

To Professor Daniel Dennett:

I have no personal knowledge of just how a computer works, but I have this picture in my mind that when my computer locks up it is as the result of a group of binary codes getting caught within a closed loop, like a thought racing around on a rectangular track, unable to get off or out. It is human nature to take such closed loops of thought and use them as the structure for the foundation of our thinking. We call them truths, when they are really only suppositions. And while it is a natural thing to do, to want to rely on those things we use to navigate our way through the questions of life: when we begin to shout down, or ignore, ideas that are outside that rectangular box because we have become vested in what is in fact untruth, these natural instincts take on a sinister nature.

The tenants, upon which, University is built are no different than the tenants upon which Church in the form of Institution is built. In a conversation I tried to have with a young "Educated" man on the subject of the "Big Bang" I found myself unable to make a single point. Each time I began, I found myself interrupted as he reiterated the single "truth" that Einstein's observations on Relativity proved that the "Big Bang" happened everywhere and all at once, rather than from an epicenter outward. The problem with his logic was that, regardless of whether or not he can make a case for his viewpoint, he had adopted his view as his only possible hypothesis. I have made a case elsewhere that the "Singularity" was most certainly the epicenter of a blast that

expanded outward consistent with Natural Law. The young man never heard the case though, because he was insistent that Einstein's example of two trains could be used to disprove my opening premise. Of course, Einstein's example used two objects on a linear plan, whereas I maintain that the Universe is expanding spherically in a three dimensional one. But more than that, the thing that was most striking was his need to defend "his" as the only hypothesis. And why? Because, just as the "Church" was threatened by Galileo's realization that the earth revolved around the sun, those who are vested in the denial of God are threatened by a "Big Bang" that is not outside Natural Law. They have twisted their mathematics and their hypotheses as surely as the "Inquisitors" twisted theirs. But before you accuse me of the same, I would tell you that I did not come to believe as I did because the "Big Bang Theory" supported my belief in God. I came to believe because it supports a Unifying Theory that encompasses magnetism, gravity and Black Holes within the equation $E=MC^2$.

Scientific "Proof" is always contingent upon the "Framing" of the question. Testing of any hypothesis is only as indicative of the truth as the truthfulness of the tenants used to frame the test. The notion that the "Ether" (as it was imagined) did not exist is a basic tenant of modern thinking that is a misconception that came to be because the testing of the Ether was based upon incorrect assumptions about the nature of matter and energy. To reassess such thinking is to disturb the foundation

upon which vested interests stand. Another example of this is our notion of "Time Travel".

Einstein hypothesized that as the speed of an object's movement approaches the speed of light, "Time" slows down. To test his hypothesis, an atomic clock was placed on a plane and another matching clock was kept on the ground. The jet was sent aloft and sped away at "Mock" speed. When it returned, the clocks showed different times, proving the hypothesis: or did it? Suppose a plane could be built that could circle the planet without slowing down until the clocks showed a difference of a month. At what point would radar contact be lost. And if we presume that the radar would continue to see a "Ghost" image and satellite images came back as a result of those on board being evaporated a month before those of us on the planet?

Einstein said that as an object approaches the speed of light it would become cigar shaped and that makes perfect sense. After all, if atomic particles travel around the center of an atom at a speed less than, or equal to, the speed of light, any atom approaches the speed of light, any orbiting particle will loose speed "relative" to the atomic configuration when orbiting in the direction of trajectory. This will cause the orbiting particles to build up at the trailing end of the atom. Somewhere near the speed of light, the atomic bonds are likely broken. But none of these hypothesis or experiments have, "of necessity", anything to do with "Time". It is just as

plausible to imagine that it is not atomic movement that is the "Measure" of Time. It is just as plausible to imagine that "Thought" is the true measure of time. From the time that Mankind first began to "Row, row, row his boat" down this stream of time, the possibility has always been entertained that we are each writing out our own individual Binary Codes a digit at a time into a "Great Computer" that assimilates all there is or ever will be at the speed of God.

There can be no doubt that religion, in general, has a checkered past and a dubious future. Unfortunately, the parallel universe of Academics has become just as much a force for subjugation predicated on personal convictions and prejudices, as any other Dogma. Academics love to wave the flag of scientific scrutiny as a banner under which every department of every College at University finds justification. But the simple truth is that almost all of what is taught at University is both subjective and conspicuously devoid of the whole of what is truth. Selective omission is, after all, nothing more than a lie. Truth, under a scientific definition, is predicated on the ability to predict an outcome. Any outcome that can be predicted, can, by the very nature of that predictability, call itself scientific proof. It can call itself "Truth". This is the very foundation of Christianity: that within the words of the Prophets were given the clues that would one day be explained to the Disciples of Jesus, by Jesus, so that they would understand that He was the Christ Prophesied. Unfortunately for Mankind, Man was not yet ready to understand. This

too was prophesied.

Some time last year, I had occasion to be watching one of those programs on which people are interviewed as authorities in order to promote their book or their movie or their cause; and I heard you say something to the affect that "Religious" people are unwilling to have a logical discussion concerning their beliefs. And while it must be admitted that most, if not all, of those types of people have more faith than knowledge and therefore lack the ability to make a logical argument, it must also be remembered that the prophecies promised that they would all be "blind" to the truth. Those prophecies included Academics among the blind as well. That being said, I take your statement as a challenge. It is not my belief in God and believe they know God that was offended by your statement. It was my belief in God and in His Son. For, in stating that those who profess to speak on behalf of God cannot make a logical defense of that belief, you have intimated that no logical defense exists. I have come to accept your challenge: To make the argument for the "Truth" in which God is justified: and that in the real world. To that end, I have added a new icon for you self proclaimed Atheists at the website www.revolutionmumberten.com. You will find your argument at the cross. That is, if your up to it.

George Bailey

In a standard "forced air" furnace, fuel in the form of natural gas or propane, or fuel oil, is combined with air and burned in the "heat exchanger". The air from the fan below, forces air through the heat exchanger, which warms it before it is disbursed throughout the house in the ductwork. If one removes the heat exchanger and replaces it with a "Radiator" (like the one in your car) that heats the air using steam from a boiler, a steam engine can be placed "In-Line" between the two and used to run a generator, which powers a water separator, which divides H₂O into


Hydrogen and Oxygen. The Oxygen can be added back to the fuel mixture in the boiler to increase efficiency and reduce emissions: the Hydrogen is free. There are no power lines to fail because the fuel cell in your basement makes your electricity for your home and the tank in your car is filled from the same source. Solid metal Hydrogen storage is already available. GM has already built a fuel cell driven car that they offered to China but have yet to offer in the US. Rural residents can add a windmill to the equation. In Phoenix, a black metal roof can power a small steam engine or solar panels

can produce electrical current in the midday summer sun.

Coal fired power plants are 40% efficient in converting "BTU's" into electricity. Today's residential boilers are 93% efficient at converting gas to heat. Adding Oxygen increases that efficiency. If the steam engine and generator are even 20% efficient in converting that heat to electricity, an equivalent amount of coal or other fuel has now become at least 113% efficient. POWER PLANTS become unnecessary, and once wood chip boilers are developed, the answer to the world's energy needs is to

percentage of that money for the purpose of researching alternative fuel sources over that time frame and while the world burns: when all we really need is a safe "clean coal-exhaust scrubber" for home use, to eliminate oil as fuel altogether, using the coal the world is already burning at 40% efficiency. Where are your wise men? Where are your leaders? Whom do you worship? Worship God. Whom do you trust? Trust in God. To whom do you turn? Turn to God.

George



Generator attached to steam engine produces electrical current

Fuel Cell converts Hydrogen into electricity, heat and water: water then returns to separator

Grow your own energy while greening the planet