

This Free E-Book is brought to you by Natural-Aging.com.

100% Effective Natural Hormone Treatment
Menopause, Andropause And Other Hormone Imbalances
Impair Healthy Healing In People Over The Age Of 30!

Evolution and Exorcisms

By Robert Bruce Baird

Evolution and Exorcisms by Robert Bruce Baird

EVOLUTION: More surprising to me as I consider where my intellectual head-space has been on this issue, which is central to theological ideal; is the fact that I have become more of a creationist. Skeptics may say that God doesn't exist and I am inclined to agree he/she isn't within our purview to limit and say we know; HIM, or even what it is that really goes on, in the world about us. It would be difficult to say there is any one humanistic discipline or theology that fits with my perception. Teilhard de Chardin's 'templates' and 'quantum many worlds' join Lamarckian science, that requires uncertainty and values mystery and uncertainty principles with purpose. In the final analysis you can put me in whatever 'cubby-hole' you want and there'll be agreement and respect for the truth therein expressed. I see a lot of people sounding like they disagree and yet I see little difference except when they seek personal gain by it. Surely science has given a great deal of support to the concept of consciousness existing in the very smallest parts of energy, and in the ways it performs what was once considered miraculous, or magical. Here are the thoughts of two very scientifically oriented people from MIT in a book called 'Darwinism Evolving':

"They also made it harder for the scientific worldview to be received with equanimity by other sectors of culture. Indeed, since the reducing impulse undermines fairly huge tracts of experience, people like Wallace, who feel deeply about protecting phenomena they regard as existentially important, frequently conclude that they have no alternative except to embrace spiritualism, and sometimes even to attack the scientific worldview itself, if that is the only way to protect important spheres of experience that have been ejected from science's confining Eden. In response, scientists and philosophers who feel strongly about the liberating potential of a spare, materialistic worldview began to patrol the borderlands between the high-grade knowledge scientists have of natural systems and the low-grade opinions that in the view of science's most ardent defenders, dominate other spheres of culture and lead back toward the superstitious and authoritarian world of yesteryear. 'Demarcating' science from other, less cognitively worthwhile forms of understanding was already a major feature of Darwin's world. A line beyond which the Newtonian paradigm could not apply was drawn at the boundary between physics and biology. We have seen how hesitant Darwin was to cross that line and what happened when he did. Twentieth-century people are sometimes prone to congratulate themselves for being above these quaint Victorian battles. They may have less reason to do so, however, than they

Evolution and Exorcisms

think, for the fact is that throughout our own century, the same sort of battles, with emotional overtones no less charged, have been waged at the contested line where biology meets psychology, and more generally where the natural sciences confront the human sciences. Dualisms between spirit and matter, and even between mind and body, may have been pushed to the margins of respectable intellectual discourse. But methodological dualisms between what is covered by laws and what is to be 'hermeneutically appropriated' are still very much at the center of our cultural, or rather 'two cultural', life. Cognitive psychologists and neurophysiologists are even now busy reducing mind—states to brain—states, while interpretive or humanistic psychologists are proclaiming how meaningless the world would be if mind is nothing but brain. Interpretive anthropologists are filled with horror at what would disappear from the world if the rich cultural practices that seem to give meaning to our lives were to be shown to be little more than extremely sophisticated calculations on the part of self—interested genes. Conflicts of this sort would have given Darwin stomachaches almost as bad as the ones he endured

over earlier demarcation controversies.

The rhetorical pattern of these battles is still depressingly similar, in fact, to Huxley's confrontation with Wilberforce. Hermeneuts ridicule scientists like Hamilton, Dawkins, and Wilson when they suggest that nothing was ever known about social cooperation until biologists discovered kin selection. Reductionists in turn criticize hermeneuts, now transformed largely into 'culturists,' for bringing back ghosts and gods, just as their nineteenth—century predecessors were taxed with being 'vitalists' every time they said something about the complexity of development. Humanists identify scientists with an outdated materialist reductionism. Scientists insist that hermeneutical intentionality is little more than disguised religion.

Perhaps, a way out of this fruitless dialectic between the 'two cultures', can be found if each party could give up at least one of its cherished preconceptions {Or just give up the science that rejects certain facts in favour of convention or the 'Toilet Philosophy'}. It would be a good thing, for example, if heirs of the Enlightenment would stop thinking that if cultural phenomena are not reduced to some sort of mechanism; religious authoritarianism will immediately flood into the breach. They should also stop assuming that nothing is really known about human beings until the spirit of scientific reductionism gets to work. Students of the human sciences have, after all, been learning things alongside scientists ever since modernity began. Among the things they have learned are that humans are individuated persons within the bonds of culture and cultural roles, and that as recipients and transmitters of cultural meanings, they are bound together with others in ways no less meaningful and valuable than the ways promoted by strongly dualistic religions. By the same token, it would be helpful if advocates of the interpretive disciplines would abandon a tacit assumption sometimes found among them that nature is so constituted that it can never accommodate the rich and meaningful cultural phenomena humanists are dedicated to protecting, and that therefore cultural phenomena 'ought never' to be allowed to slip comfortably into naturalism. Humanists seem to have internalized this belief from their reductionist enemies, whose commitment to materialism is generally inseparable from their resolve to show up large parts of culture, especially religion, as illusions. These opponents, we may safely say, take in each other's laundry." (7)

Ego and protecting territory abound in the internecine warfare that academics who seldom DO anything, often fight over. Meanwhile the real DOERS explore the boundless and awesome 'waves of

the marvellous'. (8) We should accept even the ridiculous possibilities that come to mind as having merit or avenues to understand, rather than constantly fighting to make black and white answers that support our ego and limit the people who put forward possibilities. The real rule should be something along the line of 'if it hurts no one, why not enjoy the possibility? There are ample evidences that every supposed correct point of view or paradigm is short-lived unless backed by force and some kind of authority that limits rather than supports god and his/her purpose. Then an open-mind obtains new insight and finds the templates of reality even in exploring what first appears to be utterly absurd. I admit I often have found the idea of creationism absurd, and yet as I said at the start of this entry I am now on the side of creationists through evolutionary forces with intentional creative inputs in the Intelligent Design or Interventionist mode. The next entry will seem absurd to most people and few will think it deserves inclusion in a segment purporting to have anything to do with science. I must include it in honest presentation despite the ridicule most people will attribute to it, and me.

EXORCISMS: – No, I don't believe it has anything to do with devils and those who project such evil images and intents. These people are the ones who claim only they can exorcize the very devils they manufacture, in the hallucinatory and delusional or vulnerable people they treat. 'The Devils of Loudon' by Aldous Huxley exposes these Catholic masters of the art of deception. That doesn't mean there are

no spirits or dimensional entities with consciousness. To say such a thing would fly in the face of all the science we have presented. The soul would have no immortality as the Keltic Creed and Mandukya Upanishads that Eugene Wigner thinks explains quantum reality tells us is real. To deny such phenomena is the kind of thing reductionists in love with logic and certain of their omniscience will assure us they know. How can shamans create herbal concoctions that chemists can't create? How can we doubt the actual results of the 'dowsers' and Tesla's great achievements from visions or his 'non-force info packets' which allow such 'free energy' to be manufactured in something called a vacuum. NASA assures us the ingredients of life are 'everywhere' and that could even include a vacuum. What kind of avoidance of fact or 'easy answers' do you have to find in order to explain away reality and what you can observe with your own eyes? You would have to attribute the construction of 'henges' or the Nazca Lines to aliens or gods!

We don't reject these possibilities but they would only serve to enhance the probability of spirits that can possess our physical and complex body with all of its conscious atoms and coordinated centers of energy known as chakras. The science and medicine of the ancients assures us that these things exist and these scientists have a solid track record of performance. They DO the things others can't explain – then they explain how 'chhi' or Shakti is in every part of everything in the universe, and have suffered the guffaws of know-it-alls who are usually wrong. This energy with consciousness is open to direction and will avail the trapped or confused soul without awareness and unwilling to go on with life, an opportunity to hang on as ghosts or in the bodies of those they have shared life with. Sorry to disappoint the authors of 'Darwinism Evolving' but I knew this was fact even before 500 watts were extracted from a vacuum by machines built on the principles of Tesla. Those of us who have first hand knowledge of 'the waves of the marvellous' like Bucky Fuller and Einstein need no peer approval from those who deny god, the soul and ESP.

I am an activist author for ecumenicism and exposure of Synarchy. My work can be seen at World-Mysteries.com.

Transitional Fossils

By Greg Neyman

Transitional fossils, or the supposed lack thereof, has been used for many years by anti-evolutionists to argue against evolution. Here, I will explain what a transitional fossil is, and why it is not valid as an argument against evolution.

A transitional fossil shows the evolutionary development from one species to another. For example, if organism 1 existed 70 million years ago, and organism 2 shows up in the fossil record 5 million years later, then theoretically there should be intermediate species in this 5 million year gap, which shows gradual progression from one species to another. The lack of these "transitional" fossils is proof to young earth creationists that evolution is false.

Evolutionists have shown that indeed there are transitional fossils, and there are plenty of examples of them. For instance, see this article.¹ Here is the key point...even if young earth creationists accept these examples of transitional fossils, they will still claim that there are no transitional fossils! These fossils will be called either unique species, or they will come up with some reason (disease, birth defect, etc) that accounts for the apparent transition feature.

Naturally, they will say, "Where are the transitional fossils between these transitional fossils?" If we had a clear fossil record, showing progression every 10,000 years for millions of years, they will not believe it, and will want the "transitional" fossils for the missing 10,000 year period. No amount of evidence will convict them that their belief is wrong.

The same thing could be said of progressive creationists as well. Progressive creationists believe in an old earth, but that God created each species a unique creation, and not evolved from an earlier species. I happen to be one of these myself. However, we must be careful not so say our view is the only one that is valid. Dr. Hugh Ross of the old earth ministry Reasons to Believe, has put forth many arguments against evolution. However, when you consider the possibility that within Theistic Evolution, you have God guiding the evolutionary process, then all bets are off. Yes, evolution by itself could not have happened...as Dr. Ross explains, 13.7 billion years is not nearly enough time, statistically speaking, for evolution to occur. However, with God's supernatural intervention and guidance, it could have easily happened.

I'm not saying that evolution is right, but what I am saying is that with God, all things are possible, including evolution. We should not be so quick, as progressive creationists, to condemn evolution.

Conclusion

The fact that young earth creationists will not be convinced, no matter how much evidence is presented, makes this a weak argument. The argument is not based on science, but on assumptions based on a young earth interpretation of creation.

This article comes from the Answers In Creation website (

). The

source article is located at

.



This Free E-Book has been brought to you by Natural-Aging.com.

[100% Effective Natural Hormone Treatment](#)
Menopause, Andropause And Other Hormone Imbalances
Impair Healthy Healing In People Over The Age Of 30!