

A collection of short essays.

Michael Mill.

Latest version, --- 20/07/2023

By their nature, we are in majority concerned with habits. These are things of both utility and disfavour. As with anything else, there is a flip-side to them. We both require and would happily dispense with habits that are unfavourable (eg, eating habits) -

The concept of judgement. I despise 'a', - for/against, - the standpoint that we all share a view that is “against” or “for” something. What is the nett result of this?

Concepts surrounding God, as to the proof or disproof of his existence.

The basic tenet given, that it is neither possible to prove the existence of God (Atheism) - vs. the corollary of being unable to disprove it.

We are quick to judge each-other, yet what is the motivating property here, what is judgement and why do we consistently judge (on the basis of some authority?) - Who is the greater in that contest? – the judged or the adjudicator?

I think this falls back to the primitive concept of duality.

Thoughts on AI

In terms of artificial intelligence, I believe that algorithms that mimic the behaviour of the mind, are incomplete. The mind uses a highly adaptive and learning process -- which through participation, one is enabled to understand or to think.

We have a variety of senses which deal with the concious action of the mind. In an assumption, we believe that information is retrieved and processed – on the basis of some fundamental psychological laws.

It is fallacious to believe, that a simple algorithm can reproduce this behaviour.

The algorithms that we use and adapt to suit or reproduce intelligence, are founded in a very mechanical and abstruse way. I fail to see any light on a subject wherein we use machines to reproduce this behaviour. We are essentially, organic systems – and I feel that this is inaccessible if we rely on a simple set of algorithms which aim at enabling the concept of sentence.

If we try to defer between the macro and microscopic, I think it is essential that we recognize the higher level structure of the mind. Simply isolating or decomposing the mind into smaller elements isn't a solution. I cannot emphasize more clearly on this, as the topography of science – relies on a very essential system of elimination, raising answers on the back of physical proof. The direct physical or empirical insight isn't a sufficient

explanation. It begs for something deeper.

I feel that the gamut of artificial intelligence will rely to a large degree on the philosophical rearing of the subject.

If I were to conjure up a “living” algorithm, I would imagine it would have to be able to learn. This to me is the primary requirement. This, in the digital realm – is hideously complex. What is it to say, that a machine can learn, interpret, assimilate and act on some sense of will. These are very much human concepts, yet we would have to fulfil these in order to state that some algorithm is autonomous and free thinking.

QT and random behaviour

The quality of quantum theory and superposition is inconclusive.

I am going to focus shortly on random behaviour. I can't place more emphasis on the fact that a proof of random behaviour isn't visible.

I sit on the fence wherein QT and deterministic systems exist in parallel. Instinctively, my first conclusion is on the basis of determinism. I don't see how chance or random behaviour can exist, – and it strikes me that the majority of QT insight is only a stochastic explanation and insufficient to explain nature, in anything more than a structure modelled, on chance and indeterminism.

I feel that the hypothesis that information can travel faster than light, is amiss.

If I think of questions raised about causality, I try to identify wherein this reaction exists within man and to a greater extent, on all things.

I think I tend to some degree to tie up reasoning as a model, to try and derive some insight into the way the world thinks and reasons. In this, I hit upon the topics of random behaviour, – and the concept of chance.

A creator and natural selection

I feel that the existence of God, doesn't necessarily have to dispense with natural selection, wherein the development of the species could have a participating agent which “designs” by degree on the basis of some physical strata.

I feel that it is significantly amiss to proclaim that the concept of a “creator” is unlikely due to the backbone of scientific insight.

Science is a great arbitrator wherein physical laws are essential, yet these laws and any relevant proof – rely predominantly on the physical world and little else.
The deeper questions and insights into our existence and purpose (If any) – cannot find a foothold in this.

Thus, the seeds of religion are present within this.

These questions have always existed and have been raised. This kernel, is what I believe to be the strong influence in the birth of questions relating to all of our deeper questions, insights and religion.

The world is littered with concepts that rely on illusory thinking, – with no essence or retort in fact.

On social innocence

There is an innocence in both man and the world surrounding him. What is this?

If we stop to consider nature, – we have an instinctive response to it. This is largely untouched and innocent, - hence the quality of attachment. I have also recognised this with different ethnicities.

With respect to the latter, there appears to be a relationship of service between the two groups. It is often a flip-side.

In this, it raises the psychological issue of how people are generally in service to one another, especially with respect to the grouping of families.

Of time and infinity

With respect to concepts such as infinity and eternity, we at some very basic level seize upon the concept, yet it is entirely inconclusive. I feel that we can recognize these ideas, although they are unbounded. On some very simplistic level, we can grasp it, yet it seems that we cannot resolve it.

The idea that boundaries exist to a finite point is I feel mistaken, as I can't see a limiting condition existing whereby no further detail is exposed. The basis of classical or new theory is that there are further and more detailed explanations which either rise or fall infinitely.

Our theories being explanations at a specific level, it stands to reason that each description into our environment and those basic laws are simply intermediate explanations for something that has a greater level of detail. (In this instance, infinite detail)

On language

I feel that language in whatever form it transpires, is crucial to man in this being a distinctive quality that we do not share with the rest of the animal kingdom. We are both able to be numerate and literate. - leading thoughts to the ideas surrounding information, storage of it and issues

surrounding communication (Something that is not entirely native to man)

On ethics

It seems our convictions set-up a framework for our lives. In that, the axioms we derive and the substance given to our choices, define in large the outcome of what we both believe and perceive. In this, where does morality lie and why is it that man strikes out to be right - and that the use of wrong or what is considered immoral is useless.

I feel that this may be mistaken, - it cannot be that virtue alone is sufficient. What is it in the basis of holy, that man cannot dispense with it or do anything to harm its carriage. We cannot directly and without impunity harm what is considered holy. Why is this? - where in man and the course of his life do we find this automatic respect for something not necessarily revealing itself in nature.

On the old and new

Where is the dividing line, between the old and the new? - I think this relates to concepts surrounding time. There appears to be a quick shift between the present and the past. Independent of the qualities of time in common thought, the mind itself exhibits some relevant qualities, in terms of memory.

Thus, what could be considered “fresh”, - is deceptive. Age itself, is a very human concept.

On conformity

With respect to our peers, we appear to be in a continuous sortie. We feel compelled to “fit in” – hence, the herd instinct of man. Given this, we also feel and desire acceptance with those we hold in esteem, and attempt to disband those we feel are beneath our given standards.

It seems that the social apparatus of man, is a continuous requirement. We move between different groups, and share a social contract with those we wish to find acceptance by.

In all of this, we feel a direct participation in judgement. It appears that our emotional agenda, shapes and forms the relationships we share with people.

In this, are the crucial concepts of subjectivity and objectivity.

I feel that the two are remarkably closely defined, and to derive a distinctive line between the two is difficult. In this, the feeling that one could be entirely impartial, falls short of reality. As with this, to be entirely open and share a passionate position, or to derive a complete connection, is difficult.

On morality and evil

In terms of good and evil, – these concepts or ideas have become entirely vague, given the current material world or existence. I suspect the softer approach to this, could be conceived as “good vs. bad”.

With respect to those who commit crime there is usually a clinical explanation for this. I suspect that in the “modern” world, we can't signal where evil lies, as mostly this relates to certain behaviour.

We are conscious of our own mortality. This is a striking reality, in that we try to expand life beyond the grave. This too, is a seed in terms of religious development. The larger questions we have about an afterlife, seem easily given. Unlike our relatives on Earth, we are unique in our prescience of this difficult subject. I feel that the genesis of religion, relies significantly on this.

We have always raised these questions, and they are no foreigner in the province of religious belief. I think it's crucial to realize that these “bigger” questions are ubiquitous in the arena of mortality and the potential life beyond.

On families and service

In terms of families, a nuclei is the embodiment of closely knit relationships. The ties that sustain these groupings, are significantly bound to each other.

It is an interesting apparatus, that we share a “weighted sum” with respect to the people we share time with, on a daily basis. This seems to have significant reach in terms of depth, as the connection pool of relationships extends significantly, outwards.

In other words, we are all in service to one another.

We scale things, across the foundry of less or more, have or have not.

I feel that prestige, the assortment of ownership and given titles are a shallow perspective, to the degree that we are both possessed and ruled by these incumbents.

The ego, suffers this admittedly.

I feel that the betterment we all proclaim to share, is a blind agenda.

In terms of authority, who and what defines this. Where do we lay our foundations in this. We derive the assumption, that there is always something targeted towards. Something, in which we perceive to be greater than ourselves.

On applicable logic

My thoughts on logic and its application to programming languages and their general use. There are defined fundamentals in computer languages that are ubiquitous in both design and usage. It might even be an idea to define these similarities on the basis of common aspects and to derive a general explanation for it.

In terms of AI, this is a subject still in its infancy. I feel that the algorithms that have been designed to mimic this behaviour are truly exaggerated. The game of life is an interesting adaptive algorithm which develops from an initial seed. In terms of the real it could be said that random behaviour doesn't exist. This is relatively elementary.

Given that, - how is it that QM relies on the idea of random behaviour?

What is mathematics? - we define some simple terms which relate to the way in which nature reveals itself. The question is, is mathematics embedded in nature or do we find that it is purely dependent of thought. It seems that patterns exist in nature which repeat or follow cyclic systems. I think that language is fundamentally the core of this. We use a logical process whether or not it's defined in typical language or to more complex systems found in mathematics. I suspect it is simply a tool as any language to facilitate a process of comprehension or understanding.

What is the nature of man and his interpretation of his surroundings. We seem to absorb information and process it. In what way does the brain function.

On the material

There is the material sense whereby we find our explanations on the basis of a mechanical understanding. This is partially in contrast to developing a theory. What lies beyond the material existence? - we perceive reality yet the (ref : mind-body problem) - experience of reality is a question.

Thoughts on time and the idea of a space time. If I narrowly look at dimensions, it strikes me that dimensions are very much a human design. We develop theories and laws which define a large array of the technology we use daily. By degree, I suspect that this is a good use of applied science.

Is there any visible proof of QM's legitimacy? - it seems that our approach to experiment and the empirical doesn't necessarily provide a working example.

Morality and ethics? - my thoughts on the fact that a creed isn't in itself entirely sufficient. Why does the human mind flock to the "right way" of doing things. What does it mean to be right? - is this simply one side of an argument? - this brings up the philosophical idea of truth and its validity. In a conventional sense, language defines our interpretation or use, leading to understanding.

The subjective idea is one in which a participant is directly involved in a given scenario. In

other-words, a passionate position. Whereas the opposing idea relates to the dispassionate or impartial. An aside, it strikes me that the line between the two are extremely thin.

What makes us laugh? - what in language derives this effect? Is it something congruent that leads to this? A comical result, due to something unusual? - humour and at the expense of someone else?

On the mind and axioms

It strikes me that the material approach to the question, "why?" doesn't provide an entirely valid answer. We tend to explain through moral, scientific and religious views.

What is it to ask "why?" - we strive to find a cause, yet it seems this is something that has infinite depth. (first cause?)

On pride and how it holds up others and the self. It seems that pride provides a chassis for the mind to "hold up". It allows the mind to sustain specific conventions and beliefs on the basis of some ethos.

- The intuitive? - natural instinct? - the gut? - it appears that our minds require a valid basis and foundation in terms of thinking. In this, axioms need to be provided and developed in order to sustain our thinking and to a large extent, our belief system.

A failure in this would lead to error prone thinking which doesn't satisfy or provide a strong result.

Thoughts on natural selection

Thoughts on natural selection on the basis of society or a given social model.

It's a given that the process of natural selection doesn't cease on the basis of any social model. The question remains, what influence does this procedure have on man's development. The construct, as to what we can attribute to saying, civilisation - is a chassis, largely man made or artificial.

Yet the distinction or line dividing these concepts is relatively thin. It's clear that influences that are formed by nature and of it are difficult to discern in comparison to how man responds to nature and largely to himself. The question is, what is the nett result of man and the competing quality of nature.

So, initially it helps to try and define what are the fundamental and strong cursors in terms of natural selection. There should be a given, hierarchical system whereby some components are more active than others. The question remains, what are they. The senses are a good place to begin, as it seems throughout the animal kingdom we share these with the rest of it.

So, given the idea of articulation and how best to manage the environment we look towards our appendages, etc.

The one notable aspect of man is his distinguished capacity for thought and what some may describe as sentience. I tend to believe that there isn't a sure distinction in terms of what we can call this as animals tend to display a variety of actions in concord with us.

Thoughts on UT

Thoughts on a universal theory, or a complete set of given laws.

The idea that boundaries exist to a finite point is I feel mistaken, as I can't see a limiting condition existing whereby no further detail is exposed. The basis of classical or new theory is that there are further and more detailed explanations which either rise or fall infinitely.

Our theories being explanations at a specific level, it stands to reason that each description into our environment and those basic laws are simply intermediate explanations, for something that has a greater level of detail. (In this instance, infinite detail)

This raises the unsolved issue between the finite and infinite. In an infinite model, it should be a given that the depth into either the small or large spans infinitely - given that, it's permissible to accept that the explanations themselves are finite and intermediate. There cannot be a complete solution. A distinct part of this, is our ability to provide a unique and finite solution which acts as a representative of what is fundamentally something infinite. There is no complete solution and there could never be a complete solution.

What is that dichotomy of the finite and infinite. How is it that boundaries exist within an infinite space?

Our models do in fact function as we have seen the direct response of science to technology and it's functioning character.

The formalism of mathematics

Mathematical statements, the idea that certain elements of language describe something that is both illusory and difficult to prove. Concepts such as applied mathematics, lead to the idea that basic properties of mathematics can be realised in the tangible world.

What does this mean? - Is it that our ideas and concepts are realised in the physical domain? Where lies the bridge between this? - that man can conceive of theory and find applicable assignment in nature.

It seems possible, that we create concepts which are applied in nature.

The other standpoint is that mathematical constructs are embedded and are a part of natural existence.

We then through an empirical process try to infer meaning and derive constructions from a natural standpoint.

By example, the Mandelbrot set displays an interesting phenomenon. In this, we can view an infinite set which transcends our own conceptions and displays an infinite series which appears to be embedded in nature.

A crucial example as to where we can perceive a very “human” construct, is the development of dimensions. That is to say, we exist in four given dimensions, which isn't directly analogous to what exists in nature.

God, and his tangible existence

In the consideration of God, - a question raised in terms of His existence, relies on the fact that he occupies some form of space? - alternatively, that His spirit transcends the material existence.

This is inconclusive.

What is it to say, that the divine existence of God, or the constructs of Heaven and Hell require some type of tangible reality. If we exist there, be it in a supposed after life, I would imagine that we occupy some material space or that these places do exist in the material realm.

For us to exist there, – I would imagine that we would need to still retain essential material properties.

When we die, how is it that the mind is translated to this given existence which transcends the physical?

Concepts surrounding determinism

What is it to say, that existence is both determined and fated. This contravenes the concept of free will. We make choices, daily – yet are these an exercise in free will or are they simply a fated system where thoughts are subsequent of one another, without any conscious activity.

The concept of free will is purely a human idea, – it doesn't have any relevance to a natural phenomenon or insight.

Random behaviour

What does it mean to say that something is random?

Wiki exert : “**Random** is a term used in [mathematics](#) (and less formally) to mean that there is no way to reliably predict an outcome (to know what will happen *before* it happens) or sense a pattern “

So, we can evaluate using an initial seed, – which by selection is always unique. Yet this in no way defines anything random, even though the selection criteria is always unique. (ie, using time as a seed, as an input to a computer program)

In terms of Quantum Theory, - the evaluation and assessment of a specific state, is always on the back of a stochastic argument.

This is purely, an approximation to some measurement, - yet to me, it smacks of an incomplete description or explanation.

With respect to Chaos Theory?

Questions on the origin of life

How is it that life comes to be? - If we look at the evolutionary sequence, we recognize that life forms on the back of some very, standard conceptions. It looks arguably inevitable, that life should form based on the principles of given, environmental cursors. It almost appears to be an expected result after a period of indeterminate time.

Is this a linear conception?, – that the evolution of our given environment follows a linear and rigid path?

There don't appear to be rapid and divergent paths which contradict the idea of a linear evolutionary sequence.

It appears to be a linear and sequential process.

I think molecular theory needs to augment these ideas into a full understanding of the basic constituents of life's, manifestation.

Thoughts on a multi-verse

This to me is good explanation for a cosmological insight regarding “parallel universes”

Although, I think the concept that for every moment, an ad-joint universe is instantiated is amiss. Although I feel that in the concurrent universe we find ourselves in, – there is a

sequential death and birth, of new or more “universes”.

Thoughts on Causality and Chance

What of the first cause? – this specifically relates to the initial condition of the given universe. Concepts of cause, motive, purpose and general principles of action, are not entirely amiss.

The physical standpoint is that they are inconclusive and arbitrary.

One of the failures of an entirely material existence, is that it dispenses of any idea, such as there being some sense of causality to existence. I feel that the abundance of scientific theory has placed these concepts, in a very difficult light. I tend to think that the meta-physical is a crucial aspect of our trying to assign a certain understanding to the world and universe we live in.

If we look back towards the inception of scientific thinking, it was still a small niche of expertise. Religion, still provided the framework as to what is real and where we come from. I think it's a given, that the impetus of science has left us bereft of some more fundamental moral values.

I suspect I enjoy the idea of chance, yet I don't see it's existence in anything.

If I look at the general landscape, in terms of our thinking – it strikes me that there is so much uncertainty. We are all battling with these concepts, at some very fundamental level. I do believe that self examination is crucial, - to find a hand in understanding the world and what makes it, the way it is.

I see this continued battle between two camps, science and religion.

I think it's important to clearly differentiate here, – as they do not entirely share the same goals, nor are they of the same footing.

In terms of religious thinking, often we can derive comfort from the idea of an “after life”. These primitive ideas, have always been around – they are not foreign to us.

We quickly surmise, on the basis of death – that it isn't the end of it.

I think at this point that it's important to stress, that the seeds of religious thinking is something we all face, by some degree. This in itself, is an indication of a potential existence beyond the grave. It isn't evidence, - yet man has raised these questions since the very beginning. The fact that we ask these questions, is sufficient to say that a kernel or ingredient of faith is potentially always present.

In terms of purpose, causality, etc – I feel that these concepts should not be abandoned due to the materialistic, existence.

Neither science or religion, are complete. They cannot provide us with a full framework. I think that the meta-physical, is a requirement. We cannot escape these questions, nor can we find a signal belief, in them.

Thoughts on education

I think education is crucial, in the development of the mind. It doesn't dull, our experience. It does quickly, provide a very rational framework whereby we can understand and practice within the world, we live in.

Our capacity for speech and thinking, is closely tied to the simple act of reading.

I cannot underestimate this.

Our ability to reason, is formed on the bedrock to conceive and think, – directly coupled with the capability to read. The internal dialogue, – is a core activity that we all share. This manifests as words, thoughts, etc.

The written word, is very much a human endeavour. We are unique, within the animal kingdom to have developed enough, to both conceive and share with the written word.

Words themselves are symbolic, they assist with our ability to think, conceive and generate ideas.

In my estimation, the capacity to deal with words, ideas etc – are closely coupled with intelligence.

I think, truly understanding something, is crucial. We cannot elucidate on this, without some basic element of reading, comprehension, etc.

On moral values

Is morality innate? – is this something dependent of us, or is there some form of natural explanation or condition for it.

In terms of good vs. evil, – If we consider racism as an example, I suspect that even the tolerance that we develop for this, doesn't entirely reduce or alter its reality. The question is, does this perceived wrong through tolerance, become a right? –

Are these the seeds of acceptance, which make the negative concept something good or positive?

Is pain and suffering a measure, by which we derive something is wrong or evil?

On objective reality

“(of a person or their judgement) not influenced by personal feelings or opinions in considering and representing facts. “

How do we come to this determination. If we try to ascertain an external reality, we are bound by a subjective position, which exempts the possibility of deriving an objective standpoint. What is it to say that something is objective and has a necessary basis in fact?

It is difficult, to avoid the passionate position. We can only surmise, that an objective reality exists, – although due to our own subjectivity, we are not in a position to prove this reality, in any reliable way.

We cannot leave bias, at the door. It is given, that we enter into contact, with some degree of unique perspective.

So, only by some degree can we define a distinction, between the objective and subjective.

On proof

On this, I think that proof is a questionable concept. In this, science relies on an objective insight. Yet we are reliant on the senses to adopt a view of objective reality. What we share in common helps derive what we believe in to be fact.

Yet where is the proof in this? – what does proof and it's requirement actually mean.

It is only through our direct and empirical experience of nature, collectively – that we come to a common thesis and what might be defined as an objective standpoint.

There is a parity between material proof and what could be defined as empirical understanding. We are truly limited by what we can see, feel, etc.

On the existence of love and evil

Love, is a remarkable experience, in that we bond to each other for life. There is a significant and powerful attachment to children – given to the relationship between their parents and themselves.

I think the qualities of compassion, kindness and a general aspect of strong emotional attachment could be defined as being beneficiary. This is something else that belies any real tangible definition in physical reality.

I think I can relate back to a previous argument on proof, and how there is something more compelling than the simple physical existence and explanation for these experiences. In relying purely on a material explanation, it removes any real substance from the argument.

I feel that this is a deep issue.

The idea of evil is another concept which rallies in a variety of directions. I think this moral argument steps backwards as we try to ratify the distinction between the “real” and “unreal” – and towards concepts of the supernatural.

It is simply too compelling, to say that we are purposeless beings without any sense of significance in this maelstrom that we inhabit.

Unfortunately, neither camp can lay claim to a proof. It strikes me that this argument will forever be incomplete and unsatisfied.

We strike out so strongly to try and lay claim to a personal truth and belief, - in this vault of disparate connections. I suspect it could be considered fruitless – to some.

Free will and determinism

I would like to believe that we are free agents. Yet on the basis of determinism, it is possible that our actions are predefined.

So that there is ultimately no “choice” in our behaviour, actions, will, etc.

Where does this very human concept come from? – In everyday life, we consistently believe that our actions are the result of free will.

What does determinism actually mean?

Irrespective of determination, our thoughts, actions are still the result of some conscious activity in daily existence. So, if this too is determined, how is it that our conscious activity exists – in that we do make, choices.

I don't necessarily believe that faith, or the concept of free will has to be a religious idea. We cannot prove, the existence of consciousness, – yet this doesn't mean to say it doesn't exist, and that we exercise a process of self will.

On a scientific method

I digress, - I find that the evolution of scientific ideas follow a proportional model. I suspect that time, conditions, etc – play a large role in our ability to develop new ideas. This is entirely divided and fundamentally non-linear, in that the world itself and the history of it follows a system of ideas which is not always consecutive.

There are simply too many, varied influences.

In terms of scientific ideas, the kernel of these ideas happened in a certain time. The seeds of ingenuity seem to follow a diverse pattern.

I don't feel that a unified theory, exists.

If we look back in hindsight it displays that ideas, and progress – are not always subsequent of one another.

My thoughts on there not being a unified field theory is that all of our abstractions and theories are only definitive by degree.

We have a great model, – yet it is only that, a model.

This is something we as humans derive and fashion. It cannot be complete.

I don't really believe that this argument, is ill founded. It strikes me that we have always only been able to strive towards an approximation.

In theory, we can fold a piece of paper infinitely. This itself spells of the fact that infinity rises and falls in opposing directions.

On society and evolution.

The social model or general social “collective” has a direct and corresponding influence on the outcome of man's evolution. We are no longer primitive, in that we lead a relatively leisurely existence. The outcome of man's actions, are largely a result of his thought and responding behaviour which fashions the “modern” world, we live in.

What is to say is the defining result of our interactions at this level. In what way is the species of man and the attributed process of evolution, shifting in relation to our modern environment. It seems to me that the mind, is the strongest arbitrator in terms of the “success” of man's general development.

On society and evolution, ad.

We live in a world defined largely by the civilisation we live in. We are no longer compelled by primitive causes alone.

In the modern world, we predominantly live a life of leisure without any serious incumbents. This cannot directly relate this to the “lower” echelons of society, yet we strive towards a world wherein our pursuits and a result, are based largely on the endeavours of the mind. It strikes me that in modern history the men and women who have had the most significant impact on society, are those of significant intellectual grace.

It seems to me, – that great incumbents are often the direct result of a great mind. In this, we are not punished for being “smart”, – usually the opposite. We are chiefly rewarded by the very token of being smarter than a competitor.

Where does this chassis we call civilisation, lead man? – The process of evolution on any level has always been a very direct and empirical process, largely based and defined on the back of natural cursors. That is no longer the case, we live in a very well defined existence, designed to a large degree by man. We are clothed, comforted and fed. Not by the result of a natural impetus.

On God, good vs evil.

Where do these basic concepts exist? – In a world that is entirely physical and materialistic, begs the question at any level of morality. I feel this is why the concept of some independent justice which is a greater authority to man, is so terribly important.

If we dispense with the idea of causation, - as we revoke and dismiss some higher morality, we are left with the basic reality that our judgements towards what is both good and true, evil and wasteful – are simply materialistic concerns and are simply the result of nature's compelling action towards evolution.

I do believe that morality is innate, yet it is likely a direct result from a higher authority which claims to observe these qualities and what it means for us.

I see no reason why nature alone can manufacture this. It simply doesn't “ring true”.

This is a telling statement. Wherein lies the hand of God? – where does he exist, if at all. If we consider as a template, the vacuum of space, – or any close appreciation of matter at microscopic level, We see no hand other than that of nature. Yet, we easily conclude that his existence is given and unalterable.

I don't believe that natural selection obviates the need for a creator or Yahweh. In a very participating process, the passionate and ever present motive of God is at every turn of nature, present in this. Unfortunately, I can't “see” his existence, and thus conclude that he doesn't exist. So, I need to rely on the next direct assumption that his existence is something we cannot perceive on a physical level, – and that it is something entirely undefined.

Further to this, – one of the requisites of God is that he is never revealed to man directly. There is no “direct” contact with God – whether it be through the eyes of a believer or someone who chooses not to believe at all. In either of these situations, it's clear that his existence isn't something definable, – and this is key.

It is crucial, in that if he were to “come down” – to the reality and existence that man inhabits and dwells, it would be a quick process for man to shape, fashion and form God at the very level man himself, adjudicates.

Thus, it is an eternal requirement that he is always separated from us, that we cannot in truth find him directly and give him that form. I suspect that the divine character of God requires that he is emancipated from the judgement of man.

The holy trinity from which Christ was born, spells as part of his incumbency on earth was

not only to deliver a message, yet to bridge this great divide between man and God. I suspect it became His responsibility to try and merge these two quantities. Or that his Son came to us to reveal the mercy, love and with emphasis, the condemnation of God.

In terms of God and religion, the most primitive beginnings of man, or more specifically the dawn of man and his earthly consciousness, tells that we all ask the questions of this kind. Ie, Why are we here? – Where do we come from?, etc. These are the seeds of religiosity and religious thinking.

Further thoughts on AI

I always feel an innate aversion to any popular hype, – and I feel that Artificial Intelligence is no foreigner to this. The given concepts surrounding AI, are not in the least new, – although there are commercial, economic and what I feel, more anecdotal charges, in the development of AI.

In the development of this idea towards a tangible, real world and functioning AI, we need to look closely at what we're modelling this on. In this, what fundamental backbone we are rearing the development of a computational, yet free agent.

The concept of free, is a very human and often, divine construct.

If AI were to be true, it would need to reflect the same ability to learn, propagate and reproduce as any human does. In the sense of reproduction, ideas, thoughts and general innate behaviour which we as human, tend to take for granted.

Whether freedom exists, is another issue.

Yet on the basis we are free agents, I suspect that AI too would need to be autonomous in this.

What does it mean to learn and respond? – There is always an “I”, a fundamental ego which surfaces on every level. If this could be considered the basic ingredient of the human ego and the expression as a free agent, I imagine an AI would need to exhibit the same properties. Would it be possible that a living, AI – could turn against it's creator? Where is the line drawn between human and digital behaviour? - This is a crucial concept to understand. We are not, God – yet we try to recreate something so utterly complex and evasive to understand. I suspect I could work on the assumption that if we did succeed in producing a digital free agent, it would always be subordinate to its creator.

Would it equal man, in this respect? – Would we be creating something that can equal us in disposition, intellect and sense of moral virtue?

In truth, I doubt it.

A mechanical process – which is what algorithms are, a complex recipe. Instructions on a computer are just a list of sequential branches and “easy” calculations. I doubt my pocket calculator at it's roots has the penning ability, to master and replicate the process of an

autonomous intelligence.

There is no easy facsimile, to the human mind.

I have given thought to self propagating algorithms, and in some way have tried to play with this idea at an engineered level. I admit, the childish notion and concept of AI is an attractive concept, – although is it misled?

On age and growth

It seems that our experience of time changes as we grow and develop. I feel that there are deep physiological changes to the mind, which alter our experience of time.

The brain develops towards maturity and in some sense there is a degrading result to the mind towards the later stages of life.

On time and retention

It seems that mind and the retention of memory, is a persistent force. We can remember, – yet we cannot predict the future. Where in the evolution of the mind did the capacity for retention surface?

If we take a snapshot of something, – it reflects the past, - yet we cannot simultaneously take a picture of the future.

If we consider the concept of space/time, we have to recognise that this is merely a man made fabrication – even if it works well. Something that is immediately apparent is our visible and ubiquitous ability, to derive an image of what has transpired and hence our ability to obtain a “sense” of the passage of time.

Science vs. religious faith

Science and religious faith, are two entirely dissimilar concepts.

One is not necessarily tied to the other. I believe that denouncing one in favour of the other, is amiss. If we skip ahead to concepts like faith, purpose and causality, we step into the arena of religiosity.

I think it's easy to muddle these two ideas, as they answer very different questions.

Science does not explain an origin, per example – of everything. It strikes me, that this is something that lies in an infinite regress. The concept of God, doesn't disqualify science, and vice versa. We can quickly usher in a belief that the process of all things, stems from a divine hand.

The real question is, - where is God?

The only result I am left with, is that God resides somewhere entirely supernatural.

A place, devoid of material explanation.

If I venture to assume that God doesn't exist, – I immediately try to apprehend all of creation as being a cold, agent – which sheds nothing else but on an unfeeling, and purposeless existence.

I can't agree with this, – yet simultaneously, I feel the urge to conceive of all things as being entirely devoid of a divine presence.

If I search deeply, this strikes me as being unlikely – although is it perhaps that I am consoled by the concept of God, – that there is a “greater” cosmic meaning and significance to my life.

On information and the written word

Our ability to pen, or record information through the written word is significant. We think and communicate via the process of language, symbols, etc. This directly stems from the use of the mind and symbolic referencing.

We quickly fashion understanding, relative to language.

The variety of symbolism, seems to interact directly with our thinking and as importantly, our ability to communicate to what we feel, think, etc.

This mustn't be underestimated.

On uniqueness and diversity

It is interesting to note, that we are largely unique. Yet, we are also very similar in design.

If I consider the passage of time, and experience – I realise that we are largely very alone.

Who, where and what we are, – is significantly unique.

How is it that we know of someone else? - On what level can we through insight, gain an image into the life of another.

Thus, we are often a prisoner within, – and that we find that only through a smattering of contact, can we gain perspective into the existence of someone else.

On atheism

There is something cold in the atheistic belief. If the world we live in, is devoid of purpose, or cosmic significance – we are quickly robbed of something truly compelling.

Yet simultaneously, I feel that having the courage to believe in no creator, requires a level of belief in itself. We cannot easily dispense with these issues. It strikes me that both camps, rally to find an explanation or justification for either belief.

Or the lack, thereof.

Yet, my final or conclusive feeling, is that we cannot abandon the idea of God, regardless as to what we might choose to believe.

The universe, is in truth a very unforgiving constant.

The meta-physical, is tied loosely to abstraction. Our lives, are simply too meaningful to emancipate religious concepts. Even dispensing with the written word of God, – the deeper questions still reside, beyond any historical accounting – such as to the nature of the Christ.

On conflict and other ideas

As an aside, if we try to consider conflict, who is to say which side God favours? - Questions of this kind, are where error prone reasoning exists. Especially, in a universal creator who doesn't favour one specific religion over another.

Again, if we consider the issue of starvation and the general problems surrounding poverty and crime, - these arguments beg to see where the will of God lies and where his desire rests, with respect to humanity and the evils it faces.

On the new and old

It seems to me that what is defined as “new”, is a constant and ubiquitous process. I think this can be approached on a variety of levels, from the very small to the very large. At a top level, society and it's incumbent process face a constant stream of general ideas and revised thinking. Ie, a new car, is a revision of a previous concept (Or design, in this instance).

The fundamental constructs, such as the actual constituents of the car, do not evolve, or evolve at a level where the only occupant, is requiring a scientific explanation.

At a material level, the process of evolution ages at a much lower level. Taking this further, the intangible and finite aspects of natural systems, such as atomic theory, evolves almost indistinctly and finitely.

On this, we can decree that the “higher” levels translate quite quickly into change, whereas at the levels where atomic theory are dominant, the rate of evolution almost ceases.

I think it's important to note, this rising and falling of matter and ideas based on scale, – from atomic levels, to molecular theory and up, to the large scale organization of our minds and general ideas effected into reality.

Entropy and time

If we consider the arrow of time, or the reality of Minkowski space time, we try to ascertain the evolving reality of space, through time. The common belief that we inhabit a four dimensional structure, with time as the “fourth dimension” plays with the concept of change, likewise considered as constant.

So, this isn't an entirely new perception, that change is constant – that there is a defined evolution which spans every level of existence. It isn't known as to what level the physics of reality exists at the start of (this) creation. A general assumption is that the symmetry and fundamental laws break down in the beginning.

Thus, they too – are constituents of change, and that even the natural laws that we so eminently describe, break down to something more fundamental. I have given previous emphasis on time, and to the idea of a multi-verse, which I feel is entirely likely.

So, the idea of the first cause, is translated into something else, somewhere else.

I re-iterate on the concept of the limitation that exists with the descriptions we give to the reality we inhabit. It seems all our definitions for natural law, are just fallible by their very nature.

The interesting reality, is that when we apply these laws (such as the theory of electricity, such as Ohms law) to nature, we have the most astonishing result of being able to manufacture puissant devices, (Such as the classical circuit used in a semi-conducting layer, or as a general calculator, or transistor)

Thus, we cannot easily dispense with the validity of these laws, as they allow us to create certain “things” – in a way that they fundamentally work together, cohesively.

I believe that these laws are not entirely artificial, and that they have some real and distinct nature which is independent of man's artificial construction.

On size and scale

Complexity increases proportionally to scale.

As we move up, in scale – it is found that the complexity of any system increases. At the very height of scale, we begin to tenderly place feet on issues such as abstraction. More specifically, meta-physical concepts rear their head. We cannot realistically prove abstract notions like love, purpose and fundamental reality. Simply saying, it's “the brain” – is a

misnomer.

I feel that distinct concepts, such as the mind and any purported ideas, relates to the meta-physical reality of issues that have no foot-hold in a simply material explanation.

The real difficulty, lies in the reality that all we do perceive, is of the physical.

On the nature of theory

Theory, in itself is largely a description of reality. Given that, it's safe to assume that the description itself is limited. There is no complete description, as it leads to a deeper understanding of reality. We try to aim at a correspondence between what is both tactile and fundamentally, a primitive association. This is a tacit, assumption. There is no “complete” description of reality, as we can only surmise by some degree, hence to a theoretical definition.

What does natural law and theory have to say about reality?

If we refer to Planck's length, we immediately draw an understanding that nature itself is limited by some degree. In this instance, a scale which cannot evolve any further into something smaller,.

I cannot provably argue this position, although I do feel it might be amiss to consider that there is a stop sign in terms of nature's composition. Where is this finite definition? - as we look into nature we see that boundaries exist, and hence a limited or finite definition exists in parallel to something “infinite”.

A consumer society

It seems that we are all active participants in what could be defined, consumerism. This consumption doesn't necessarily have to be relative to goods digested physically, yet leads to broad applications in way which we consume ideas, information, news, etc.

Some of this could be defined as a process of sensation, - whereby we move from one to another without any real thought or consideration between.

I suspect that some of this could bode ill, – as we rarely step back and rear into a more insightful and patient perspective.

In what way is this direct consumption, propagated?

I suspect initially, information (As an example), is used orally and hence with a more pervasive impulse, into the written word. The medium used in this respect, is partially irrelevant (Although the frequency and reception of information can be effected by the type of medium used)

What is the nett result of this consumption and how does it alter our lives?

I suspect the way in which we relate, is a direct consequence of this. Being aware of the process of politics, religion and less specific information is crucial in terms of making choices, – from religious convictions to political narratives. This all should be beneficial to the user, although there are as with anything, negative consequences.

In social media, news could be transmitted which reflects a fake or deceptive reality or simultaneously, used to reflect negative or taboo topics without any real sense of discretion.

So, we all consume, yet by some varying degree.

Civilisation and evolution

We are primarily, creatures reared on the influence of natural selection. Yet, what is not as closely seen is the evolution of society and how it effects our evolution. We live in a world confined with walls, digital equipment and food, easily obtainable. I suspect, these aspects of our daily reality influence our genome.

To what degree does this exist and how do we identify it?

The artefacts of our evolution, such in the way we wear clothing and currently, rely on a digital existence -- transcends nature and could be defined as having a unique impact on our state of mind, thus leading to an evolutionary shift.

I think it's important to understand the chassis of civilisation.

I suspect this is a collective term, with respect to society, culture and it's defining factors. I imagine the concept of closely knit cultural elements isn't in any way a new or original concept. In the animal kingdom, we find a simplistic tribal grouping in the majority of species. I imagine that the evolutionary curve in terms of the human species, translates quickly upwards in terms of our own, recent evolution.

So, if we try to imagine the evolving fate of man, it would be important to see just how civilisation and its content, is shaping our collective future.

Our primitive emotions

We are mammalian, and hence we inherit a variety of antecedent quantities. I tend to consider that we inherit a lot of powerful elements, such as anger, fear, etc. These primitive qualities make a certain impression on our lives, in such a way that they are difficult to control. A few examples of this, are anger, fear, etc.

In terms of control, this is largely difficult – as seen in lesser educated environments, that the compelling force of these qualities quickly shapes our actions. Such as with respect to breeding and uncontrolled promiscuity. It is difficult to say, that education and breeding are the primary tokens in this.

In terms of brain mass, this isn't a sufficient explanation to intelligence. As humans, we have developed specific areas of the brain – which provide for a greater aspect of mental aptitude. Our digits and general articulation are also immensely important in our own evolution and how we deal with the environment.

So, in terms of anger, sex, hunger etc – these are imminent concepts and qualities of the human species which are subterranean in nature, and we rely on our “higher” functions to debate the process of this. It seems a lot of what man defines as virtue, is closely tied with trying to control and sustain these human and primitive qualities.

Social compulsion

Evidently, we face a variety of social forces which map our thinking and our behaviour. These are fundamentally difficult to avoid, yet it becomes apparent that the choices we make, largely ingested by society and it's compulsion, could be destructive rather than advantageous.

What is to measure the good & evil in this context? – it is often cited that the lesser path rather than the common, is the best way in order to develop a unique or good result. I feel ambiguous about this concept.

It is provably possible, that the common and the mean are as, or more so – beneficial in terms of social development and general rearing. Often, rebellious and distinctive qualities are not well adopted and do not necessarily dictate good behaviour or development. Yet if there is a requirement to be unique, a level of creativity and a penchant for stubbornness is required which goes against the less formidable, common.

I feel there is an important question, which relates to the many and the few.

In terms of the many, we cannot escape fundamental limitations to our development, whether through society or additional aspects. We strike out to be first, – wherein the unique approach is seen as more advantageous. I feel that this could be deceptive. By inflating what is the common good, could also be strictly useful.

So, we cannot avoid that we are a unit which consequently faces pressure from society and our peers. If we take a global view of humanity, it's strikingly apparent how so much of what we do is collective, and inspired by the common.

Definitions and their limitations

When we define something, we reference something circular. In terms of less literal concepts or objective fact, we find that the intuitive aspect of learning, especially through abstraction, is difficult to define and requires a lateral element to help sustain the context and definition.

So, by which process do we learn the intuitive?

A significant aspect, is through the context of knowledge, especially found in the simple act of reading a book. We draw conclusions, on the head of our imagination and the undefined and figurative properties of language.

A difficult aspect of learning, is through the simple act of reading a dictionary. We find a variety of referenced definitions which require elaboration that doesn't map, one to one against what is trying to be understood.

So, I suspect the most powerful form of learning is through the simple use of speech. Our dialect and unique facility, is often derived directly from those we grow up with and the generation represented by our age.

We are all consigned to an age, – given that what we think, feel and act is on the basis of the generation which represents us.

Imagination, its uses and abuses

I believe that imagination, steers us to think visually and often in a very unique way. I also feel, that the ability to develop abstraction and it's plentiful ideas, are reliant on imagination which is based on insight and thinking.

The important benefactor, is in our ability to sustain and manifest different ideas and concepts.

Without this “so-called” tool, we would not be able to construct symphonies, colourful art and the abstruse insight of scientific thinking.

I don't think it is possible to have an excess of thought or imaginative thinking. I believe that what we imagine transcends, daily life. It sends us to a very, complex space – wherein we can fathom the most difficult of concepts. This should never be underestimated.

So, in terms of its use, we can generate an architecture of insight, thinking and into self constructive ideas.

I don't believe that imagination is largely reliant on the visual, yet allows us to conceive of the most remote and difficult concepts, – to soar.

Intuition and the literal

I wish to be more specific regarding intuitive and it's opposite, literal thinking. With respect to the intuitive, we largely rely on instinctive reasoning – to solve this. I suspect concepts that relate to absorbing written content, forces us to consider the undefined and the figurative.

The polarity of the greys vs the literal, is a deeply rooted subject.

Do we learn by degree? – Or is it a function of basic opposition in terms of concepts.

The literal, often relates to what could be defined as objective fact, – rather than a subjective inheritance. The ability to think of foreign concepts, often requires a more intuitive sense of reasoning. So, in more colourful terms, the ability to discern specific information requires the assumption of concepts which are not easily associated in terms of an objective reality.

If we at all look decisively into the metaphorical, we find an area drenched in the more abstract of thinking.

This is where a successful imagination, - can quickly aspire to understanding difficult concepts that do not necessarily relate to anything in objective fact.

Nature and man

In terms of encroachment, we quickly see that man has had a pervasive influence, on the living model of the world, surrounded by cities that have no relation to common, natural environments.

By what degree, does our sustained way of living influence the development and behaviour of the natural world?

Secondly, how is the well-being of our natural environment sustained and kept healthy. I think that this is a telling environmental issue, in that we are not entirely aware as to the impact our society has on nature, – and that we are still infants, in trying to resolve this signal issue.

We are the only sentient species, on earth. Yet I think to cultivate the concept and action in the protection of nature, is underestimated and that the consequences of man's actions are still misunderstood.

We are the custodians, of this planet.

The lesser road vs. the common

I suspect we all are by some degree, unique. Yet simultaneously, we share a magnitude in common with others. This is an interesting dichotomy. By some measure, I feel we have more in common than is essentially recognised. If a global snapshot of human life is taken, it is both awe inspiring and defeatist as to see human life and its consistent, mass.

In terms of different ethnicities, we can see that language, colour, etc – are all decisive barriers.

It is a suggestion, that man is entirely equal, irrespective of race, creed, etc.

We colour and avoid deeper social and political issues, avoiding the fact that there is a real and defined “elite”, especially in terms of wealth, prestige, etc.

This also radiates around religion, education, etc.

I feel that largely, we are still a very divided world. Yet with the advent of the Internet, those barriers have thinned extensively. The ability for any ethnicity, to be entitled to freedom of choice, speech, etc.

So, retroactively – we sum up the global influences which might shape our ability to be less than common and to try and aspire to some lifelong purpose, meaning and deeper conviction that spans the remainder of our lives.

So, as stated previously, I have touched upon the aspect of the unique vs. the common.

We wish to succeed, in a variety of aspects. This isn't just a result of the pedantry of daily living, yet the scope and general projection which defines our lives and what lies ahead, for us. We are closely tied to the future, – and we tend to learn from the past in order to avoid mistakes and to activate critical thinking, with self examination.

On the divine

The concept of divinity, refers directly to the remarkable concept of an endowed holiness, which refers to God, or given gods.

If sanctioned, the given idea of the Christ, refers to a personage who was the Son of God. In this, the concept of the holy or divine, is manifestly seen. I think it's a seductive idea to conceive of attaining the divine, through our actions and our devotion to what is considered holy.

Yet, as with anything holy, this is a very transcendent idea. Man alone, irrespective of his auspices – cannot rise up to a position which could be considered divine.

Yet in the same breath, to bequeath a sainthood, is permissible.

Once again, touching upon what could be considered holy, could also be a passage into divinity.

I suspect that if you can put entire faith into the existence of what is considered holy, it may be possible to acquire certain “divine” attributes. Yet, unless it is given, it is likewise exceptionally difficult to attain this state.

Further on what is holy

I just wish to digress into further detail regarding the carriage of holiness.

I suspect that it is often obvious to declare that a holy “state” is achievable. Yet I wish to emphasize a given or provisional fact, that the existence of something holy is an answer unto itself.

You would not harm, the reality of Christ or the blessed. The fact of its existence is blatant

and irrespective of your choice, in terms of denomination, - leading up to and inwardly, the atheistic approach, - you still would do little to disqualify what is holy.

This is a contentious topic.

What I am trying to communicate, is that the reality of “holiness” exists, irrespective of what belief we hold to be true. Consequently, debasing holiness is still a black mark.

What is artificial and man made

I think there is a distinct quality between what is artificial (man made), – and a derivation of nature.

Man constructs a variety of telling things, ranging from the innards of human poetry, art and literature – to the colder, distinct sciences. The written word is a man made fabrication, which compels us to transmit ideas, concepts and information through a powerful narrative.

I think that this is potentially the greatest of our inventions, in our ability to record and transmit information through the written word.

With the advent of the digital space, we see a powerful provocation – in the Internet and our ability to share information, globally and accessibly. This has a range of applications, to educate, teach – and at a separate level for simple entertainment.

I think in terms of art, - our ability to represent ideas and generally fabricate the “new” – is an inescapably powerful tool. Art is often, a reflection of an age. It is a sweet agent, in its ability to represent concepts visually and to convey a story.

We cannot not escape our natural hereditary, yet we can create what could be defined as something new, readily easily.

The concepts of the new and the old

What does it mean for something to be new?

If we look at the more primitive backbone of human evolution and time, we surmise that what happened yesterday, isn't entirely new. What is today, is current and what is tomorrow, is new. Yet that is a simplification.

Yet if we look closely at behaviour, action, telling, etc – we realize that most things are simply in subsequence to something else. There is no distinct change, in terms of something original and new. Yet, at the same – each successive addition to the stack of knowledge and representation, is essentially new.

I think it's crucial to recognise that all things are a result of what came before. Something in complete isolation, isn't realistically possible.

If we look at the human species, irrespective of the physical strata, - we realize that evolution doesn't cease. I think a key aspect of this, is to satisfy the perspective that a majority of levels and fields exist, which find something “new”, all of the time.

Yet the reality of subsequence, cannot be escaped.

On authority in literature

Where does authority lie?

We give credence to certain topics, more than others. Some conceptions are considered to be more valid representations than other, counterparts. If we look at information “as is”, it doesn't disseminate. Information itself, has no intrinsic authoritative substance. Yet, if we begin to weigh up what is digested, we give more reference to some works, more than others.

What defines this substance?

Often, we take into consideration the author, which we feel through some process of impression and taste, we are more willing to rely on terms of authority.

Often the way the knowledge or telling is represented, in terms of the usage of language or the direct and compelling insight it has, gives direct emphasis on what should be read or distinctly, ignored.

I feel that this is often simply a concept of ruling, – and how we give power to others, often in a neglectful way.

When we assign our values and belief to a specific system or dialogue, we lose a specific aspect, in the currency or exchange.

On sin

On the basis of divine law, - a transgression against God is defined as being something sinful. This significant divide, is purported as being the relationship with respect to the divine. Anything that effects this relationship in a negative way, is defined as harmful.

What is the nature of sin? -- from what basis does it manifest? -- On what level in human thinking does the seed of this, originate.

The genesis of this, lies in the fact that we have done something immoral. So, I suspect that immoral behaviour is closely tied to sin. In subsequence, what is the basis for evil or good action, - given that anything evil results in sinful behaviour.

The next step is, - where does morality lie? -- The consequent step is to define that moral authority might stem from God and his given law. This is a religious standpoint. It might be permissible to consider that moral laws are innate and have nothing to do with any religious

application.

I suspect that in a very basic way, we can try and define these issues in natural ways. This debate, sits with the concept of morality with God or with man. Is sin something stemming from nature? -- or do we need to rely on something transcendent, such as the warning or red flag raised with religiosity.

On scale and the new

It seems, that as we move upward in scale from the atomic level, we tend to see transitions in nature. This change or constant of time relates to the process of life and evolution. At the macroscopic scale, we find a number of "new" or revised states. Yet, at the fundamental levels of nature, we don't find anything "new".

Energy or matter is a conserved sum, - yet as we shift upwards in scale from the simplest elements to the complexity of life, we see a distinct and evolving change. Where does this fundamental transition begin? - If we consider life at the molecular level, we see a definitive shift from one state to another. At the atomic level, this doesn't exist. Yet as an array of atomic structure is developed scaling upwards, we find more complicated forms that allow for change, such as life.

On science and religion

Science and religion are entirely dissimilar. I suspect that we quickly raise into the opinion, that these two fundamental concepts, relate. I believe this is a misapprehension. I think this tends to relate to the concept of reasoning as to the nature of all things.

Science is a great tool to define the "how", -- yet in terms of the "why", it has no real foothold or any real basis. I tend to feel, that our falling into these dissimilar concepts is a fallacy. At what point, do science or religion mix? -- I think the inception of religious ideas and thinking is significantly primordial. This too, relates to science.

Yet I think if we step back and look at either camp, - we see that these are two very different aspects of reality. I think we fall into the habit of believing that these two ideas are in correspondence.

I suspect it is simply our way of explaining the world in which we live, yet we need to be wary as to which of these tools we use in order to define the reality we live within.

I feel that science and religion are really distinctly opposing ideas.

On entitlement

If we stop to consider the concepts of science or reasoning, on authority - we see that often we feel dis entitled with respect to a certain type of thinking, and that

competing with given and authoritative concepts is unachievable -- simply because we do not sit on a similar level, in relation to the given authority.

Fate, determinism and free-will

Fate could be defined as a sequence of events wherein the consequence of time and events are subsequent of one another. In this, the idea of free-will ceases to exist. The concept of fate and determinism, abolishes the concept of any freedom in the exertion of will, and that we exist in an entirely deterministic existence, -- that there is no traction in the sense of choice.

If I actively use my mind, - the process of choice in thinking seems to be apparent.
Yet this could be deceptive.

With respect to divine providence and fate, I find it disquieting that a significant portion of humanity lives in squalor, with no real emancipation in terms of privilege, etc. On the basis that a "generous" fate exists, - how is it that there exists a preponderance of humanity wherein there is no good or positive existence.

If God is to favour one man over the other, -- wherein does this exist?

On trust

The capacity for trust, diminishes with age. I suspect, the instinctive capacity to trust lies in the beginning with youth. IE, "firm belief in the reliability, truth, or ability of someone or something", is a general yet vague definition regarding trust.

I imagine it is a definitive belief or agreement with another party or person. The impetus for trust lies in the basic acceptance that no harm will be evident, in the process of agreement or simultaneous acceptance with someone else.

Our ability to judge or discern is the fundamental action of discretion allowing us to trust. If that trust is abused, we disengage from any further contact and in line, disband our allocation of faith.

There also appears to be a natural evidence for trust, especially in the close-knit bondings found in families. The trust between parent and child, is notably a strong example of where trust lies.

The impetus for science

What is science? -- on what basis do we derive and form natural law in the physical sciences?

It seems as if we develop equations which are assigned to nature and a derivation or explanation for it. The physical theories we manufacture are only theories, at

best. It is evident historically, that some descriptions of nature are incomplete. I believe that a purely theoretical position is in question. I suspect we try and ratify the equations in correspondence with nature.

The equations of length, mass, and charge are examples of where very primitive concepts exist, that underlie our experience of reality.

What is the real goal and ambition of science? -- My perspective on this, relates to the underlying and crucial explanation of nature, evinced by the natural laws that form the basis of our physical understanding.

I feel that philosophy is an important counterpart to science, as it tries to resolve arguments that science isn't necessarily able to defend.

I think the real impetus for science, relies strongly on an innate desire to try and understand the world, we inhabit. There are deep questions, such as to the nature of existence, etc. - that science isn't in a position to explain.

These questions are more simply delegated to alternative, philosophical or religious camps. I feel that religion, is more capable to define issues relating to morality, belief, faith, existence and purpose, etc.

I am confident, that the majority of our understanding of the natural world relies heavily on scientific insight.

The scientific method

There is a very specific model, defined as the scientific method. This essentially is a method or process, whereby we try to approach and solve a variety of scientific issues. I tend to feel that a good practice in method, is to have a strong objective position. There are distinct questions (discussed previously) about the use of impartiality, and how subjective thinking is difficult to avoid.

The method is founded on the principles of analysis and experiment. The required detachment necessary for scientific thinking is I feel, a crucial mentality for the absorption and efficacy of scientific ideas.

I tend to find that "quiet contemplation" is a useful ingredient in terms of disposing with ideas and their distinct application to nature. I feel that the longer we take to develop solutions, results in a more robust result.

Thus, the scientific method is an application and process employed to deal with understanding the natural world.

On mathematics and a description of nature

An ingredient regarding mathematics is the question as to whether it is derived and found in nature, -- and in opposition, to the idea that numbers themselves, are entirely innate to man.

If we look at specific mathematical models, such as the Mandelbrot set -- we see an interesting and infinite series. Through some computing models, it is simple to apply this equation into something that is both visible and compelling.

I tend to find that mathematics is an exceptionally powerful tool used to explain nature, or any alternative process. We do find repetition and series in nature, - yet the basis of mathematics from my perspective is largely innate.

If we stop to consider the number line and it's varying attributes (Whole numbers, Real and irrational, etc) - it becomes evident that these concepts directly do not reveal themselves in nature.

Yet, through the dissemination of physical laws which are through mathematics defined, we can apply certain physical laws to nature, through the application and evidence, of mathematics.

In terms of Euclidean geometry, we can find a variety of symbolism which through basic geometrical constructs, tries to define very basic concepts through a geometric model. I feel this is a root of mathematical reasoning.

The mathematical definitions found in this work, are a primary example of where mathematics is truly innate.

The basic concepts such as a line, sphere and a circle are not to be found anywhere in nature. These primitive concepts, reveal themselves in mathematics alone.

On morality and God

Is morality innate and provided by nature, or is it entirely given by a higher authority? - I suspect the majority of man's derived concepts of good and evil, - requires the intervention of God and some ethical backbone.

I think in terms of morality, we cannot dispense with God and his interaction. If morality is derived from nature alone, it makes it increasingly difficult to clarify just what it means to be good or evil.

The religious issue in terms of morality and ethical thinking, is that the interaction with God is extremely, loosely defined.

Where does his involvement exist in our daily lives? - I don't feel that it's easy or apparent, as to his existence in man.

The biblical reference to God, - displays a strong and vivid insight into the mind of God and

his application of his covenant with man.

In the modern world, - this level of interaction doesn't exist.

Is it to say that God doesn't exist? -- or perhaps is his presence simply not evident?

Where is God?

Are moral questions, purely the domain of religion and His subsequent teaching?

The mind body problem

With respect to the state of consciousness, the compelling experience of self-awareness is in clarity, the simplest explanation for the mind. What does it mean to be self-aware?

The mind body problem relies on the idea that the mind is independent of the body. I tend to be undecided in this. The awareness of life, seems to be more than simply material.

There are a few elements that separate us from the rest of the animal kingdom. We are conscious of death and our own mortality. Yet these aspects of evolution, don't provide any insight into the reality of sentience.

I suspect that the function of the brain, is a collective system. Through this unity of separate mental processes, there could be a higher level which could be described as a state of consciousness.

On the news

I imagine news could be defined as the propagation of general interest information.

This information typically relates to current affairs, yet in a more simplistic way the procedure whereby we evince on human interest topics, on a daily basis. At a more fundamental level, it could be defined as the way in which we develop daily narratives.

What sells? - I expect a lot of the attraction to news is relating to the exposition of affairs, knowledge and insight into man and a variety of human interest topics. Some of this is a lure, in terms of negative or controversial categories. This tends to solicit colourful or questionable content.

I suspect that the impetus for news relies on the idea of providing a template to what could be considered as a reflection of what the world is consequently "doing".

The concept of fact and how what is to measured as the truth, is another competing argument for the revelation of news and what it expands on.

On faith and conviction

It strikes me that our tenure of conviction can span a lifetime.

I suspect this is closely coupled with the idea of faith in your own convictions and their subsequent value. In terms of betrayal, it is often possible to change or more specifically betray, a life long conviction. I think this is the kernel and root whereby we derive our own self sustained belief system (IE, in what is most valued)

By cheating our own values, or more specifically dispensing with something considered to be fundamental, is perilous.

On this, it appears to me that there are deep rooted physiological aspects of the mind which cannot be avoided. The brain ages, -- in that, it seems that there are specific changes which everyone faces through a physical or tangible reality.

If there is a golden rule, I suspect it is entirely requisite of our own developed status in life. The mind faces challenges on a variety of levels - although it is up to the individual to define and sustain convictions that are to be considered good and valid.

On truth

It seems, that truth on a very fundamental level could be considered a fabrication.

(Exert : Truth, that which is true or in accordance with fact or reality)

In a standpoint of the physical and material, truth itself ceases to exist.

In isolation, we can represent certain "truths" that are not necessarily to be found in nature, or on our comprehension.

(Exert : An axiom, a statement or proposition which is regarded as being established, accepted, or self-evidently true)

We can pen certain axioms and proofs at a purely differentiated level to reality, found in isolation with mathematics. Yet mathematics does not manifest itself in nature, - rather these are propositions which we develop in some visible way. I suspect that a specific equation can "map" to reality, - yet this is still just theoretical.

If we look upon the world at a purely materialistic level, it seems that concepts of truth and fact, are largely artificial.

There doesn't appear to be any real explanation for truth and fact, besides our own application of these ideas to reality.

On justice

In what could be considered "right" or "fair". I suspect that righteousness rears itself on the back of basic moral arguments. I suspect to clarify as to what "right" effectively means, scales downwards to the activity and idea of doing what is considered good and fair.

Certain actions, could be considered moral or righteous. Yet once again, I find myself in the domain of the artificial. Justice is a very social and human concept, - and hence, something requiring elements of truth, belief, etc. There are ubiquitous aspects to the development of the idea of justice, yet this again is an abstraction.

I feel that the concept of human interaction and what is beneficial to the whole, could be considered fair and just.

This brings up ideas relating to the individual and society and how they relate. I feel that there is a basic compulsion to treat others in a way that could be conceived as moral.

This begs the question as to what justice truly is in thought and through the province of man.

On physical law

It seems that there are both primitive and natural distinctions, in terms of law. I refer to this, as physical law and the evinced properties of nature that culminates in a physical description of nature.

This manifests itself largely in the form of equations. These equations attempt to form a mapping relative to what is through empiricism, observed.

This one to one correspondence, is a closely tied definition to our own application of mathematics and physical equations relative to nature.

I suspect the real question, is to what depth of accuracy do these "laws" contribute towards our understanding of nature. I have defined elsewhere, - that our laws are largely a fabrication, even if a very telling and accurate one.

On poverty and equality

It seems evident, that poverty is a cultural and inherited concept. There appears to be a long-standing issue with respect to an inherited status. The striking emancipation in this, is through education and any economic injection. Thus, to liberate those in a state of need, could be assisted by an external pressure or process of augmented privilege.

The calamitous reality of poverty, is in it's latency and the fundamental economic divide between those in an economically sound position to those who are not. I don't believe that money in isolation is a solution, -- yet it might through an extended period of time

provide for opportunity that didn't necessarily exist before.

In my experience, education is the most fulfilling and substantial escape from a specific status, - especially where access to knowledge is easily given and digested.

The application of this is key, - yet a closed system, (IE, a family) - leverage's towards a more developed self-understanding and the exposition towards a life led by issues that are more intellectually cathartic.

The basic constituents of life, is the intake of basic living requirements, such as water, food, housing etc. I feel that if we can open up these requirements in society and provide these units of existence freely, it will provide greater scope towards a development into a more intellectual focus and a separation from the mundane.

I feel that man has a long way to go, until he reaches a position of economic equality. This is where self-interest could be conceived as harmful, - and altruism as beneficial. This is a complex argument, as the concept of self-interest is tied up with the freedom to capitalize on our own sense of value and success.

I think that the whole, versus the individual is where an interest into the well-being in terms of your given peers, could be considered as useful. In a modern environment, the impetus for the individual to succeed is given weight. I feel that this is crucial if merit must be afforded to those who do better (socio-economically) rather than their counterparts.

On crime

It appears that crime has become the province of the clinical.

In a moral perspective, - the distinction of right vs. wrong can be deferred to an entirely materialistic sense in ethics. Crime is punishable, and this is where law derived by man (and indirectly, by religion) is applied to the consideration of crime and actions that could be considered evil.

Hence, again - this is considered a moral argument. Yet in the present world, we treat criminal behaviour as a clinical or morally charged issue.

The concept of rehabilitation, is valued. It could be conceivable that given behaviour could be restored, to a specific individual.

What is the genesis of crime? - It seems on the back of a previous argument, that poverty could induce a variety of socially disabled activity.

Do we punish the individual? - it seems retrospectively that their actions are not entirely self engendered and could have been influenced on the basis of environmental factors.

On human law

A given, is that man manufactures human law or legal systems for a variety of reasons. This is in one respect, the capacity to regulate society and to find a very specific set of rules which both control and regulate human affairs.

This enforcement of a given set of rules, - has a variety of influential aspects. It controls how society dictates certain behaviour, choices and the agreement required for a basic tally between people, or parties.

To control crime, - we expose a variety of legal systems that try to regulate this.

"Is man made any better, through rules?" - this is a valuable expression.

I think we need to be clear as to what moral arguments exist in law. It is a given, that for a collective system of regulation, laws are crucial. We cannot operate as an able civilian, if we don't give weight to law and our ability to interact honestly and fairly with the rest of society.

There is the controversial idea of control and how specific institutions try to manage our lives in a specific direction. I feel that the underlying democratic process provides for a valuable exercise in terms of global sanction.

I feel that this is eminently important for any reliable and agreeable society to survive.

On judgement and God

The idea of divine intervention. In the theist denomination, we allow for the concept of God and his distinct judgement. If God is entirely present in life, - I suspect he is thus concious of all our thoughts, actions, etc.

Thus, judgement from God is a severe offence, and especially where moral arguments exist.

The expression, "I will be judged by God". -- frees up the concept that our judgement by fellow man, is entirely finite and that any severity of accuracy in terms of judgement is left up to God.

Unfortunately, judgement by God is a frightening reality. It is significantly more damaging that anything our mortal fellowship could decree.

I suspect that judgement of this kind is final and incontrovertible.

There is a proclivity to claim the mercy and love of God, yet it seems that his direct judgement of our lives leaves us entirely defenceless. His judgement, is without any question the "last word" with respect to us, and the life we may have led.

I suspect that heaven and hell, are significant concepts that lead us to consider our actions

and their relevance to the immortal soul.

On time and alien life

Given the current standpoint in terms of our search for alien life, we find that we are very much alone in this small area of the universe and more directly the milky way, in which we inhabit.

I am confident our technology (Especially, recent advances in technology) - don't really provide for a seasoned approach to try and discover alien life.

If we consider the span of time we have actively been searching (Using radio as a measure) - we find very little evidence in terms of a foreign sentience.

The time of our modern civilization is quite small by comparison to the time taken to derive the age of the universe. A century of actively looking for alien life is a pinpoint by comparison to the age of the known universe.

Our adolescence, is significant. I think it is also entirely possible that extinction is possible, albeit unlikely. I refute the idea that man will become extinct, - rather I am under the positive opinion that we should at some point be able to migrate outwardly to other known and life sustained planets.

Life itself I believe shouldn't be entirely rare, and given our understanding of biology, - they should have evolved in terms of the same basic units we describe for conscious life.

Chapters in life

It seems that there are both naturally and self imposed aspects to the life we lead. Age is a very fundamental aspect to our physiological development. We cannot avoid specific aspects of growth, - such as that found in our teens with respect to puberty.

Yet outside of the natural compulsion of life, we make a variety of choices in terms of our ability to learn, reproduce, etc.

I suspect I could use the expression, "Chapters". - those specific and memorable units of life that define who we are and what we've done within the span of life we've led.

The regressive "echo" of life, -- is a compulsive response based on the life we have led and wherein this, lies our most valuable lessons.

There are doors that open, and yet others that close. I think that given our mind and a telling perspective we fashion a response to the past.

It is almost a "looking glass" - which through an aperture we try to cognitively recall what we've done. This process of imagination, is exceptional in that so much of who we are, is

defined on the back of what we've done.

On the nature of work

Work is something typically, not enjoyed. It seems our incumbency towards work, is usually a forced experience and not done willingly.

We often have little choice on our profession and it exists primarily as a means to survive.

This is an unfortunate yet very real disposition.

I believe that if work is an enjoyable experience, quality and productivity increases. Unfortunately, we face a variety of issues in life which are not entirely of our own making and something entirely out of our control.

The majority of mankind, - doesn't work on a real basis of pleasure, - rather something that could be defined as drudgery.

So, this could be defined as something relating to circumstance, as our immediate environment doesn't always function in a beneficial way, especially with to respect to our education and the fostering of a truly benign approach to our livelihood.

I feel that the single most valued primitive, is our education and how it can free us up of a variety of otherwise negative circumstance.

The majority of our waking lives, are formed by our working life.

I believe that having the freedom to choose, is a crucial element towards a really beneficial existence and future.

Lateral thinking vs. single-mindedness

I suspect that these are two crucial and yet very interdependent ideas.

It is entirely possible to have an element of each. Yet I feel to be faithful, it would be beneficial to choose one over the other.

A singular approach to thinking, is fundamentally a process with a very linear assumptive.

This mentality, is formed on the bedrock of a linear and specific singularity. The linear aspiration, relies on a process of subsequent thinking.

To be more specific, a singular model relies on a given set of processes which are linear in the way they are defined and consumed.

In terms of lateral thinking, - this is often the more creative of the two approaches.

I feel that creativity in thinking is especially crucial to fathom new concepts, ideas and larger generalizations.

To think laterally, has an additive outcome to find abstruse solutions.

The process of abstraction, is a fundamental key to developing new ideas that are not easily formed on the basis of common ideas.

Which is the lesser or greater of the two, is difficult to define.

On reason

This is fundamentally a topic with a variety of differentiation. What is it, to reason?
- I assume that reason could be defined as a mental process which through analysis could reveal a very specific "type" of thinking.

This assimilation of thought, is a cleaving process which through given differences, an approach to understanding our world is populated with the analytical mind.

In common thought and pedagogy, - it seems that the approach to reason is the method whereby we illuminate our thinking and a very sharp end towards understanding the world we live in.

It is often cited, - that reason is the enemy of religion, as religious aspirations are formed by faith based thinking, whereas reason is a process of thinking requiring evidential knowledge.

I don't necessarily feel that they're enemies, yet I do believe that reason does require an element of evidence, which is something that religion does not provide.

On regression

This relates to the idea of retroactive ideas, words, etc. In the desire to define something, we find a circular and regressive aspect to any kind of definition. It seems that in our assignment of these ideas, they all largely relate and have no definitive "root".

In terms of cause and effect, - this regressive reality, seems to disband the idea of any real causation. It strikes me that there is an infinite depth in relation to ideas and that our ideas and definitions are largely in subsequence of one another.

A common dictionary, is a perfect example of where this lack of originality exists. Words themselves, are circular in definition and are incomplete.

We assign definition, yet it is typically something that requires a further explanation

and in this, it doesn't have a defined boundary.

The concept of a "first cause" is another abundant idea that on the basis of the infinite and unbounded, ceases. This is a polarity in explanation that requires further insight.

It seems that the majority of our assignments and the concept of regression, are unavoidable and it is through the concepts of metaphor and abstraction that we can formulate some "sense" of understanding.

On the origin of time and similar thinking

The only real evidence for time is our very own ability to remember the past -- vs, our inability to "see" the future.

The asymmetry of time, revealed as "the arrow of time", is a current definition.

Yet, there is no fundamental indication of this.

From a physical standpoint, there is the facility to be able to define time in some evidential way. This is not currently, available.

Time could be considered a process of subsequent events evolving in a specific direction.
(IE, Minkowski space-time)

I am not going to digress into mathematical theory for this, albeit to say that space-time is a 4-dimensional mapping of time and space.

The issue of entropy relates to the concept that events move in increasing disorder or entropy with time.

This in itself isn't a complete solution.

It seems that time at the macroscopic level, is not reversible. Whereas the equations hold true for the microscopic, - thus to reverse the flow of time is permitted.

I don't believe that our theories are complete regarding the nature of time.

On secular and insular thinking

The secular disposition, emphasizes on the concept of a less spiritual aspect or approach to thinking. This "dryness" and absence of spiritual thought is crucial. I feel that our thoughts and opinions are largely based on the rearing of our childhood, peers, etc.

As stated previously regarding religion, - the seeds and genesis of the youth of religious thought has always been present. We are aware of our mortality. In this, it raises questions regarding a life beyond the grave and as an adjunct, a procedure whereby we ask for

the "reason" for things.

Secular thinking, is one specific approach to the world we live.

The insular, simply relates to the idea of ignorance in terms of cultural and social ideas.

This is not really a relation of the two concepts.

I think that specific "styles" of thinking are important.

We are such a mass of the unique and the same. These two contrary ideas state that our thinking is largely based and inferred from the world we live in.

This in itself is a significant limitation with respect to the originality of ideas and the difficulty of finding anything unique.

On consciousness

It appears that for us to understand what consciousness is, requires we try to see this as objectively as possible.

We are very much bound up with the idea of conscious activity, yet this is a concept that doesn't lie on anything evidential or tangible. This again, moves back to the issue of the "mind, body problem".

I tend to believe that our very current and isolated thinking, is the kernel of this idea. We cannot prove the existence of conscious activity, yet we can assume and surmise what it is based on our singular understanding as to what it is.

I think the core of this relates to our self participation of thought and the "active" ability for us to judge, think, etc.

If we look upon the mind in a purely materialistic sense, we realize that consciousness itself cannot be defined, besides on the auspices of thought.

We have a plethora of ideas, such as meaning, purpose, etc - that have no foothold in reality. I expect this is simply another example of this.

We are made up of a variety of illusory ideas, that simply share nothing with the basis of evidential fact.

These ideas, will never be ratified further as they are not in any way defined on the back of evidence.

On a conscience

In terms of a "conscience" - this is the primordial idea of that telling aspect of our minds that relate to the response, to what is morally acceptable behaviour.

This again, touches upon a variety of issues such as good vs. evil.

In terms of some internal ability to say what is and what isn't acceptable behaviour.

Again, if we look upon life from a purely materialistic perspective, we find that evil and good, don't exist.

I feel this relegates to a given, higher authority.

The physical existence, is simply insufficient.

Moral concepts, cannot be derived from nature alone.

As we pick up a scientific explanation for morality, this is an impasse. Science deals with the material basis for reality, yet it cannot be used to define where a moral impetus is required.

So, I expect that the fountain of understanding in terms of a material sense is insufficient to explain a conscience, or any substance for any real moral arguments.

The adolescence of technology

Our evolution in terms of technology, is expansive.

Yet, a telling aspect of this technical achievement is if technology is always benign and beneficial to society, and in a more immediate sense, to man.

There are questions as to the potential outcome of a sentient AI. I am largely sceptical about the real possibility of an AI becoming a free agency, - yet if (hypothetically) this becomes a reality, what is the consequence of this to man?

This is a very fictional based account and I am a little reluctant to assign any real value to the idea of a conscious AI. (IE, and hence inciting a mutiny)

Our naivety in terms of technical accomplishment, lies in the fact that we are not fully confident of the social and individual impact of this technical prowess.

As with anything, there is a flip-side.

Our consumption of social media is another display of where technology can have a divisive effect. Simultaneously, this could be conceived as a way to establish knowledge sharing and

a process of diminishing social divides, and where insular thinking is avoided.

On argument

What does it mean to argue a specific standpoint?

As with man, we all share a variety of opinions. A large measure of these opinions are common and duplicated easily, within specific social circles and more distinctly within the nucleus of families.

We quickly defend our convictions, - with any real confrontation avoided.

Our convictions are not necessarily static, and tend to evolve throughout the course of a lifetime. Yet our deepest beliefs and convictions, are held in the best esteem.

An argument, by convention requires a one on one correspondence. We share our thoughts, feelings and simply just the daily narrative. When we contest a specific opinion, argument steps up as the forefront of disagreement.

It is entirely rare, to provide an argument so compelling that it is in any way sufficiently convincing. Yet, I do believe that a truly able argument can defeat another perspective.

Or at the least, a response of serious self examination and reflection by the combatant.

What is the impetus or compulsion for argument?

I suspect this usually requires a motive to proselytize the opponent. I suspect the reasons for this, vary significantly.

The changes with age

There are serious physiological effects to age.

These are largely changes that the species itself cannot avoid or through a process of introspection, change or exempt. Adolescence and the subsequent introduction of the "adult", results in a variety of competing changes. Especially, by example if we relate to innocence of children.

Yet, in parallel - there are a number of ways that it may be possible to achieve a specific type of thinking that could be conceived as more beneficial to one, either in the short or long term.

Our perspective, -- isn't entirely dependent on a physical component.

We can acquire a distinctly "different" mentality, one that controls the outcome of our actions. This is where ethical thinking is so utterly compelling.

We are all very much unique, yet in the same light we are also entirely related.

At a very deep level, the convictions we have and the thinking we adopt (Consciously) - manifests into a difference in the mind. These "states" of thought and insight, can make life more acceptable, such as the idea of happiness.

On ethics, a creed and morality

Ethics in itself, is a concept that is entirely admissible to the majority of society. Yet, there is the potential that a specific creed could derive and manifest a more compelling or favourable state of mind. This specific state, could be defined as happiness, joy or some elevated state of mind that isn't possible, without a significant amount of ethical thinking.

Our behaviour, I don't believe is entirely natural and that we are incapable of "freeing" our minds to a state that could be conceived as a liberation or salvation.

In terms of virtue, these are fundamental aspects of ethical thinking. Words themselves are insufficient, and the higher state should conceivably be achieved through truly moral behaviour. This is where morality is such a crucial concept.

Our emotions or the way we feel is largely dependent of thought and approach to daily activity. I have gone into significant detail about the materialistic, this is again where I dispose of the idea of a purely physical existence.

I believe that these specific experiences are directly from a type of thinking which is not entirely materialistic.

I tend to believe that it is crucial, to liberate the mind

A utopia and dystopia

I suspect that the idea of a transcendent state, could be conceivable. Throughout history, this doesn't entirely appear to be the case. Although, in terms of war, there have been a variety of dystopian states.

It is entirely admissible, that our experience of peace, could be conceived as a utopian state.

In a historical perspective, there has not been any real collective in which a utopian standard exists. Yet this doesn't prevent man from wishing for a greater liberation from circumstance to a perceived nirvana.

Yet I believe, that an individual can achieve a utopian experience in their lives. I tend to

define this is a prolonged state of joy, happiness, etc.

Although these are largely, variances. Most people never experience any real elevation in terms of thinking or experience.

This is a saddening truth.

This begs the question as to where specific individuals are poised to achieve liberation or some raised state, - yet I feel that this is ubiquitous to man.

The penalty, is that this is highly uncommon.

Is this due to privilege - Or a fundamental auspice?

The fall of man

On the fall of man and the transgression between man and God, with an aim towards the idea of original sin. Is this defined as the tainted aspect of man's existence?

I suspect this is derived from the idea that man is inherently sinful, -- and that there is no real commute and bond between the laws of God and man's ability to transgress, these laws.

I expect the "fall" seems to stem from the scripture in Genesis, displaying the fact that fruit was taken from the tree of knowledge.

This action, led to the fall of man through Adam.

Whether this is true or contestable, is largely not important.

Thereafter, the plight of man was to be forever distanced to God, - as a consequence of doing something so, sinful.

On the basis of the redemption of the Christ, it seems that God gave his only Son, to die for our sins. This is an exceptional conviction, displayed by someone who (Contest ably) - was the living Son.

Whether this account is valid, - is a separate argument.

I suspect that if man is inherently sinful and given to actions that could be considered as harmful, -- then we are forever destined to being fallen from grace.

On conflict

The idea of conflict, is a powerful idea. It seems that in humanity, there are a variety of contested issues. Whether this is through race, gender, etc -- there are always distinguished separations between opinion, and the variety of dichotomy.

There are bigger issues, especially with respect to war.

War itself, is reared on a variety of compelling arguments. I don't believe there is a justification for war, - although if a specific transgressor forces a specific ideology, - especially if this process could be conceived as evil or harmful, the necessary response to this, is to fight it.

Conflict, can be entirely diabolical.

In a different light, in closed systems there is also a system of engagement, which is founded on the backbone of conflict.

For whatever reason, there is always a contest.

What is conflict and it's more fundamental nature?

I feel that the pronounced "ego", - works significantly to protect and to affirm opinion or ideology.

Heaven and hell

I believe the idea of a Heaven or Hell, is really something derived deeply, historically.

I don't believe that life itself should be forsaken in the promise, of a life thereafter.

Yet this steers away from the argument. The hope of a Heaven is not entirely amiss. As far as we are aware, we are the only species which is aware of the mortal coil. In this, it is a quick step to start thinking about a hereafter.

In terms of eternal hell-fire, I can't really see how the person can be punished eternally. I suspect that only by some degree, can we experience pain. Yet I attest, that the idea of hell does make me think twice.

It doesn't really feature strongly, - yet it is a powerful caveat.

The reward of Heaven and eternal life, is again something that is promising and provides on some very fundamental way a response to the idea that life exists beyond the grave.

Concepts of this kind, have been around since the dawn of man. They are not necessarily unique to any given religion.

On common sense

With the title of "Common sense", - this is described as a sense (Or, thinking) that is common to all people.

On the basis of the use of the word "common", we can derive the next step that defines this as a way of thought that is ubiquitous, amongst people.

(Exert : Common sense is sound, practical judgement concerning everyday matters, or a basic ability to perceive, understand, and judge in a manner that is shared by (i.e. common to) nearly all people)

I think the previous citation, does effectively describe the concept of common sense. The question is, does this have any footing in terms of the reality we experience and the assumption that we all share common values or ideas which are held to be of self-interest.

I think in terms of the common, - it could be perceived as a fallacy.

I admit, that there are a variety of relationships and concepts that are in relation to the fellow, man. If this is defined as being common sense, - then it is admissible.

Once again, this is another concept which doesn't necessarily have a materialistic proviso, or active resort.

In finality, it seems to me that concepts of this kind, are largely metaphorical.

What is reality

Reality is a difficult subject, rooted in the ideas formed on the body of abstraction. Reality could be defined as the singular experience we share with the external world, - with some idea that the external world signifies reality.

The word, "reality" - denotes an existence which is both internal and external. The passionate experience of life, and it's direct contact with the visible and known.

This is a very "current" process. We experience a reality through our given senses, - with reality being defined as what is "real". The idea of the factual and tangible, are necessarily important given that a reality supposes a real or valid existence.

Reality is in opposition to the idea of what is imaginary.

We share a relationship to a given environment, and it is this congress with nature and existence, that could in clarity define what reality is.

On prayer

It seems to me, that prayer is something baked upon the back of primordial thinking. It is in my estimation, that this process of worship, has always been available to man.

With respect to whatever deity is worshipped, this concept is strong evidentially to the idea

of calling upon a "higher power".

We give credence to concepts that are defined as God given. That weather, famine, etc - are examples of where prayer is founded on the idea that God or gods, exist.

The obsession of man to assign these qualities to God is fairly common. This isn't to say that prayer is invalid and doesn't result in any distinct change, in response to the action of prayer.

I suspect we are in service to this, - this also extends to the service and direct engagement we share with common illusory concepts.

I believe that we all share a degree of fundamental belief and reasoning which isn't entirely religiously based.

Our desire to speak to God, within the confines of our minds is not in any way, fallacious.

On service

It appears to me, that we are in a shared system of service with respect to each other. This seems to propagate outwardly.

I suspect that the kernel of this assignment, is up to the fact that families form a closed unit, wherein we devote our lives through and on the existence of others.

I think the fundamental unit of currency, is love. This exceptional emotion, binds us to our families and any given peers in which we assign the emotion, to another party.

This concept of service, extends significantly from the individual to the more pronounced collective.

Thus, I suspect there is a rooted interdependent action to serve people, concepts, etc.

In terms of media, we tend to assign a variety of associations with respect to the content digested and shared with other people.

We are thus, in freedom, allowing for the use of servitude towards certain ideologies or concepts, specifically to where we can find, a penning relation.

On chance

This is a profound concept. I suspect an easy definition for this is on the basis of something with no obvious intention or cause.

Once again, - this is a non-deterministic concept and is tightly coupled with Quantum theory.

This is indeterminism at play, where events that occur have no footing in tangible reality.

Concepts of this kind, like random behaviour seem to be entirely fictitious. Yet I suspect there is some possibility for this type of thinking, - although there is no direct proof of chance, random behaviour and indeterminism.

This could also be loosely defined as happen stance.

The bedrock of the concept of chance, theoretically has footing, although with respect to anything outside of QT (Quantum Theory) -- it appears to be entirely inadmissible.

The apocalypse

On the end of all things. This is a deeply religious idea. I suspect this relates to the idea of final judgement or God's revelation for the end of time.

A description for this, is on the idea that those who are to be punished for sin, by comparison to those who will find the well of life. (Or, eternal life)

The concept of an ending, - features quite consistently in a variety of religions.

On the basis of Christianity, it appears that the Second Coming of Christ, signifies the end and where the final judgement occurs, through all nations.

As specified, this isn't a unique concept.

I am going to end this book with a reference to a citation from the bible. I have always enjoyed this verse.

"Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate,
and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and
many there be which go in thereat: Because strait is the
gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life,
and few there be that find it."
