A final solution to the Great Debate.

42 - The Answer to Life, The Universe, and Everything

Buy The Complete Version of This Book at Booklocker.com:

http://www.booklocker.com/p/books/3174.html?s=pdf



"The Answer To Life, The Universe, And Everything!"

by Mal Smith

ONVIEW BOOKS Published by Onview.net Ltd. 2007

Registered Office: Onview.net Ltd. 4a Oxford Road, Wallington, Surrey. SM6 8SJ. England. Distribution: Frilford Mead, Kingston Road, Frilford. Abingdon. Oxfordshire. OX13 5NX. England.

www.2x21.com

Copyright © Maurice Smith (mol) 2007 All rights reserved.

The moral right of the author has been asserted.

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

First Published 2007 by Onview.net Ltd.

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-0-9557137-0-5

42

The Answer to Life, the Universe, and Everything. by Mol.

This book is dedicated to the 6 unknown ants I incinerated with my sun-magnifying glass heat ray in the summer of 1962 at 2 Links Rd., Tooting, when I was eleven years old, and to the future intellects of machine-human hybrids and their evolving consciousness.

Sorry ants. Because you were different to me, I thought you were unimportant, but I know better now.

Hello machine-intellect and welcome to the issues. Remember the ants!

Preface

Who am I? Where do I come from? Is there a God? What happens when I die? How should I live my life? Is there a plan? Does fate exist? What is my purpose? Did I arrive on the wrong planet? Who is this book for? Is it for me?

Will this book really answer my questions?

YES!

Science versus Religion: The Don Delusion?

often Scientific reason is straight-jacketed by institutionalised indoctrination, and refuses to become infected with the ideas, and perceived absurdities, of religion. Theologians, equally afraid of their position and the values they wish to protect, launch repeated academic defences against the mutually exclusive attack from science. Discerning people throughout the world, eager to learn the nature of all things and their part to play, are torn to this side or that: God, spirituality, religion, on the one side-science, knowledge, and heartless universe on the other. Are our lives only the product of ruthless laws in a physical universe, devoid of abstract intent? Is the answer for human purpose only to be found in the out-of-date ceremonial ritual of a two thousand year old religious ideology? Can science, reason, and new ideas, not redefine a clearer insight into our nature of existence? Is there nothing new to answer our probing intellectual questions and our innate feeling of deeper meaning for our lives?

Yes. There is.

A few eminent, educated, and qualified people, who should be casting off their blinkers to talk with each other to combine their convictions and work, are not doing that. They are fighting over their differences. Their bruised egos frequently imbue their writing not with considered, and objective, debate but with scorn and ridicule aimed at character assassination of their opponent. Since the learned professors and dons, with their combined knowledge of hard science and spiritual beliefs, are locked in a spitting war, and thus unable to offer a convincing, unified, account of what everything is all about, I thought it is about time someone tried. But then are we only to explore the nature of everything through the polarised perspectives of two camps, or should we not use broader skills: art, creativity, and intuition too?

I think if we are to discover the meaning of life, we require more than just a few narrow views to comprehend it. I have elected myself for the job of trying to illuminate the truth. What I have to say already exists in various books written by good authors in different fields of science, art, and philosophy. I have merely tried to pull all the parts together to present a reasonable set of solutions to the unanswered questions. If I have added anything of value then it is only open-mindedness, and the refusal to accept anything I am told to be true unless it makes sense in an otherwise absurd world.

Mol

* * * *

Contents

PREFACE	5
SCIENCE VERSUS RELIGION: THE DON DELUSION?	5
Contents	7
INTRODUCTION	10
CHAPTER 1: SEEING CLEARLY	18
ME	18
Us	21
THE POWER OF DECEPTION AND FALSE BELIEFS	23
A POLICE FORCE WAS CREATED TO PROTECT THE	
POPULATION OF A CITY OR COUNTRY	25
CCTV CAMERAS PROTECT YOU	26
ANARCHY MEANS REVOLUTION AND CHAOS	26
GLOBAL WARMING IS MAN-MADE	26
CHAPTER 2: ANT MINDS	28
CHAPTER 3: SUPER MINDS	36
CHAPTER 4: BIRTH	42
CHAPTER 5: THE ILLUSION OF SELF	47
CHAPTER 6. TO BE OR NOT TO BE MORE, LESS, OR NOTHING	58
CHAPTER 7. DEATH OF HUMANITY	64

CHAPTER 8. TAKING THE CHRIST OUT OF CHRISTIANITY	69
CHAPTER 9. CHILDREN OF STARS	80
THE LINE OF CONTINUITY – BIRTH AND REBIRTH	80
CHAPTER 10: DESIGN	86
INTELLIGENT DESIGN?	86
ANOTHER SMALL TALE:	88
CHAPTER 11: THERE BE MAGIC TOO!	93
ENTER THE NOTION OF DARK ENERGY!	94
MORE MAGIC: DARK MATTER!	94
QUANTUM THEORY	95
MANY WORLDS THEORY/MULTIVERSE	97
WAS GOD AN ASTRONAUT?	100
DID THE ONE TRUE GOD MAKE US?	100
ARE WE REALLY LIVING INSIDE A COMPUTER PROGRAM?	102
WAS OUR UNIVERSE JUST SIMPLY MADE IN A LABORATORY?	102
CHAPTER 12: LOCAL LIFE	105
LOCALITY AND YOUR PART IN THE NATURE OF THINGS	105
CHILDREN	105
Adulthood	107
CHAPTER 13: THE MATERIAL WORLD	113
WHAT IS WEALTH?	113
CHAPTER 14: DEATH	120
WHEN YOU DIE, YOU ARE DEAD	121
HEAVEN AND HELL	123
REINCARNATION	125
WE ARE THE DREAM OF A HIGHER INTELLECT	126
WE ARE THE DREAM OF OUR FUTURE SELVES	126
ALIEN LIFE FORMS MADE US	127
WE ARE IN A COMPUTER PROGRAM AND THEREFORE NEVER DIE	127

CHAPTER 15: PREPARING FOR THE ANSWER	132
CHAPTER 16: THE DECISION	141
THE END OF DAYS	141
THE RISE OF THE MACHINES	144
THE END OF EONS	147
RAISING THE DEAD	148
CHAPTER 17: THE ANSWER TO EVERYTHING—42	152
THE RECKONING	152
To Be or Not To Be	153
CHAPTER 18: EPILOGUE	155
A FINAL THOUGHT TO PONDER	159
APPENDICES	160
I FALSE BELIEFS (FULL LIST).	160
II OBSERVATIONS	168
REFERENCES, FURTHER READING, NOTES	169
*1 BIG BANG UNIVERSE.	169
*2 BRANES.	170
*3 Omega Point	170
FURTHER READING	172
About the author	177

Introduction

Everyone eventually asks the question, "Why am I here?"

Many people have already discovered a wealth of material aimed at answering their most profound query. Unfortunately, religious theories, blind-faith belief systems, touchy-feely quasi-philosophical ranting, along with distorted scientific truths, unimaginative logical dogma, and fashionable hype fill the vacuum in the human-mind-not with truth, but confusion, conflict, and illusion. It is no surprise to discover the shelves of retail bookshops are filled with a proliferation of titles under the heading of 'Spiritual'. Closer inspection reveal books on every aspect of self-help and how to enrich our experiences. It appears many members of the human-race have reached a point where they desperately seek genuine purpose rather than remain, for the most part, unfulfilled. This phenomenon exists predominantly in western society, where giant super-markets fill cathedral corridors with the greatest hoard of material wealth ever assembled in one place; where each minute of every day, citizens are bombarded by billboards, television screens, emblazoned buses, banners, newspapers, magazines, and store windows to own this thing or that to improve their routine existence!

Outside the western world, two-thirds of the six billion people on the planet struggle to obtain their daily needs. Most are on the bread line wondering where the next meal is coming from. Their spiritual questions are answered by inappropriate religious indoctrination, designed only to convince them to come to terms with their misery in this life through the false promise of a happier existence in the next one, or by western propaganda infiltrating their societies and bringing, to them, the same deceptive material-promise we already know.

Apart from illness and human-intervention, most other animal species on the planet do not seem to experience the kind of unhappiness we do. A tiger appears to be fundamentally content with its lot. Predator and prey live

in better harmony than people do. One could argue this is because we are thinking bipeds and are 'aware', whereas other animals are not. We are able to think intelligently. We have the ability to deceive and lie. Such argument fails miserably in the light of the fact many animals, among them octopus, dolphin, monkey, elephant, dog, fox, and wolf, have proven intellects and mental capabilities equal to our very young infants. It is difficult to prove what 'self-awareness' and consciousness actually involve, but I believe a tiger is happy with his lot because he knows, inherently, he *is* a tiger. He behaves one hundred per cent to his role and purpose. All other creatures on the planet sufficiently aware to explore their environment, intellectually, know what they are, and have little need to question it. A fish enjoys being a fish, because it will never be anything else, and therefore does not worry about it. It *knows* what it is either because it lacks the imagination and capability to wonder, or because it is born with inherited traits to be only a fish.

People are unhappy for different reasons, but I believe that underlying all of them is a single cause: they have never discovered or understood their unique role in being alive, and do not understand what their function is. When we ask our academic peers or our moral leaders for intelligent advice, we are directed towards ancient soothsayers, unproven deities, gods, prophets, dusty-texts, and muddled books of wisdom for our answers. It's like asking grown-ups to believe in tooth fairies. People are given stories only suitable for the inexperienced minds of young children or, just as bad, unfathomable theories suitable only for the membership of MENSA. Faced with myth and fable in answer to our questions, we remain in a state of ignorance about our role in the grand evolution of a universe. We are left to wander through short lives grasping at being all things, but never truly being the one, we were designed to be. It is as though we are tigers, believing we are elephants, with all the pain and disappointment it brings in not being able to discover our true identities.

Human history is populated with emerging ideas regarding religious belief. Paganism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, and Christianity are just a handful of repeated attempts at determining a shared universal purpose. Did we evolve or were we created by a supreme intellect? Are our lives just

proving grounds, testing our loyalties to this God or that one? More recently in the last four hundred years, an ancient ideology achieved sufficiently new prominence to gain worthy attention again: *science!* From its outset, this strand of human understanding has required repeatable, demonstrable evidence to be forthcoming for its arguments to be accepted as true. Religion, on the other hand, has never required repeatable proofs; instead, it asks only we believe, and many of us do exactly that—believe! We do so in defiance of the cold and ruthless light of reason. Why?

Faith and religion are often cited as having profound effects on people's lives, with many believers reporting dramatic life-changing moments as though these experiences were somehow fated to happen. Bad people have become good people. Good people have become amazing benefactors to other people, whose own lives are blighted with poverty and disease. There is no doubt that passion can drive human endeavour, and enhance the idea of being on a righteous path serving God. Yet, such behaviour offers no proof of any religion being true; people can perform similar acts, and feel overwhelming emotions, through passion and belief in their country, their team, or their own ideas. Believing in something, no matter how great it makes you feel, or how much it seemingly provides strength and purpose in a harsh and difficult world, does not offer evidence for any spiritual influences—it just illustrates the way emotional traits, within our makeup, can help us feel better, or drive us to make positive contributions in our lives. If we possessed a different mix of chemical stimuli from the norm (one questions what is normal), our feelings would be different to those we currently have. Our minds, emotions, and our body chemistry are woven together into an inseparable mix, which provide each of us with a *subjective* view of life. There is no objective view of anything. Humans seem unable to untangle themselves from their own, poorly constructed, version of universal truth. This is because we are all effectively deluded in one way or another by other people even more deluded than us.

A spate of books has been published setting faith-believer against pragmatist—religion against science. What appears lacking to me in most of these informed, and cleverly argued, works is recognition of the boundaries separating the diverse strands of human need. We seek

knowledge but also purpose; we comprehend mortality but still harbour hope. We are able to imagine fantastic and impractical scenarios on what we really expect to happen when we die, simply because we are unable to accept the finality of death. We secretly know much of what we dream and hope for can never possibly be.

People live for more than material security and the daily practicalities of getting by. Art, music, love, musing, daydreaming, fooling around, and humour are equally important to us as knowledge, wisdom, and morality. The theologian amplifies the importance of spirituality in fulfilling human abstract need, whereas the scientist offers a growing understanding of reality, but one devoid of any promise to fulfil our fundamental yearning for a greater purpose.

Religion and science, instead of being opposing forces may, in truth, be parallel ones failing to recognise their own origins and the different methods they employ to aim at the same target. The problem with specialisation is that, when one becomes immersed in a thought discipline, most other ways of seeing a thing become obscured. Where scientific knowledge of the universe, and our place within it, is weakest and least proven, the champions of religion fill the void with mystique. Scientists fall victim to the same mistake as the theologians, and pick through the detail of biblical text trying to find fault, instead of considering how their own area of study might offer fantastic spiritual possibilities for human purpose. Both camps resort to exposing the gaps and weaknesses in their adversaries' arguments, when they should be accepting that we all have a long way to go, before we obtain absolute understanding of everything.

Science is the slow deliberation of acquiring knowledge and truth. We are only a small way along all the learning paths, and we still have so much yet to find out. Science may, one day, ultimately discover a divine awareness (God or gods) responsible for all creation, despite the fact there is no hard demonstrable evidence of this right now. Religion appears to satisfy the need for purpose—human purpose, something casually reduced by science to be a 'purpose-less' role: we are just a chemical reaction in the universe and have no pre-determined point in being. The problem is religion offers a promise of purpose within an absurd modern framework, and from

the shaky foundation of a chequered history; it is devoid of modern thinking, and attempts to sell an old idea beneath an atmosphere of welldeserved cynicism from science-enlightened people. Science offers only a cold and convincing knowledge of life, but adds nothing of value to help us accept the struggle, and the terror of death. Are these really the only two philosophies humankind has to make choices from after 4.5 million years of existence?

The questions we should be asking are not whether religion or science holds definitive answers to our human curiosity and emotional needs, but whether these divided camps can offer a convincing method for finding out. I think the best way to attempt to create a proper resolution to the meaning of everything, and the discover the purpose of life, is to explore how scientific truth can be wedded to the core values of spiritual ideologies, irrespective of whether the answers are acceptable to purist theologians, or unimaginative scientists. Hopefully, a large percentage of open-minded ambassadors for both of these disciplines will glimpse the seed of unification and glaring truth in this account.

I believe we have always been lost. Humanity gropes in the dark. After a few thousand years of stumbling around, a few small truths have been discovered to shed sufficient illumination on a unique and almost impossible existence. I think enough data has been gathered for each of us to find the real light switch, and the time has come to resolutely flick it on! This book will explore and expose exactly who we are and suggest what our true purpose is. It is not about belief at this stage; it is simply carefully deduced argument. We live in deceptive times where it has become far more difficult than in the past to prise out the truth from what we are told. I want to blow away the dust of religious fable and remove the vain mirror of human distortion from science. I want to tease out the facts from what is known, and present answers to the meaning of life clearly for everyone to understand and consider.

My book would be incomplete if I dealt only with what can be proved today. Knowledge is continuously being added to our understanding of all things. What is imagined one second becomes the inspiration towards what is possible the next. '42' deals with evidential truths, those ideas that can be

tested or deduced by everyone. It is also about what is *not known*, but can be theorised and imagined as plausible. I have sometimes used passages of fiction to expand on conjecture and make imaginative models of our universe more vivid. You can wonder about these illustrations and bolt them on to your own views. So, if you would prefer to believe in 'ifs' and 'maybes', at least mine will offer something more reasonable and contemporary than the faded gospels, and blood-splattered science papers strewn across the pitted battleground of intellect at war with emotional need.

I think no one should accept the truth about anything until all truth has been wrestled from nature. My work is not asking anyone to close any doors on seeking alternative answers to their questions. We can all be wrong, or convey something inaccurate by mistake. I am not God, or his son, or the devout self-righteous sage who would say, "This is it... the truth... forever and ever, Amen!" *My truth* is extracted from what is understood about our universe today. Whatever may be constructed by discovering additional truths tomorrow, next year, or a million from now, I leave for others to consider and debate. I am hopeful this work may help to enlighten human thought, and bring about a greater degree of harmony between each struggling member of the human race. It would be a bonus if, after reading this, more people found a common direction through life instead of the diverse, and often conflicting, avenues we currently travel to make sense of it all.

What I have to offer here is a heuristic work! I am attempting to draw a series of pictures using fact and fiction in understanding a problem and exploring an answer. My methods are designed to expose the absurdities contained in resolutions offered by religious and scientific theories to the question of the meaning of life. My intention is to reveal my working out so that it stimulates further investigation by you, the reader. I believe no matter which course you choose other than mine to answer your own self-searching questions, my answers can be adapted to your own beliefs even if we differ slightly on the details and mechanism of how we derive a solution.

Some of this work examines the more local problems we experience in

the days of our lives. How should we live a constructive and worthwhile period on this planet? How do we advance happiness, both our own and that of our kindred? If I have done my job correctly, we should be able to explore some interesting insights together, and find sustainable answers to these questions. I have deliberately avoided writing scientific explanations in jargon, and instead I have tried to make many pioneering concepts understandable to everyone. People already versed in the state of knowledge at the various frontiers of scientific investigation will recognise my statements are true (as far as we know right now). Anyone else less informed about science, and the theories underpinning current trends of investigation, will need to put a little faith in me. I have annotated some of the more critical statements in the major sections of this work, and I have provided further clarification at the end, together with suggested published works by other authors, for anyone curious enough to read up and check my facts.

I wish to make two clarifications now; they are both important in understanding my references to consciousness and to the non-aware state of the universe. When I talk about being 'aware', I have often used the words—conscious, consciousness, self-aware, aware, sentient, thinking, and possibly one or two other terms as well. Each of these expressions has slightly different meanings to a perfectionist, but I have used all of them synonymously as a state equal or higher to human consciousness: the feeling we have of knowing we are conscious and aware.

When talking about the universe, sometimes I am really referring to everything in it apart from us and, at other times, everything including us. One should regard the universe as the totality of everything in it. I also infer it to be a mathematical universe although it is more accurately defined as a program-universe. My concern here is to distinguish it apart from something having any will, or human-like purpose, and to avoid inferring any direct intelligence, intent, mind, or perception to it. As far as science and I are concerned, the universe is not alive and does not possess a mind. All its activity, including the existence of living things, is a consequence of properties, traits, and processes inherently woven into its constitution. The cosmos behaves more like a few lines of recursive software code, bound by mathematics and rules, which—along with trial and error—blindly gives a physical existence to the unknown abstracts driving it.

I would like to explain one final important point before you run out of patience with me. Most of us mere mortals find it difficult to come to terms with our individual ultimate deaths. Many readers will have strong belief systems. However erroneous and misinformed these may be from the truth of all truths, some kind of faith enables millions of people to come to terms with finality. A life without hope and magic is like a grey morning where the sun never breaks through for an instant. If you need to believe in magic to confront death, despair, and misery, then a beautiful message is already encapsulated within this work. What is important to me is that you find the message, think about it, and come to understand its astonishing implications. Afterwards, you may genuinely feel you are a worthy and important living entity because of it. The degree of belief required to do this is much smaller than any you currently apply to follow the particular faith you already have. This one is based on looking at what is here now in this life and this world, not on the promise of a non-evidential one in the hereafter. Whether you know it or not, I want you to realise that you, and everyone around you, are critical to the survival of everything there is and will ever he.

Chapter 8. Taking the Christ out of Christianity

This chapter is likely to lose me many friends. Religious belief is so powerful that it blinds us to reason. However, as so many people are already contaminated with unshakeable faith in Christianity, Islam, or any number of other concepts aimed at filling the painful void of 'purpose', their blind faith threatens to divert them away from humanity's proper role forever. Because it only causes misery for tigers to think they are elephants, I believe I should try to show why at least one religion is founded on falsehood. I would like to do the same to dispel any notion of truth contained in other faiths as well, but I understand most of them less than the one I was *infected* with: Christianity! I have no doubt though that Islam, Hinduism, Judaism, and most of the other culturally entwined religions are all bent from their original philosophical roots into supernatural and unrealistic ideologies by humans—where they were originally intended to be only good social-behaviour guides.

Two thousand years ago, the world was a place populated with people with no understanding of the Earth as a body in space. It would take another 1600 years before science penetrated our ignorance to reveal true knowledge, and alter our perception of reality. Back then, humankind thought the world was the plaything of gods. They believed it could come to an abrupt end at any moment. Epileptics and people suffering mental disorders were not ill, but possessed by demons. It is impossible for us now, in an enlightened world, to imagine what life must have been like to believe the sky above was a physical thing dividing earth from heavenly paradise.

Everything we know about the man called Jesus comes from the four gospels of the bible. These gospels were written neither by Jesus nor anyone who knew him, and it would be at least two decades after his death before any written script would refer to him. We know little or nothing of the real man—the living, mortal Jesus. The fact he was tried and crucified has no significance by itself, because thousands of people suffered this

terrible execution under the rule of the Romans. There is no evidence anywhere of Jesus proclaiming to be the son of God. Just Imagine your neighbour or friend popping around for a cup of tea today and telling you he is the direct earthly descendent of a divine and all-powerful god. Things would have been even more extreme in a Jewish society two thousand years ago, and a man walking around saying he was the son of God would have been treated with the same ridicule back then as today!

It is far more likely Jesus was a charismatic man with a high degree of honesty and understanding of the human condition. Not divine! We would never have heard of him without the existence of a tiny religious sect that began around twenty years after his death: the Thessalonians. I believe Christianity would have died out then, or shortly afterwards, if it had not been adopted by Emperor Constantine I (Gaius Flavius Valerius Aurelius Constantinus) some 300 years later as the one true faith of the Roman Empire. Constantine was a brilliant military leader and an ambitious, ruthless man. Before his reign, the Roman Empire was fragmenting and tottering. He succeeded in bringing both the eastern and western countries under a single ruler-himself, head of the Roman Empire. One should note here the main faith in Rome at the time was Paganism: a broad term really describing all other faiths not fitting into the Abrahamic monotheistic group of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Pagans had belief systems based on many male and female gods, often venerating nature. Over seventy-five percent of Roman citizens, along with the majority of subjects in the Roman Empire, would have held Pagan beliefs and practiced associated rituals.

Constantine remained a non-Christian believer for most of his life. Some historical texts proclaim he was baptised into the faith on his deathbed, but there is no real evidence of this. Although Constantine passed legislation against the practice of magic, his actions were motivated by fear that others might gain power through those means; his rise to power had also been through the advice of soothsayers, which persuaded him of the clarity and truth of prophecy. Soon after his victory in a decisive battle in AD 324, he outlawed Pagan sacrifices because he felt more at liberty to enforce his new religious policy. The treasures of Pagan temples were confiscated and used to pay for the construction of new Christian churches. Gladiatorial contests were outlawed and harsh new laws were issued prohibiting sexual immorality. Jews, in particular, were forbidden to own Christian slaves. Yet, with all this, he forbade persecution of Pagans and remained a firm believer in his original faith.

What reason would a clever tactician and military leader have in taking the side of a small religion, established for only three hundred years, and declaring it the one unifying faith for the entire global Roman Empire, especially where such an act challenged the majority of Roman citizens in their long established beliefs? Christian theologians may well argue Constantine had seen the light. They would of course blind themselves to the true nature of dictators, but I think most reasonable people can quickly understand how Constantine saw a high degree of logic in the idea: one God, one ruler, one Rome. It fits well with the association of an emperor being like a single god, and a man such as Constantine would have relished the idea.

Roman military power and Christian (Catholic) Priests ruled kings, queens, and entire countries for thirteen hundred years with a powerful and irresistible force—give or take the odd dark-age step backward. Minds were ruled by suspicion, belief, and fear of armed soldiers or of retribution by God himself. Put a step wrong and you would be hanged, drawn and quartered, tortured for witchcraft and heresy, or crucified. Worse... on your demise you would be whisked off to the eternal fires of hell for not living the joyless life your leaders were preaching you to follow, while they were all debauching themselves with sexual malpractice, greed, and murderous activities.

The holy wars, which at their darkest hour pitched Muslim against Christian in bloody and terrible battles, were fought under pressure from religious leaders, not by monarchy. The North American Indians, the South American Incas and Aztecs were all exterminated by Christians, in one guise or another, spreading across the western world to establish a theological empire still existing in two camps today: the Vatican and the United States of America. Both of these institutions are the direct surviving legacy of Constantine the Great's decision to wed Christianity with military might! In the words of Sam Pascoe an American scholar "Christianity

started out in Palestine as a fellowship; it moved to Greece and became a philosophy; it moved to Italy and became an institution; it moved to Europe and became a culture; it came to America and became an enterprise."

None of this grand and tragic account, of how politics wedded to religious and military ambition conquered half the world, has anything to do with God or gods at all. More importantly, it has even less to do with the reason you arrived here in this universe as a conscious entity from out of the dust of stars.

However, we should not forget to understand how 'good' can often be distilled from the error and confusion of human endeavour. Christianity, together with other religions, offers much in the way of representing fair guidance on how we can live decent lives, and get along with one another. I am hopeful and optimistic that the originator of the Christian ideology, which was probably Paul, had nothing but good intentions in proclaiming the concepts of love, passiveness, sacrifice, and treating one another well— attributing them to Jesus and mysticism only to raise them up above earthy ambition and stupidity to give them impetus. Other than that, everything these religions promise about immortality, heaven, surviving death, and belief in any deities in our universe—one god, many gods, Jesus, Thor, Superman, or Buddha—is completely made up. Jesus never invoked mysticism. The bible may say he did, but he didn't. Other people claimed he did, years later, because they knew there was no real evidential legacy of anything Jesus uttered, and therefore attributed *their own ideas* to being his.

I could write a book revealing the way Jesus, as a man, has been used as a monumental pawn to spread ideas and concepts originating in the minds of other people years after his death. But there is no need to: I recommend to anyone who keeps a bible to read the work of A.N. Wilson 'Jesus' as a definitive start to questioning the myth and fable they have been deliberately infected with. Being a good person is a great idea. Treating one another as equals seems fair to me. Attempting to understand there may be more to life than just the next quick fix is both brilliant and worthy. Unfortunately, the principles—aimed at creating a stable and just society have emerged as assets of Christianity instead of being declared as a legacy of good people thinking good thoughts; being comprehensively entwined with religion, makes it seem that if we dismiss Jesus and a one true God, we also deny the reason and sensibility of the embedded socially-good ideas.

I see no reason for mixing some of the better thoughts and concepts of my human peers with magic, the supernatural, or the idea of a deity's son descending from heaven. Good ideas stand alone as just that: reasonable and sensible. Christianity and other faiths often contain good social rules, but they are infected with bad and false concepts too. The storywriters of Christianity and Islam seem to have cared little for homosexuality, women as equals, and avoidance of childbirth—where too many mouths to feed would certainly bring misery and poverty. Here lies the crux of the problem with all faiths: social rules and power politics have been woven together with ideas and desires of universal purpose. Clever! As most people feel there might be something more to life than day-to-day living followed by death, why not fill this vacuum with a made up, attractive purpose; one which can neither be proved nor disproved, and then tag on a few extra concepts to enable greater social and political control of the people.

Let's not pick on one faith to show how people's underlying need to believe in a higher purpose has been twisted and exploited by self-made leaders in a bid to subjugate the rest of us. Today, Christianity is still an ideology followed in one form or another by a third of the people on the planet—around two billion people. The second major faith, due to overtake Christianity through ever increasing numbers of believers within a few years, is Islam.

I write this work at a time when the activities of the western world focus increasingly on the resources of the Middle East with envy. Oil drives the technological advantage of predominantly Christian-founded communities. Iran and Iraq are oil rich. Western and Middle Eastern communities seem destined to clash over a desire for resources by one faction, and the fear of being plundered by the other. A 'wonderful' opportunity therefore exists to disguise political and financial ambition beneath the deceptive cloak of religious differences. Here we go again!

Islamic philosophy is built on a similar set of ideas as Christianity. If one removed the false and supernatural origins from the principle rules for living together in harmony, we would see little difference between these

seemingly opposed faiths. A man, not God, founded Islam. The new faith was born about six hundred years after Christ because, according to Islam teachings, God was angry we had failed to listen to his sixth prophet (Jesus), and His word had been distorted by priests and people because of their self-interests. Deciding to try one final effort to save us all and establish His word, God sent one final messenger to carry it: Mohammed!

Muslims believe God gave a direct revelation to Jesus, the Injil (*Gospel*), which means 'Good News'. They think some parts of it have been misinterpreted, misrepresented, mistranslated, passed over, and textually distorted over time, and that the earliest manuscripts discovered by archaeologists reflect these changes. Muslims believe the New Testament no longer accurately represents the original revelation. Nevertheless, the Qur'an calls the original Gospel a "Light", guidance, and a divine scripture.

It surprises me the prophet Mohammad was required. Christianity was moving across the world after having been given a due place in the importance of human affairs by Constantine the Great and his conquering armies. Who exactly was not listening to God? The beauty of Islam, in the grand deception of satisfying human universal purpose with references to the same deity worshiped by Christians, is that it preaches religion, culture, and politics should not be divided. Naughty Turkey! Unlike Christian based countries where progress has been made in segregating this triad of ideologies into its distinct parts, Islam countries govern their people with severe civil laws inseparable from religious ones.

Ordinary, good people everywhere, be it China, Iran, America, Egypt, India etc., only wish to move from the cradle to the grave with an opportunity to suffer as little pain as possible, rear their children, see them happy, and then die knowing their job is done. Few of us have fanatical ideas about religion, and most of us extract the wisdom put into them by human philosophers by applying them in our social interactions only where they make overwhelming sense. We often pay lip service to religious decree in western societies, and I am sure it is the same everywhere. If you want to prosper and you are a person of reason, never tell your civic rulers you don't really believe so much in what they say they believe in. Human beings need common ideas to aid their social instincts. We are social animals. We have many sets of 'belonging-labels': we are English, we are vegetarians, we are Christian, we are men, etc. If we removed all ideology and criteria, by which we collect together, and just retain a single concept to guide behaviour in each social group, would we not just be left with the one unifying idea: *we are human!* Would this not bind us together greater than the alleged word of this god or that one?

Maybe it is all Moses' fault leading 'his' people through the desert to a promised land; one promised over two thousand years ago by God according to the all-knowing authors of God's word; a land only partially secured sixty years ago, but now requiring nuclear arms and an entire nation of call-up military personnel-not God-to sustain it. Moses decided to chisel out a brilliant set of social rules and proclaim them God's work. In this one act, he probably set a precedent for all the God-inspired texts thereafter. All this confusion with Godly stuff for so many years is probably the result of a few inspired people trying to stop the rest of us stealing, mating with other people's partners, and killing one another instead of behaving like responsible and caring people. Do we really need to believe in a god or a hereafter today after all that history has shown us on battlefields soaked with the spilt blood of brothers, sons, fathers, and members of our own humankind? What common purpose does everyone need to bond together as a human race other than the evidential truth, provided by science, that we are all destined to be completely exterminated on this planet—not by God, but by blind universe—unless we get on top of it all? The Sun will not shine forever folks!

God believers everywhere, listen up and ask yourselves—65 million years ago, did God believe the dinosaurs were misbehaving? Having sent the requisite lucky seven prophet dinosaurs to tell the others—that, if they don't shape up, they are going to have to face the music—did he then hurl the rock into the earth and wipe them out? Alternatively, do you think it just might be the fault of the sun failing to catch that one somewhere back in time? Since we seem to have been around for the last 4.5 million years, why wait for the last tick of the clock to send prophets down to persuade us all to understand His will of our purpose. Why wait until the last $1/1500^{\text{th}}$ of all humankind time on earth to intervene? Can't *He* get a watch as accurate as

the ones we make? Is this god, the supreme intellect and the absolute knowledgeable being in all of existence, a wee bit dumb?

I say it is *we* who are dumb. Many of us are stupid because we cannot tell truth from fiction, nor appreciate how clever and good people, living in a superstitious age, just had to invoke God and gods to get ignorant people to behave as a society instead of like dinosaurs at each other's throats. Let's say "Mission accomplished!"; we have a sense of society; we acknowledge good ideas can be hijacked and bent by other and less well-meaning people in our society; we have a chance to move on and determine real purpose besides just being.

Let's get on with it!

On the subject of Moses, this is where it all began: the Ten Commandments. These were introduced in a world where people were still trying to come to terms with all manner of fears, and where they suspected that life was under the control of a host of different gods, just a short distance away in the sky. Who can blame them for being superstitious and feeling vulnerable when they believed this god or that one, at the slightest whim, could throw down a thunderbolt to kill the hapless mortals. You have to steady up the crowd, remove the fear of previous superstitions, and keep re-affirming new ones, if you really want to prevent them from entering abject despair. In Islam, like Christianity, Moses (Musa) is considered one of the leading prophets of God. However, Islam also teaches that the Gospels have been corrupted from their divine, original meaning due to carelessness and corruption through self-interest (Really, just the Christian works and not the Islamic ones?). However, messages from the Gospels still coincide closely with certain verses in the Qur'an. This is more or less the case with the Ten Commandments. Consequently, despite the Ten Commandments not being mentioned explicitly in the Qur'an, their message is substantially similar to some of the verses in the Qur'an.

I have reproduced the Ten Commandments from their original (Hebrew) roots below, along with my comments in italics. You should recall what I said earlier about the world of yesterday being one where superstition ruled mind and heart; where people across the globe believed they were on an earthly chessboard as mortal pawns of the gods above them. One wrong

move meant you were likely to be hit by a bolt of lightening, or struck by illness, and be recalled to suffer your fate above. People would make tokens, offer up sacrifices, anything to appease the gods. Moses had to take a large number of people and lead them through formidable challenges and stress. It is highly likely they would revert to all manner of unsociable human activities, and return to previously held views or lucky-charms, when things got rough. The 'discovery' of The Ten Commandments must have been a timely, intuitive 'find' by Moses, and a bit like winning the International Lottery today without paying for a ticket, because they covered most of the problems he, Moses, anticipated.

I am your God (Many people probably still thought of the old gods a lot.) You shall have no other gods before me (Listen up and forget about those other ones, you know—God of sex, God of war etc.,) You shall not make for yourself an idol (Many pagan beliefs were iconic. Best nip that in the bud.) You shall not make wrongful use of the name of your God (What... like no God? Or maybe Thor, Venus, Zeus, Elvis?) Remember the Sabbath and keep it holy (So, we can stop working and spend a day chanting and reinforcing our *new brainwashing instead?*) Now here comes the real crunch and good ideas for the backbone of an ordered social group: -Honour your parents (Yup. Good idea!) You shall not murder (Now you're talking!) You shall not commit adultery (Hard sometimes, but I get the point and it's a good one.) You shall not steal (Agreed. It only creates problems.) You shall not bear false witness (I just hope I am not the only one telling the truth.) You shall not covet your neighbour's wife (What? Not even in my fantasies? But it makes sense.)

You shall not covet your neighbour's house (Why must I live in a tent, and he in a mansion?)

I believe we no longer need God, priests, bibles, or ancient books to tell us which core values provide a basis for good social fabric today. Most of us can see the sense of getting on with one another, as I am sure common people probably did back then. Why not just wipe the slate (stone) clean and accept its wisdom without worrying too much about who provided it?

Observation from the philosophy of 42: If you want people to behave socially, maybe it is best to explain why certain actions are good for all of them, rather than command them to obey!

I have a final word to say in this attempt to convince you that religion, the world over, is fabricated. Before the introduction of Christianity and Islam, Pagan faiths incorporated women priests as well as male ones. Even gods were from both sexes. I believe this indicates women were considered equal to men in many of the Pagan-based cultures, but then for the last two thousand years, with the introduction of two relatively young belief systems, women were relegated to an inferior role and consequently lost their equality with men. If religious gospel did well by providing us with sober and enlightened understanding of the exemplary behaviour necessary to form stable societies, it achieved it at the expense of subjugating women in the process.

Women occupy extremely few positions of leadership and power. Until recently in the western world—and I mean as little as seven years ago in the UK—state law sided predominantly with the husband in divorce; a legacy of far stricter past restrictions on the rights of women compared to those of men. In many non-western countries, females are still regarded as owned through marriage, and are required to be in complete obedience of their husband owners. The one true God is male. All his prophets were male. Priests are male. The story of Adam and Eve irrevocably condemns women to a position of wayward sinners and the deceivers of men. Yet, this is in complete denial of reasonable truth, which is women hold the critical role of sustaining human life through birth and the nurturing of children at their breast. I cannot help wondering, if women instead of men were the past leaders of state and church, would they have readily sent children, suckled at their breast, so quickly to die on the fields of Agincourt, Flanders, and countless other places down through time. I think not! A final solution to the Great Debate.

42 - The Answer to Life, The Universe, and Everything

Buy The Complete Version of This Book at Booklocker.com:

http://www.booklocker.com/p/books/3174.html?s=pdf