs. Shamefully there are those in the free world who depend upon people's complete apathy to disseminate lies. This is true for the Christian as well as the scientist. This method of control completely depends upon our lack of desire to seek evidence for their claims. Ignorance demands more than tolerance, it also demands silence, and blind acceptance.

If a priest or preacher states something to be a truth from the Bible and it is not who will question it? Only those who pick up the Bible for themselves and research what has been mentioned could determine whether what they had stated was the truth or a lie. The same applies to the scientist. Only people who are educated in the teachings of science and are willing and able to research their claims could determine if a stated fact is actually true or whether it is speculation. True wisdom is gained through learning, understanding and experience. Only if we begin to question what we

understand as knowledge and to discover the facts for ourselves can we gain true wisdom. Therefore we must pick up the books and verify what we are taught by others to determine whether it is truth or a lie, which is being used for another person's agenda.

The complete overview of the arguments from both sides can be determined by realizing that neither Christians nor Scientists claim to have complete definitive and provable answers to the origins of the universe and life itself. It is merely the portrayal of the media that gives the impression that Science is ultimately correct, and Christian teachings are outdated and incorrect. Christians claim that the Bible is the ultimate truth. This claim cannot be proven using scientific methods but it is rather a question of faith. We must read the words and determine if they are truthful using our own methods of deduction and apply the teachings within to our own life experience. Scientists claim that theories (e.g.: Evolution and The Big Bang) are correct because there is some evidence to suggest that they are fact. However there is no complete proof for these theories. Therefore the scientists are also unable to claim that they are correct. True wisdom can be gained by studying all of these theories, and teachings, and understanding them. For example: Do the teachings of creation in the Bible contradict the teachings of science? On further inspection this is simply not the case. Scientific theories attempt to explain what happened but do not contradict the testimony that an intelligent creator caused these events to take place. It is however suggested by the media that the teachings of science disprove the teachings of the Bible without providing true evidence for their claims. Note how television programs refer to the Theory of Evolution as "Evolution" (the word theory is dropped as it is assumed to be true without complete evidence to suggest that it is fact). Also counter evolutionary theories are being slowly removed and discredited.

Like many other people I was locked into a mindset of believing that scientific teachings contradicted the teachings of the Bible. When my closest friend Nestor discussed with me the similarities between Stephen Hawking's teachings (A Brief History of Time) to those of the account of creation in the Bible I was surprised. Our discussions were more involved than I am able to portray, as he is a man who has studied many scientific principles. Therefore I would suggest, as with all the research that has been mentioned thus far, that you obtain a copy of this book and explore these findings individually as you may be able to gain more insight than I am able to provide.

Consider the following quotations from Stephen Hawking's book. A Brief History of Time, which is a well-respected book detailing scientific reasoning for explaining the origins of the universe.

"At the big bang itself the universe is thought to have had zero size, and so to have been infinitely hot. But as the universe expanded, the temperature of the radiation decreased. One second after the big bang, it would have fallen to about ten thousand times the temperature at the centre of the sun"

Hawking (1988) p117

"There are, however, other primitive forms of life that can flourish under such conditions. It is thought that they developed in the oceans, possibly as a result of chance combinations of atoms into large structures, called macromolecules, which were capable of assembling other atoms in the ocean into similar structures"

Hawking (1988) p120

Notice the use of some of the words in these quotations. Hawking's uses phrases that suggest an element of speculation. For example: "...it **would** have fallen..." and "...primitive forms of life that **can** flourish under such conditions..." To state that it "would" is not to say that it "did". Notice the difference in the language used here. Hawking's does not claim to provide definitive answers but he is stating current scientific thought as to what they reason to have taken place.

Let us now consider the account of creation as told in the first book of the Bible. Also let us consider that scientific principles do not exclude the possibility of creation by God but attempt to explain what actually took place. It is the perception of the media, and those who hold an atheistic viewpoint who attempt to convince us that scientific findings point to the non-existence of God, which they cannot prove to be true. When we examine some of the accounts of Genesis we can perceive some quite interesting and relevant information. Consider the following passage:

*"1 In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.
2 The earth was without form, and void; and darkness was on the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God was hovering over the face of the waters.
3 Then God said, "Let there be light"; and there was light.
4 And God saw the light, that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness.
5 God called the light Day, and the darkness He called Night. So the evening and the morning were the first day.
6 Then God said, "Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters."
7 Thus God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament; and it was so.
8 And God called the firmament Heaven. So the evening and the morning were the second day.*

Genesis 1:1-8 (NKJV)

Notice how this passage speaks with absolute authority. Unlike Hawking's text there are no hints of theory or speculation. The creation is centred on the actions of God, and the formation of the universe from an earth centred perspective. It is important to realise that this creation account is thousands of years old yet current scientific knowledge cannot disprove it. Consider the following text from Hawking's book:

"The earth was initially very hot and without an atmosphere. In the course of time it cooled and acquired an atmosphere from the emission of gasses from the rocks. This early atmosphere was not one in which we could have survived. It contained no oxygen, but a lot of other gasses that are poisonous to us, such as hydrogen sulphide (the gas that gives rotten eggs their smell)."

Hawking (1988) p120

There is a noticeable similarity between the two accounts. Hawking's agrees with the Genesis account that the earth was without form (or the earth was initially very hot, hence there could not have been any form as the surface would have been molten). Genesis and Hawking's work both

agree that the earth was without an atmosphere during its early stages of creation. Verses 6-8 mention that God created a firmament. The dictionary defines firmament as the sky or heavens, considered as an arch. Therefore just as Hawkings account suggests that the earth did not have an atmosphere at one time, the Genesis account mentions that the earth did not have a sky (no sky = no atmosphere) Therefore by comparing these two texts we can see that there is truly no contradictory argument between scientific thinking and the biblical account as we may have been lead to believe by media, some scientists, and perhaps our peers.

Now we can understand that the contradictions, which we may have assumed to be true, may not actually exist. True wisdom is gained by understanding that there is always more than one side to a discussion, argument, or dispute. However those who hold an atheistic viewpoint have endeavoured to remove any counter arguments. One of the most common attacks on the belief in a Creator God is the Creation vs. Evolution debate. Atheists constantly use evolutionary theories to discredit the existence of God by assuming that life formed and developed by a series of coincidences and chance, which seems ludicrous when we consider the immense complexity of this universe, our world, the species of life on our planet, and even the delicate balance of our eco-system as we have previously discussed.

One of the most major counter-arguments to evolution has never been addressed within our education system, and most people are unaware of its existence. As a result of this we were unable to form a completely balanced opinion of the Creation vs. Evolution debate. Let us now discuss this so that we may be able to gain a better understanding of all the relevant information, which has been quietly withheld from us during our education.

A man called William Paley wrote a piece called Natural Theology, which was first published in July 1802 approximately 57 years before Charles Darwin's Origin of the Species. His work discusses and supports the theory of intelligent creation, which is a complete counter-argument to evolutionary theory. However his work is currently not addressed by our education system and as a result has been largely unnoticed with the exception of one of his earlier works entitled "A View of the Evidence of Christianity" which was published in 1874 and was required reading at Cambridge University until the latter part of the 20th Century. Paley's work suggests that the nature, purpose and personality of God can be understood by observing creation in the natural world, and through this we can consider the complexity of life, its eco-systems, and the mechanics of nature itself, which allows us to perceive the intelligent design by our creator. Consider the following quotation:

"In crossing a heath, suppose I pitched my foot against a stone, and were asked how the stone came to be there: I might possibly answer, that, for any thing I knew to the contrary, it had lain there for ever; nor would it perhaps be very easy to show the absurdity of this answer. But suppose I had found a watch upon the ground, and it should be inquired how the watch happened to be in that place; I should hardly think of the answer which I had before given,- that, for any thing I knew, the watch might have always been there. Yet why should this answer serve for the watch as well as for the stone? Why is it not admissible in the second case as in the first? For this reason and for no other, viz. that, when we come to inspect the watch we perceive (what we could not discover in the stone) that its several parts are framed and put together for a purpose, e.g. that they are so formed and adjusted as to produce motion, and that motion so regulated as to point out the hour of the day; that, if the different parts had been differently shaped from what they are, of a different size from

what they are, or placed after any other manner, or in any other order, than that in which they are placed, with no motion at all would have been carried on in the machine, or non which would have answered the use that is now served by it. To recon up a few of the plainest of these parts, and their offices, all tending to one result:- We see a cylindrical box containing a coiled elastic spring, which by its endeavour to relax itself, turns round the box. We next observe a flexible chain (artificially wrought for the sake of flexure) communicating the action of the spring from the box to the fusee. We then find a series of wheels, the teeth of which catch in, and apply to, each other, conducting the motion from the fusee to the balance and from the balance to the pointer: and at the same time, by the size and shape of those wheels, so regulating that motion, as to terminate in causing an index, by an equable motion....”

“....This mechanism being observed (it requires indeed an examination of the instrument and perhaps some previous knowledge of the subject to perceive and understand it; but being once, as we have said, observed and understood), the inference we think is inevitable, that the watch must have had a maker: that there must have existed, at some time, and at some place or other, an artificer or artificers who formed it for the purpose which we find it actually to answer: who comprehend its construction, and designed its use”

Paley (1825) p1-2

This is quite an interesting perspective that Paley portrays. Consider the impact this can have on our perception of this world, the universe and its origins. The main issue that Paley is attempting to explain is that when we consider the complexity of life, its diversity and systematic form it is ludicrous to speculate that it happened to be this way because of chance. The complexity of life points to an intelligent creator. It may seem plausible to us when we hear scientists via the mainstream media attempting to convince us that life formed as a series of chance happenings but when we begin to rationalise this argument using Paley’s philosophy we understand that this is highly unlikely. It is this argument and this mode of thought which completely contradicts an atheistic mindset and progresses towards, and even beyond, a more agnostic direction in the sense that we begin to perceive that there is a greater possibility of God or some kind of supreme being existing who created all things. Paley uses the example of the eye to further develop his argument for the case of intelligent design. Consider the following:

“Sturmius held, that the examination of the eye was a cure for atheism. Besides that conformity to optical principles which its internal constitution displays, and which alone amounts to a manifestation of intelligence having been exerted in the structure; besides this, which forms no doubt, the leading character of the organ, there is to be seen, in every thing belonging to it and about it, an extraordinary degree of care, an anxiety for its preservation, due, if we may so speak, to its value and its tenderness...”

Paley (1825) p23

Could something as complex and useful as an eye have formed by chance? Paley deeply considers its design and function in length and uses this example to demonstrate the likelihood of intelligent design similar to the example of the watch on the beach. By his transference of this analogy to a device which was not made by human hands (the eye) we can see that the same argument is

applicable. We could either consider that this complex machinery formed as a chance result of an evolutionary process or that each particular model of eye was specifically designed by a creator to meet the visionary requirements of each creature. Paley also considers the consequences of chance happenings within the natural world and our own bodies and makes an interesting conclusion. Consider the following:

"I desire no greater certainty in reasoning, than that by which chance is excluded from the present disposition of the natural world. Universal experience is against it. What does chance ever do for us? In the human body, for instance, chance, i.e. the operation of causes without design, may produce a wen, a wart, a mole, a pimple, but never an eye. Amongst inanimate substances, a clod, a pebble, a liquid drop, might be; but never was a watch, a telescope, an organised body of any kind, answering a valuable purpose by a complicated mechanism, the effect of chance. In no assignable instance hath such a thing existed without intention somewhere."

Paley (1825) p44

If we consider the chance occurrences which can take place within our own bodies and the natural world Paley concludes that there does not exist an example of a complex formation, but rather imperfections, or basic formations which do not contain the complexities and purpose of those which can be considered to have been intelligently designed. Therefore when we consider Paley's conclusions it seems less plausible that life could have formed by chance, and evolutionary processes, but rather that life and the universe itself has been designed and created by a supreme and intelligent being which leads us to consider the existence of a Creator God.

If we again consider our education, the information we receive from the mainstream media and even the opinions and assumed knowledge of our peers, it is apparent that the arguments are biased. Why does our education system ignore the teachings of Paley? This would be a perfect counterargument to the Theory of Evolution. Currently we are educated to understand that the belief in a God is a religious choice and the understanding of scientific principles is an intellectual requirement. The two become separate rather than opposite. We are taught to accept religious belief in order to avoid offending people who belong to these groups but never to question their validity. Therefore the world seems to speak to us in this manner. "Do not consider the existence of a god because these ideals are old fashioned compared to our advanced understanding. Respect other peoples beliefs and understand their cultures so we can better integrate with each other, but you should never question their values or teachings." However wisdom speaks to tell us "Question, understand and learn. Consider all the facts and make your own judgments. Only consider the truth and reject uninformed opinions. Knowledge may not have been given to us but we can find it for ourselves. Therefore leave no stone unturned and consider all things. Then you will know the truth." Therefore because we have not been given impartial teaching in these matters we must discover these things for ourselves and understand that there is a possibility of God existing, and that some scientific teachings may be incomplete and misleading.