

From Physics to Metaphysics; From Feynman to God:

A look at how physical laws/truth points to metaphysical truth, especially as metaphysics speaks to the issue of the existence of God.

***Addenda:** with notes/comments regarding the SETI Project and its parallels to Metaphysics and the reality of God

First, let me begin by apologizing for the inevitable errors one brings into any discussion when the subjects are as deep and far-reaching as physics and metaphysics. I would be out of my league even if I were an expert in both (I am in neither). My great joy in life is theology and its practical implications to everyday people, yet even in this field I am no great scholar – just a preacher. This work is an attempt to deal, in an “everyday way,” with an issue that confronts all Christians at one time or another; science, of which physics is a part, and metaphysics, of which religion is a part. Thus, for those who know more than I in either, especially physics, I ask for longsuffering and a touch of sympathy. My request is to overlook any errors (which if there are errors, I believe they are inconsequence to the overall argument), to see ideas of consequence as one thinks of the truths of physics, and the possibility of a “Physik,” or physics-maker, God.

Second, I ask for patience, because it will take a little time to work from physics, to metaphysics, to my real interest, the evidence and logic of God being the sovereign guiding Person of this universe full of “physics” (e.g., laws that we see governing our physical universe).

My thoughts/meditations which lead to my stated conclusions are based on having looked at the physical universe and its physical activity, in particular as reflected in a work by Richard Feynman, “The Character of Physical Law.” I have realized conclusions which I believe are logically true – more, inevitably true from the evidence of the physical universe and its verities. Further, *if* it be found that metaphysical “law”/truths are greater in describing our universe, God, the ultimate metaphysical truth, is not just possible/probable, but more, the idea that His presence and sovereign will purposely driving the realities of our universe is, I believe, an assured reality. Indeed, I judge that only the truth of God can explain what exists properly and accurately (and thus my title).

I must again express at the outset indebtedness to a classic work that stirred my thinking on physics – Richard Feynman’s, “The Character of Physical Law.” It is his detail in dealing with many an issue, in particular the law of the attraction of heavenly bodies:

$$\text{(or, in the language of math, } F = G \frac{mm^1}{r^2}\text{)}$$

By his discussion, Feynman speaks to the laws of the material universe (in the above case, the attraction of heavenly bodies), and this is what I am speaking to when I am speaking of physics. If I might paraphrase many physics experts at once – and in one phrase – Physics is all that is included in describing the “hows” of the universe, **precluding the “supernatural.”** These issues are the themes Feynman deals with in his beloved work. This particular truth reflected in our above formula, Feynman calls “elegant” in its simplicity, which is simple for him to say (I think I would give six bits easy if I understood it). But there it is – a clear example of physical law; a description of the universe as observed over the years by many a scientist, and giving us the essence of “how” something observed acts via the *language* of physics, elucidating the “hows” of this physical universe – *mathematics*.

Axioms and Definitions

With apologies regarding any repetitions, let us make sure of our definitions and terms prior to digging into the meat of our discussion.

First, with regard to physical law, that which is described as “eloquent” (and described eloquently by Mr. Feynman), physics is an exposition of the **“HOWS”** of this universe: *how* is it that planets revolve; how we prove this and other laws; how do planetary and other bodies attract; *how* does distance and a hundred other factors affect such “laws” as the attraction of planets...these are physics/”how” questions.

What I would have you burn into your minds for this particular work ***is that physics and its truths tell us “how” things do what they do*** (hence the phrase “physical laws”). So in speaking of **physics**, *my axiomatic idea is the “hows” of existence (i.e., how things work to produce what we observe in this our universe – precluding anything outside its laws and forces – e.g., God)*. This is physics’s *raison d’etre* or reason for being. When you go to a physics class, you are going to learn “how” the universe, or part of it, functions as it does. I would submit no physics professor would descent (in general) from this postulate/definition.

Second, when I speak of *metaphysics*, I am speaking of: 1) unseen truths/laws, and 2) the “WHYS” of the universe: why planets revolve at all (i.e why that is the way they exist); why the “eloquent” law of the attraction of bodies so beautifully put above in mathematical symbols exists – or, for that matter, why the “G” of the formula (gravity) is what it is and acts how it acts. When I ask the why of the metaphysics, I am not asking why the physical universe does what it does. That I’ve reserved for the “hows” of physics. I am asking why it exists as it does. *Thus, physics is the “how” of what we observe, metaphysics is the “why” what we observe exists as it does (might I say – the “why” of the “how?”)*.

Let me now state six “Truisms” which lead us from the profound of physics to what I am convinced is the super-profound of metaphysics – and in the end, God.

Truism #1

There is a difference in knowing the “how” of any universal activities as compared to knowing the “why” of those same activities and both affect the issue of what we call reality.

The truth of part one of this six part work is simple and, I would assume, obvious. As an example, it means different things to tell a man about the laws – the “hows” – of rotation around the earth. It is quite another to tell a man why the moon was captured in earth’s gravitational field and why it, and not the asteroid belt moves around our planet. Yet both are needful to explain the WHOLE story as to why the inner planets exist as they do. Whether we can do both or not is another matter for discussion, but the “hows” and “whys” are both needed to tell the whole issue of what’s in our sky (indeed, according to one source, Plato seemed to speak of an earthly “pre-Selene” period, i.e., pre-moon period).

Or, to take another interesting issue, sight, what are the details relating to us, or any sentient ability, and why man (as an example), sees wavelengths of approx. 10^{-3} to 10^{-7} (approx.!). The how of man’s optics and the nerves and chemicals of sight is one issue, and just why man sees no further or lesser ~wavelengths is quite another – but both are part of the story of sight. Indeed, it seems some animals might be colorblind...why them and not us (all things being equal)? Let me take from a quote in a book called “Seed of the Woman” (READ IT!) gives a most lucid illustration to show how important the “how” and “why” issues are essential – in particular when man is the subject.

In Arthur Custance’s above mentioned book, the chapter titled, “What is man, and the Son of Man, that thou visitest him,” he gives the following insight to our **how/why** query; “A colleague of mine walked into my laboratories one day and said, ‘We’ve had this thing around the house ever since I was a kid. Any idea what it is?’ We both looked at it carefully. It was made of wood, obviously shaped by hand, about six inches in length, and asymmetrical along its axis. It weighed only a few ounces, and it had been nicely finished with a good lacquer. I had always felt I was quite sharp at this kind of guessing game...but I couldn’t identify it at all. Apparently nobody else can either, not even the National Museum of Canada!

It was not simply a piece of wood that someone had doodled into shape as the fancy of the moment had suggested. It had without doubt been made for some purpose, and there were even unmistakable wear marks on it in one place indicating that it had been made for something. But *what had it been made for?*

And there’s the point. We could not say **what it was** because we could not imagine **what it was for**. The fact that we could identify it as to its weight, color, size, shape, or any of its other physical or chemical characteristics

which are measurable (the universe/scientific “hows,” DMT), still did not tell us what it was because we did not know what it was for. As far as I know, he never did find out. One day, someone will say, ‘Oh, I know what that’s for..., and the problem of identity will be solved.’”

“Why” implies meaning, and meaning is design with purpose. That part of the story of anything in this universe is as much a part of the story as the speed of light and its propagation, the elliptical orbit of planets, or the yellow of a poppy on a California hill. The “how” of each is a percent of understanding, the why and its meaning completes every portrait of every part and parcel of our universe and its workings – i.e., its existence.

Thus, “how-isms” are science’s functional oration to any given issue/incident in our universe, whereas “why-isms” issues/incidents speak to not operation, but existence, and BOTH are required to speak to our universe – if only for the simple fact that man has done just that, and has never stopped with just one or the other.

Truism #2

*In the experience and thoughts of man, to know the “why” of a matter has always been deemed **greater and deeper** in understanding a given physical occurrence than the “how” of that same matter.*

Now might I be blunt about how little we really know and say when the “how” issues arise. Take Saturn, and all that makes up the physical realities we observe. When we describe Saturn, what are we really saying? When we look at Saturn and we are informing others of the truths of its actions, we are really observing what Saturn does when all that affects Saturn is taken into account – nothing more, nothing less.

But wait! When I am giving multiple formulae of laws and truths of this majestic planet, mathematical or otherwise, *am I not more-or-less just unfolding – not some deep laws or truths of Saturn – but simply just what Saturn always does...unless it doesn't**?* This is the “how” that comes from physics and the laws of observation. Further, we don't really know if these are laws because: **1)** we are not sure that we know *all* issues/laws that cause Saturn to act as it does; and **2)** further, this still is no help if all the laws observed are the same because of our *particular* sphere of observation. It is just as if we drew laws about universal facial hair in the “universe” of Israel, where there may be no such thing there as a blond mustache (just accept as given for example's sake). Thus, our universal law of all Homo sapiens is, if they have mustaches, they are always dark for we know no other universe – and in the universe of Israel this is a *universal* fact to us.

In other words, to draw proper laws of **immediate** areas we would need to know **all** areas and observe them so as to know nothing is left out of our conclusions. In other words, our laws of physics derived from observation are quite impotent in reality because of the same truth that made our mistakes at Pisa... **us!** We have both the problem of limitation via fallible observation and limitation of existence/experience (i.e., we can only deduce limited ideas based on limited observation with limited abilities – all spheres libel to error).

What is far worse regarding the “how” of things, we do not know how far these limitations might extend and thus in what fashion it might affect all our “hows.” We are claiming by our proclamation of physical “laws”, not insight about what we observe, but really much more “laws” about ourselves. Thus, the biases of humanity – might I say the metaphysics of humanity – is really the key issue in the “hows” we proclaim so boldly. Has not the history of science, observations and deductions, written this truth powerfully through time?

By the way, this also extends to our instruments of observation, and I do not mean just our eyes, ears, and minds, but the bias of the accuracy of our instruments of observation: telescope lenses, compass needles, etc. Our

information and thus deductions are only as good in all cases as our equipment of observation...is this not so?

But let us just grant that all is fine, is it still not clear to know the “why” of any issue (**e.g., truth/reality**) is superior knowledge in any incident to just the “how?” Let me give two examples: the courtroom and the hospital room.

Place yourself in a “Perry Mason” courtroom and the days and days of presenting physical evidence. All the actions and bullet directions and evidence of bloody shirts, DNA, and fingerprints speak volumes to the issue of the reality of what happened. But for the evidence to unveil to the jury “why” all the activity took place as it did; to be told the truth of motives involving the “hows” as to the evidence (e.g., the movers and makers of that evidence marked “A” thru “D”) is the heart – may I call it knowing the “**heart of the hearts**” of all involved – is what the guilty *are really* hiding, and what the jury *is really* seeking, for the jury knows you assuredly will uncover the truth, and how they would arrive at a verdict of truth (we are assuming somehow the truth is always spoken). All jurors would unanimously assent to this utopian serum of unambiguous fact as it pertains to all persons involved. To see all the physical evidence is great, but to understand the motives of the people involved, and have it revealed without the least spin, is really everything of importance. *The “whys” are far superior in apprehending the reality of a situation than the “hows.”* Is this not so? The metaphysics leads to an accurate picture of reality – far more accurate than physics alone, and superior in discerning truth/reality/facts in a courtroom.

Second, consider the scene of a deceased man who has his breathing tube removed. Now if we called in some of our CSI examiners to purse the scene with a fine-tooth comb, much would be learned as to the situation that people found to be what constituted all physical evidence related to the event. But, even with fingerprints all over the breathing tube, and all the “how-the-evidence-got-there” resolved, the case would only be closed when we found the note bespeaking the desire of the patient to end his/her life, thus giving the real “whys” of the breathing tube not being where it should, and how the fingerprints on the tube should be truthfully interpreted. The actions and issues of the unseen will of the patient make all the difference in understanding all the physical evidence – that is, all the “hows.”

The breathing tube was out, it could not provide necessary air, and it lay on the side of the bed; but the real understanding of all that was found did not lie in pictures of the scene, or dusting for prints, but in the mind of the patient whose life had come to an end. *The metaphysics* – the unseen mind and desires of this patient or any attendant who meant harm – are everything when the object is why what CSI found was what they found. Again, the absolute thorough examination of all records of physics and the body of the patient, and the nerve impulses from birth to this tragic hour (if it were even possible), would not tell us why the breathing tube was where it

was. That most important answer – the summa of the situation in this hospital room – lay in the mind of that patient. It lay in metaphysical reality.

May I add an ad homonym argument/story, and move from the court and patient room to a “man-on-the-street “room”/example. In other words, via an average Joe, let us ask the importance of “hows” and “whys” – not of the specialist juror and CSI medical examiner – but of you and me.

Here we have an everyday Joe (or Joan), and have put him on the eye of the Hubble Scope in space, gazing up at the physical and metaphysical realities of stars and beholding this universe. Given the choice of having all the Feynman – even all mankind’s – formula’s involved in what he sees, and having the “why” each planet is, both “how” and “why” it exists as it does, or at all, indeed the “why” of himself relative to this great panorama and the “how” related to the gravitational pull of the moon...which would he choose to know? Which would he consider “deeper,” more profound, essence-of-truth knowledge regarding this physical display? Which would you desire to know and understand? I am convinced, like the courtroom illustration, that we would get a unanimous vote from all the “Joe’s” that the “how” things work as they do – physics – would not hold a candle to the “why” of the stars and ourselves relative to them (unless possibly our Joe is an absentee Montana conference speaker from the society of Atheistic Materialistic Skygazers).

Thus, to conclude Truism#2, not only are the material physics truths which answer “hows” in this universe different from the disciplines of metaphysics and is “whys” of existence, even unseen, *but the “whys” of existence and their impact on the universe expound truths far deeper, far greater, far more to the heart of understanding reality.*

****p6,above,** To quote C.S. Lewis on our subject of physics and physical law – Part 1 (who states this most beautifully in “Mere Christianity”): “...what we usually call the ‘laws’ of nature – the way weather works on a tree – may not really be laws in the strict sense, but only in a manner of speaking. When you say that falling stones always obey the law of gravitation, isn’t this much the same as saying that the law only means ‘what stones always do?’ You don’t really think that when a stone is let go, it suddenly remembers that it is under orders to fall to the ground! You only mean that, in fact, it *does* fall. In other words, you can’t be sure that there is anything over and above the facts themselves, any law about what ought to happen (metaphysical, D.T.), as distinct from what does happen. The laws of nature, as applied to trees and stones, **may only mean, what Nature, in fact, does.**”

Truism #3

In knowing, describing, and understanding the “hows” of the universe (the key issue of Feynman’s work), what is required is observation, perception (e.g., the data of the universe) via man’s faculties. That is, man uses his physical instruments, along with the instrumentation he has developed, to: 1) observe and note the actions of the matter he is studying in this, his universe, and 2) codify all these observed truths into patterns or laws so as to explain realities – the physical “hows” – of the universe.

This is physics’s purpose and goal. It is the very essence and working theme behind both the discipline of physics and Feynman’s work “The Character on Physical Law.” Added to this in his book is the truth that mathematics is physics’s language to express those laws derived and coded from observation, description, and deduction.

Now we need to notice some attending details that naturally attend, or flow from Truism #3.

First, physics has as its *raison d’être* the “hows” of the universe. The result of this is that there is every reason **not** to pursue the issues, the possibilities, of “why” type axioms (metaphysics) in physics/Feynman’s “how” universe. The *a priori* starting point and foundation of Axiom#3 (if I may steal from our law courtrooms), is that the universe **is physics, all physics, and nothing but physics** (and the tools and instruments physics uses to gather the needed information for “how” truths evidence this conviction). Thus, as might be seen right away, metaphysical ideas do not add to physics’s knowledge or its goals – as physics defines them.

Second, when discussing themes related to physics, to bring in metaphysics *to help* accurately explain the truths of this world/universe would seem irrelevant, inconsequential, and just plain useless, when the world you desire to understand expresses itself in mathematical-style forms. It is essential to understand that, regardless if the subject be physics, medicine, or any other discipline, *if your instruments of inquiry and exposition take a particular form, truth will take an analogous form* – as will your methods of data collection, data expression, and thus data conclusions. *Truth in physics takes a form, and that form does not use metaphysical ideas/forms.*

Therefore, if truth(s) regarding this universe are expressed via physics/mathematics language, you have an *a priori* exclusion of metaphysical truth/explanation – even if it might be true/essential (e.g. courtroom)!

Third, just as physical observation is the means of the discovery of truth (and metaphysical or “why” truths oftentimes cannot be observed), in a sense physics has ostracized both metaphysical interest (for it gives no physics-type observations) and metaphysical answers (for it gives no physics-type answers).

Thus...**Because of the axioms attending Truism #3, logic and practice demand “how” answers, and preclude “why” (metaphysical) answers to questions of universal activity.**

That is, there is a built-in prejudice against metaphysical routes of explaining existence, and the interest that possible insights through metaphysics might be the best, deepest, and most proper way to understand and explain the actions of the universe, and whatever its truths, they are *ipso facto* given the deep six (or in office parlance – put in “file 13;” e.g., the garbage). Again, this is because facts are interpreted in light of physics expectations, and metaphysics adds nothing toward those styles and types of answers!

Thus, the possible truths offered by metaphysics have gone from: **1)** existing, but of no real interest because the scientist could not see the benefit, to **2)** no interest at all, because truth is defined in the language of physics/mathematics, to **3)** physics precluding metaphysics, to finally, **4)** metaphysics and especially its most profound expression, God, does not exist, but is rather an ethereal, unreasonable, illogical coterie of ideas that actually work against true scientific inquiry (i.e., a deterrent to all truth and truth-seeking men).

Truism #4

*In knowing, describing, and understanding the “whys” of the activities of the universe (e.g., metaphysics), what is required is **more** than just observation and perception by man and his instruments, it requires an awareness of a mind and a will to: **1)** accurately observe and note the actions of the matter he is studying in this, his universe, and **2)** accurately codify all these truths into patterns or laws.*

Why this might not be true is only if man’s observations of material activity are the sum and substance of reality (e.g., the postulate of physics/materialism). But it seems clear that to explain an activity involving basic physics (such as why a two-ton truck stopped), concluding that it was because of the wave-length of the light hanging above a double-striped walkway (whatever “red light” wave-length is), is to give an absolutely wrong answer as to “how” the truck came to a stop. To say the reason for the action observed (the stopping of the truck) is because a certain other physical action was concurrent (a red light illuminating), is to entirely misunderstand the truth of this particular incident.

The true reason is all the above coupled with the will, motives, and thoughts of the driver, along with his perceptions of the surrounding stimuli. ***This is the answer to the physical occurrence; which is to say we must include the “whys”/metaphysics (e.g., the “will”/mindedness of the driver) to give the proper picture to, in this illustration, a truck stopping.***

Note that the most observant scientist, documenting every jot and tittle, would indeed come to the *wrong* conclusion regarding the “how” of this, and that because no “why” is under consideration. But it is the “why” that gives the essence of the reasons for all the issues, for included is not just physical issues but the “why” – the metaphysical.

What is essential to note is two-fold: First, unless the metaphysical “whys” are taken into account, our answer(s) will be incomplete at best and down right wrong at worst; Second, the difference in knowing both “whys” and “hows” is – in our driver illustration – the personhood of the driver. Obtain the truth(s) of his motives, thoughts, and general state-of-mind, and both the issues of what physically happened at the light and the “whys” will explain the whole truth of the situation and resolve the facts.

In other words, include the metaphysics, and you have the real story – that is, the correct answer behind the physical actions you beheld. Most important, we see how metaphysical issues *trump* just plain physics issues in understanding what is observed, its details, and the conclusions that issue forth (e.g., Truism #2).

Another issue in comparing Truisms 3 and 4 – something that seems so clear, yet so clearly avoided. In our search for realities and truths (e.g., “laws” of our universe), and given truths of a physical nature are observable and metaphysical truths are not, why so often the insistence – one might say dogmatic desire – to eliminate the latter, when so frequently in experience it is the metaphysical that hits the heart of understanding and explaining the observed incident. This seems especially true when the answer might relate to religion and God? If the physics method cannot confirm or deny by observation, why is the option so vehemently not a metaphysical answer? Is it because science is so equated with truth, and metaphysics is not?

We now move to systems and designs, the one a flower and the other the Trans-America pyramid building in San Francisco. In both we have system, structure, and a beauty which elicits our admiration. In the latter (our building), if we exclude in our explanation of its attributes the designer, foreman, workmen, etc., etc., we would have to contend with many an ego – not to say the unions.

But what of the flower? It had its “Trans-America” ***all within a tiny seed***, and of much greater complexity than the building – if only that it is alive. I would venture to say that all men of learning would stack the flower’s DNA and its complexity against the complexity of every person/nut/bolt etc. in every building ever having existed, and confess the flower DNA outdoes all TransAmerica’s combined when considering a comparison of genius, complexity, or whatever. Then why, for the flower (i.e., the more complex), would we postulate it had no designer, foreman, etc.? Again, it seems the more complex (our flower) has – how shall we say it – less brains behind the beauty? The one (building) is multiple genius, the other (flower) is water, dirt, and chance **but no mind!** Is this because, although greater complexity is in the flower, we observed things in the building not observed in the flower? *But surely the more complex required at least what the building did.*

Which is, to use Feynman’s description, more “eloquent?” If will/mind is ***a must*** in the simpler, surely we should consider such ***a must*** in the more complex – and more eloquent!

In conclusion, it really does seem sensible to expect in this super-complex system we call “universe,” that there is truly “more than meets the eye.” That in observation, there is not just physics and physical activity, but the driving force of mind and will, designing and guiding what we behold in that greater system. And that “hows” can be discovered and explain certain aspects of universal law, but beyond is the greater, the deeper mind/will – the “whys” which tell the full story of the universe’s/Feynman’s

$$F = G \frac{mm^1}{r^2}$$

Truism #5

Since the “whys” – the metaphysics – are often far the more essential to accurately explaining reality in particular realms of truth, and this often includes personhood, mind, and will; it is only logical that the greater system, the universe, have its person, mind, and will (e.g., God) involved to explain its reality(s).

If the “laws” of actions on earth include man, it would seem sensible a greater than man is part of the universe – a part of its rules and its results. Do the rules, the beauty, the axioms of the planets preclude a mind only because man’s mind and interest is only as an observer and not a creator or mover of those laws? It seems sheer human hubris – not to say the resistance to evident soundness of both basic logic and reason – that in beholding the heavenly wonders/laws, we would conclude there is no mind that acts because there is no man to effect the actions?

Reason and logic declare to us in conclusive terms – as hinted in the previous truism – if something is true of the lesser (earthly activities), it might well be (more properly must be) expected of the greater (universal). Materialists – by which I mean those thinkers who see the universe as atoms obeying laws self-evolved apart from mind-will-purpose – have two conundrums that will forever baffle until an unbiased sobriety descends upon them.

First, as one pursues an average coffee shop like the one I am in, everything – and I mean everything – is/has system, creation, design for a specified purpose; from the signs advertising, to the chairs for sitting, to the jars which hold sugar, salt, or whatever, all had design unto purpose created by a person with a mind/will involved. What the materialist “how-ist” scientific mind would have us believe is: **1)** the grand oak tree just outside the coffee shop has no designer; and **2)** the best example/analogy of all that surrounds me and its “whys” of existence is the random Salvador Dali-istic stain of chance like the “chance-like” spilt frappacino on the floor in front of my chair. **Now that is what reality is; and how the oak, the rose, – and the sun which inspires them both – are most properly understood by accumulating all the “hows,” and you will have the truth and reality of the universe.**

Second, material “how-ists” would tell me (much to the endangerment of their lives) that my wife of twenty-five years is, like that splotch of coffee, an accumulation of some of the 90+ elements held together with other “how” laws. Most important to me, our relationship is based on a chance series of electro-chemical activities called “love” and “affection”, and that smile she turns my way is not “elegant” because of all that makes up the one I love, is but a splotch of human DNA in a universe of splotches.

But surely my twenty-five year coffee-spilling romance is of distinctly greater conceptions than either sign, chair, or sugar jar in our coffee shop. Most surely the greater (the person called my wife – Kim), is far more than an accrual of all physics “hows.” (P.S. if you would desire real trouble, tell me that *the reason she drew near to grant me a kiss* (i.e., the law of the attraction of bodies) was/is.....

$$F = G \frac{mm^1}{r^2}$$

I think not. A rose by any name would not exist if not for the fashioning of such atoms, the methodology of such structures, the loving creativity of such fragrances – and all calculated to be enjoyed by another.

Now the laws, truths, and realities of this our universe when compared and contrasted with lesser (e.g., our coffee shop), must lead us to conclude that the greater laws, truths, and realities were designed by a greater-than-us. The one supreme inference flowing from our considerations and deductions demands that, as all of our lesser systems and structures have a designer – a will-er if you please – the greater system does as well. This universe has the same truth of Personhood driving the observations of man, for the same attributes are seen in both; purpose, beauty, propriety, intelligence, and so much more.

If the great lesser systems – the “coffee-shop systems” we see – do not exist but for the mind of man, universal systems do not exist but for the mind of God.

Truism #6

Thus God, the Great Person (or as Jonathan Edwards would say, “that Great Being”), and as such possessing a mind, a will, and thus purposefulness – is the one who has determined the “whys” of the greater system, the universe and its existence; at times giving reasons for the “whys,” of this universe, but always having reasons for the “whys” of existence – even those things of existence like suffering which have always been difficult for man to grasp.

Each step of truth has led us in this direction.

So.....

May I make this summery brief, to the point, and thus conclude. With the “coffee shop” illustration in mind: 1) the inner shop designs (signs, cups, chairs) surely are present via a mind – that of man; 2) the more complex, i.e., that which I behold living outside the shop requires at least the same... if just contemplating the tree’s DNA, the reproductive squirrel scampering up the pine tree, the gentleman purchasing gas – if anything a more assuredly greater case for a much greater mind behind these living examples; thus 3) given a blank sheet of paper, what say I about Van Gogh’s starry, starry night and the bits of what I and others see via Hubble’s telescope? Chance... Law(s)? No. If man feels a greater mind might be “out there”, most likely the evidence says yes (and I mean not just on another planet – but the creativity and power of the WHOLE speaks “Almightily Maker”, then this world’s infinitely smaller example must speak to our conscience... “Almighty God.”

If the less complex – the “coffee-shop systems” we see – do not exist but for the mind of man, those universal systems do not exist but for the *mind of God* – or the least we are forced by the evidence to confess (unless we are adamant in our prejudice) is a great Mind designed, purposed – or whatever equivalent word one chooses – to fashion the glory of what we behold. That is surely *the least* truth the evidence leads us to confess in the courtroom-box of truth – or as another put it poignantly, what our conscience demands if we are under the weight of “judgment-day honesty.”

ADDENDA

The SETI Project

- 1) SETI Parameters Equal to Religious Parameters, or,**
- 2) Science Search Parameters Parallel to Religious**

As a true “P.S.” on the title page, it stands for; 1) “extra thoughts on the subject”, and, 2) in particular the theme of this “ADDENDA” – “**Project SETI.**” I would submit that the SETI PROJECT (SETI an acronym for the “**S**earch for **E**xtra-**T**errestrial **I**ntelligence”), is both *the* classic science project on seeking intelligence in this universe governed by the axioms which form the basis for its (SETI’s) research, purposes, and goal(s); and **the surest attestation** and confirmation of both the accuracy and approval of my thesis that science and the evidence that streams forth from science establishes the unity of both religious and scientific facts which lead to mindedness, intelligence, and ultimately to the Great Designer/Mind – God.

In other words, my axiom/thesis is that: 1) SETI is a quintessential scientific study to discover intelligence in the universe; 2) the parameters that guide SETI research into intelligence in our universe may be used/applied to the same question regarding the earth and its existence...therefore 3) the conclusion most likely regarding the earth and its existence is via intelligent design, e.g., a Creator-Mind...God, or as Jonathon Edwards spoken truly and humbly – “That Great Being.”

Further, we see this via; 1) SETI looks for patterns and such evidence that bespeaks BEYOND chance to order – which is SETI’S greatest evidence of mindedness; 2) patterns and design speak to the SETI fact of PURPOSE of that which is observed, and so patterns confirm purpose, which demonstrate mindedness and not chance, and thus SETI’S belief of its great search is established – that we are not alone in the universe (and the above theses and such ideas and truths justify/establish their **S**earch); thus, 3) the SETI theses and designs for its proof regarding intelligence in our universe is by far the *clearest proof* as to scientific conclusions – WHICH parallel the axioms of both this paper and religion as expressed best in the 16th and 19th centuries... for all of SETI’S presuppositions, combined with their reasoning, logic, instrumental data etc.; **ALL are parallel to religious reasoning for a God of intelligence and purpose** – again ALL of which establish that Feynman’s-type work (science based on evidence), which so evidenced in SETI, is also the only route which is clearly the journey to find GOD!

In concluding: every evidence/principle we find on earth has its analogy in our solar systems/galaxies etc.; yet, the interpretation of science of the discoveries (particularly earthly) we've declared to be proclaimed as evolution (i.e., without mind/intent); but science second data research, which is without the earth and its evidence (e.g., the SETI project), we view, not as proof of data of an evolutionary universe, but as a reflection of an intelligence in the universe!

Same Evidence, same presuppositions – YET, differing results/conclusions...??

The truth, if we follow SETI's presuppositions, results in these two conclusions (at least):

Conclusion#1:

This is the true conclusion of all man's mental acumen, deductions, research, and on. There is every reason to deduce from the evidence gleaned in this world and the sum of all others: that what we find is overflowing displays of wisdom, design, purposefulness, guidance, mysteries, and most of all – a small reflection of humanism derived long before humans set foot on this speck.

Conclusion#2:

Thus, if SETI'S science has chosen to interpret the data *from space* **examining earth** (rather than SETI's 21st century *perusal of space* **examined from earth**): if our findings in either case are orderly and organized rather than random; then SETI'S presuppositions *based on their search parameters, presuppositions (e.g., their 'guidelines')*, bring in only one conclusion – if evidence is found and gleaned from their instruments which have been set based on their presuppositions, **the conclusions can only (even per SETI) be mindedness and not randomness** (e.g., non-mindedness). Thus all I can say is, in applying the same parameters/logic to *this* world, Darwin is and was wrong, and the design we see in the heavens and the earth lean far more to the scientific direction and conclusion of a creator... or, **In the beginning, God created the heavens (with its order) and the earth (with its design)... Genesis 1:1.**