

***GOD, US and the
UNIVERSE***



The Symbol of Truth

Nicholas P. Ginex

Copyright © 2012 by Nicholas P. Ginex.

Library of Congress Control Number:		2012906669
ISBN:	Hardcover	978-1-4691-9895-8
	Softcover	978-1-4691-9894-1
	Ebook	978-1-4691-9896-5

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the copyright owner.

Copies of this book may not be printed without *written consent notarized* by the writer. For efforts to understand various beliefs of religious people, portions of this book may be reproduced without prior written permission of the copyright owner.

This book was printed in the United States of America.

Nicholas P. Ginex

God, Us and the Universe

Text includes Foreword and Table of Contents.

1. Ancient Egyptian beliefs
2. Judaism, Christianity, and Islamic commentary
3. Critique of religious dogma
4. Discourses on the soul and God
5. Challenge of religions
6. The universe
7. Title

Order via: www.xlibris.com/Ginex

To order additional copies of this book, contact:

Xlibris Corporation
1-888-795-4274
www.Xlibris.com
Orders@Xlibris.com
108175

Acknowledgments

This book could not have been written without the many written comments and responses from members of a highly respected Internet Forum:

www.gather.com.

I am deeply grateful and honored that members of the Gather forum have responded to my posts and confided their personal views with honesty.

The written dialogs between this author and Gather members are assembled in this book to provide personal interchanges about their religious beliefs and presents many questions and answers that may increase the religious perspectives of all of us.

As the author of the historical novel, *Future of God Amen*, my views and personal beliefs could not be included since history must be presented with facts and verified findings. I believe many comments and responses contained in *God, Us and the Universe* offer precious thoughts that may be worthwhile for the reader to reflect on the views of agnostics, atheists, and believers in God.

Foreword

This book provides articles posted by this author on the Internet forum, www.gather.com

Many of the articles have been stimulated by the historical novel *Future of God Amen*. They have been written to add further insights and supporting arguments of many assertions and conclusions presented in the novel. This book presents member comments and author replies to articles posted on the Internet link, www.nickamen.gather.com that, I believe, may illuminate for the reader many points of view and give greater scope to previous ideas about God, the soul, and what we have mentally conceived.

It is the novel *Future of God Amen* that serves as the backbone for the articles presented herein, for it was written for those people who desire to learn how mankind conceived one universal God. It reveals facts and findings brought to light by highly respected scholars and Egyptologists. This author believes the belief in God and our next step of human development are inextricably bound to prepare us to enter the universe.

Few people have been exposed to the history of our religious past. Only by having a true understanding of how our beliefs in God originated can we proceed on a path of knowledge about God and our purpose in life. Such knowledge will challenge many of us who have been brought up with a prescribed set of religious dogma. However, as with the twin of this book, *Amen and Jesus' Revelation*, an extract from *Future of God Amen* is provided to reveal that truth is not static but must change based upon continued experiences and acquired knowledge.

Following the extract on truth, the author has included a book review of *Future of God Amen* written by Mike Voyce. Mr. Voyce, now retired, has survived the practice and teaching of law, psychology, abnormal psychology, and counselling and is the celebrated author of *Edward*. Mr. Voyce hosts a radio talk show in the United Kingdom with his wife Christine and writes blogs and articles that deal with the paranormal, psychology, and the soul.

It is the author's hope that by exposing our religious views freely and honestly, we can someday not only agree to disagree, but come to a clearer understanding that we all pray to the same God. Further, such an understanding will precipitate a movement whereby people from the major religions will bring pressure to bear upon their religious leaders to unify our beliefs in God.

Such unity in the belief of God is a challenge for the future. We are still in our infancy in the understanding of God and our purpose as creatures of God. There is no doubt that to break the chains of dogma that restrict religious leaders to have an open mind and provide the mandate of their profession, which is to teach us to love one another, they will need the assistance of loving and perceptive daughters and sons of God. Hopefully, the articles within this book will stimulate the hearts and minds of our youth to initiate the religious changes badly needed if we are to advance closer to God and better understand ourselves. *Future of God Amen* is a book for the future whereby people from all cultures and countries will actively follow the Word of God—*love one another*.

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	iii
<i>Foreword</i>	v
God	1
<i>An Extract from Future of God Amen</i>	1
<i>Review of Future of God Amen by Mike Voyce</i>	5
<i>What Does Amen Mean?</i>	9
<i>The Revelation of Jesus Christ</i>	23
<i>Has Jesus Always Existed or Was He Created?</i>	37
<i>A Challenge for Judaic, Christian, and Islamic Religious Leaders</i>	179
<i>Will Religious Leaders Respond to the Challenge?</i>	186
<i>What is the Soul? by Bent Lorentzen</i>	238
<i>What is the Word of God?</i>	253
<i>Do You Know the Word of God?</i>	263
<i>The Word in John's Gospel</i>	276
<i>What Did Jesus Christ Reveal to the World?</i>	302
<i>Are the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic Gods the Same God?</i>	307
<i>Was Jesus Christ a Martyr and for What?</i>	310
<i>Do You Know the Origin of God?</i>	322
<i>The Beginning of the Creation of God</i>	359
<i>Why Future of God Amen?</i>	373
<i>Is the Future of God Amen Viable?</i>	377
<i>Son of God or Son of Man?</i>	389
<i>Is Jesus God?</i>	403
<i>Was Genesis Inspired or an Emulated Work?</i>	435
<i>God's Last Command</i>	447
<i>A New Religious Perspective Is Needed</i>	450
<i>The Church Fathers Committed a Gross Error!</i>	455
<i>Is There Need for a Religious Revolution?</i>	465

<i>Can Religious Leaders Provide World Peace?</i>	473
<i>Have Religious Leaders Corrupted Religion?</i>	484
<i>Are Religious Leaders Too Arrogant to Unify Their Beliefs?</i>	487
<i>The Koran Advocates Violence and Murder</i>	513
<i>Are Muslims Misled by the Koran?</i>	538
<i>Demand Muslims Provide Religious Reciprocity</i>	561
Us	591
<i>How Can Integrity, Love, and Understanding Be Instilled in Humans?</i>	591
<i>Excessive Personal or Corporate Wealth</i>	599
<i>Is Unconditional Love Sensible?</i>	608
<i>Is Love a Concept or Real Human Attribute?</i>	616
<i>Must Worship of God and Moral Beliefs Go Together?</i>	622
<i>A Moral Code Is Essential to Stop Wars</i>	630
<i>Are Theists and Atheists Both Right?</i>	632
<i>Is Pain and Suffering Needed to Learn of a Better Life?</i>	639
<i>Will Science and Religion Ever Be Compatible?</i>	643
<i>Resurrection of Does a Savior Exist?</i>	655
<i>It Is a Shame! Surfaces Again</i>	660
<i>Commentary on the Dignity of Difference</i>	663
<i>Knowledge Is a Wonderful Gift, Amen</i>	673
<i>Hello to Elsie Duggan</i>	675
<i>A Review of Edward</i>	677
<i>Is Our President an Effective Leader?</i>	682
<i>Why Do Many Women Disrespect Sarah Palin?</i>	695
<i>Let Your Voices Be Heard</i>	704
The Universe	711
<i>Does Consciousness Pervade Our Universe?</i>	711
<i>On Being and Doing</i>	737
<i>Epilogue</i>	747
<i>Author Bio</i>	751

God

An Extract from *Future of God Amen*

A Father Seeks to Reveal Truths to All

It would be derelict of this father not to reveal the truths learned by extensive reading and research and by the exchange of ideas with the many people that have entered my life. Truth can be elusive and may take many years to comprehend based upon real-life experiences. This author has been fortunate to have come upon truths by accident and, in many cases, by simply connecting the dots through the application of common sense. It would be a foolish gamble to wait for somebody else to present the findings acquired in my lifetime. Our lives are made up of too many different events that shape our thoughts. Be they on an educational, social, and personal level, these events combined with our intellect and sensitivity will always present a different color of the way each of us see, interpret life, and develop our thoughts for others to hear or read.

This father feels a deep responsibility to educate and prepare his children for the world they live in. They were the initial motivation to write *Future of God Amen*. As a father who desired to inform his children of the traps and deceptive ideas propagated around us, he felt obligated to share thoughts that may enable others to get closer to the truths that he has earnestly tried to bring to light. It is the author's nature to be grossly offended when he or others have been made a fool of by means of lies and deceptive ramblings. However much it hurts, he prefers to always know the truth. He will not knowingly stand by and let his children made fools. This

author writes for all those who have the courage to examine new avenues of thought. They will benefit by getting to know their own God and be less likely to end their spiritual quest in disillusion and separation from God¹.

The spiritual quest this author alludes to may simply be love for mankind. However you may conceive your God, you may be assured that He would rather have you love the people around you than to focus your love on Him. My responsibility as a father is to educate and prepare my daughters to make their own way in life. They need not bow down, prostrate themselves in a submissive manner, and humble themselves as if their father was a god. They need only to respect me for the love and precious time invested to help direct their lives, develop their potential, and become strong individuals who can stand on their own two feet. God may be present, but He cannot do what a father and mother can do for them, that is, to have them carry on the legacy of raising wonderful children in this world.

As mere mortals, we may never be able to know the whole truth about God. We have had our share of prophets and righteous men who endeavored to show their fellow beings how they can lead moral lives. We shall see in the forthcoming chapters (*Future of God Amen*) that some have made mistakes in their zeal to impart knowledge about God. We should not fault them for trying to have us inherit a belief and way of life received through their revelations. Only by consistently trying to seek the truth will we be able to have a clearer understanding of the lives we lead and a more positive and healthy outlook for the future.

Many of us have some doubts about the existence of God. Others find themselves with a desire to believe in God but unable to accept many religious teachings and traditional mores. There are others who feel that the concept of God is simply another form of philosophy that tries to find answers to questions of morality and the possibility of an eternal life. Then there are those who do not want to deal with

¹ God may be your own personal god that is not bound to a particular religious faith. God is therefore not conceived in the same way by each person and is formed by one's own sensibilities, intellect, acquired beliefs and knowledge.

the concept of God at all. They may follow the rule that is most equivalent to, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.”² Stated more simply, “It’s nice to be nice.”³ This book (*Future of God Amen*) is not written to deceive my children and my readers. You will find that every conclusion and assertion made has been grounded in facts and references that have come from reliable sources. This author will not waste time on gobbledygook to prove a point. It is love for the truth that gives him the stamina to share his research efforts with you. There is no other agenda in this book than to open your eyes, widen your perceptions, and bring you closer to understanding yourselves and the God in which you believe.

² **Holy Bible, King James Version, Matthew 22: 39**

³ Anonymous

Review of Future of God Amen

by Mike Voyce

Let me say I now understand the difficulties of a reviewer faced with a book of true originality, depth, and scale. It is not like any other book I have read, and for that reason alone, it is a must read for anyone with any interest in any part of the Western religious tradition; embracing Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, or any section of those religions. Let me say again, unless you are entirely uninterested in the religions and cultures of the West and the Middle East, you owe it to yourself to read this book.

I remember when that sensational volume, *The Holy Blood and the Holy Grail*, came out. It sold in the tens of millions of copies; and that book was based on the limited proposition that Mary Magdalene had born Christ's child and produced a bloodline which could be traced into modern times. The scale and potential importance of the *Future of God Amen* is very much greater.

What Nicholas Ginex's book does is create a framework, spanning many thousands of years, in which you can place the development of religious ideas. You can trace components of each of the three Western religions, making it possible to compare, contrast, and evaluate the expression of these ideas. I have absolutely no doubt, if this book is taken seriously, it can add a depth and richness to the quality of each of these religions and the understanding of the followers of any one of them for the others.

By the way, the book is neither critical nor judgmental; at no point does it say "you must take this view" or that one religion has it right and others do not. It simply lays out major ideas of religion, where they came from, and how they were developed.

In these days of very rapid change and consequent conflict, with the awful tensions and misery of the Palestinian question seeming perpetually entrenched, there is an obvious need to realize that no religious inspiration or tradition should isolate its followers from the rest of humanity. By putting the development of religious ideas into the context of Egyptian and post-Egyptian history, *Future of God Amen* makes this possible. On reading his reasons for writing the book on Mr. Ginex's website: <http://www.futureofgodamen.com>, I naturally felt they were unreasonably ambitious; I no longer feel that.

Myself, having used inspiration to write a book and talking about inspiration regularly on an Internet radio show, I believe I can recognize it when I read it. Inspiration shows itself in the richness and range of what comes through, completely unlike a conscious invention or rehearsal of dull facts. The scale of the inspiration here is awesome, and I think Nicholas Ginex is still in awe of it himself; it shows in his need to reference, credit, and give details.

I elected to read *Future of God Amen* in an e-format; as my copy stands, the notes can get in the way a little. It's a minor point and one which does not apply to a paper edition. In a way, these notes are endearing, showing Nicholas at pains to be open and truthful, and I have no doubt he is. His care to develop his story through the book carries you with him and drops "pennies" into place in your mind regularly as it goes.

Unlike radio and television, if you read a book, you give your time and yourself to it. For me, at least, the investment should be worthwhile. With so many books released today, I feel that investment is not worthwhile. On the other hand, you must never give up hope, for there are still books released today which can genuinely change your life. *Future of God Amen* is one of them.

It is Nicholas' style to give you examples, and I can practically hear him wishing me to do so now. To be honest, it would be a mammoth task to do justice to his book in this way, but let me make a point about the title; *Future of God Amen* takes that one word, the derivation and meaning of which few of us know, right back to the Egyptian ultimate creator god, Amon.

"It is conceivable that God was at work from the very beginning by first introducing Himself to the Egyptians as the god of creation, Atum.

This god, venerated as two phases of the sun, Atum and Kheprer, later became Atum-Re. As the Priesthood developed a high moral code of conduct that offered the promise of eternal life, Atum-Re became Amon-Re, the principle god of Egypt. By 1270 BCE, the Priesthood of Amon proclaimed, "*Amon As the Sole God*" of all creation. Today, many worshippers are unaware that they revere Amon as they announce his name as Amen in temples, churches, and mosques. They have been misled by religious leaders who continue to ignore the words of Jesus Christ stated in John's Revelation 3:14. There, Jesus proclaimed Amen as, "*the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.*" Rather than reveal the truth, religious leaders have taught their worshippers that Amen means "so be it."

This is a book for every Jew, Christian, and Muslim. Having myself looked in some detail at the initiation of a pre-dynastic Egyptian priest, I could wish Nicholas had given more time to the development of Egyptian pantheistic beliefs—that must be the subject for another work.

I commend this book to you.

Mike Voyce

What Does Amen Mean?

Gather Post by Nicholas P. Ginex—November 18, 2010

Many Jews, Christians, Muslims, agnostics, and atheists are unaware of the true meaning of Amen. Most people believe that Amen means “so be it.” The Hebrew definition of Amen has more specific connotations meaning truth, firmness, verily, and true. New findings by Egyptologists over the past one hundred years reveal that Amen was an Egyptian god for over 750 years before the Moses Exodus and more than 2,000 years before the birth of Jesus Christ.

Egyptologists have been able to decipher hieroglyphics carved into temple walls, pyramids, and tombs that bring new knowledge to the God Amen. As many as thirteen pharaohs used Amen or Amon in their throne names as far back as 2,000 BCE. The Hebrew definition of Amen upholds the most revered attribute of the Egyptian god, which is truth. More importantly, in the Bible, Revelation 3:13, 14, Jesus Christ proclaimed Amen is

*. . . the faithful and true witness,
the beginning of the creation of God.*

Should we believe the words of Jesus Christ that Amen is, “the beginning of the creation of God” or Judaic and Christian religious leaders who teach Amen means “so be it?” This is a highly significant question because worshippers of these religions announce Amen at the end of a prayer, supplication, giving thanks and praise, and singing Amen.

Could it be that God first introduced Himself to the Egyptians as Amen? The Egyptian priesthood was the first to develop the concept of a soul, an eternal hereafter upon living a life of truth and righteousness, a belief in God, and a Son of God.

Can it be that Revelation provides a key for religious leaders to acknowledge Amen as the *common bond* for them to work together to unify their beliefs and teach the Word of God—love one another?

These three questions are very relevant today with much division between Jews, Christians, and Muslims. Your comments and answers to these three questions may be very useful to assist religious leaders to work together.

Place an Internet search on *Future of God Amen* to view press releases and the author's Web site, where he appeals to daughters and sons of God who are endowed with love for humanity to assist the perceptive and courageous religious leaders to work together.

Comments and Responses

Larry M., November 19, 2010, 3:49 p.m. EST

Interesting speculations. From the point of view of a living language, the word means whatever people take it to mean. But following the changes in meaning over time of a word is quite interesting.

Nicholas Ginex, November 19, 2010, 6:26 p.m. EST

Thank you, Larry. I agree with you that the meaning of Amen as one of the greatest Egyptian Gods for over 2,000 years before Jesus Christ has been lost. This loss was mostly due to the inability of the Egyptians and Hebrews to decipher the hieroglyphics carved into temples and monuments. But then, the name Amen is specifically prohibited from being announced in Muslim communities as told to me by Greek orthodox religious leaders.

However, we need not fault the Muslims. Jews and Christians have interpreted Amen as not being related to a god but to admission of truth, such as, "so be it." Many interpretations by Christian religious leaders have claimed that Jesus Christ was referring to himself as "the beginning of the creation of God." But this is foolish because God existed before there was any need for a Son of God to teach mankind to love one another.

It is no accident that Amen continues to be announced in temples and churches. Mosques are exempted because the Muslims regard Amen

as a false god. Yet, the Priesthood of Amon, before the Moses Exodus, wrote scripture that proclaimed Amen as the one universal God of all creation. The Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders will fight to preserve their traditions, dogma, and scriptures by denying that Amen was the greatest Egyptian god. They further deny that many of their beliefs originated from the Egyptian religion. But, we need to accept that people indoctrinated into a particular belief will resist new information that threaten their way of life. Hey, what is wrong in admitting the truth and advancing on a new path of unification of three major religions instead of causing continued divisions and eventually, the killing of innocent people?

Peace. Truth hurts, but knowledge allows us to grow into better human beings—if we are open-minded enough to accept the most wonderful legacy given to man.

Norm Hinderliter, November 19, 2010, 7:18 p.m. EST

If you think *that* is a “revelation,” then check this out: Prior to his demise, His Holiness Pope John Paul II received the “last rites,” multiple times from Vatican staff. According to what was printed in my local newspaper, the *State Journal-Register*, when the Vatican was asked if “last rites” were to prepare a soul to enter heaven, the Vatican responded that “last rites” are prayers for increasing in strength and awareness. Anyone wanting more information on this subject and a much clearer definition of “last rites” should contact either press archives or the local Catholic church. I have no doubt that Amen, and the last rites are not the only religious identifiers whose meanings have changed over time.

Nicholas Ginex, November 20, 2010, 1:53 a.m. EST

Thank you, Norm. Yes, it is true that Amen has had its meaning changed over time. But notice the Judaic, Christian, and even Islamic worshippers say Amen, though not as frequently because they adhere to their God, Allah.

It is no accident that Amen is announced in temples, churches, and maybe mosques for it expresses thanks, praise, and acknowledgment to God. But funny that people are taught Amen means “so be it,” because religious leaders of these faiths do not want people to know he was the greatest Egyptian god for over 2,000 years before Jesus Christ and 750 years before the Moses Exodus.

John Knight, November 22, 2010, 5:02 a.m. EST

Nicholas,

“The difference in my belief is that they are the Same God but worshipped differently by different people from different countries.”

That is not different from what anyone who believes in God believes. If there is only one God, then no one was really ever worshipping anything but Him. No matter what they thought they were worshipping, there was nothing to hear them and respond but Him (except perhaps Satan in some sense).

And there is no indication in the Book that He did not have relationships with people before Abraham (or Moses), and quite the contrary, the Book speaks of many people walking with God. It is not at all troubling to me to think that some persons in Egypt and Asia and Europe and all over the world “met” Him and communed with Him and told others about those encounters. In fact, it would be somewhat troubling to think these things did not happen. He’s God, for goodness’ sake. He was God then, just as He is God now. Why on earth would He not relate to His children?

That other notions of gods sprang up through the fickle imaginations of men is what it is. None of those gods ever did anything, and that people did not grasp what was happening when they saw evidence of His activity and interactions is perfectly understandable and does nothing to undermine what the Book tells us. There is no need to introduce the idea that the people we see in the Book “plagiarized” belief in the only real God from anyone else . . . He’s God and could reveal Himself at any time to anyone at all.

Of course, those who lived before Moses and walked with God, would have “met” him before Moses did . . . So what? That does not logically render anything that anyone wrote about a God (or gods) trustworthy or informative of the actual Being and does not render all notions that all people had or have of Him, valid or inspired by God Himself. If you want to believe or do some stuff you think some Egyptian hieroglyphs or other ancient records speak of, or more modern things, have a go, knock yourself out. It’s a free country (for now).

Nicholas Ginex, November 24, 2010, 3:04 a.m. EST

Dear Mr. Knight,

You have provided a very perceptive comment and I commend you for that. To admit that God has entered into the minds of men before Abraham and Moses is a breakthrough because you are willing to examine factual evidence that proves exactly that. However, it is not true that the God Amen never did anything. In a response to Mr. Clarke below, you will see that the ancient Egyptians believed that their God “created all there is.”

The proof that Amen was the first universal God does not undermine the Torah. However, there is positive evidence that the Hebrews did borrow much of their beliefs and some of their scripture from the Egyptians, which has been revealed by respectable Egyptologists, such as Henry H. Breasted.

If you wish to deny factual evidence, I can easily show “plagiarism” of Egyptian scripture has occurred by Hebrew priests. But this is not what we should be getting upset about. We should learn how our conception of God has advanced from its beginnings in ancient Egypt. We should not deny the gift the Egyptian priesthood has given to mankind; a belief in one universal God. Do not be so proud that you cannot admit that the Hebrews learned many of their beliefs about one God and an ample code of morality and ethics from the Egyptians. The trouble with Judaic, Christian, and Islamic believers is that they believe they have the only true God. But, lo and behold, that God first introduced Himself to the Egyptian people as Amen.

Norman Chambers, November 20, 2010, 1:50 a.m. EST

The word could have originated with the Coptic Church in Egypt, and borrowed from the ancient Egyptians, whose supreme god was Amon-Ra.

Nicholas Ginex, November 20, 2010, 2:34 a.m. EST

Norman, you are absolutely right. But the ancient Egyptians existed before the Coptic Church. You mean the Coptic Church borrowed

the name Amen from the Egyptians. The Egyptian priesthood wrote scripture, *Amon as the Sole God*, before the Moses Exodus. This universal God was so popular for over 2,000 years that his name Amen (is the same as Amon) existed in the minds of men even as the new monotheistic religions gave birth.

Norman Chambers, November 20, 2010, 12:49 p.m. EST

That's what I was trying to convey, Nicholas; sorry that I wasn't clear enough.

Lea and . . . c, November 22, 2010, 1:01 a.m. EST

What good does it do to know which God came first?

Confusing at best. I studied with Bible experts for seven years, listening.

My conclusion is that the Bible, if it is true, describes a god who is vindictive, violent, and belligerent. I have no use for that god. I think much of it is metaphors. Now Jesus had a different outlook. The law of love was what he talked about. Since he never wrote anything, we have to trust those who heard and repeated it.

As for the Son of God question, we all are. If God exists, it makes sense we are all part of God and therefore can call ourselves "sons."

Imagine an infinite soul and each one of us is a bit of it but also the whole of it . . . falls in line with a hologram, each part no matter how small represents the whole.

In fact, we are god or god is us. We are all connected, so begin with yourself. If you want peace, be peace, and if you want love, be love and spread it around.

When we all understand that, we will create it.

That is what Jesus meant when he said the Kingdom of God is here on earth but you cannot see it. It is within yourself, but you must acknowledge it yourself. Let go of illusion and you will see it. Makes sense that we are in the world as form but not of this world as in soul. We are energy at the soul's level, and there are other dimensions

of being. Where you go depends on your choices of choosing light versus darkness in this life . . . you are co-creators of your own destiny, and your actions will either help or hinder others, but it also affects you because we are all related at some level. Law of cause and effect holds. Some call it Karma.

God is a great scientist. Just look at nature.

We are pitiful. Some of us destroy, but we all participate.

Nicholas Ginex, November 23, 2010, 1:59 a.m. EST

Dear Lea, I will answer your leading question, “What good does it do to know which God came first?”

Knowledge allows all of us to see the roots of our ideas and beliefs. It is a marvelous accident that the Rosetta Stone was found and allowed Egyptologists to decipher hieroglyphics. The knowledge that surfaced allows mankind to understand how the concept of God, a soul, a hereafter based on truth and righteousness, and even a Son of God had evolved.

This knowledge does not mean we forsake the beliefs in God taught by Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders. What we should do is rejoice and admire an ancient civilization that gave mankind the legacy to believe in God. There is no shame in acknowledging where and how mankind conceived God. Only the truth will set us free to expand our belief in God. By knowing the truth, we are allowing our beliefs to grow with the scientific method that relies on knowledge based on facts. The knowledge unearthed by Egyptologists and archeologists are factual evidence of man’s growth and development in conceiving God. This knowledge is not based upon revelations that may or may not have any validity whatsoever. We all know that many of the revelations are simply myths. For example, God’s Flood could not have happened, because the Egyptian civilization existed before and after Noah’s Flood without loss of any Egyptian lives.

You are absolutely right that we are all sons and daughters of God. Do you know that is the subtitle of my book, *Future of God Amen*? What this book does is reveal the truth about how man came to conceive God. It shows this God, named Amen, has profoundly influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. Upon presenting the beliefs of the Egyptian religion, a careful critique was

given of the three monotheistic religions showing weaknesses in their scriptures. The last chapter provides recommendations for these religions to work together, unify their scriptures, and teach the Word of God—love one another. A key recommendation is that people, around the world, pressure their religious leaders to unite and teach the Word of God given by Jesus.

We agree Lea. You are most perceptive, a daughter of God.

Jerry Kays, November 22, 2010, 5:15 p.m. EST

None of that crap even matters to the one who has truly found *God* (not God nor Gods)(*God*, ultimate truth . . . God and god(s), less and lesser truths.)

God is truth and unconditional love . . . none need more . . .

Nicholas Ginex, November 23, 2010, 2:27 a.m. EST

Hello Jerry,

It's good to have you here on this topic. I agree with you about God being *truth* and *unconditional love*. However, this has no meaning without linking truth and unconditional love to what you are trying to say.

Jesus Christ said it best, which can be reduced to just three words—*love one another*.

It would be wonderful if people from every country are taught to love one another; they are our brothers and sisters. As Lea has beautifully stated, we are all part of the same body of God. We are His creations. Let's make Him proud of us.

Jerry Kays, November 23, 2010, 6:01 p.m. EST

I “basically” agree . . .

Lea and . . . c, November 24, 2010, 3:47 p.m. EST

We are the new species who bridge light and darkness. Our consciousness has evolved in deep space millions of light years

away. We have come back to see how mortals are doing. Basically nothing has changed since the day we placed a little knowledge of your Creator in your heads. You have continued to wage war and make mortal enemies of your brothers. You are a race prone to destruction. Blind as a bat in a cave, you dwell in the darkness of your mind and plot murder and thievery.

You never followed my law. There is no love in your heart. Your ego is too large to make room for love . . . you shall perish like others before you.

Nicholas Ginex, November 24, 2010, 11:12 p.m. EST

Dear Lea,

I always look forward to your writing because you are truly a sensitive and perceptive woman. Your response scares me and I am highly concerned that you may be right. The way people are behaving toward each other is on track for a disastrous train wreck. However, we that “see” the danger of a frightful future must not just recognize the problem, we must rebel and solve the problem.

My book, *Future of God Amen*, was written to inform people around the world how man has come to conceive God. More importantly, it identifies weaknesses in Judaic, Christian, and Islamic scriptures and provides recommendations for the “good” people in this world to “wake up” and be proactive. I will not cry over spilled milk but fight for the survival of the human race and our planet.

Clarke M., November 23, 2010, 7:42 p.m. EST

The root of the word Amen comes from Hebrew *amen*, which means to nourish and make strong. *Emunah* (faithfulness) in Hebrew refers to God the Father as the faithful (Nourisher).

Aum in Sanskrit and Pali is traditionally given as from A (*aa*) representing First One and UM (*auum*) representing God the Mother.

With the Hebrew language, the development of a sense of the observer as distinct from the observed becomes evident. The relation of the sounds of the Hebrew language to the human body indicates that this awareness of humans as separate from nature developed organically.

Owen Barfield says, “The Semitic languages seem to point us back to the old unity of man and nature, through the shapes of their sounds. We feel those shapes not only as sounds, but also, in a manner, as gestures of the speech-organs—and it is not difficult to realize that these gestures were once gestures made with the whole body—once—when the body itself was not detached from the rest of nature after the solid manner of today, when the body itself was spoken even while it was speaking.”

Nicholas Ginex, November 23, 2010, 11:54 p.m. EST

Dear Clarke,

Your response is very illuminating and I thank you for that. The Hebrew connotation of Amen refers to “God the Father as the faithful (nourisher)” and reinforces the Egyptian belief in their God Amen as the Creator of all there is. The following extracts from *Future of God Amen* reveals that Amen was worshipped as the one universal God of all there is.

Amen, the universal God—the following excerpts from a hymn to Amon-Re, from the Boulaq Papyrus residing in the Cairo Museum, are dated sometime in the eighteenth dynasty. It indicates acknowledgment and joy in praise of Amon-Re to the height of heaven and the width of the earth.

Extract from *The Hymn to Amon-Re*

The chief one, who made the entire earth . . .
Jubilation to thee for every foreign country—
To the height of Heaven, to the width of earth,
To the depth of the Great Green Sea!

Ikhnaton (Amenhotep IV) was more specific in his praise of Aton as the god of other countries and ultimately, the entire earth. The following extract from Ikhnaton’s “*The Hymn to the Aton*” clearly states that God is a universal force for all mankind:

The countries of Syria and Nubia, the land of Egypt,
Thou settest every man in his place,
Thou suppliest their necessities:

In *The Hymn to Amon-Re*, the god Amon-Re is viewed as the supreme God that creates and sustains life. The following excerpts are provided to emphasize Amen as the “Creator and Maker of all that is”:

Amen, the God of Creation

Hail to thee, Amon-Re, . . .

Lord of what is, enduring in all things, enduring in all things, . . .

Lord of eternity, who made everlastingness . . .

Who made what is below and what is above, . . .

The chief one who made the entire earth, . . .

Thou art the sole one, who made all that is,

[The] solitary sole [one], who made what exists . . .

Father of the fathers of all the gods,

Who raised the heavens and laid down the ground,

Who made what is and created what exists; . . .

Maker of all mankind, Creator and Maker of all that is . . .

Revisiting *The Hymn to the Aton*, the eloquent pharaoh and poet Ikhнатon wrote:

How manifold it is, what thou hast made!

They are hidden from the face (of man).

O sole god, like whom there is no other!

Thou didst create the world according to thy heart.

I also agree with Owen Barfield, who says, “The Semitic languages seem to point us back to the old unity of man and nature, through the shapes of their sounds.” However, Owen was not schooled in Egyptian history. Otherwise, he would have pointed us back to the thousands of years in Egypt before the use of Amen by a Semitic people.

Lea and . . . c, November 25, 2010, 8:50 p.m. EST

Myth is real or vision of unseen is real, imagination, intuition, foresight, insight, etc. You talk about the interaction between individuals and the world.

Mirror neurons, of course, we interact. We are not isolated; at some level, we are all connected. Need to have awareness of this and acknowledge it . . . we communicate in a virtual world without computers, have done so forever.

Is that what you call the myth? Maybe that is where the myth comes from. The universal knowledge out there . . .

Nicholas Ginex, November 26, 2010, 1:24 a.m. EST

Dear Lea,

Again, you present something very wise and perceptive; are you an angel? (Smiling with admiration at your response). Myths are the beginnings of man's early conceptions of things he could not explain or beheld in wonderment, hence, the creation of gods. The imagination of men (and women) bare the fruits of thought that gave rise to some of our greatest philosophical theories that have materialized into the world of reality, such as electricity, TV, planes, rockets, and roller skates. I do not know if there is universal knowledge out there, but I do know that our minds create thought based upon the experiences each of us have encountered. I firmly believe that junk input and prized input handed down to us by our great minds of the past, and present, forms the thoughts we perceive in our waking moments. Yes, we are able to communicate in a virtual world as long as it is done with dignity, respect, and an appreciation to keep an open mind to learn from others.

Lea and . . . c, November 26, 2010, 2:32 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

I think what you do has value in trying to bring together all religions based on origins, just not sure it would work as you think. Muslims know already the Christian God and their God are the same. I am sure Hebrews realize that. One is still waiting for Jesus and the other believes it is a prophet not the Son of God. These beliefs suit them for various reasons. The first has to lower Jesus to give Muhammad some credibility, because if Jesus was God, then they would have no reason to exist. It would have been final for the Bible to be the Book.

The second, of course, they rejected him so they cannot accept him now or either their faith is false, or Christianity is based on falsehood.

If I begin a new religion tomorrow, I have to discredit the old one to a degree to give mine reason to exist.

These contradictions convinced me they are all wrong in some way.

I take Jesus as he is represented with his teachings, because I think it is right, not because I believe by faith it is true.

So my faith is not blind or without reason. I did what he said to do, listen to no one but what my heart tells me. That conviction helps me correct myself when needed knowing that what he said was valuable.

Base on life experiences and observation, as Confucius said, one can arrive at the best moral decisions.

I am not an angel, far from it, but I am working on it. We all are to a degree and working on it.

I do have premonitions, dreams, and have experienced other unusual occurrences. So I know there are other dimensions of being, not sure what they are like, but it could depend much on what you achieve in this life as becoming aware, learning to tune in, develop certain attitudes and behaviors to grow in knowledge and understanding.

Like Solomon, I think wisdom is the precious pearl to seek.

As for your book, I appreciate the gesture, but I am studying for a master's and have more to read than I have time, plus papers to write, and all at a fast pace.

At this time, my interest is devoted to metaphysical pursuits when I have time.

I have to follow the path chosen for now without distractions.

Gather for me is taking a break from work . . . which I need to return to.

Nicholas Ginex, November 26, 2010, 4:17 p.m. EST

Dear Lea,

You are pursuing a masters and I congratulate you for increasing your knowledge and ability to better know the world and yourself. I have been highly impressed with your responses and I thank you for that.

You do have a deep sensitivity and love in your being, which does translate itself on paper. I wish you speedy progress in the attainment of your master's degree and would like to be your friend for life as you attain your objectives in life. There is the hope that you may share an effort with me by being a co-author in a new book I have in mind. We both appear to share the same aspirations and I would be honored if you would be my teammate. But first things first, complete your studies. We can discuss the book later through correspondence via my e-mail: nickginex@gmail.com

Returning to your comments; I am aware that the religious leaders are no dopes and know the differences in the God they worship. The dogma between the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are at odds with each other, but intelligent, courageous religious leaders do exist who understand that by not uniting their beliefs in the vision of one God, their religions will eventually crumble as people become more educated or there will be a downward slide into the devastation of our earth.

If religious leaders are representatives of God, the smart ones will understand that the only way to preserve the belief in God, and their religions, is to unite their beliefs and teach the Word of God—love one another. People with less intelligence can agree that we all pray to the same God. If the religious leaders are incapable of agreeing on a set of beliefs in one God, then it is the people, all around the world, of all races and religions, to force the backward, mentally trapped religious leaders to sit together and work it out. Yes, it means revising the Old and New Testament, and Koran so that there is one unified scripture that all people can believe and follow. Today's scriptures are truly outdated and need a new perspective about God and His intentions for His creations. The scriptures are full of old, antiquated stories, myths, and lies that belittle His creations and cause bigotry, hate, and death to His creations. My book, *Future of God Amen* perceives that a religious revolution is needed to right the worn, outmoded scriptures of today.

The Revelation of Jesus Christ

Gather Post by Nicholas P. Ginex—August 14, 2010

Few people, be they believers in God, agnostics, or atheists, know how one universal God was conceived by man. From the age of six, I thought about where did God come from and assimilated information both consciously and subconsciously whenever the subject of God and religions were brought up.

I received a Catholic indoctrination, and after serving in the army, I read the findings and thoughts of highly respected historical writers on religion and exceptionally qualified Egyptologists. It was during my research efforts in writing *Future of God Amen* that I read a most profound statement by Jesus Christ, which validated the entire theme of the book.

In Revelation of the New Testament, John is visited by an angel to signify the revelation of Jesus Christ (Rev. 1:1) and to provide a record of the Word of God through the testimony of Jesus Christ (Rev. 1:2). John then heard a great voice that identified Jesus with the words, “I am he that liveth, and was dead; and behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death” (Rev. 1:18).

We note that Jesus uses the word *Amen* to infer “verily or true.” Jesus is expressing “truth,” a renowned attribute of an Egyptian god worshipped as Amen. Jesus does not connote today’s accepted definition of “so be it,” which implies a favorable outcome of a supplication to God. Is it possible that Jesus was tutored by esteemed and learned rabbis who taught him that Amen was the one universal God of Egypt, Syria, Palestine, and Nubia? Was Jesus honoring the god that was worshipped by a spiritual people as long as 2,000 years before his birth? The book *Future of God Amen* provides a detailed history of how Amen was venerated and worshipped to finally achieve the status as, *Amon As the Sole God*.

In Revelation, chapters 1 through 3, Jesus tells John to write and send to the seven churches in Asia his displeasure and pronouncements of those whose works were not found to be perfect before God. It is in Revelation 3:13 that Jesus is about to reveal a most profound statement by stating, “He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.” Through the Holy Spirit of God, Jesus then provides a profound revelation in Revelation 3:14:

*And unto the angel of the church of the Laodiceans write;
These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning
of the creation of God;*

Jesus admonishes the church by further stating in Revelation 3:15, “I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot.”

The above verses from the revelation of Jesus Christ has been provided so that allegations of cherry-picking verses to suit my deductions and using verses out of context are eliminated. Let us examine the revelation of Jesus that refers to Amen as “the beginning of the creation of God.”

The first phrase that needs to be understood is Jesus’s reference to Amen, “the faithful and true witness.” This statement nullifies the definition of Amen as being “so be it.” Jesus is using Amen to designate an entity and not the attribute “truth.” It is true that the terminology of Amen has changed after more than two thousand years since its usage by Jesus because the Hebrews were not able to decipher the Egyptian hieroglyphics that indicated Amen as a universal god. But from a political position, even if they did have knowledge of the Egyptian God Amen, they would not honor this god because it would compete with their god and nullify the premise that their Judaic god is the one universal God.

Further, note that Jesus does not refer to himself but an entity identified as, “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.” Christians who believe in the Trinity are convinced that Jesus is one with God and His Holy Spirit and therefore strongly believe Jesus is God and simply another manifestation of God. As such, they propound that Jesus was not created but existed in the beginning with God. But that would mean *Jesus cannot be Amen* since Amen was *created* and did not exist in the “beginning” with God. Proponents of

the Trinity profess that God, Jesus, and the Holy Spirit were “never created” but “always existed” and are manifestations of the one God. Again, because Jesus stated Amen was the *beginning of the creation of God*, he cannot be Amen who was “created” in the minds of men.

The above reasoning clearly shows that Jesus was not referring to himself but to the god that was first envisioned and created by a spiritual people in the name of Amen. It was the God Amen that was exposed to the Hebrew people years before Abraham entered Egypt, and it is this god and the beliefs of the Egyptian religion that influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. The reader may be shocked at these conclusions, but to obtain a decision based upon facts and findings that were brought to light by highly respected Egyptologists, the reader should obtain *Future of God Amen* to see if the historical development of how mankind came to conceive one universal God is indeed valid.

It was Jesus Christ who has revealed the “truth” about Amen. Apparently, he had received knowledge in his religious training as a child that Amen, the embodiment of Aten and Amon-Ra, existed for over 3,000 years in the belief system of the Egyptians. In fact, Amen and Amon (equivalent names) were used in the throne names of at least thirteen Egyptian pharaohs 2,000 years before the birth of Jesus Christ. Perhaps, we should not fault religious leaders of ignoring the history of Amen and the words of Jesus Christ, because the Egyptian hieroglyphics were deciphered about 180 years ago. By the early 1900s, Egyptologists were able to bring to light for the modern world what was written on their temple walls and tombs.

The author hopes this post has given you an appreciation of the research, findings, and conclusions he desires to share with people around the world. An overview of the author’s book may be read by visiting: www.futureofgodamen.com

Do you agree with the words of Jesus that Amen is—*the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God*? Another question presents itself for your deliberation. Is the revelation of Jesus a challenge for religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic faiths to honor our religious past and recognize they all are connected to the same god who revealed himself to mankind as Amen? Can Amen be the “common bond” that can bring these religious leaders to revise their beliefs so that they clearly worship the same God?

Comments and Responses

Gary G., August 15, 2010, 12:18 a.m. EDT

Amen is a confirmation word. It holds many meanings in this support. With all scripture, we need to take into account the whole gospel. I would say that the “so be it” is far from a dogma statement. God has the last say in all things. I can see how He is referred to as the Amen. This as well fits in line with the use of the word throughout Scripture.

Perhaps a greater concern is that we take into account Jesus’s words when he said to “love our neighbor as ourself.”

Nicholas Ginex, August 15, 2010, 2:53 p.m. EDT

Hello Gary G,

Thank you for your response.

Yes, Amen is a word used as a confirmation in the sense of “so be it.” Amen also means truth, which was the greatest attribute of this Egyptian god. “So be it” is appropriate to say when requesting a favorable outcome to God but does not fit well when “thanking God” for a favorable outcome. However, when using Amen as an entity, “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God,” it makes a lot of sense because we are thanking God. This is why Amen is sung and announced with adoration, praise, and thankfulness. We are not singing “so be it” we are praising and honoring his Name.

Gary G., August 15, 2010, 3:55 p.m. EDT

Correct! Jesus said he was the Way, Truth, and the Life (John 14:6). Hosanna is a great adoration as well.

Nicholas Ginex, August 15, 2010, 5:35 p.m. EDT

Hello, Gary G,

I agree with you that Jesus was the greatest prophet in spreading God’s Word—love one another. This is truly a Son of God in spirit who revealed the truth in Revelation 3:13 and 3:14, namely, Amen, “is

the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.” Be careful not to distort, misconstrue, and misinterpret the words of Jesus Christ. Jesus was very clear with his pronouncement. If he was referring to himself, he would have simply said, “I am the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.”

Please avail yourself of knowledge, the history, findings, and facts revealed over the past one hundred years and documented in *Future of God Amen*. Such knowledge will increase your belief in God because it is based upon truth. Believe me, I do not like to be made a fool of by ramblings of the so-called religious men, and likewise, I am not about to make fools of people who only wish to know the truth.

Gary G., August 15, 2010, 4:01 p.m. EDT

Jesus said, “This is eternal life, that they may know You, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom You have sent,” (John 17:3).

Knowing God is an intimate relationship. God sent His son to the earth to die for us in an act of love. Also, if you read Revelation 21 and 22 this will give you a picture of who God is as well. Wish you well on your journey.

Nicholas Ginex, August 15, 2010, 6:10 p.m. EDT

Hello, Gary G.,

You will find that in *Future of God Amen*, Jesus Christ is acknowledged as the greatest prophet. He also revealed words that have not been taught by Christian, Judaic, and Islamic leaders. Jesus was very clear in John’s Gospel 1:12 that anyone can become a Son of God. For convenience, it is presented below:

But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the Sons of God, even to them that believe in His name.

Then in John 14:12, Jesus himself confirms that those who believe in him will do even greater works:

Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; And greater works than these shall he do; because I go to my Father.

So you see, we both agree on the words of Jesus Christ, for he provides hope for this world. The subtitle of *Future of God Amen* is A Call to Daughters and Sons of God. Unfortunately, Jesus and John forgot to include our most wonderful partners, the daughters of this world.

We do not have to try and convince each other of the faithfulness and truth given us by Jesus. That is not my intent nor my mission at this point in life. I only desire to inform people worldwide that the beliefs in one universal God, the soul, eternal life, and the Son of God, originated in Ancient Egypt and have been embraced by the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions.

Donald Hawley, August 15, 2010, 3:08 p.m. EDT

An interesting article, but I do not think like you on much of some aspects. For instance, your idea that God does not want man to bow down to him is the height of arrogance as I see it. I remember the film *The Egyptian* and was terribly impressed when the pharaoh, Aknoten, went into the desert alone and prostrated himself before God. I think that this is the most noble thing a man can do as long as it is not in front of others or before a symbol of God (such as a pope). It is very un-American, of course, but then that is the problem with American culture, the elevation of the individual before “all else.” I think you have missed some extraordinary aspects of religion by not paying more attention to Muhammad and his message (the Holy Koran) and not “moving on” from the limited aspects of Christian theology. Jesus Himself, time and time again, warned against this stagnation and promised that more would be coming from God as it had from the beginning of history.

Nicholas Ginex, August 15, 2010, 5:05 p.m. EDT

Hello, Don,

Thank you for your response.

You had indicated that it; “is the height of arrogance” that God does not want man to bow down to Him. God never commanded that man bow down to Him. For your own edification, read the last Gospel of John, and there you will find God’s last command was stated three times by Jesus Christ—*love one another*. God would rather see his creations, the sisters and brothers of every nation, love one another. It means nothing to God to prostrate oneself before Him, for He is not

an insecure God, seeking adoration. However, He does command us to follow His command. Any believer in God who has failed to love his sisters and brothers of every nation will not be accepted by God.

Don, you have not closely read the Holy Koran because you either have “missed” what it advocates or ignore and excuse its messages of hate, bigotry, violence, and the killing of innocent human beings in the name of Allah. To “move on” from the limited aspects of Christian theology and pay more attention to Muhammad and his message is a statement that does not make any sense. Comparing the two prophets, Jesus Christ and Muhammad, Jesus never spread the Word of God by using force—killing nonbelievers in the name of God called Allah. You definitely need to reread the Koran. *Future of God Amen* reveals the deficiencies in not only the Holy Koran, but also in the Torah and New Testament. Please cite in the Holy Koran the words of God given to Jesus Christ—“love one another as I have loved you.” Certainly, God would want His last command, pronounced three times by His surrogate Jesus, to be stated once again by Muhammad clearly in the Holy Koran.

Let me know where Muhammad has stated the Word of God—*love one another*. If you love God, you should love me, for I am your brother. Let us learn the truth about “the beginning of the creation of God.”

Don L., August 26, 2010, 12:16 p.m. EDT

This is very strange pursuit in retirement, to prove the nonexistence of God.

To see the stars in the heavens, to know that we are wonderfully made, is to receive messages from the God who made them. But God goes even further. He sups with us and watches over our sleeping children as we do.

Our problem is simply belief. We don't trust in this God but prefer our own ways, robbing us of the sight that should be evident.

I do however agree with your assessment of man's will to create gods in his own image. No one can dispute that. But I do think there is a higher dimension that you are failing to acknowledge.

At some point, God must reach out and touch you, as he did for me, or you will go on in your disbelief. I pray that this will happen in your lifetime.

It is sometimes hard to understand the ways of God. He does not always explain his reasons or his purposes.

I don't think he will allow you to write a third book without adding some input on his own. Or at least I'd like to think I might be a resource in that direction. Check out my three groups on gather.

Christians Making Friends, Christians making peace and making discoveries about the Scriptures. If I can assist you in any way, be sure to ask me.

If not, God bless!

Nicholas Ginex, August 26, 2010, 3:48 p.m. EDT

Hello Don,

Thank you for a very meaningful and thought-provoking response. I must address the very first line of your comment, "This is very strange pursuit in retirement, to prove the nonexistence of God."

Nowhere have I tried to prove the nonexistence of God. My mission is stated at the beginning of *Future of God Amen* and is provided below. To reveal a past with truth, which has been confirmed by Jesus Christ, is to inform people of man's development of God. Because mankind has evolved the concept of God does not mean He does not exist. Many concepts have matured into proven realities, such as the theory of electricity, its composition of electrons, and the makeup of atoms has led to technical advances of many products, i.e., the plane, computer, artificial light, and television.

With the following link, www.futureofgodamen.com, you will see the following reasons why *Future of God Amen* was written:

Why This Book?

- ▶ Inform people that the soul, truth, righteousness, justice, a hereafter, the God Amen, and Son of God, were developed by the religion of Ancient Egypt.
- ▶ Reveal that Jesus Christ acknowledged Amen in Revelation 3:14 as, "the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God."

- ▶ Motivate religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions to accept Amen as a common bond to work together for religious unity.
- ▶ Energize religious leaders to eliminate separatism between their religions and prevent the loss of belief in God by a more discerning people.
- ▶ Assist Judaic, Christian, and Islamic unification efforts. As an aid, copies of this book have been mailed to 123 religious leaders.
- ▶ Initiate a Council for Religious Unity that provides a forum for Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders to unify their beliefs with the assistance of daughters and dons of God.
- ▶ Emphasize religious leaders are required to teach our sisters and brothers, from every nation, to love and support one another.
- ▶ Base religious beliefs with truth about their beginnings so that faith and science will advance on a parallel path in the quest to know God.
- ▶ Encourage religious leaders to preserve the spiritual nature of mankind. A silent position will continue bigotry, hatred, violence, and invite terrorism that threatens the very survival of human life and indeed, our planet.

Don L., August 28, 2010, 1:34 a.m. EDT

You're welcome, Nicholas.

I don't like to sound disparaging. But as Socrates, I feel compelled to question, to examine, to inquire about the nature of statements made by others that seem slightly out of the mainstream.

Of course, I'm referring to the Amen that you mention. Are you sure you're not putting a little too much emphasis there? Certainly strange doctrines creep into otherwise consistent materials. Revelation, it must be remembered, is considered by many to be Apocrypha. I'm not implying that that makes it less important. I'm just saying if you're wanting to be truthful and honest, that is not the heart of the Word revealed to us.

After all, Jesus is of the line of Judah, and not the line of King Tut. To infer otherwise is really leading people down the briar patch. Now if you called Jesus the Messiah or the Desire of Ages, it would make more sense to me. That would fit with the chief materials and be more consistent with what came before.

I just think you should be aware of what you look like to the casual reader. You're not really laying all the cards on the table, are you?

Nicholas Ginex, August 28, 2010, 7:19 p.m. EDT

Dear Don L.,

You bring up religious points of view that you wish to discuss and I have not introduced; such as, is Revelation a valid revelation to John from the Holy Spirit—God, and the birth of Jesus from the line of David? It appears you are on a defensive mode to stand up for your beliefs. It is not my purpose to stray you from your beliefs because I respect believers, atheists, and agnostics, who, whether they believe in God or not, follow his final command—love one another. As a true believer in Jesus Christ, can you identify where in the New Testament Jesus proclaimed this last command from God?

By reading the book, *Future of God Amen*, you will find that as a man who has searched for truth throughout my life, I have with honesty, clear evidence, and support by the greatest works of Egyptologists and writers on religion, provided a true historical development of how man first conceived one universal God. I will not deceive my daughters, for whom I was first motivated to write the book, and people worldwide with false assertions and conclusions. My purpose is to inform people of knowledge of a past civilization who has given mankind its greatest legacy—the belief in God.

If you are truly seeking God and not afraid to open your mind to new information, you will find that I have laid on the table a wonderful gift—knowledge. Are you courageous and curious enough to read *Future of God Amen*?

Don L., August 28, 2010, 1:43 a.m. EDT

I do like the idea of Jesus as the Amen appealing to different religions and bringing peace and comfort to the world. I think that was the original idea. Unfortunately, mankind screwed it up and accepted him only, as you said, as a mere prophet. If you examine the Scriptures, and be honest in what they have to say, Jesus is so much more than that, the very image of God!

So I can't take literally your opinion that we can't know God. We can know him. We just have to decide whether or not we're going to love him as he commanded.

Nicholas Ginex, August 28, 2010, 7:40 p.m. EDT

Dear Don L.,

You are misinterpreting the words of Jesus Christ because religious leaders have misconstrued the true meaning of Amen. Jesus is not and cannot be the Amen, not if it means "so be it" as taught by religious leaders today. But more importantly, Jesus proclaimed Amen as the "faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God."

After reading *Future of God Amen*, you will find that the historical evidence that Amen was Egypt's greatest God, a God worshipped as far back as 2,000 years BCE, so honored that His name appears in the throne names of more than thirteen pharaohs since 2,000 BCE, and he represents truth, righteousness, and justice.

To say Jesus is the very image of God is highly inaccurate. This is what you are taught to believe, however, and continue with your belief as long as it gives you strength. You have also misquoted God. God did not command that his children love Him. No, God commanded that we—*love one another*. You need to follow the Word of God.

Don L., August 28, 2010, 2:00 a.m. EDT

Our Catholic brethren have insisted upon Revelation being a part of Scriptures because it is a veiled reference to the Eucharist, the Lord's Supper. This is very evident. Let it not go unnoticed by believers. Now if you believe it is worthy to do a daily, or even hourly, oblation to God, then Revelation makes a lot of sense. Otherwise, it is a very weak document indeed. It just doesn't carry any weight theologically. The idea being that God created the world to destroy it so that mankind could be saved through the second coming. It is just total nonsense! Nobody in their right mind would believe it. If given this message to bring to the unbelieving world, you'd have to reject it as unworthy. They simply won't listen to it, and would consider you to be an absolute fool.

Nicholas Ginex, August 28, 2010, 10:34 p.m. EDT

Dear Don L.,

You appear to have the opinion that portions of Revelation in the New Testament are unworthy; its message of a second coming is total nonsense, and anybody that listens to (accept) it would be considered an absolute fool. Yes, your objections to Revelation have a lot of merit. However, the point of my post was not to dispute certain portions of Revelation but to reveal to God-loving people, especially those of the Christian faith, that Jesus Christ proclaimed in Revelation 3:14:

*These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness,
the beginning of the creation of God.*

If Jesus proclaims Amen is “the beginning of the creation of God,” should you believe him or the religious leaders who have misconstrued and misinterpreted the words of Jesus? It is clear that Jesus was knowledgeable about the Egyptian God, Amen. But unfortunately, religious leaders are fearful that their Scriptures would be questioned because they would have to acknowledge that God first introduced Himself to man as Amen.

Do you agree with the words of Jesus and the conclusion substantiated in *Future of God Amen* ? That is, Amen is—the *faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.*

Don L., August 28, 2010, 2:12 a.m. EDT

Listen to the words of Jesus: “I have come that they might have life, and have it more abundantly.”

His mission is crystal clear! It doesn’t have anything to do with the literal ending of the world.

Nicholas Ginex, August 28, 2010, 11:00 p.m. EDT

Dear Don L.,

Nowhere in my post did I refer to the end of the world. But you need to clearly understand the *new command* given by Jesus Christ. It was stated three times in John’s Gospel—*love one another*. Religious

leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic faiths have sorely neglected to preach the Word of God—*love one another*. It is for this reason alone that the religions themselves have caused more bigotry, hate, violence, and killing of innocent human beings. And why? Because these religions, as demonstrated today by misguided Muslims, have an agenda of greed, power, and domination over the hearts and minds of God's children, the brothers and sisters of our world.

I have just posted an article that reveals the threat of Muslim fanatics under the title, *Why Future of God Amen?* Your comments will be most welcomed.

Don L., August 29, 2010, 12:08 a.m. EDT

Well, thanks, Nicholas. I appreciate your helping me to understand your position on the Great Amen. I've never heard anyone else speak on this before. I can't think of any other objections than the ones I've mentioned. I have always felt that Egyptian culture had some kind of secret knowledge and assumed it to be mathematical or scientific, but no one has so simply stated what that thing might have been. I'm willing to consider the Amen (It has a striking resemblance to the I am that God refers to himself as, now that you mention it).

Pardon me if I seemed to be on the defense. I just wanted you to be clear about what you believed. I have learned from listening to others, and your voice is certainly one that is worth hearing.

There are so many crackpots out there. One can never be sure who to trust and who to avoid. I may have misjudged you and wanted to say I'm sorry.

Thanks,

Don

Nicholas Ginex, August 29, 2010, 8:40 p.m. EDT

Dear Don,

I am deeply touched by your response and apology. You are truly a man with a kind heart who also seeks the truth. I respect your beliefs in the God you worship, for although we all visualize God in a different way, it is the same God.

Beliefs, however, may from time to time need to be revised with new knowledge we acquire about ourselves and our past. It is not sacrilegious to question your beliefs and see them in a more positive and truthful way. I contend that by accepting the truths of our heritage, our legacy given to us by the ancient Egyptians, we will have a clearer understanding and appreciation for our beliefs.

Very few people have read about the discoveries brought to light by Egyptologists, and I admit, it was not until I read James H. Breasted's *A History of Egypt* that I was able to connect the dots of the many books I have read on religion. I thank you for your ability to receive new information. Your criticisms are appreciated, because it offers me other perspectives to consider. I am not a know-it-all but one who is willing to consider new information, evaluate it, and either reject it or modify my thoughts to something more concrete and acceptable. To not do so, I would be making a fool of myself and, I don't like to be made a fool of.

Thank you again for your willingness to understand not me, but the information I have been able to gather and share with others. The book *Future of God Amen* will be available for sale by the third or fourth week of September. However, I will be honored to send you an autographed copy. Just e-mail me your address to: nickginex@gmail.com

Keep in touch with me. We can learn a lot from each other.

Has Jesus Always Existed or Was He Created?

Gather Post by Nicholas P. Ginex—December 11, 2011

Of the three religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, it appears that Christianity, especially during the Christmas season, receives negative criticism from the liberal media and intellectuals who believe religion is a myth and it is better to focus on love of humanity than of God.

But why are atheists more outspoken by placing signs on the steps of our political buildings that state religions are myths? In particular, why does the Christian religion bear the brunt of protests by secularists who do not appreciate symbols of the cross and nativity scenes during the holidays?

All three religions profess the worship of one God, and their scriptures are related to one another. Sadly, God is viewed differently by the religious leaders of these religions where each claim they have the “true” God. Worse still, the disparity of their scriptures consists of myths, inconsistencies, and abominations of behavior that have caused bigotry, hatred, violence, and the killing of innocent people.

But returning to Christianity as being the focus of derision and anti-belief in God, it may be that many people cannot agree on the basic premise that Jesus is God. The disagreements stem from inconsistencies within the holy Gospels themselves. In the Gospel of Matthew and Luke, we learn that Jesus was born upon the inception of Mary by the Holy Spirit of God and therefore “created.” This initial belief that Jesus was born through the line of Abraham and David is acceptable by most worshippers, but in the last Gospel of John, Jesus is revealed as one with God from the beginning of time, whereby the world and all things were made by him.

In *Revelation* by John of the New Testament, an extraordinary revelation was announced by Jesus. It is a revelation that has not been understood by Christian religious leaders because of lack of history that surfaced just over one hundred years ago. Egyptologists have conclusively shown that Amen was an Egyptian God that existed more than 2,000 years before the birth of Jesus. It was Jesus in *Revelation* 3:14 who proclaimed for those “that hath an ear” that Amen is, “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.”

This revelation by Jesus clearly states that Amen is an entity, not a phrase that means “so be it” or confirmation meaning “truly or verily.” Rather, Amen was the “beginning of the creation of God.” Believers in the Trinity, where God consists of three “Persons” as Jesus, the Holy Spirit, and God the Father, are convinced that Jesus is co-equal and co-eternal with God. This contention means that Jesus “always existed” as God from the beginning of time. But then, this contention means Jesus was never “created,” for which reason, he cannot be Amen, “the beginning of the creation of God.”

Religious leaders ignore Jesus’s revelation because it contradicts their belief that Jesus is Amen. But is this an inability of religious leaders to accept the truth that Amen was an Egyptian God that Jesus acknowledges as the “beginning of the creation of God?” Are Judaic, Christian, and Islamic leaders afraid to accept that it was the Priesthood of Amon that first articulated the belief in one universal God as documented in *Amon as the Sole God*?

Do you believe the revelation of Jesus that Amen was man’s initial belief in God? As such, do you believe the Hebrews embraced Egyptian beliefs of morality and righteousness to be accepted by God? And finally, do you agree that the controversy of Jesus as always existing versus being created is one of the major reasons why many people cannot accept Christianity? Your thoughts are appreciated.

Comments and Responses

Clarke M., December 12, 2011, 5:26 a.m. EST

We know from the Old Testament, the testimony of Jesus in the New Testament, and the teachings of St. Paul to his churches that Abraham recognized the God of the Hebrews as their Creator. The Egyptian

“Amen” cults had no relation to the monotheism of the Jews. Scholars who theorized that the Egyptian texts indicated that Judaic monotheism was influenced by the Egyptians have been shown to have been wrong. Contemporary scholars have done so, based on research that included more archaeological and textual discoveries in Egypt than previous scholars knew of, which provided a greater knowledge of Egyptian history and beliefs. St. Paul, quoting first from the Old Testament, 1 Cor. 15:45-48 NIV makes clear the promised coming of Jesus to the Jews since God made His covenant with them and to Abraham:

So it is written:
 The first man Adam became a living being;
 the last Adam, a life-giving spirit.
 The spiritual did not come first,
 but the natural, and after that the spiritual.
 The first man was of the dust of the earth,
 the second man from heaven.
 As was the earthly man, so are those who are of the earth;
 and as is the man from heaven,
 so also are those who are of heaven.

All humans share a physical body with Adam—and that physical body will die—but through Jesus, everyone is offered a spiritual body. (1 Cor. 15:44)

The connection between Jesus and Adam is fundamental to Christian doctrine and holds together the entire Christian system or “salvation story” in all its stages—*election, redemption, atonement, justification (acquittal), regeneration, and sanctification.*

The Old Testament makes this clear, and Jesus affirms in his own words everything stated in the Old: the two sections constitute one story.

Nicholas Ginex, December 12, 2011, 10:51 p.m. EST

Dear Clark,

You did not respond to the question presented in this post, which is “Has Jesus Always Existed or Was He Created?”

I did not ask you to defend your beliefs and provide a connection between Adam and Jesus. You wrote that “Abraham recognized the

God of the Hebrews as their Creator.” Yes, Abraham did recognize God as the Creator of the Hebrews, whereby Adam was the first man according to the Old Testament. What you fail to understand is that Abraham was a complete failure in communicating “God as their Creator,” because even when Moses led the Hebrews out of Egypt and gave his followers the commands from God, they still resorted to making a golden calf for worship, which verifies they still were unable to relate to Abraham’s God of all creation.

You also wrote: “The Egyptian Amen cults had no relation to the monotheism of the Jews.” Clark, you continue to demonstrate a lack of Egyptian history and prefer to denigrate the Egyptian religion as a cult. You do not want to give credit to a civilization that advanced to a much higher level in conceiving God than that of the Hebrews and Babylonians. They were the first civilization to develop the concept of a soul, a hereafter one attains upon living a moral and righteous life, and after hundreds of years of worshipping many gods came to worship Amen (Amon) as the one universal God.

You fail to realize that Moses was brought up in the house of a pharaoh for the first forty years of his life where he learned many Egyptian beliefs and was exposed to scripture written by the Priesthood of Amon before he left Egypt around 1250 BCE. Are you in denial that even Jesus proclaimed Amen is, “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God?” Could it be there is a reluctance to give the African people praise in conceiving the concept of one God because they are “black?” I hope not. Please give credit where credit is due.

Abraham never wrote a line of Scripture and his oral communication was definitely a failure. Abraham is the *Father of the Hebrews*, but it is Moses that is the *Father of the Judaic religion*. It was Moses, around 1250 BCE, that communed with God and put the words of God in the Book of the Covenant, which contains many of the commands, judgments, and ordinances, including the Ten Commandments from God. But do you know that the Egyptians always followed eight of the Ten Commandments for more than 2,000 years before Moses wrote the book?

I do not mind responding to your attempts to proselytize your Judaic-Christian beliefs, but please use your own original thoughts in response to the question of this post.

Vickey W., December 12, 2011, 5:39 a.m. EST

Interesting and I had never heard this one before . . .

Nicholas Ginex, December 12, 2011, 11:23 p.m. EST

Thank you, Vickey,

This post was the result of extensive conversations with highly knowledgeable Christians and Jews who were strong supporters of their beliefs as written in their scriptures. I always thought that Jesus was born of the Virgin Mary upon the inception of the Holy Spirit of God. For this reason alone, I always thought Jesus was a Man of God and was content to accept that he was called the Son of God. It was only over the past year that I learned that deeply religious Christians believed that Jesus is God, co-equal and co-eternal with God. Their reasoning is based upon the opening lines of John's Gospel where Jesus is depicted as the Word, and the world was made by him.

The inconsistency between the Gospels of Matthew and Luke with that of John caused me to reflect, and lo and behold! It was Jesus himself in Revelation 3:14 that solved the dilemma by stating Amen is, "the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God." Having authored the book *Future of God Amen*, I knew that Jesus was proclaiming a truth, for Amen was the greatest Egyptian god for more than 2,000 years before Jesus was born.

My objective is to reveal the words of Jesus, because if the leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions acknowledge the words of Jesus, they would realize and agree that the roots of their beliefs began with the beliefs of the ancient Egyptians. It is no accident that Amen is still announced in Jewish temples and Christian churches. Are they singing "so be it" or "verily, verily," or are they subconsciously venerating the name of Amen, "the beginning of the creation of God?"

Char H., December 25, 2011, 4:57 p.m. EST

And when God wrote: "Thou shall have no other Gods *before* me."

How do you release yourself from this, the given commandment? You are going a real stretch to undo the salvation plan, IMHO. Are you here denying the birth of Christ as free from carnal inception? This is

to make the salvation plan of totally non-effect. If so, it would make the redemption of the carnal from the carnal. That makes no sense. I don't think I can be understanding you properly.

Char H., December 25, 2011, 5:18 p.m. EST

Amen would seem to mean "the truth," as in the incorruptible word. Like praying, standing on the promises of scriptural promises to us, and ending our prayer in remembrance that in faith we believe, God is not a man that he should lie. Therefore, knowing the prayers in truth will be answered.

When it says Amen in Revelation, it is easy to see it is speaking of Christ, the beginning of the redeemed from death, the beginning as promised in truth or in God's Word, which cannot lie. I really think you are reaching for something. I will, however, read with this in mind and test it in the Scriptures. If what you are saying is true, it will line up, and it will verify from Genesis to Revelation. I am open to truth, but the one example you gave did not convince me. Only the Holy Spirit can open my eyes, if it is true. Do you believe there is a Holy Spirit to guide us into all truth?

Char H., December 26, 2011, 10:36 p.m. EST

Hello Nicholas,

Those two are for you. I do see below where you have offered other verses also, but how do you get past "have no other Gods . . . ?" Do you not have any answer for that, or did you not realize I was asking you?

Nicholas Ginex, December 26, 2011, 11:57 p.m. EST

Hello Char,

Thank you for commenting on this post. It is beneficial to get many different points of view. First, let me be clear that I am not advocating a new religion, nor do I support any religion. My purpose in writing religious topics is to have people think and learn why they believe in God. I believe in God, but my god is the Creator of the universe and all life forms, including us. Yes, I have read the Torah, the Gospels, and Revelation, and the Koran. What I have found is that all three religions

have their roots from a very spiritual civilization that have a formal religion thousands of years before the birth of the Judaic religion.

I will now try to answer your questions. You indicated one of God's commands, "Thou shall have no other Gods *before* me" and asked me if I release myself from this commandment.

I only believe in one universal God, the Maker of all there is. I do not believe God has a salvation plan that you speak of. It is clear to me what Matthew and Luke has said that Jesus is a Son of God "created" by the inception of God's Holy Spirit with Mary his mother. This makes a lot more sense to me than believing that Jesus "always existed" with God from the very beginning. I do not subscribe to the fabricated concept of the Trinity, which is polytheistic, whereby one God consists of "three persons."

Char, you wrote: "When it says Amen in Revelation, it is easy to see it is speaking of Christ, the beginning of the redeemed from death, the beginning as promised in truth, or in God's Word, which cannot lie."

You are being misled, for Jesus states that Amen is "the faithful and true witness," which means that Amen in another entity and not Jesus. Jesus also states that Amen was created by saying Amen is "the beginning of the creation of God." This means that Jesus is revealing a "truth" that Amen was conceived by the minds of men and was the beginning of the belief in one universal God. Jesus cannot be "Amen" if he "always existed." If we believe Jesus is Amen, then he was "created" like Amen, and this would not be consistent with the Trinity concept.

Char, you asked of me another question, "Do you believe there is a Holy Spirit to guide us into all truth?" Yes, Char, I believe that the Holy Spirit is the spirit of God that pervades the universe. I believe there is a consciousness that intelligent life forms begin to think about their beginning and how did the universe begin. We are reaching out to understand God and our purpose in life. I believe that we are still evolving in our quest to know God and ourselves. The Egyptians first formulated the concepts of one universal God, the soul, a hereafter upon living a righteous life, and a Son of God. The Hebrews were exposed to many of the beliefs and moral codes of the Egyptians; Moses wrote many of the commands he learned from the Egyptians in The Book of the Covenant; Jesus extended the belief in one God to

all people; and the Moslems have benefited in adopting many of the beliefs of the Judaic and Christian religions.

However, the scriptures of these three religions reveal many inconsistencies, myths, and abominations of the Word of God, causing bigotry, hatred, violence, and the killing of innocent people. We need to advance in our beliefs in God, and a good start would be to improve the scriptures so that there is unity of belief and the Word of God is taught—*love one another*. This was given as a command by Jesus in John's Gospel.

Char H., December 27, 2011, 1:17 a.m. EST

You continue to speak, when quoting Revelation, that Jesus said it. It spoke *of* Jesus but was not spoken *by* Jesus. This rethinking to get to one religion of *love* to bring the whole world into is exactly what the beast wants to bring. It is relegated of the end-time that he would deceive the very elect, if that were possible. I urge you to reconsider that Christ was slain before the foundation of the world. God knew all, and while we are free to choose, he knew before the foundations of the world what we would do. He is the beginning and the end, the Alpha and the Omega, and knows all. Even though I sleep now, he knows my end, and my beginning again. Please look again. There are just too many places that are seamless, and what you are saying does not fit.

BTW, please forgive all the typos and if you see a strange word now and then. I am typing on an iPad my sister loaned me, and it auto completes in some strange ways.

I do not see your Amen, and in order to pick it up, I would have to directly disobey a commandment. Sorry, that doesn't sit with me. Moses, being raised in Egypt, surely would have known if this were so.

When you say Christians don't know Jesus came to say to love each other, yes, he did say that. His main reason for coming, being born, was to conquer death. The incorruptible took on death, so that we (who deserved to die as mortals) could be raised immortal again. It is this spirit body that is eternal. In the beginning was the Word, and God spoke, and it was. The moment he created Adam, the whole thing

was created. Jesus being first, but in spirit, not body, even as we were all in the ethos too. He is not creating each one as a child is born. You can't believe that, can you? All were created before that. What do you think?

Nicholas Ginex, December 28, 2011, 7:04 p.m. EST

Hello Char,

I have told you what I think of God, His Holy Spirit, and that Jesus is a Son of God born of the Virgin Mary by the intercession of God's Holy Spirit. Sorry, but I do not agree with your thoughts derived from the Bible. There are many myths, inconsistencies, and abominations of the Word of God in the Bible as well as the Koran. It seems that God inspired scriptures for the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders, and these very scriptures have caused division, bigotry, hate, violence, and killing of innocent people. Can you say God did a good job in His inspiring people to write them?

Char, you have an understanding of the Bible that I cannot agree with, and that is because I do not believe Jesus's message is to conquer death. His message is clear. It was a command given three times for those that hath an ear. That command is to love one another.

I believe that God did not create mankind, starting with Adam and Eve. He first created a universe with many galaxies, stars, and planets, where life could evolve. On planet Earth, a highly intelligent life form came to exist with its partner for procreation—man and woman. There are multiple other planets that may have highly intelligent life forms as well. To think God made humans in His own image is the height of arrogance. Once again, Char, you should not believe everything you read. You must use your intelligence to throw out the chaff from the wheat and one day you will discern "truth."

Scott, I support Zionism, December 12, 2011, 7:43 a.m. EST

Nicholas wrote: "Why does the Christian religion bear the brunt of protests?"

Because Satan and his demons know who God is. This keeps demonic people very busy.

Nicholas Ginex, December 12, 2011, 11:34 p.m. EST

Hello Scott,

Here we go again. Let's blame it on Satan rather than be accountable for our own actions of stupidity or mistakes. I must say, Scott, you have a sense of humor.

Scott, I support Zionism, December 13, 2011, 10:38 a.m. EST

"Here we go again. Let's blame it on Satan rather than be accountable for our own actions."

Nicholas you are not knowledgeable of these things. You are of this world.

It has to be hard for you.

Bye for now.

Scott, I support Zionism, December 12, 2011, 7:46 a.m. EST

"Has Jesus Always Existed or Was He Created?"

Jesus has always existed. Before the big bang even.

Nicholas Ginex, December 12, 2011, 11:43 p.m. EST

Hi Scott,

I agree, because it took a long, long time before the "Big Ball" to gather so many atoms of gases and matter to finally explode with a "big bang" to create the universe. But I believe there are "black holes" that are attracting matter constantly, and eventually one of them will also reach a limit and cause a "big bang." Who's to say there is only one big bang in the universe?

Richard W., December 12, 2011, 12:54 p.m. EST

"It appears that Christianity, especially during the Christmas season, receives negative criticism from the liberal media and intellectuals,

who believe religion is a myth and it is better to focus on love of humanity than of God.”

I am critical of Christian arrogance, because it is a threat to my freedom of religion. I perceive no such threat from other religions. As long as Christians insist that their belief transcends the Constitution, they will continue to receive such criticism.

“But why are atheists more outspoken by placing signs on the steps of our political buildings that state religions are myths?”

That’s a new one. For several years, it has been the Christian community which has ignored the Bill of Rights by erecting Christian monuments on public lands. It has been the Christian community who has placed copies of the Ten Commandments in front of courthouses and in the courtrooms themselves. Contrary to Christian claims, our laws are not based upon the Ten Commandments.

“All three religions profess the worship of one God and their scriptures are related to one another.”

This country is made up of more than just three religions. There are Buddhists, Hindus, and members of religious groups which you haven’t heard of in this country. No one religion, not even Christianity, should be shown favoritism.

Nicholas Ginex, December 12, 2011, 11:58 p.m. EST

Hello Richard,

You are correct in that people of all religions should have equal opportunity to worship as they please. The only objection is when they proselytize and interfere with the property that is shared with other people. I agree that worship belongs in a house of worship and in the home, not where it is displayed in public whereby it infringes on the beliefs of other people.

Years ago, when whole communities believed in the same beliefs because it was a smaller world, the proud display of one’s feeling for their god was a good thing. But today, where we have multicultural people and races, we have got to be mindful of the beliefs of others.

Scott, I support Zionism, December 12, 2011, 2:02 p.m. EST

“I perceive no such threat from other religions.”

That’s because you are one with them, from the same fold. You are of this world, Richard.

Good day, sir.

Richard W., December 12, 2011, 2:56 p.m. EST

You disagree with me, therefore you respond by demonizing me. That is a common response from those who find it impossible to believe that there can be validity in any religious system except their own. They refuse to recognize that other religions are entitled to the same constitutional rights which they claim to cherish.

Scott, I support Zionism, December 12, 2011, 5:27 p.m. EST

“Richard W. December 12, 2011, 2:56 p.m. EST

You disagree with me, therefore you respond by demonizing me.”

Demonizing the demon-influenced. I am not sure if that can be done, but interesting.

It’s this country. For now you have free will, Richard. In the end.10.

That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth;

11. And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. (Phil. 2:10-11, KJV)

Richard W., December 13, 2011, 2:40 a.m. EST

How do I have an intelligent discussion with a person who lives in a fantasy world populated by demons? Those demons belong in the same category as the invisible pink unicorn and the flying spaghetti monster, but Scott believes in them, so it will be a waste of time to argue.

For some irrational reason, Scott tried to influence me by quoting Philippians 2:10-11, the King James version, no less. He knows

that I'm not a Christian, so why does he think that will change my mind?

As I have pointed out to Julie on another topic, the authors of the New Testament often mistranslated or distorted the Old Testament. The example I gave Julie was from Matthew:

... In this way what was spoken by the Lord through the prophet was fulfilled: "I called my Son out of Egypt." (Matt. 2:15)

Scholars are in agreement that this is a quote from Hosea 11:1. However, if that is correct when taken in context, it makes Jesus a worshiper of Baal:

When Israel was a young man, I loved him like a son, and I summoned my son out of Egypt. But the more I summoned them, the farther they departed from me. They sacrificed to the Baal idols and burned incense to images. (Hosea 11:1-2, NET Bible)

There are two possibilities:

- 1: The original quote was about the Israelites, not Jesus.
- 2: Jesus Christ was a worshiper of Baal.

Either way, the New Testament is not as reliable as Christians insist it is.

Nicholas Ginex, December 14, 2011, 1:34 a.m. EST

Hello Richard,

Thank you for the information whereby you presented two possibilities after providing excerpts from Matthew 2:15 and Hosea 11:1-2. It would appear they refer to the children or sons of the Israelites.

The New Testament Gospels present Jesus as a man of God who, though initially described as a Son of God in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, he became known in the last Gospel of John as one with God. Generations later, the Church fathers proclaimed Jesus as co-equal and co-eternal with God with fabrication of the Trinity, which is really a polytheistic concept, where God exists as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit of God.

What is astounding is that Christians now believe that Jesus is God. What Christians do not understand is that Jesus was never needed on the earth until the creation of man. Few Christians know that God gave Jesus to mankind to deliver His last command stated three times in the last Gospel of John—*love one another*.

Richard W., December 13, 2011, 5:31 a.m. EST

Nicholas,

I am happy to see that you believe people of all religions should have equal opportunity to worship as they please, but you make it appear that it is the non-Christians who are depriving the Christians of their right to worship as they please. Christians have placed numerous religious monuments on public lands, and they raise hell when the monuments are removed. It is Christians who want to force their beliefs upon others. It is Christians who want to make prayer a part of the curriculum in public schools. Judge Roy Moore in Alabama insisted on displaying the Ten Commandments in his courtroom, and he had a monument extolling Christianity placed in the courthouse.

I grew up in the 1940s and 50s and well remember the religious hatred against Jews. For years, I have heard the religious hatred Christians use against gays and lesbians.

At one time, Christians turned to the Bible to justify slavery, the burning of witches, and child beating. The Bible was used to keep women from voting or holding jobs with the same opportunities and pay as men. The Bible is used to justify war, racism, and hatred, all in the name of Jesus Christ.

Nicholas Ginex, December 14, 2011, 1:55 a.m. EST

Hello Richard,

I agree with your criticisms of Christians being more outspoken about their faith than worshippers of other religions. But you must understand that this nation was founded on Judeo-Christian beliefs.

Do not fault the Christians for all the holy deaths of innocent people in the past. Yes, they have their fanatical beliefs that harbor hate toward homosexuals and lesbians and rather have a woman give birth

to a baby when she has been raped or made an error in judgment in becoming pregnant with a man that does not love her or the baby. This idea of pro-life is a sick view to let a baby be born without the love of its mother and father. It also dishonors the command of Jesus to “love one another” by allowing degenerate and undeserving people to bring about a baby that propagates the “bad” genes of irresponsible people.

But you must also realize that the Koran sanctions bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent people who do not worship Allah. The Muslims are also openly expressive of their belief in God and are infringing on the public by demanding they have the time and place for worship even in public and educational places in this country.

Richard W., December 14, 2011, 11:13 a.m. EST

Nicholas, you stated, “But you must understand that this nation was founded on Judeo-Christian beliefs.” There were a lot of Christians around at the time, but this country was not founded on Judeo-Christian beliefs.

At the time of the American Revolution, there was a strong reaction against Church authority. This is well expressed in Thomas Jefferson’s “Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom in Virginia” (<http://religiousfreedom.lib.virginia.edu/sacred/vaact.html>) and in James Madison’s “Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments” (http://religiousfreedom.lib.virginia.edu/sacred/madison_m&r_1785.html).

Concepts such as an elected government, equality, and freedom of religion are nowhere found in the Bible.

Some of our ideals come to us from Greek philosophers and Roman law. England itself transmitted to us the ideals found in the Magna Carta and the Common Law Court system. When William the Conqueror became King of England, he did not attempt to enforce Roman law upon his new subjects, but instead allowed them to settle disputes through local traditions, which go back to the Anglo-Saxons, with these traditions coming down to us today as the common law.

The American Revolution itself was influenced by the non-Christian writings of Thomas Hobbes and John Lock. It was Hobbes, in his work *Leviathan* who suggested that there was a “social contract” between

the people and the government. Hobbes also stated that the people had a right to overthrow an authority which did not fulfill its obligations to the people.

In his *Second Treatise on Civil Government*, John Locke proposed a model government which consisted of three branches composed of the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. Through a system of checks and balances, the branches would share power between them. This formed the framework for our present federal and state governments.

Nicholas, you also stated, “But you must also realize that the Koran sanctions bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent people who do not worship Allah.”

The Bible and the Koran have much in common. Bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of people who do not worship Jesus runs throughout Christian history.

Clarke M., December 14, 2011, 12:23 a.m. EST

Nicholas,

No, I said nothing about my beliefs. It is you who try to convince others of your “religious” beliefs and supply, to defend them, interpretations of texts from the Bible and Egyptian ones that are based on inadequate, inaccurate, and out-of-date research—often quoting sources by old scholars who have been proved years ago by other scholars to have misinterpreted Egypt’s texts and lacked accurate knowledge of its history. You now repeat the same errors! You won’t learn. You haven’t bothered to check the academic sources I have supplied you that make clear the errors in your book and theories.

My beliefs have nothing to do with the “what the Bible says.” I supplied briefly some quotes that indicate what the Bible says about Jesus that any scholar might accept, whether he happened to be an atheist or believer in some other faith than the Christian one—which has many sects that may agree on “what the Bible says,” but have personal views on the question “Has Jesus always existed or was He created?” They interpret words in the Bible in certain ways. I only quote what the Bible says.

You are dishonest and ignore what I wrote in your response, not least when you write:

I do not mind responding to your attempts to proselytize your Judaic-Christian beliefs, but please use your own original thoughts in response to the question of this post.

You are the one who “proselytizes” and who has failed to write a book that qualifies as responsible academic work. Arrogance and ignorance are evident in the case of some proponents of their “beliefs,” as we see in some Christian and Islamic “preachers.” You are demonstrating the same qualities.

Nicholas Ginex, December 14, 2011, 10:42 p.m. EST

Hello Clark,

The reasons I found you proselytizing and circumventing the question of this post was that you referred to Abraham and provided an opinion that he “recognized God of the Hebrews as their Creator” and then stating Jesus is the second Adam. These thoughts of yours shed no light on an objective answer as to whether Jesus was created or always existed.

I have tried to clarify you accusing me of, “often quoting sources by old scholars who have been proved years ago by other scholars to have misinterpreted Egypt’s texts and lacked accurate knowledge of its history.” Please know that in my response to you, I have used the Bible as the sole source to prove my conclusion that it was Moses that was brought up in the house of a pharaoh for the first forty years of his life, where he learned many Egyptian beliefs and was exposed to scripture written by the Priesthood of Amon before he left Egypt around 1250 BCE.

I also stated using the Bible that, “Abraham never wrote a line of scripture and his oral communication was definitely a failure. Abraham is the *Father of the Hebrews* but it is Moses that is the *Father of the Judaic religion*. It was Moses around 1250 BCE that communed with God and put the words of God in the Book of the Covenant, which contains many of the commands, judgments, and ordinances, including the Ten Commandments from God.”

Are the scholars you have great esteem for going to deny that Moses wrote the Book of the Covenant that forms *the core of Judaic religious beliefs*? Those beliefs were mostly derived from the beliefs of the

Egyptian Priesthood of Amon. Many of the moral codes and ideas of truth and righteousness were practiced by the Egyptians over 2,000 years before Moses walked out of Egypt and more than 3,400 years to the birth of Jesus.

You refuse to answer questions that I back up with real hard facts. I find you are not courageous or honest enough to reveal your thoughts to some of the relevant questions that pertain to the question of this post. They were presented to you to “see” if you would share your thoughts. The questions were, “Are you in denial that even Jesus proclaimed Amen is,” “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God?” Could it be there is a reluctance to give the African people praises in conceiving the concept of one God because they are “black?”

No, Clark, I am only concerned with revealing the “truth” that religious leaders and indoctrinated scholars are reluctant to acknowledge to followers of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. They have hidden the “truth” that it was the Egyptian religion that has had a profound effect on the development of the Judaic religion, which in turn, influence the development of the Christian and Islamic religions.

Once again, I proudly offer the name of my book, *Future of God Amen*, to Gather readers so that they have an opportunity to learn of the facts and findings that religious leaders and scholars would ignore and misconstrue because they are not only embarrassed of the myths, inconsistencies, and abominations contained in their scriptures, but they do not want to give credit to the oldest formalized religion that developed the concepts of a soul, a hereafter, and finally, one universal God Amen. Like you, they rather denigrate the Egyptian religion and refer to it as a “cult.”

Clark, I admire you for your scholarship on religions and your ability to share very interesting knowledge with me and our Gather readers. But please try to stay on topic, and if possible, provide your thoughts to the questions I have raised for you. Forgive me if I appear to be too forward, but this is a forum where I try to share my thoughts as honestly as is possible, for I will always seek truth even if I must modify my own views. But for me to modify my views, I look to those who do not circumvent a topic but diligently try to obtain an answer we can all benefit by.

Clarke M., December 16, 2011, 12:11 a.m. EST

Nicholas, you fail to respond to what I have said and instead repeat your own ideas.

I researched, including consulting a number of recognized scholars personally, on the word “Amen” and the question of the origin and development of monotheism among the Hebrews. I reported a lot of this to you. I have noted you have used as sources outdated Egyptian and biblical scholarship, and you make claims based on those sources that have been proven wrong in a number of ways: your descriptions of the various Amon-Ra, Amen priestly religions or cults are distorted because you have failed to describe their differences, often the hostility of one set of priestly ideas about Amen, etc., to another. One priestly group would gain power and replace the other and impose a different set of gods and rituals. The arguments you make about the development of Hebrew monotheism don’t stand up to what reliable scholarship has shown, and your claim that “Amen” in the Bible came from “Egypt” doesn’t. Hebrew monotheism was an independent development from Egyptian ideas, and the Hebrews did incorporate some significant concepts from Iranian monotheism—the Iranian culture pre-dated the origins of Egyptian culture—at the time of the Babylonian captivity and the reign of King Cyrus, who had carried on some of the ancient Iranian/Zarathustrian monotheistic teachings. Obviously, Egyptian “Amen” cults were influential in Greece, Africa, and the Middle East for hundreds of years, as Herodotus and other historians have described. But the development of the Hebrew monotheism was independent. To connect Moses’s teaching and the exile of the Hebrews in Egypt to an “evolution” of the Hebrew monotheism, as some Western scholars did—you quote as an “authority” a scholar’s book published in 1904—which has been shown to wrong. While the Egyptians originally had a concept of one Creator is indicated by some ancient texts attributed to the “Ancients,” the establishment of priest-king religions with their various pantheons of gods in Egypt took place later and represented a decline in the belief of one Creator that the Egyptians once had. This sort of decline in recognition of one Creator is seen in other world religions, which later developed similar institutional religions that were based on maintaining the power and interests of rulers, notably priests and royalty.

The rise of secularism and “scientism” as a “religion” on the one hand and on the other hand competing fundamentalist religious

doctrines today is evident in the debates between “Creationists” and “Evolutionists.”

Science and religion are not opposed and never have been, but the perceived schism between them that has developed historically in the last three hundred years has created a situation that only the efforts of those with reason and intelligence in all fields can help to resolve.

Your idea that organized religions, that is their “leaders” are ignorant of “one God” and that the Egyptians’ ideas can teach them what they have denied and even conspired in the past to obscure, as in not accepting that the “Amen” in the Bible indicates that Christ was the Logos that the Egyptians recognized, which is the message of your book, is not shown to be reasonable or acceptable by scholars as well as demonstrating a superficial understanding of not only the Bible and Christianity but of other religious teachings that are practiced today and in the past. It can be said that the idea that Christ was the Logos is not contradicted by any of the world religions, although their rituals, forms and practices may differ considerably. I can attest to this personally by my having worked for over fifty years with thousands of people and groups, including many of their leading representatives. While I am, by view of my education and faith, a member of the Episcopal church—sometimes we American members are jokingly called the “frozen chosen” because of the political and financial dominance in American history of individuals who were wealthy Episcopalians. There is common ground among people of all faiths, along with the hostility throughout history and today. I like the Arab saying, “There are as many ways to God as there are children of Adam.” I have experienced the essential truth in this in my work with those in many nations and of many faiths.

There is ignorance, fear, and hatred among humans everywhere. This is not true of some and never has been. Do I doubt my faith in Christ denies the sincere faith in God of individuals of different faiths? No. Love is universal as is the experience of His presence. As Mark Twain’s simple Huck Finn said, “You can’t pray a lie—He knowed it, and I knowed it.” Humanity is one body and shares a common aim.

There is much to learn in studying the texts of the world religions. A profound lesson they all can teach us is that violence changes nothing. As we are, we live our lives as imperfect humans, seeking to become responsible in the conditions of ordinary life, which may require our

participating in wars to defend our nations and families from enemies who wish to destroy us. I have participated as a patriotic American in more wars and revolutions than most of my fellow citizens. I also honor and know the wish and work of many throughout the world for the welfare of all humans. Preaching faith and tolerance is not wrong in itself. Throughout history and in many cultures, many historical and legendary figures have done so.

We are “slow learners,” but their message has resonated among humans and touched some more deeply than others. I have seen this throughout the world today. I find in Jesus’s words addressed to humans of “good will” an affirmation of hope for us all. I do not need the words of any scripture, the Bible or other, to convince me that “God is love.” I am just an ordinary human and my lack of being able to love is evident every day. I do not know the mercy and compassion of the Creator, yet in working with others and seeking to be sincere in how I relate to others, I, at moments, have a personal taste of God’s will. But most of the time, I fail to experience it and behave in ways that I later realize I was “missing the mark”—the literal words in the text of the Greek New Testament which is translated in the English New Testament as “repentance.”

Nicholas Ginex, December 16, 2011, 2:57 a.m. EST

Dear Clark,

Your response was honest and I appreciate your views. You have repeatedly stood by your convictions and the knowledge you have acquired. I respect you for that. But you continue to deny that the word “Amen” was originally the name of an Egyptian god in use as far back as 2,000 BCE and maintain it was the Hebrews that developed this word, which shows a lack of Egyptian history. You fail to acknowledge that the greatest attribute of Amen was “truth,” and it is this connotation that is in usage by the Hebrews as true, or verily, or “so be it.”

I maintain that religious leaders of the Judaic and Christian religions will not honor the words of Jesus even as they worship him as a man of God and in many cases, the Son of God, or even God Himself, in accordance with the Trinity.

It is abundantly clear that upon learning the history of Amen and how the Priesthood of Amon finally wrote scripture in 1270 BCE,

venerating him as the one universal God of all creation, that Jesus was knowledgeable of Amen. In Revelation 3:14, Jesus reveals a “revelation” by proclaiming for all those that hath an ear that Amen is, “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.”

It is pride, arrogance, and fear that religious leaders will not acknowledge the words of Jesus because it lends “new light” on the fact that it was the spiritual people of Egypt that first conceived the belief in one universal God. The Hebrews borrowed and emulated the beliefs they were exposed to while in Egypt. The one outstanding fact written in the Bible is that it is Moses who is the Father of the Judaic religion. Moses communed with God and wrote the *Book of the Covenant*, which contains the core of the commands, judgments, and ordinances in the Bible.

Yes, the first scripture to be written by the Hebrews was in 950 BCE, and the five books were completed after the Babylonian experience. The final edit of the Torah was around 400 BCE by two high-born Jews, Ezra and Nehemiah. Ezra was a scribe at the Persian court, and Nehemiah was a descendent of Zadok, the first high priest appointed by King David.

Clark, please be open to the facts I present to you, for there is no harm in accepting Jesus’s revelation that Amen was “the beginning of the creation of God.”

Clarke M., December 16, 2011, 10:49 p.m. EST

I have researched the word “Amen.” That it was used as a common epithet in many cultures does not show that people of various religions related it to Egyptian gods. Jesus’s words and those of his followers consider Abraham the founder, and they all quote from the prophets attesting that. Moses’s teaching was radically different from that of the Egyptians. He was a Jew among Jews who were slaves in exile in Egypt. For Jews, the covenant between God and his chosen people existed since Abraham. I agree with scholars who see the development of Jewish monotheism as independent of other religions. More advanced ideas were incorporated from Iranian monotheism (Iran’s culture was older than Egypt’s) by the prophets at the time of Persian King Cyrus, whom the Bible has much to say about—they considered him their supporter.

To say that the Egyptians considered “Amen” the sole God is not correct. He was a competing god among others in their pantheon, which the priests and kings of one region made a major figure. There were various Amen, Amon, Amon-Ra cults in different regions at different times. There seems to have been an ancient religion among the Egyptians, from texts attributed to the “Ancients” that taught of a single Creator. The creation of pantheons of gods and priestly/royal institutions in parts of Egypt, Greece, and elsewhere came much later.

What Moses taught after he was called out of Egypt was part of the Hebrew people’s long story that began with Abraham before their exile in Egypt. The Egyptian religion of Moses’s time was not one the Hebrews followed. They were a separate people, although prone to accept pagan idols. Scholars and thinkers like Freud, who did not know as much as later researchers discovered, wrongly thought Moses’s monotheism came from the Egyptians. The word “Amen” indeed has meanings like “truth” in the family of ancient languages of several peoples, but to claim when it is used as epithet for Jesus it is related to an Egyptian god is a supposition that available evidence does not support. The unity of the Old and New Testament supports the view that Hebrew monotheism was a unique and independent development. It had little in common with Egyptian beliefs. While all the world religions have a single source, they developed different forms and practices.

We find similar accounts of creation by a single Creator, however, to that in the Bible. This is clear in Lao Tzu, for example. There is also the concept of a Perfect Man or Savior, a figure similar to Christ as Logos. This is stressed in the Iranian religion, which introduces a concept of historical time and the evolution of humanity through individual right thoughts and deeds.

As an archaeologist and researcher in ancient cultures, I think we have much to discover about ancient peoples and their beliefs. We sites in Crete and Israel that reveal there were communities 900,000 years ago that had features of “modern living.” They had dwellings with separate areas for work and living. Sites in Spain show that 250,000 years ago, there were ritual burials, indicating religious beliefs. Burial sites in Siberia from 35,000 years ago have artifacts that show precise knowledge of astronomy, the movements of the stars and planets.

Perhaps they could chart the seasons and predict eclipses. Other ancient cultures could do so. There are caves in France as old as the Siberian graves that show paintings superior in sophistication to contemporary ones. Scientists are unable with modern technology to do what ancient builders did. The past is still largely a mystery. We don't know what advanced civilizations may have existed. Some geologists think life appeared on earth at least twice. They estimate all life forms on earth were likely extinguished many thousand years ago. Many scientists think that the population of Africa was reduced by 90 percent before our ancestors moved out of Africa.

Nicholas Ginex, December 22, 2011, 2:29 a.m. EST

Dear Clark,

You stated an inaccurate fact that, "For Jews, the covenant between God and his chosen people existed since Abraham. I agree with scholars who see the development of Jewish monotheism was independent of other religions." Clark, you fail to follow the Bible that clearly states, "Moses wrote all the words of the Lord" in Exodus 24:4 and it became *The Book of the Covenant*, Exodus 24:7. Clark, you neglect that Exodus relates the events Moses had with God and that *The Book of the Covenant* contains all the commands, admonitions, and ordinances he received from God. Abraham had a covenant with God, but outside the command to have all their males circumcised, Abraham never instructed his people with the commands that were extensively given to Moses by God. Let me again emphasize for your benefit and many people that have been misled by religious leaders, Abraham is the Father of the Hebrews and Moses is the Father of the Judaic religion.

Clark, you also stated, "More advanced ideas were incorporated from Iranian monotheism (Iran's culture was older than Egypt's) by the prophets at the time of Persian King Cyrus, whom the Bible has much to say about—they considered him their supporter." The five books of the Torah were finalized by Ezra and Nehemiah by 444 BCE. But the efforts attributed to periods of Cyrus the Great of Persia, Iranian culture, and the Babylonians occurred six hundred years after the Moses influence that was recorded and contained in *The Book of the Covenant* written around 1250 BCE.

Clark you wrote: "I have researched the word 'Amen.' That it was used as a common epithet in many cultures does not show that people

of various religions related it to Egyptian gods.” This is another misleading statement because the use of Amen occurred in Egypt around 2,000 BCE, and the Hebrew people were not exposed to this name or word until around 1680 BCE when Abraham entered Egypt. To say the word Amen originated as a Hebrew word is a distortion of the “truth.” Be honest and admit the greatest attribute of the Egyptian God Amen is truth, and for that reason, the Hebrew connotation of Amen is “verily or true.”

Clark, you are correct that Amen was one of many Egyptian gods. However, by 1270 BCE, the Priesthood of Amon recognized Amen as the one universal God, the Maker of all there is. This belief was documented in *Amon As the Sole God* at least two decades before the Moses Exodus in 1250 BCE. You are correct that Amen evolved with multiple transitions from the first Egyptian god of creation, Atum, became Amen-Ra, and finally became the sole god of all there is. This process was slow. It did not occur overnight for the Egyptian Priesthood to arrive at the concept of one universal God.

Clark, another distortion of the truth was your writing, “The Egyptian religion of Moses’s time was not one the Hebrews followed.” Apparently, you rather believe that the oral rendition of Abraham had a greater influence on the Hebrews than the detailed communication from God, which Moses recorded in *The Book of the Covenant*. It is clear that between 950 BCE, when the Torah was first drafted, to 444 BCE that much has been added to finalize the Five Books of Moses. But the core and foundation of beliefs were contained in *The Book of the Covenant*. Religious scholars that do not perceive this significant fact are delusional or want to distance the influence that the Egyptian beliefs had on the development of the Judaic religion.

Clark, your reference to other civilizations that existed thousands of years before the Egyptian civilization, even as much as 900,000 years is well noted. I sincerely understand and respect that there were possibly civilizations that developed a spiritual belief in God. But we do not know anything about the extent of their beliefs because, unfortunately, there are no written records except suppositions by scholars.

We are very fortunate that a French soldier found the Rosetta Stone. This finding enabled hieroglyphics to be deciphered, and Egyptologists unlocked a greater understanding of the religious beliefs of the Egyptians. Although fanatical people, who wanted to rewrite

history, destroyed the library of Alexandria, the gift of understanding a civilization that developed the concept of one universal God was no longer buried with the past.

Clark, let us read and understand what knowledge is available to us and not live in a world of suppositions and theories by scholars that may have their own agenda to support their own religious and biased views.

The information I have provided for you in this reply (and many others) should give you ample reason to support and admire the legacy given to the world by the ancient Egyptians—the belief in one universal God. There is no doubt that they were the first people to document the concept of a soul, a hereafter upon leading a righteous life, a Son of God, and finally, one universal God. I agree that scholars and Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders desire to distance themselves from these beliefs as originating within ancient Egypt because of their fears that their religions may be tarnished with the idea that their roots lead back to Egypt. However, only with truth will religious leaders finally understand “the beginning of the creation of God,” which was clearly stated by Jesus in Revelation 3:14 that Amen is: the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.

Clarke M., December 23, 2011, 6:09 a.m. EST

Nicholas wrote: “You stated an inaccurate fact that, ‘For Jews, the covenant between God and his chosen people existed since Abraham. I agree with scholars who see the development of Jewish monotheism was independent of other religions.’ . . . you fail to follow the Bible that clearly states ‘Moses wrote all the words of the Lord’ in Exodus 24:4 and it became the book of the covenant, Exodus 24:7. Clark, you neglect that Exodus relates the events Moses had with God and that the book of the covenant contains all the commands, admonitions, and ordinances he received from God. Abraham had a covenant with God, but outside the command to have all their males circumcised, Abraham never instructed his people with the commands that were extensively given to Moses by God. Let me again emphasize for your benefit and many people that have been misled by religious leaders, Abraham is the Father of the Hebrews and Moses is the Father of the Judaic religion.”

Nicholas, I am disappointed not only in the weakness of your research, which I have tried to fairly criticize, but also your willful ignorance and arrogance regarding religions.

What you say does not agree with what the NT and OT say about the covenant with Abraham. He is a giant of the faith, but that is not evident in the early days of his life. From Ur to Canaan to Egypt and back to Canaan, Abraham is tested by God, who yet constantly repeats the promises He made to him in His covenant, even when he fails and disobeys. It is a dramatic story of God's working with Abraham to see the covenant is fulfilled. He did not give Abraham instant, fully developed faith. God called him and led him through various trials and tribulations so that his faith would grow over time. Abram is told to walk throughout the land of Canaan, to look at all that will be his. As he travels to these places, he symbolically claims this land as his own. He will not possess it in his lifetime, but his descendants will.

In the New Testament, Stephen (Acts 7:1-4) speaks of Abram's call:

1 Then the high priest said, "Are these things true?" 2 So he replied, "Brothers and fathers, listen to me. The God of glory appeared to our forefather Abraham when he was in Mesopotamia, before he settled in Haran, 3 and said to him, 'Go out from your country and from your relatives, and come to the land I will show you.' 4 Then he went out from the country of the Chaldeans and settled in Haran. After his father died, God made him move to this country where you now live."

Before the king of Sodom reaches the victorious Abram to honor him, Melchizedek a "priest of the Most High God" appears (Gen. 18). He arrives with bread and wine and blesses Abram with these words:

Blessed be Abram of the Most High God, Creator of heaven and earth. Worthy of praise is the Most High God, who delivered your enemies into your hand. (Gen. 14:19b-20a)

Melchizedek's only appearance is here, but who is the topic of later revelation (Ps. 110:4, Heb. 5:6, 10; 6:20; 7:1-17)? He plays an important role in Abram's life at this moment in time. He informs Abram that the victory he has won was not his victory at all, but God's. It was He who delivered Abram's enemies into his hand (verse 20). And He is "the Creator of heaven and earth." The NASB renders "Possessor of heaven and earth." To be the Creator is to be the Owner, the Possessor.

Abraham learns humility through his trials and to overcome his fear.

As Paul says to his followers: “Think about the circumstances of your call, brothers and sisters. Not many were wise by human standards, not many were powerful, not many were members of the upper class. 27 But God chose what the world thinks foolish to shame the wise, and God chose what the world thinks weak to shame the strong. 28 God chose what is low and despised in the world, what is regarded as nothing, to set aside what is regarded as something, 29 so that no one can boast in his presence” (1 Cor. 1:26-29).

A concordance search will indicate that the name “Abraham” occurs some 230 times in the Bible. Included in this number is the appearance of his name 67 times in the New Testament. “Abram” occurs in the Old Testament another 60 times.

Moses and the prophets considered only the God of Abraham their authority and guide. Abram communicated directly with God, in a manner similar to the way God talked with Moses (Exod. 33:11). Surely Moses could identify with Abram here. Moses wrote in a way that the Israelites would see the connection between Abram’s sojourn in Egypt and Israel’s later sojourn. Men must learn to wait patiently for God to fulfill His promises. Abraham had to wait for God’s judgment upon the Canaanites. Abraham had to wait for a son and for the land to be his possession through his descendants. Israel, too, needed to learn patience and endurance.

To attribute the instructions received by Moses to what he knew of the Egyptian priestly religions is not correct. *Amen* is a Semitic word, used as an epithet by a number of peoples with reference to certain moral qualities, not necessarily of gods.

The Abrahamic three-fold covenant was foundational to all other biblical covenants between Yahweh and His people:

The promise of land: Israel’s possession of the Promised Land
Deuteronomy 30:1-10

The promise of kingly descendants in the Davidic covenant through which the Messiah is promised

2 Samuel 7:12-16

The promise that all nations would be blessed through Abraham is fulfilled in the new covenant in Christ

Jeremiah 31:31-40; Luke 22:17-20

As new covenant believers, we become the heirs of Abraham

Romans 9:6-8

For not all Israelites are true Israelites nor are all Abraham's descendants his children, but as Scripture says, "through Isaac shall your descendants be called." That means that it is not the children of the flesh who are the children of God; it is the children of the promise who are to be considered descendants.

Jacob's prophecy in Genesis 49:10-11:

The scepter shall not pass from Judah, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet, until tribute be brought him [until Shiloh come]*. And the peoples render him obedience. He tethers his donkey to the vine, to its stock the foal of his she-donkey.** He washes his clothes in wine, his robes in the blood of the grape.

*Note: John 9:7 translates the Greek word "Siloam" [in Hebrew = "Shiloh"] as "the one who has been sent";

**Also see Zechariah 9:9-11 and Matthew 21:1-9; Mark 11:1-11; Luke 19:28-38.

Clarke M., December 24, 2011, 7:15 p.m. EST

I do not mind responding to your attempts to proselytize your Judaic-Christian beliefs but please use your own original thoughts in response to the question of this post.

Nicholas, I hope I have shown I do not "proselytize," but I really never have in any posts over several years. I can explore a bit more "the question of this [your] post." Has Jesus always existed or was He created? The Bible interpreters have many views about that question.

The idea that Christ has always existed is believed and claimed by many: what faith they may belong to is often of no concern to them and some consider all the world religions to be versions of one teaching that has been known by some on earth for perhaps hundreds of thousands of years and transmitted to a few throughout history. The notion that

the Egyptians (whose civilization came later than such civilizations as several Asian ones—and perhaps many other civilizations we do not know of) “discovered” one God and that man had a soul was popularized by some nineteenth century Western scholars who had notions of the “evolution” of humanity and civilization from ignorant “primitive” men to a more “enlightened” contemporary humanity, along with the nineteenth century belief in the ideas of “progress” and the “truth” of materialistic science (the “religion of science”). In fact, we have much evidence today that the teaching that man has a soul and there is one God is found in all the world religions.

There are literally forty thousand Christian denominations! It is the same with other religions. This does not mean that texts like the Bible and those of other religions and the practices in different religions fail to guide many to God. Some leaders mislead, others do not. Reform from within each religion based on its own teachings and traditions—not inventing or copying ideas from others—is always possible and beneficial. We see this happening today as it has in the past. False prophets are legion, but there are those working within many faith structures who are wise and responsible and recognized as so by others they live and work with. Not all parishes and congregations are the same, but many manifest the positive acts and principles of their faith in their lives and communities.

Negative and arrogant people do what they do. They have no real respect for others and like to feel they know what is right in all matters. Some of them like to judge others, even to teach them.

There is an interesting “question,” notably for serious biblical scholars with Melchizedek, which relates to *Jesus having always existed*. There are many dense studies that examine this question. I have listed all the biblical passages that speak of Melchizedek.

As a scholar, I think the interpretation of *Melchizedek* is like interpreting the meanings in many “sacred” texts. There are many ways of interpreting the words. Who is Melchizedek? A man or a theophany, or perhaps both? Is he eternal? Does he appear to others throughout history? Intelligent researchers have presented interesting views on this. Whether he is one or both, Melchizedek in the Bible may be seen as representing *the new covenant to come* that replaces the still *yet-to-come*, incomplete, “intermediate” Law of Moses (that is, an intended yet temporary “covenant”). The new covenant can thus

be seen as the fulfillment of the original covenant of God with Adam/humanity through Abram and others that culminated in the mission of the historical Jesus.

In the Bible text, Melchizedek (whether human or theophany or both) has been seen as an appearance of the Messiah/Christ-to-come who also perhaps has always existed and is eternal. The witness of the different biblical characters regarding Melchizedek (in the Bible passages I have noted*) suggests different interpretations. Scholars have explored the meaning of these passages and continue to do so. Melchizedek for some OT and NT characters seems to be a manifestation of the Christ who is eternal and who has always existed.

* Note: Before the king of Sodom reaches the victorious Abram to honor him, Melchizedek a “priest of the Most High God” appears (Gen. 18). He arrives with bread and wine and blesses Abram with these words, “Blessed be Abram by the Most High God, Creator of heaven and earth. Worthy of praise is the Most High God, who delivered your enemies into your hand,” (Gen. 14:19b-20a).

Melchizedek’s only appearance is here, but who is the topic of later revelation (Ps. 110:4, Heb. 5:6, 10; 6:20; 7:1-17)? He plays an important role in Abram’s life at this moment in time. He informs Abram that the victory he has won was not his victory at all, but God’s. It was He who delivered Abram’s enemies into his hand (verse 20). And He is “the Creator of heaven and earth.” The NASB renders, “Possessor of heaven and earth.” To be the Creator is to be the Owner, the Possessor.

Jerry Kays, December 25, 2011, 1:02 p.m. EST

There is also the concept of a perfect Man or Savior, a figure similar to Christ as Logos.

Then more recently, the mention of Melchizedek . . . I see both the same way, world spiritual “manifestations” of the same . . . the Holy Spirit (=) of *God* (+=-). They manifest spiritually into “our human recognition” internally making us “equivalent to” all others who have manifested said Spirit . . . this is not to say that all such are fully “equal” with each other, but that each has a spiritual mission to help others evolve spiritually.

IMnsHO

Nicholas Ginex, December 26, 2011, 4:41 p.m. EST

Clark,

You refuse to acknowledge that Moses is the *Father of the Judaic religion* and rather praise Abraham, who is really the *Father of the Hebrew people*. You mentioned the king of Salem, Melchizedek, who was described as a priest of the Most High God. It is not clear which god is being referred to as there were many Babylonian gods in addition to Yahweh that also existed at that time. You misquoted Genesis 14:19 by writing “Creator of heaven and earth” but my Bible states “Possessor of heaven and earth.” Your distinction between possessor and creator is noted but to possess or create are two different actions.

You make a big issue about Melchizedek, a priest, but exactly the god he speaks of to Abraham is not clear. You dismiss the fact that God’s covenant given to Abraham in Genesis 17:5-10 was to state he will be the father of many nations, his people will be exceedingly fruitful, that he and his seed will be given the land of Canaan, and every male shall be identified via circumcision to be a token of the covenant between his people and God.

More importantly, God never gave Abraham commandments (which includes the Ten Commandments), judgments, and admonitions whereby He even told Moses how to design the tabernacle, the mercy seat, altar, animals to be sacrificed, how to design the temple where He wished to be worshipped, specified the garments to be worn by the temple priests, and even the kind of perfume to be used within the temple. Let it be known that *The Book of the Covenant*, written by Moses after speaking with God, is the core document that initiated the writing of the Torah in 950 BCE. It appears that the scholars you so proudly acknowledge were remiss in understanding that it was Moses and his intercession with God that set the groundwork for the Judaic religion regarding, if not all, most of God’s commands in the Old Testament.

Clark, you try to fabricate your reasoning around documents that were written as second-hand accounts of the belief in God (such as Acts, Romans, Corinthians, etc.). They were written by righteous men that did not have actual conversations with God as Abraham and Moses. The three-fold covenant of Abraham that describes the land of Canaan to be for Abraham’s people, kingly descendants, and circumcision of

all Hebrew males also includes a new covenant with Jesus Christ is a stretch of your imagination. This assertion by you is misleading, for Jesus never referred to his mission as being an extension of Abraham's covenant. Please be accurate in stating your sources and avoid providing your own interpretations which mislead the reader. Your quotes from second-hand sources do not clearly make a point as to the question of this post, "Has Jesus Always Existed or Was He Created?"

Clark, you are trying to make a case for Melchizedek by writing, "As a scholar, I think the interpretation of *Melchizedek* is like interpreting the meanings in many 'sacred' texts. There are many ways of interpreting the words. Who is Melchizedek? A man or a theophany, or perhaps both? Is he eternal? Does he appear to others throughout history?" This is all hypothetical reasoning and suppositions that you present to try to advance the theory that this priest is a manifestation of Jesus, who is eternal and who has always existed.

Clark, from what you have written, you are also a manifestation of Jesus, for you are gifted with a spiritual nature and a strong believer in the Trinity, where God, his Son Jesus, and His Holy Spirit are one and "always existed." I do not believe Melchizedek is or was any closer to God than you and many other people who have a deep belief in God.

Jerry wrote: "The more recent the mention of Melchizedek . . . I see both the same way, world spiritual 'manifestations' of the same . . . the Holy Spirit (=) of *God* (+=-). They manifest Spiritually into 'our human recognition' internally, making us 'equivalent to' all others who have manifested said Spirit . . . this is not to say that all such are fully 'equal' with each other, but that each has a spiritual mission to help others evolve spiritually."

I believe that Jerry has stated that a "spiritual manifestation" can be realized for any person that seeks God and internalizes Him as part of their purpose in life.

Jerry, I hope my statement is in accord with your spiritual belief.

Clark, you advanced the idea that Melchizedek had a priesthood that was stronger than the weaknesses of the Levitical order and that Jesus's priesthood needed to be like Melchizedek's. With the scant historical information about Melchizedek, for you to make an assertion

that “Moses was not enough to complete the original covenant” is disingenuous. Please be objective and honest in the future when advancing an argument.

Clarke M., December 25, 2011, 10:45 p.m. EST

Yes, Jerry. Consciousness is infinite, as the Buddhists say. We are only beginners in experiencing it. There is the concept of a perfect Man or Savior in the world religions, as in China, ancient Iran, etc., a figure similar to Christ as Logos. All these figures, including the Buddha, demonstrated compassion as the goal and fear and violence as the resistance.

Melchizedek in the Bible (NT and OT) is interesting: he is seen as being a spiritual or a human manifestation—or both. Melchizedek (whether human or theophany or both) has been seen as an appearance of the Messiah/Christ-to-come who also, perhaps, has always existed and is eternal.

What is made clear later in the Bible is that the Law of Moses was not enough to complete the original covenant with Adam. The Aaronic priesthood was not as good as the Melchizedecian priesthood. Jesus’s priesthood needed to be like Melchizedek’s so He could bypass the weaknesses of the Levitical order and save those who come to Him. Jesus has both the office of king and priest (which the Aaronic priesthood could not have) like Melchizedek and serves for life.

The Levitical/Aaronic priests could not save those who came to them. They had to offer sacrifices daily for their own sins before they could offer sacrifices for others’ sins: “Jesus can save all that come to Him . . . because He lives forevermore to make intercession for them” (Heb. 7:22-28).

Jerry Kays, December 26, 2011, 2:27 a.m. EST

Thank you . . . I can buy into that . . . (PS . . . it reminds me of the LDS. They have two priesthoods, the Melchizedek as the highest for the “white guys” and the Aaronic as lesser for the black guys. (None for the women, of course.)

Nicholas Ginex, December 26, 2011, 5:36 p.m. EST

Hello Jerry and Clark,

Jerry, I found your response amusing to Clark's belief that, "The Levitical/Aaronic priests could not save those who came to them." and that, "The Aaronic priesthood was not as good as the Melchizedecian priesthood." My, my, where did Clark get so much information about the "Melchizedecian priesthood?" But then, for Clark to extend his reasoning powers to state, "Jesus's priesthood needed to be like Melchizedek's so He could bypass the weaknesses of the Levitical order and save those who come to Him. Jesus has both the office of king and priest (which the Aaronic priesthood could not have) like Melchizedek and serves for life."

Once again, Clark makes statements and ideas that are not offered in the Bible. First, Jesus never occupied the office of King of the Jews nor was he an ordained priest, like Melchizedek. For Clark to make a comparison between Melchizedek and Jesus is very disingenuous. To state Melchizedek is a spiritual or human manifestation, or both, and may be seen as an appearance of the Messiah, Jesus, and has always existed and is eternal is a hypothetical assertion that is not founded in the Bible.

Clark, I would rather support your belief that Jesus is co-equal and co-eternal to God and the Holy Spirit by using much more acceptable Scripture, such as the first few lines of John's Gospel. There, John wrote: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."

I believe you are aware that the Word was formally written as Logos. I believe John's opening line in his Gospel needs to be understood on a basic level. First, John is not correct with the phrase, "In the beginning was the Word." If Jesus is the Word, he does not come before God in the "beginning." A correct statement would be, "In the beginning was God." It would be rather infantile to believe that the Word, namely Jesus, existed before God. The Son cannot precede the Father or God or have any reason to exist with the Father in the "beginning." But also, how could Jesus come before God or even exist with God when mankind was not yet conceived and created by God? Is John saying

that in the beginning there was a Son of God that existed before, or with God, that created the billions of galaxies, stars, and planets that can sustain life in other parts of the universe? Of course not.

John was operating on the original philosophical term, “Logos.” To be fair, John was referring to the power of God, the Logos, which was God and it was God that created all there is. Who ordained that the power of all creation was other than God? This would be a lie, and I would call it heresy to inflict upon believers that Jesus was a product of God before being born upon the conception of the Virgin Mary by the Holy Spirit of God. The first three Gospels have it right in that Jesus was not known to mankind until God felt that His creations needed direction. That direction was provided by a man of God called Jesus. To say Jesus was with God at the beginning of time is nothing more than a lie by the Church fathers, a fabrication documented as the Trinity around 325 CE, long after the last Gospel by John written circa 90-120 CE.

Char H., December 26, 2011, 11:53 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

In your writing of Dec. 26 above, you at 5:36 talk about how John must have it wrong in Revelations about the Word, or Christ in the beginning. I would submit, all throughout the New Testament, Hebrews, Acts, everywhere are the statements that all were created before the foundations of the world. Hebrews 4:3 says all was finished from the foundation of the world. Throughout the scriptures, all was done before it began, including Christ being the Son of God, including the creation of all mankind. In the mind of God, it was all done. When Adam was created, all of mankind and womankind was in him too, and they called his name Adam. Read it. He was male and female until the female portion was separated. That’s why marriage in line with the Scriptures will always be between a man and a woman. I am not a person to interfere with what someone else wants to do, but what they cannot have is a sanctioned marriage. Why not just go with a civil union? Anyway, that doesn’t matter to me, it is not a big issue with me, just a side note very evident from studying the Scriptures. The ying, the yang, so on, the poles of a magnet. Like poles repel. The Bible says even nature shows it isn’t natural. Anyway, I don’t know how or why I was sidetracked with that, maybe because I just happened across the story of Noah. Anyway, Christ was the Word, and the Word was

with God, and the Word was God. I know there are not three Gods. A jealous God would never allow that, so how it seems to me, is that Jesus was all the God (Logos) that could fit in a mortal and let it live. And the Spirit is the Word as it continues to reveal itself every day to us. But the Bible from beginning to end says Christ was slain from the foundation of the world. To reject that is to make up your own religion, don't you think?

Nicholas Ginex, December 28, 2011, 4:34 p.m. EST

Hello Char,

I read your comments with interest, and I first will say that you may believe anything you feel has truth and makes sense to you. I am not out to advocate a new religion but to save the religions from themselves in missing the entire Word of God. You are well read in the Bible and you must know that God gave His last *command* to mankind through His Son, Jesus. In the Gospel of John, Jesus stated the command three times—*love one another*. This, Char, is the Word of God announced by the man known as the Word.

For you to believe everything you read is not a good idea. What you wrote does not make sense, even if you attribute it to various sections of the Bible. You wrote: "Throughout the Scriptures, all was done before it began, including Christ being the Son of God. Including the creation of all mankind. In the mind of God, it was all done."

I cannot reason with that kind of thinking that God had planned all creation, Jesus, and mankind from the beginning of time. To me, God is a force or energy that nobody is capable of understanding, for He is incomprehensible, mysterious, and unknowable to all of us at this stage in our development.

To me, it is only the Spirit of God, the Holy Spirit, that pervades the universe, that evokes a consciousness in the minds of higher forms of life that appear throughout the universe. It is the Holy Spirit of God that comes into the consciousness of people who desire to know who is their Creator and to learn their purpose in life. At this time, it is Jesus who has given us the Word of God, and we could all benefit by applying that command in many ways. Mankind, in many cultures, has sought the meaning of their lives and how they may be able to join their Creator. It is the Egyptians that documented their beliefs

and gave mankind the concepts of a soul, a hereafter, a son of god, and finally, the belief in one universal God. Let's hope that the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders honor the words of Jesus in his acknowledging Amen, the greatest Egyptian god as the "faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God," (Rev. 3:14).

Nicholas Ginex, December 16, 2011, 12:02 a.m. EST

Hello Richard,

Thank you for providing history that I was not astute enough to retain and that may have been partly by my lack of perceptive and honest history teachers. By the way, I sense you are not only a scholar of religion but also of world history. Have you been involved in being a teacher with the honor of instructing our young minds? In any case, I find you a jewel for the intelligence and knowledge you possess.

I must say, you have proven your point about my giving our country the label of being founded on Judeo-Christian beliefs. However, for the most part, this country does have Judeo-Christian beliefs that have formed much of our moral value system. Let us give credit where credit is due, for even many of our greatest intellects have been nurtured by the religious indoctrination of the Bible.

Regarding my assertion against the Koran, of the core scriptures, the Torah, Gospels, and the Koran of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions, respectively, it is indeed the Koran that "sanctions bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent people who do not worship Allah." It is true that all three religions have fought religious wars for gain of power, wealth, and dominance of people, but only in the Koran are there actual verses (suras) that are an abomination to the Word of God. Not to take much time to list many suras that incite hate and violence, you may refer to a post I wrote on Gather, *The Koran Advocates Violence and Murder* via my homepage, www.nickamen.gather.com/ under Posts.

Richard W., December 16, 2011, 12:40 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

First, let me make it clear that I do not claim, nor have, an academic background in religion or history. Both areas have always been of

interest to me, and over the years, I have picked up numerous ideas, but you will find that my information is often spotty. I do have a degree in mathematics, which I acquired after retirement, and for several years, I have tutored college students in math. That is the only academic background I claim.

“The Son of God concept was originally founded in Egypt.”

The “Son of God concept” was more political than religious. I’m not sure where the concept began, but I know that it is also found among the ancient Sumerians. The older Sumerian kings were described as gods themselves. Later kings, such as Gilgamesh, were said to be descendants of gods. In time, even usurpers, such as Cyrus the Great, would claim to be the descendant of a god. Alexander the Great claimed that his father was the god Apollo, whom he identified with the Egyptian sun god.

In Psalms 2:7, God says to King David, “You are my son! This very day I have become your father!”

Notice the “adoptive” language of this line. The king was not born the son of God. He became the son of God.

In Luke 3:22, the line becomes “You are my one dear Son; in you I take great delight.” Some old texts quote Psalms 2:7 exactly. And in Acts 13:33, while quoting Paul, Luke uses the adoptive language:

. . . that this promise God has fulfilled to us, their children, by raising
 Jesus, as also it is written in the second psalm, “You are my Son.
 Today I have fathered you.”

The big question is: What did Jesus mean by “Son of God?” Basically, Jesus believed that everybody who followed God was a son of God. Jesus never claimed divine descent.

Richard W., December 16, 2011, 7:20 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

“However, for the most part, this country does have Judeo-Christian beliefs that have formed much of our moral value system.”

Unfortunately, that is true. The first Judeo-Christian moral value to pop into my mind is slavery. Slavery was accepted in both the Old and the New Testaments:

As for your male and female slaves who may belong to you—you may buy male and female slaves from the nations all around you.
(Lev. 25:44)

Slaves, obey your human masters with fear and trembling, in the sincerity of your heart as to Christ. (Eph. 6:5)

Neither Judaic nor Christian traditions had a very high regard for women or were willing to offer women equality with men:

Likewise the women are to dress in suitable apparel, with modesty and self-control. Their adornment must not be with braided hair and gold or pearls or expensive clothing, but with good deeds, as is proper for women who profess reverence for God. A woman must learn quietly with all submissiveness. But I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man. She must remain quiet. For Adam was formed first and then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman, because she was fully deceived, fell into transgression. But she will be delivered through childbearing, if she continues in faith and love and holiness with self-control. (1 Tim. 2:9-15)

The Old Testament is racist, but the New Testament turns that racism right back onto the Jews:

For you became imitators, brothers and sisters, of God's churches in Christ Jesus that are in Judea, because you too suffered the same things from your own countrymen as they in fact did from the Jews, who killed both the Lord Jesus and the prophets and persecuted us severely. They are displeasing to God and are opposed to all people, because they hinder us from speaking to the Gentiles so that they may be saved. Thus they constantly fill up their measure of sins, but wrath has come upon them completely. (1 Thess. 2:14-16)

Christians cannot leave non-Christian people alone. Christians have to convert the nations:

Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. (Matt. 28:19)

When it comes to sex, that is where Christians believe they are morally superior to everybody. That is when I laugh. Christians want to force their concepts of marriage and sex upon everybody. Not only do they object to same-sex marriage, they don't believe that people of the same sex should sleep together.

Maybe you can help me out. What is the Judeo-Christian moral value which you believe is the most important?

Nicholas Ginex, December 21, 2011, 7:12 p.m. EST

Dear Richard,

You have brought up information about the Bible I was not aware of because I do not give credibility to the writers that wrote supporting documents to the Old and New Testaments. I only use the Torah, Gospels, and Revelation as my sources in the belief of God and Jesus.

The Judeo-Christian moral values are, as you know, stated in the Bible with the Ten Commandments and provide a quick set of values taught to followers of the Judaic and Christian religions. There are many commandments, admonitions, judgments, and ordinances in the Bible that are considered archaic and out of date by today's standards, such as owning slaves, animal sacrifices, food prohibitions, and the stoning of people for sex outside of marriage or having belief in another god.

What was interesting in your comments was that in Psalms 2:7, God says to King David, "You are my Son! This very day I have become your father!" This pronouncement by God proves that Jesus is not the only Son of God. It appears that the Hebrews adopted the Son of God concept from the Egyptians. Also, this concept had to have originated with the Egyptians, who developed the first formal religion that existed before that of the Sumerians and certainly before the Babylonians and Greeks. The Egyptians were a spiritual people that began a civilization as early as 3400 BCE, if not earlier.

You wrote that Jesus never claimed divine decent. It appears that you are correct, because in John's Gospel, Jesus never stated explicitly that he was the Son of God. However, others would refer to Jesus as the Son of God six times (John 1:34, 49; 6:69; 11:27; 19:7; 20:31).

This particular finding at least shows that the Bible writers did not make Jesus a liar and instead attributed the saying of Son of God to others. Jesus was a man of God, and he stated he was the Son of Man seventy-six times in all four Gospels. Only in John's Gospel, the last to be written around 90-120 CE, did the Christian religion become strong enough whereby they adopted the Son of God concept in prevalent use by Caesar and other leaders of that period.

I would like to emphasize that Jesus was a Man of God who was thoroughly taught the Torah, and from his Hebrew teachers, he became knowledgeable of the history of Amen, the greatest Egyptian god known before his birth for two thousand years. With the following pronouncement by Jesus in John's Revelation 3:14, there is no doubt that Amen was created within the minds of men as "the beginning of the creation of God."

*And unto the angel of the church of the Laodoceans write;
These things saith the **Amen**, the faithful and true witness, **the
beginning of the creation of God.** (John 3:14)*

Richard W., December 14, 2011, 10:16 a.m. EST

Nicholas,

Have you noticed the New Testament concept of Jesus has very little in common with the Old Testament's messianic passages?

Jesus saw himself as fulfilling the Old Testament prophecy of a king who would restore the kingdom of Israel. Naturally, after his death, his brother James was next in line and became the leader of the group in Jerusalem. After his conversion, Paul returned to Jerusalem and then moved to Antioch.

The Book of Acts was written by Luke, who was a follower of Paul. Luke describes Paul's visit to Jerusalem as friendly, saying that Paul spoke freely with the disciples.

Paul's letter to the Galatians gives a different story. Paul claims that on that particular visit, he spoke only to Peter and James, the brother of Jesus. Paul goes so far as to swear that his Gospel did not come from any man, but from Jesus Christ himself. Although it is often covered

up, Paul's letters reveal that there was a dramatic split between him and the Jerusalem Church.

Paul was born in the Greek city of Tarsas and was a Roman citizen. He was probably well schooled in Greek and Roman literature and could find a great many prototypes for his Jesus. *Prometheus Bound* by Aeschylus was probably a strong influence on him. Ovid's *Metamorphosis* contains a remarkable chapter which describes the death of Julius Caesar (a descendant of the goddess Venus) in which the earth shook. It became dark in the middle of the day, and the dead rose up and walked the streets (see Matt. 27:45-53). Finally, we have Caesar ascending to the stars where he becomes a god.

Historically, Augustus claimed to have seen Caesar's ghost, and he had the Senate proclaim Caesar to be a god, allowing Augustus to adopt the title "Son of God."

Nicholas Ginex, December 15, 2011, 12:00 a.m. EST

Hello Richard,

I found your information about Paul being influenced by Greek and Roman literature compelling. Your assertions are food for thought, but to say Caesar was thought of as a god after his death is somewhat nebulous, because I believe he was considered a god before his death. We must also remember that Caesar was greatly influenced by the gods established in Egypt and the fact that the pharaoh was worshipped as a son of the god, Amon. The Son of God concept was originally founded in Egypt, and I believe that Caesar adopted that title as being one with a great ego having been a successful leader.

However, I tend to agree with you that the concept of Son of God became very popular among the Romans and for Paul to adopt this concept for Jesus was a breakthrough to establish a godly authority. Since Paul died by being beheaded in Rome about 66-67 CE and John's Gospel was written circa 90-120 CE, your assertion appears to be valid.

Jesus was raised to the next level of godliness in the opening lines of John's Gospel. Then around 325 CE, the Church fathers voted in the Council of Nicea to raise Jesus co-equal and co-eternal with God by fabricating the concept of the Trinity.

Richard W., December 13, 2011, 1:32 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

To get more directly to the question asked in your post, “Has Jesus Always Existed or Was He Created?” you are really asking whether “Christ” always existed. As we know, “Christ” is the English transliteration of “Christos,” which is the Greek translation of “messiah,” meaning “anointed.” So the question boils down to whether Jesus was the messiah.

But who was the messiah? In the Old Testament, the word “messiah” refers to kings or head priests. In the period of the Babylonian exile, they began speaking of “The Messiah,” who was expected to restore the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. This is exactly what was expected by the Jews in the first century when Jesus began his ministry, and this is how the birth of Jesus was described:

He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Most High, and the Lord God will give him the throne of his father David. He will reign over the house of Jacob forever, and his kingdom will never end.

(Luke 1:32-33)

There is no god in that description, only a king. The expectation of a king is again echoed after the death of Jesus:

But we had hoped that he was the one who was going to redeem Israel. (Luke 24:21)

The tragedy is that Jesus himself believed that he was the expected Messiah, that he would restore the kingdom of Israel. Jesus was closely acquainted with the book of Zechariah, therefore he rode into Jerusalem on the back of a donkey (Zech. 9:9), and he overthrew the money changers in the Temple (Zech. 14:21). Jesus would also have been familiar with Zechariah’s description of the Day of the Lord:

Then the Lord will go to battle and fight against those nations, just as he fought battles in ancient days. 14:4 On that day his feet will stand on the Mount of Olives which lies to the east of Jerusalem . . . Then the Lord my God will come with all his holy ones with him. (Zech. 14:14:3-4, 5)

During the Last Supper, Jesus was in expectation that the Day of the Lord was at hand. After the meal, he led his followers up to the Mount

of Olives and prayed. But it did not happen. Jesus was arrested and tried for treason. Even the sign on his cross indicated that he was crucified for claiming to be “King of the Jews.”

The fact is that Jesus never sat upon the throne of David, Jesus did not restore the kingdom of Israel, Jesus did not fulfill any of the messianic expectations. Jesus was just a man.

Richard W., December 22, 2011, 3:26 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

You wrote: “You have brought up information about the Bible I was not aware of because I do not give credibility to the writers that wrote supporting documents to the Old and New Testaments. I only use the Torah, Gospels, and Revelation as my sources in the belief of God and Jesus.”

Traditionally, the Torah was written by Moses. Close study says otherwise. Strands representing four different writers can be identified. It was during the period of the Babylonian exile that the strands making up the Torah were put together and edited. It was during the period of the exile in which Judaism moved from a religion which worshiped only one god, but recognized the existence of other gods, to a pure monotheism in which it recognized the existence of only one God. Note that the first commandment only says “You shall have no other gods before Me.” The commandment does not say there are no other gods. It was during the period of the exile that the doctrine of the messianic expectation was developed.

The letters of Paul are probably the oldest writings in the New Testament. The Gospels were written later but early enough to contain authoritative sayings of Jesus. The Gospels of Mark and Luke were written by disciples of Paul. We have no idea who the author of the Gospel of Matthew was, and the Gospel of John went through a period of editing and rearrangements before it was published. The Book of Revelation describes itself as a vision and contains no saying of Jesus which can be relied upon as authentic.

Nicholas wrote: “The Judeo-Christian moral values are, as you know, stated in the Bible with the Ten Commandments and provide a quick set of values taught to followers of the Judaic and Christian religions.”

Which one? Commands such as “You shall not murder,” can be found in every culture and religion. Others, such as “You shall not make for yourself a carved image,” is ignored. “You shall not commit adultery” has been applied more to women than to men.

Nicholas wrote: “What was interesting in your comments was that in Psalms 2:7, God says to King David, ‘You are my Son! This very day I have become your father!’ This pronouncement by God proves that Jesus is not the only Son of God . . . It appears that the Hebrews adopted the Son of God concept from the Egyptians.”

The Egyptians believed in a biological descent from the gods, in which there is actual copulation between a god and a woman. Such an event is suggested in Luke and Matthew:

Mary said to the angel, “How will this be, since I have not had sexual relations with a man?” The angel replied, “The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you. Therefore the child to be born will be holy; he will be called the Son of God.” (Luke 1:34-35)

Now the birth of Jesus Christ happened this way. While his mother Mary was engaged to Joseph, but before they came together, she was found to be pregnant through the Holy Spirit. (Matt. 1:18)

On the other hand, in Psalms 2:7, God says, “This very day I have become your father.” That suggests adoption, not biological descent.

Ironically, the author of the Gospel of Matthew had just given the genealogy for Joseph, not Mary. Descent through Joseph would only apply in an adoptionist interpretation. Could Matthew have copied the genealogy from a sect which used the adoptionist interpretation?

Nicholas wrote: “Also, this concept had to have originated with the Egyptians who developed the first formal religion that existed before that of the Sumerians and certainly before the Babylonians and Greeks. The Egyptians were a spiritual people that began a civilization as early as 3400 BCE, if not earlier.”

The Sumerian civilization shows evidence of being every bit as old as the Egyptian. Direct evidence of where the “Son of God” concept originated would depend upon written text, and the Sumerians

texts are older and more numerous than Egyptian text because they invented writing first and preserved their records on thousands of clay tablets. However, I suspect that the idea goes back long before either the Egyptians or the Sumerians. It is common for a people to venerate their ancestors, and from there, it is a small step to making their ancestors gods.

Nicholas wrote: "I would like to emphasize that Jesus was a man of God who was thoroughly taught the Torah, and from his Hebrew teachers, he became knowledgeable of the history of Amen, the greatest Egyptian God known before his birth for two thousand years. With the following pronouncement by Jesus in John's Revelation 3:14, there is no doubt that Amen was created within the minds of men as 'the beginning of the creation of God.'"

Jesus was certainly familiar with the Torah, but his emphasis was more on the messianic expectation, which finds its source in the prophets. Jesus was especially familiar with the Book of Zechariah.

In John 18:36, Jesus tells Pilate, "My kingdom is not from this world." This is incorrectly interpreted to mean that Jesus's kingdom was not an earthly kingdom. As we can see from Luke 2:1, the Roman Empire itself was often referred to as "the world." Jesus was telling Pilate that his kingdom was not part of the Roman Empire. Pilate correctly interpreted the response by saying, "So you are a king!" Jesus was executed for claiming to be the King of the Jews. Jesus's claim was to be the messiah which the Jews expected to restore the Kingdom of Israel. Jesus called himself the "Son of God" in the sense that the king became the son of God in Psalms 2:7. This is by adoption.

Nicholas wrote: "... John 3:14, 'And unto the angel of the church of the Laodoceans write; These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.'"

Of course, you meant Revelation 3:14. Although the author refers to himself as "John," that was a common name back then and we cannot be certain who this John was. The book is presented merely as a vision. None of the words attributed to Jesus can be taken as actually spoken by him. My favorite line from Revelation is Revelation 22:16: "I am the root and the descendant of David, the bright morning star!" In Latin, the Morning Star is called "Lucifer."

Nicholas Ginex, December 23, 2011, 12:13 a.m. EST

Hello Richard,

Thank you for providing points of view and information that I was not aware of in the Bible. The reason I do not rely on supporting documents to the core scriptures, which I refer to as the Torah, Gospels, and Revelation, is that although there are significant writings, such as Paul's, epistles by apostles, including Psalms, Acts, Romans, Corinthians, etc., they are written as second-hand sources.

It appears to me that it was Moses that is the Founder or Father of the Judaic religion because he was the first Hebrew to record his communications with God in *The Book of the Covenant*. As shown in Exodus 20:1-26, the first set of laws numbered 14 and included the Ten Commandments. Then in Exodus, chapters 21-23, many judgments dealing with how to treat slaves, mistreatment toward a mother and father, treatment of a daughter sold or a wife, punishment by death of a neighbor who slays another, to stone an ox that gored a man or woman, restitution if a man steals another's ox or sheep, conduct a feast three times for the Lord in one year, etc.

But also, when Moses communed with God a second time on Mount Si'nai, Exodus, chapters 24-31, the Lord stated what types of offerings were to be given to him, such as gold, silver, brass, rams' skins, oil for light and anointing, onyx stones, specifications to make a sanctuary, how to make an ark of the testimony and overlay it with pure gold, how to make a mercy seat with two cherubs of gold, how to make a tabernacle table with spoons and dishes of pure gold, make a tabernacle surrounded with ten curtains of fine linen, how to make an altar with horns and provide shovels, vessels, and grates, how to make a court for the tabernacle, how to make holy garments for Aaron and his sons, to sacrifice a bullock before the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord, etc.

The above list is by no means complete but was presented to show that there are specific details given by God for His sanctuary, how the priests are to be dressed, and how to provide offerings and sacrifices. The commands, judgments, and ordinances given in Exodus are numerous and were written in *The Book of the Covenant* by Moses. I have given the reader some idea of how extensive the commands from God to Moses were with the purpose of having people understand that

they form the core set of Judaic beliefs that embodied behavior toward each other and worship of God.

To claim that it was the exposure of Babylonian and Sumerian cultures that were primarily responsible for the development of Judaic religious beliefs instead of the influence obtained by Moses is a distortion of the truth. The first draft of the Torah in 950 BCE had to include *The Book of the Covenant* by Moses for those are the words of the Bible. There is no doubt, upon reading *Future of God Amen*, that there are strong sets of facts and findings that verify the Egyptian priesthood were first to conceive the concepts of a soul, a hereafter attained by leading a righteous life, a Son of God, and by 1270 BCE, one universal God.

Richard, you appear to be misquoting Jesus. Yes, Pilate asked the question, "Art thou the King of the Jews?" However, Jesus replied, "Thou sayest it," (Matt. 27:11; Mark 15:2; Luke 23:3). In no case did Jesus explicitly call himself Son of God. In fact, in all four Gospels, Jesus always stated he was the Son of Man seventy-six times. Others would refer to Jesus as the Son of God as in John (six times).

I agree with you that Jesus believed he was one with God, which was why those that believed in him were also accepted by his Father. In fact, to understand that Jesus considered himself a man of God, we find that in John 14:12, he confirms that those who believe in Him will do even greater works:

*Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me,
the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than
these shall he do; because I go to my Father.*

However, Richard, you bring up another reason why Jesus believed he was from a long line of esteemed Hebrews and not of God by stating in Revelation 22:16:

I am the root and offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.

Regarding one of the most profound statements ever made by Jesus was his pronouncement, indeed a revelation, that Amen was the beginning of the creation of God in Revelation 3:14. Most Christian fundamentalists believe Jesus is God, was with God in the beginning, and is co-equal, from which they claim Jesus "always existed." But this cannot be true if Jesus says that Amen was "the beginning of

the creation of God,” because he admits that God was created and therefore could not “always exist.” Yes, Jesus may have it right in that it was mankind that conceived, aye, created God, and it began with the first formal religion known to man, the Egyptian religion.

Richard W., December 23, 2011, 10:21 p.m. EST

Nicholas wrote: “The reason I do not rely on supporting documents to the core scriptures, which I refer to as the Torah, Gospels, and Revelation, is that although there are significant writings, such as Paul’s writings, epistles by apostles, including Psalms, Acts, Romans, Corinthians, etc., they are written as second-hand sources.”

First, let’s look at the Gospels. Neither Mark nor Luke are first-hand sources. In fact, they were both followers of Paul. The author of “Matthew” is unknown, and internal evidence says that it could not have been by an eyewitness. In fact, both Luke and the author of “Matthew” used “Mark” as a source. The Gospel according to John may have been written by somebody named John, but there are several Johns, and the evidence of editing and rearrangements of the text should warn you not to depend on it.

Nicholas wrote: “It appears to me that it was Moses that is the Founder or Father of the Judaic religion because he was the first Hebrew to record his communications with God in *The Book of the Covenant*.”

That is tradition, but you should require more than just tradition to support your claim. The fact that the Torah says Moses wrote something down does not mean that he wrote the Torah. Deuteronomy 34:25-26 records Moses’s death. Certainly somebody else had to write that part. And if somebody else wrote about Moses’s death, who can deny the possibility that the entire book was not written by Moses?

There are numerous difficulties in accepting Mosaic authorship. Consider the following passage:

God spoke to Moses and said to him, “I am Yahweh. I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as God Almighty, but by my name ‘Yahweh’ I was not known to them.” (Exod. 6:2-3)

How could Moses possibly claim that Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob did not know God by the name “Yahweh” if Moses is the one who claims

that Abraham named a city after Yahweh and God identified himself to Abraham as “Yahweh” (Gen. 22:14.) See also Genesis 22:16, 24:3, 26:22, 27:20, and you will see examples of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob all using the name “Yahweh.”

There are also several “doublets” found in the Torah. A doublet is where the same story is told twice. Take the story of Abraham and Abimelech in Genesis 20, and 21:22-34. Now compare it with the story of Isaac and Abimelech in Genesis 26. They are the same story, down to the digging of the well. Somehow, Abimelech did not learn from his first experience. In truth, this isn’t a doublet at all. It’s a triplet. Compare the story of Abram and the pharaoh in Genesis 12:10-20.

I hope you are already aware that the story of Noah and the ark can be divided into two complete and consistent stories. Thus, you no longer have the question of how many animals Noah brought onto the ark with him.

Attributing authorship to an authoritative figure from the past was a common practice. Many of the Dead Sea Scrolls were attributed to Moses, or even to Enoch. The Book of Isaiah has several chapters which were added by later writers. The Book of Daniel was actually composed in the 1st century BCE. In the New Testament, 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus were forgeries attributed to Paul.

Another problem with attributing the Torah to Moses is answering the question of where the Torah was during the times of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings. In 1 Kings 2:2, David tells Solomon to follow the commandments written in the Law of Moses, but then it seems to disappear again, which makes me wonder if 1 Kings 2:2 could have been added by a later editor.

Second Kings, chapters 22-23 tells about the discovery of a scroll of law found in the temple. King Josiah carries out reforms based upon this scroll, which becomes attributed to Moses at 2 Kings 23:25. Study of the reforms enacted by King Josiah indicates that the scroll was the law code found in Deuteronomy. So this gives us part of Deuteronomy, but where is the rest of the Torah? In fact, we don’t hear about it until Ezra brings it back from Babylon.

Nicholas wrote: “But also, when Moses communed with God a second time on Mount Si’nai, Exodus, chapters 24-31, the Lord stated what

types of offerings was to be given to him (such as gold, silver, brass, rams' skins, oil for light and anointing, onyx stones, specifications to make a sanctuary, how to make an ark of the testimony and overlay it with pure gold, how to make a mercy seat with two cherubs of gold, how to make a tabernacle table with spoons and dishes of pure gold, make a tabernacle surrounded with ten curtains of fine linen, how to make an altar with horns and provide shovels, vessels and grates, how to make a court for the tabernacle, how to make holy garments for Aaron and his sons, to sacrifice a bullock before the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord, etc.”

Did you ever wonder where this group of nomads got the gold to build the tabernacle and the ark? This fits in much better with an established temple in which worshipers were required to make an offering. Attributing the commands to Moses relieved the priests from taking the blame.

Nicholas wrote: “To claim that it was the exposure of Babylonian and Sumerian cultures that were primarily responsible for the development of Judaic religious beliefs instead of the influence obtained by Moses is a distortion of the truth.”

The Garden of Eden has parallels with the Sumerian Gardens of the Immortals (Annunuki), and the Gilgamesh epic tells the story of Utnapishtim who was the Sumerian Noah and has even stronger parallels with the Bible version. There is also a Babylonian version of Job.

Nicholas wrote: “. . . that there are strong sets of facts and findings that verify the Egyptian priesthood were first to conceive the concepts of a soul, a hereafter attained by leading righteous life, a Son of God, and by 1270 BCE, one universal God.”

Actually, the Egyptians saw mankind as each having as many as ten different souls, which is going a bit overboard when you are talking about something which cannot be demonstrated or proven.

Nicholas wrote: “Richard, you appear to be misquoting Jesus. Yes, Pilate asked the question, ‘Art thou the King of the Jews?’ However, Jesus replied, ‘Thou sayest it,’ (Matt. 27:11; Mark 15:2; Luke 23:3).”

Even the replies in Matthew and Mark are affirmations of the question. But I am not misquoting Jesus. In John 18:33, Pilate asks Jesus, “Are

you the king of the Jews?" After some non-responsive comments, in John 18:36, Jesus replied, "My kingdom is not of this world." And as I explained, the Roman Empire was often referred to as "the world." Pilate correctly interpreted this as an affirmative answer to his question. This is confirmed by Mark 15:26. The inscription of the charge against him read, "The king of the Jews," and the other Gospels record similar words on the cross. Jesus was executed for treason, not for a religious cause.

Nicholas wrote: "In no case did Jesus explicitly call himself Son of God. In fact, in all four Gospels, Jesus always stated he was the Son of Man seventy-six times. Others would refer to Jesus as the Son of God as in John (six times)."

However, Jesus did refer to God as his father:

All things have been given to me by my Father. No one knows who the Son is except the Father, or who the Father is except the Son and anyone to whom the Son decides to reveal him. (Luke 10:22)

To those who sold the doves he said, "Take these things away from here! Do not make my Father's house a marketplace!" (John 2:16)

... This commandment I received from my Father. (John 10:18)

If you have known me, you will know my Father too. (John 14:7) et al.

But that does not mean that Jesus believed God to be his biological father. Look at John 20:17, "I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to My God and your God." This demonstrates that Jesus believed God was everybody's father.

Nicholas wrote: "I agree with you that Jesus believed he was one with God . . ."

I never made any such statement.

Nicholas wrote: "However, Richard, you bring up another reason why Jesus believed he was from a long line of esteemed Hebrews and not of God by stating in Revelation 22:16: 'I am the root and offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.'"

“Regarding one of the most profound statements ever made by Jesus was his pronouncement, indeed a revelation, that Amen was the beginning of the creation of God in Revelation 3:14.”

That statement was never made by Jesus. It was made by some clown claiming to have had a vision. In fact, he did not have a vision at all. Among the Dead Sea Scrolls is a manuscript called the *War Scrolls*, or *War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*. It is an apocalyptic prophecy which has numerous parallels with Revelation. The author of Revelation obviously got his idea from that scroll or from another similar scroll and made it a Christian text by adding Jesus.

There is no book in the Bible which turns me off more than Revelation. It is blood, torture, and vengeance. The cruelty and violence the book exhibits only proves that the author was sick. The author has God sitting on a throne surrounded by four creatures that never rest. The creatures sit around singing “Holy, Holy, Holy.” That goes on day and night. And then some twenty-four elders throw themselves to the ground saying, “You are worthy, our Lord and God.” A few weeks of this would drive a normal person insane, but the author of Revelation seems to think that God enjoys such adulation.

Nicholas Ginex, December 26, 2011, 8:06 p.m. EST

Hello Richard,

Your knowledge of the Bible is refreshing in that you are able to identify the many inconsistencies that exist in a book that is supposedly the Word of God. I agree with you that Moses could not have possibly written the Torah. However, there must be some credence given to the written words of the Bible that state Moses led more than 600,000 people out of Egypt and he is responsible for writing *The Book of the Covenant*. If this is not true, then the Bible is a false document. I rather believe that Moses did exist and was the catalyst that initiated the Judaic religion by setting in place the many commands he was exposed to while he was raised in the house of a pharaoh for the first forty years of his life.

There must be truth to the fact that Moses did write *The Book of the Covenant* because how else could the Torah have been written in

950 BCE without the core foundation of commands, judgments, and admonitions laid out by Moses? The Israelites were not yet exposed to the influences that occurred with the additional writings of Ezra and Nehemiah who completed the five books of Moses around 444 BCE.

Richard, you wrote: “Did you ever wonder where this group of nomads got the gold to build the tabernacle and the ark? This fits in much better with an established temple in which worshipers were required to make an offering.” If we are to believe more than 600,000 people left Egypt with Moses, the possibility of collecting enough gold to form a golden calf is highly possible at the time of the Exodus. Regarding the gold, silver, precious stones, and other rare objects needed to build the temple in accordance with *The Book of the Covenant*, the people had to have offered much of their belongings during the reign of King Solomon when the Torah was first drafted, circa 950 BCE.

Richard, it is clear that Jesus always referred to God as his Father as you pointed out in Luke 10:22, John 2:16, 10:18, and 14:7. I agree with you that Jesus believed he was not the biological son of God, but he was indeed a spiritual Son of God. He was one with God in spirit and it was his mission to teach the children of God to also be one with his Father by acknowledging God and following His commands. You misunderstood me when I wrote: “I agree with you that Jesus believed he was one with God, . . .” I meant Jesus was spiritually, not physically, one with God by “those that believe in him and they would also be accepted by his Father.”

Richard, you wrote about my statement: “Regarding one of the most profound statements ever made by Jesus was his pronouncement, indeed a revelation, that Amen was the beginning of the creation of God in Revelation 3:14.” Your response was, “That statement was never made by Jesus. It was made by some clown claiming to have had a vision. In fact, he did not have a vision at all.”

The statement by Jesus that Amen is, “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God” (Rev. 3:14) is indeed a revelation for the modern world because few people are aware that Amen existed as an Egyptian god for over two thousand years before the birth of Jesus. This god was later worshipped during the reign of Ramses II as one universal God with scripture titled *Amon as the Sole God* and was known before Moses left Egypt around 1250 BCE.

Religious leaders will try to convince the world that Amen originated as a Hebrew word, but this is false because Amen was a known word as early as 2000 BCE. Abraham and his people did not enter Egypt no earlier than 1680 BCE and were exposed to the God Amen/Amon, whose greatest attribute was "truth." It is for this reason the Hebrews use Amen as meaning true and verily.

Richard W., December 26, 2011, 12:26 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

A further comment about Revelation 22:16, "I am the root and offspring of David, and the bright and morning star."

The "morning star" is the planet Venus. It is the brightest object in the sky after the sun and the moon. Because it is so near the sun, Venus can only be seen just before the sun rises or just after the sun sets.

Watching Venus in the night sky just after the sun sets, you can easily see how it became associated with the goddess of love.

When Venus appeared on the horizon just before the sun rose, the Romans called it "Lucifer," which means, "light bringer." This is obviously the idea the author meant in describing Jesus as "the bright and morning star."

Just how long it is that Lucifer appears before the sun comes up depends on the position of Venus in its orbit in relation to the position of the earth. If Venus is on the other side of the sun, you don't see it come up until one morning you get a short view of it. The next day, it comes out a little earlier. Day after day, it comes out earlier. The earlier it comes out, the higher it can rise in the sky before the sun comes out. But then it reaches its peak and begins to come out later every day until it fails to come out at all.

In Isaiah 14:4, the *Lord* tells the people to taunt the king of Babylon with a song. A few lines into the song comes:

Look how you have fallen from the sky,
O shining one, son of the dawn!

You have been cut down to the ground,
O conqueror of the nations! (Isa. 14:12)

The King James Translation, says “Lucifer” rather than “son of the dawn,” which is probably a correct identification, but then Lucifer became identified with Satan, and the whole myth of a fallen angel took form:

You said in your heart,
“I will climb up to the sky.
Above the stars of El
I will set up my throne.
I will rule on the mountain of assembly
on the remote slopes of Zaphon.
I will climb up to the tops of the clouds;
I will make myself like the Most High!” (Isa. 14:13-15)

But you were brought down to Sheol,
to the remote slopes of the pit.

Nicholas Ginex, December 26, 2011, 10:43 p.m. EST

Hello Richard,

Thank you for amplifying Revelation 22:16, where Jesus states, “I am the root and offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.” You had indicated that Revelation being written by John is questionable, but also, you also wrote that it was written by some clown. Perhaps. But I venture to say that portions of Revelation were written to serve a purpose and was designed by Hebrew priests to convey certain truths that had been kept secret or hidden from the general public. I believe that when one writes in Revelation that Jesus states for “those that hath an ear” (Rev. 3:13) that Amen is, “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God,” that somebody wanted to reveal a “truth” not normally known.

The book *Future of God Amen* provides ample history, grounded with facts and findings, that reveal Amen was indeed an Egyptian god worshipped for two thousand years before the birth of Jesus and finally came to be the one universal god of all people, “the Maker of All that is” before the Moses Exodus.

Richard W., December 28, 2011, 2:03 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

According to Exodus 12:37, that was 600,000 men plus their families. Adding the women and children, it would come to over 2 million. The logistical problems that many people would create is beyond what Moses would be able to handle.

Jesus saw himself the “Christ.” That is the as the “Anointed,” which to the Jews is another word for King.

The men of Judah came and there they anointed David as king over the people of Judah. (2 Sam. 2:4)

Jesus saw himself as the one who would rebuild the temple:

So know and understand:

From the issuing of the command to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until an anointed one, a prince arrives, there will be a period of seven weeks and sixty-two weeks. It will again be built, with plaza and moat, but in distressful times. (Dan. 9:25)

Jesus saw himself as the king in Zechariah 9:

Rejoice greatly, daughter of Zion! Shout, daughter of Jerusalem! Look! Your king is coming to you: he is legitimate and victorious, humble and riding on a donkey.

I cannot picture Hebrew priests writing Revelation. They would have left out any reference to Jesus and would have written it in Hebrew. The Jews had their own visions of the last days, such as Isaiah 24 and Malachi 4, which are less graphic than Revelation in gore, but make the same point. Jesus himself warned of that day (Mark 13:14-23 et al.).

Did Moses write the Ten Commandments? In Exodus, the Commandments appear to be just thrown into the document. Exodus 19 ends with God telling Moses to speak to the people, then Exodus 20 begins with God speaking to the people.

In Jeremiah 7, we have a similar but shorter list:

You steal. You murder. You commit adultery. You lie when you swear on oath. You sacrifice to the god Baal. You pay allegiance to other gods whom you have not previously known.

Could it be that Jeremiah's list was written first, then expanded and placed into Exodus?

Nicholas Ginex, December 28, 2011, 11:37 p.m. EST

Hello Richard,

Thank you for more of your observations of the Bible. I was aware that Moses left Egypt with more than 600,000 people and noted that fact in *Future of God Amen*. It is to be noted that it appears that Abraham gets a lot of credit for the Judaic religion. However, it is clear that although there may have been an oral tradition in the belief in God, Abraham did not get the set of commands, judgments, and ordinances from God or provide any written direction from his God.

For this reason, I stress that Abraham was indeed the Father of the Hebrew people, but it is Moses that is the Father of the Judaic religion. There appears to be an effort by Jewish religious leaders to downplay the role of Moses because of his close affinity to the Egyptian people regarding his forty years being exposed to their culture and religious beliefs. The Bible credits *The Book of the Covenant* as being written by Moses, and its numerous commands and specific details established the specifications for the temple or sanctuary.

Richard, your references to Jesus as the Anointed One are valid but they do not explicitly indicate Jesus was praised as a king nor did Jesus ever act like a king. Jesus, as you indicated, saw himself as the messiah, a man of God. In all four Gospels, Jesus explicitly stated he was the Son of Man. Never did he explicitly state he was the Son of God.

Jesus was a man of truth and had a close communion with God to always do "what his Father tells him." The greatest commandment delivered by Jesus was in the last Gospel of John where he stated three

times—*love one another*. If Jesus believed he was the Son of God in substance, he would have said so. But Jesus knew he was born from the line of David and his devotion to God was of a spiritual nature. Jesus was so much committed to God that he believed he was the messiah and that was why he rode on a donkey to fulfill the words of former prophets.

Regarding Jeremiah and his reference to steal, murder, commit adultery, and lie, these were first defined as “shalt nots” by God to Moses, which occurred over 650 years before Jeremiah, who lived circa 650-550 BCE (1250-600). So no, I do not think Jeremiah’s list was written first. Again, few people are aware of the extensive code of conduct and laws of morality that the Egyptian people followed so that they can be received by their god in the hereafter.

Future of God Amen provides an extensive list of moral commands that had to be known by Moses before he left Egypt. The Hebrews are a prime example of one generation of people learning from a former generation of Egyptians, but few religious scholars and leaders are willing to admit this fact, which is conclusively demonstrated in *Future of God Amen*.

Richard W., December 30, 2011, 8:05 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

I was aware that Moses left Egypt with more than 600,000 people.

You missed my point. Six hundred thousand men, even without counting women and children, would be too many to manage under those conditions. Moses would have to shelter and provide for the people for forty years while living as nomads in the desert. According to Deuteronomy 9:1, the Israelites were about to enter a land where the people were greater and stronger than them. If Israel had 600,000 men, there was no nation in Canaan which was stronger.

Abraham was indeed the Father of the Hebrew people.

According to tradition, he was originally called “Abram,” which means, “exalted father.” In Genesis 17:5, the name was changed to “Abraham,” meaning “father of a multitude.” The difference is significant. A tribe

might refer to their tribal patriarch as “exalted father,” and a group of tribes or nations may refer to their common ancestor as “Father of a Multitude.” Whoever this common ancestor was, if he even existed at all, he would not have been known in his lifetime as either “Abram” or “Abraham.” Those designations are left to ancestors.

Richard, your references to Jesus as the Anointed One are valid, but they do not explicitly indicate Jesus was praised as a king nor did Jesus ever act like a king. Jesus, as you indicated, saw himself as the messiah, a man of God.

“Messiah” is another word for “king.” Other terms for the king are “Son of David,” “Shepherd,” and in the adoptive sense, “Son of God” (Ps. 2:7).

The scepter will not depart from Judah,
nor the ruler’s staff from
between his feet. (Gen. 49:10)

All four Gospels portray Jesus entering Jerusalem on an ass. As I pointed out previously, this was in fulfillment of Zechariah 9:9, where it says:

Rejoice greatly, daughter of Zion!
Shout, daughter of Jerusalem!
Look! Your king is coming to you: he is legitimate and victorious,
humble and riding on an ass.

The ass was the royal mount. Solomon rode an ass to his coronation (1 Kings 1:33, 38). By riding into Jerusalem the way he did, Jesus was proclaiming to be the king.

The Messianic expectation looked for a king who would restore the kingdom of Israel. That expectation can be found in the Old Testament:

At that time a root from Jesse will stand like a signal flag for the
nations

He will lift a signal flag for the nations; he will gather Israel’s
dispersed people, and assemble Judah’s scattered people from the
four corners of the earth. (Isa. 11:10-12)

“Jesse” of course, was the father of David. Therefore, this is a Davidic king.

In Micah, we see the same thing, plus we see that the messiah will come out of Bethlehem, and he is called a “shepherd.”

As for you, Bethlehem Ephrathah, seemingly insignificant among the clans of Judah—from you a king will emerge who will rule over Israel on my behalf, one whose origins are in the distant past. (Mic. 5:2-4)

So the Lord will hand the people of Israel over to their enemies until the time when the woman in labor gives birth. Then the rest of the king’s countrymen will return to be reunited with the people of Israel. He will assume his post and shepherd the people by the Lord’s strength. (Mic. 5:30)

Jeremiah is also talking about the restoration of Judah and Israel when he records:

I, the Lord, promise that a new time will certainly come when I will raise up for them a righteous branch, a descendant of David. He will rule over them with wisdom and understanding and will do what is just and right in the land. (Jer. 23:5)

The promise to restore Israel was partially fulfilled in the time of Cyrus (Isa. 44:28), but then came the Greeks, and after them the Romans. The prophecies were continually updated to and beyond the days of Jesus.

Jesus saw himself as the fulfillment of the messianic prophecies, not as a god, but as a king. He failed to fulfill the prophecies, but as I previously explained, he was executed for claiming to be “King of the Jews.”

Nicholas Ginex, December 31, 2011, 7:14 p.m. EST

Hello Richard,

Thank you for clarifying that Jesus saw himself as the messiah. However, Jesus never answered Pilate’s question, “Art thou the King

of the Jews?” with an affirmative “Yes.” Jesus answered, “Thou sayest.” Refer to Matthew 27:11, Mark 15:2, Luke 23:3.

Even in John:18:34, Jesus answered Pilate by saying, “Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or did others tell it thee of me?” Pilate stated he is not a Jew and asked, “What hast thou done?” Jesus replied, “My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence.” Pilate further questioned Jesus, “Art thou a king then?” Once again, Jesus does not say so affirmatively by stating, “*Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.*”

If anything, Pilate sought to release Jesus, but the large crowd of Jews called out to crucify him. Instead of Jesus voluntarily dying for our sins, it was the council of Pharisees and their chief priests that condemned Jesus to death. They feared that the miracle of Jesus raising Lazarus from the dead after four days would cause the people to follow Jesus in great numbers (John 11:52). This fear was expressed by the council of Pharisees in John 11:47, 48:

What do we? For this man doeth many miracles. If we let him thus alone, all men will believe him: and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation.

The high priest of the council, Caiaphas, stated: “*Ye know nothing at all, nor consider it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation (Israel) perish not,*” (John 11:49, 50).

Caiaphas then prophesied that Jesus should die for their nation. From that day forward, the council was determined to put Jesus to death (John 11:51, 53).

Richard, I agree with you in that Jesus saw himself as a savior, but he never acted as a king of the Jews but as a man of God. I found that in all four Gospels, Jesus always stated he was the “Son of Man” and never did he explicitly say he was the “Son of God.” This was a man of truth and as he stated to Pilate, “*To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.*”

Richard W., January 1, 2012, 3:09 a.m. EST

Nicholas,

“Richard, I agree with you in that Jesus saw himself as a savior, but he never acted as a king of the Jews but as a man of God.”

If Jesus entering Jerusalem on the back of an ass with his followers shouting “hosanna” is not acting like the king of the Jews, then what is? Notice, it was not just an accident that Jesus entered the city in that manner. He planned it. He sent two of his followers ahead to fetch the ass.

And explain the following remark by Jesus:

But as for these enemies of mine who did not want me to be their king, bring them here and slaughter them in front of me! (Luke 19:27)

The disciples know that Jesus considered himself to be the king:

Then he said to them, “But who do you say that I am?” Peter answered, “The Messiah of God.” But he forcefully commanded them not to tell this to anyone. (Luke 9:20-21)

And they knew that the messiah was the one who was to restore the kingdom of Israel:

But we had hoped that he was the one who was going to redeem Israel. (Luke 24:21)

Was Jesus really telling the people that they should pay taxes to Caesar? No.

Jesus said to them, “Whose image is this, and whose inscription?” They replied, “Caesar’s.” He said to them, “Then give to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, and to God the things that are God’s.” (Matt. 22:20-21)

By pointing out Caesar’s image, Jesus was pointing out that they are pagan coins. A nation’s coinage is a statement of its sovereignty. Jesus’s kingdom would mint its own coins in the same manner as the second century Jewish rebel Bar Kokhba minted his own coins.

Jesus's own plan for taxes is better expressed in Matthew 17:24-26:

After they arrived in Capernaum the collectors of the temple tax came to Peter and said, "Your teacher pays the double drachma tax, doesn't he?" 17:25 He said, "Yes." When Peter came into the house, Jesus spoke to him first, "What do you think, Simon? From whom do earthly kings collect tolls or taxes—from their sons or from foreigners?" After he said, "From foreigners," Jesus said to him, "Then the sons are free."

The Gospel writers were not eyewitnesses to Jesus. They were followers of Paul. The author of the Gospel of Matthew could not have been the apostle. An eyewitness would not have described Jesus as entering Jerusalem riding on two asses as this author did.

The author of the Gospel of Matthew became responsible for the greatest slurs ever pinned upon the Jewish people when he had the people say, "Let his blood be on us and on our children!"

The Jews would never have said that. Blood designated guilt. The blood was always on the guilty party, never the innocent party. If the crowd said, "Let his blood be on us," then they would be accepting the guilt for killing Jesus, something which no sane person would do. But the author of the Gospel of Matthew places the blame not only on the Jews, but on the Jews' children.

The gospels were written at a time when Jewish rebellions against Rome were common. Most Christians, except for the Ebionites, were of Greek or other nationalities other than Jewish. Therefore, it was to their self-interest to disassociate themselves from the Jews. The best way to do that was by covering up Jesus's claim to kingship and laying the blame for Jesus's death upon the Jews, rather than the Romans, where it obviously belonged.

Richard W., January 3, 2012, 7:22 p.m. EST

Jerry,

I should respond to your reference in Hebrews 5 about Jesus being a priest in the order of Melchizedek. The statement is a quote from Psalms 110:4.

Melchizedek is mentioned in Genesis 14:17-20 where he is described as the king of Salem and a priest of El Elyon. Theologians like to identify El Elyon with Yahweh, however Salem was a Canaanite city at the time, which means that it was probably a reference to “El” who was the highest god in the Canaanite pantheon. The name is often translated as “God Most High.”

“Melchizedek” is relevant in Psalms 110:4 because in it, King David is described as “an eternal priest after the pattern of Melchizedek.” Eternal in the sense that the Davidic kingship was supposed to be eternal. Although David was a king, he also had a priestly role. In 2 Samuel 6:14, David wore an ephod and danced before the ark, and in 1 Kings 8:14, Solomon blessed the Israelites. The law restricted the priesthood to the Levites, therefore the author of Psalms 110 created a new order of priests and made David and the kings of Israel members of it.

Nicholas Ginex, January 5, 2012, 11:31 p.m. EST

Hello Richard,

You wrote some interesting points about Jesus that deserve to be noted by those who desire to know more about his thoughts as a man.

I had indicated that Jesus saw himself as a savior but never acted as a king of the Jews but as a man of God. You wrote that Jesus acted like he was king of the Jews by riding on the back of an ass. This is true, but Jesus never had a following whereby he commanded a large enough support to challenge the Sadducees and Pharisees so that he never publicly announced he was king of the Jews. Even during his trial, when being questioned by Pilate, Jesus would not state explicitly that he was king of the Jews.

However, what is significant is your quote from Luke 19:27 where Jesus states, “But as for these enemies of mine who did not want me to be their king, bring them here and slaughter them in front of me!”

This statement written by Luke is highly questionable and is an attempt to identify Jesus as a king. But from the past acts of Jesus, he never brought harm against others, another Jew, or enemy. Here is a case for pointing out flaws in the Bible where there are inconsistencies and myths to be revealed.

As far as Jesus admitting he was the Christ of God and then commanding Peter not to tell anybody in Luke 9:20-21, this is not the same as admitting he is king of the Jews. To say Jesus would mint his own coins in the same manner as the second century Jewish rebel Bar Kokhba minted his own coins in reference to the Matthew 22:20-21 quote is a hypothetical assertion and not fair to a man of God who's mission was to reveal the Word of God—love one another.

In Matthew 17:24-26, Jesus makes a politically incorrect statement to only collect taxes from the foreigners and not the Jews so that “Then are the children free.” Here is a case where the rulers are accustomed to receiving taxes from people other than their own and Jesus simply acted accordingly.

Richard, you brought up another inconsistency where only in Matthew does Jesus make use of an ass and a colt, whereas in Mark, Luke, and John, Jesus only sat on a colt.

Regarding the trial of Jesus, after Pilate washed his hands, he said before the multitude, “I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it.” In Matthew 27:24-25, the people answered (largely Jews for no other group would care about Jesus being put to death), “His blood be on us and on our children.” It is true that the other three Gospels do not have the Jews yelling this.

However, another inconsistency occurs in John 19:7, where the Jews rationale to crucify Jesus was, “We have a law, and by our law, he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God.” Note, the reason for crucifying Jesus was not that he was king of the Jews but that they accused Jesus of making himself the “Son of God.” Here is another effort by John to raise Jesus to the level of a god.

John is clear that he views Jesus as a Son of God but to say he is co-equal and co-eternal with God by existing from the beginning of time is a misinterpretation of John's first few lines of his Gospel where he uses the “Word” as existing in the beginning. I believe that Christian leaders have misinterpreted the Word for it first was written as “Logos.” It is to be noted that only in John's Gospel do others refer to Jesus six times as the Son of God.

At the time of John, Logos was a philosophic word meaning the principle of order and knowledge that was introduced by the pre-Socratic

philosopher Heraclitus (535-475 BCE). Stoic philosophers adopted the term to mean the divine animating principle pervading the universe. There is inconsistent logic in John's later verses because Jesus clearly says, ". . . and the Word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me," John 14:24-26. Therefore, God is the "Logos," and He created Jesus within the womb of Mary to deliver the *Word* to mankind. Jesus in all four Gospels also states he is the Son of Man seventy-six times versus six times others say he is the Son of God in John's Gospel. As the Son of Man, Jesus does nothing of himself but what his Father has taught him (John 8:28-29).

All four Gospels assert that Jesus was a man of God who always stated he was the Son of Man. It is the Church fathers that have fabricated the Trinity to raise Jesus to the level of a God.

Richard W., January 6, 2012, 5:31 p.m. EST

I find that I must repeat some points. That is unfortunate.

Nicholas wrote, "I had indicated that Jesus saw himself as a savior but never acted as a king of the Jews but as a man of God. You wrote that Jesus acted like he was king of the Jews by riding on the back of an ass. This is true, but Jesus never had a following whereby he commanded a large enough support to challenge the Sadducees and Pharisees so that he never publicly announced he was king of the Jews."

I'm not sure what you mean by "support," but Jesus obviously had enough public support to gather large crowds. This made it necessary to arrest Jesus when there were no crowds around. If you mean military support, remember that Jesus believed himself to be the Messiah (as the term was understood in the first century), therefore, as I explained elsewhere, he expected God to appear on the Mount of Olives where "A day of the Lord is about to come . . . Then the Lord will go to battle and fight against those nations, just as he fought battles in ancient days," (Zech. 14:1-3.) So why would he need an army?

"Even during his trial, when being questioned by Pilate, Jesus would not state explicitly he was king of the Jews."

You would expect Jesus to deny the charge if it was false. But he never denied it. And in John 18:36, Jesus said, "My kingdom is not from this world." As I pointed out before, the word "world" was another word for

the Roman Empire (Luke 2:1). Jesus, a Jew, was speaking to a Roman governor. How would Jesus expect Pilate to interpret that answer?

“However, what is significant is your quote from Luke 19:27 where Jesus states, “But as for these enemies of mine who did not want me to be their king, bring them here and slaughter them in front of me!”

This statement written by Luke is highly questionable and is an attempt to identify Jesus as a king. But from the past acts of Jesus, he never brought harm against another others, Jew or enemy.”

Haven't you read Revelation? That book is full of violence and war with Jesus leading the charge. That should be no surprise, because Jesus and the prophets all warned about the coming “Day of the *Lord*” and described the violence and destruction which will occur on that day. In his own words, Jesus said:

Do not think that I have come to bring peace to the earth. I have not come to bring peace but a sword. (Matt. 10:34)

Woe to those who are pregnant and to those who are nursing their babies in those days! Pray that it may not be in winter. For in those days there will be suffering unlike anything that has happened from the beginning of the creation that God created until now, or ever will happen. (Mark 13:17-19)

But I tell you, it will be more bearable for Tyre and Sidon on the day of judgment than for you! (Matt. 11:22)

“As far as Jesus admitting he was the Christ of God and then commanding Peter not to tell anybody in Luke 9:20-21, this is not the same as admitting he is king of the Jews.”

If Peter was a Christian living in 2012 CE, you would be right. But Peter was a first century Jew. The Jews were expecting a messiah who would sit on the throne of David and restore the kingdom of Israel. To claim to be the messiah would have been the same as to claim to be king of the Jews. I have already cited several passages in which the prophets spoke of the coming messiah.

“To say Jesus would mint his own coins in the same manner as the second century Jewish rebel Bar Kokhba minted his own coins in

reference to the Matt. 22:20-21 quote is a hypothetical assertion and not fair to a man of God who's mission was to reveal the Word of God—love one another.”

In the Gospel of Luke, the messianic expectation is repeated as it was understood in the time of Jesus. Jesus was to sit on the throne of David, which would make him a king, and kings mint money:

Listen You will become pregnant and give birth to a son, and you will name him Jesus. He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Most High and the Lord God will give him the throne of his father David. He will reign over the house of Jacob forever, and his kingdom will never end. (Luke 1:31-33)

Remember, David was an earthly king. His kingdom was in Jerusalem.

‘Regarding the trial of Jesus, after Pilate washed his hands, he said before the multitude, “I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it.” In Matthew 27:24-25, the people answered (largely Jews for no other group would care about Jesus being put to death), “His blood be on us, and on our children.” It is true that the other three Gospels do not have the Jews yelling this.’

No Jew would yell such a thing. The blood was always on the head of the guilty party. In Acts 5:28, the high priest told Peter, “You intend to bring this man's blood on us!” That is exactly what the Gospels were trying to do. The Gospels were written for Greek-speaking Christians at a time when there was conflict between Rome and the Jews. Naturally, the Christians were hesitant to make accusations against the Romans and desired to disassociate themselves from the Jews. Therefore, blame the Jews, not the Romans.

“However, another inconsistency occurs in John 19:7, where the Jews rationale to crucify Jesus was, “We have a law, and by our law, he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God.” Note, the reason for crucifying Jesus was not that he was king of the Jews, but that they accused Jesus of making himself the “Son of God.” Here is another effort by John to raise Jesus to the level of a god.”

Even David was a “Son of God.” Augustus and Tiberius both used that title. It was a common title for kings.

The king says, “I will announce the Lord’s decree. He said to me: You are my son! This very day I have become your father!” (Ps. 2:7)

Of course, this only makes David the adopted son of God, but so what? Augustus didn’t use the title until the senate declared Julius Caesar to be a god, and Augustus was the adopted son of Julius. Note verse 2 where the king is referred to as the *Lord’s* “Messiah.”

Nicholas Ginex, January 8, 2012, 3:40 p.m. EST

Richard, what is more significant as heresy to the Jews: Jesus being called king of the Jews or Son of God?

King of the Jews is very different from Son of God. One means anybody can be a king without any connection to God, whereas the latter means a holy being that has been given by God.

I agree with you on all of your points that Jesus thought of himself as a messiah. But this can also mean a representative of God and not necessarily a direct descendant of God. True, Son of God was a popular term used by Egyptians, Jews, and Romans, but you must give Jesus credit for being honest for stating seventy-six times in all four Gospels that he was the Son of Man. Again, I stress and agree with you that during the Roman Empire, when Son of God was a nice title given to emperors, John in his Gospel had others explicitly state six times Jesus was the Son of God. But would you agree that this was an effort by the Church fathers to raise Jesus to the level of a god?

Yes, Jesus was a man of God who was taught at a very young age, like his mother Mary, who was brought up in a Jewish temple and received instruction by masters of the Torah. Jesus did believe he was a savior, and you are correct that he so believed in his God that he thought he was going to have God’s support on the Mount of Olives.

Richard, I do not disagree with your observations and references in the Bible, but many different interpretations of Jesus’s motivations are in question. For example, I do not believe Jesus gave his life for the forgiveness of sins; original sin is dogma taught by Christian leaders. What is significant and what all Christian leaders miss in John’s Gospel is what Jesus announced three times as a command, the Word of God—*love one another*. The essence of Jesus’s message is love for each other, and there can be no greater command given from God.

One last comment about Jesus acting for God to bring judgment to all people in Revelation, you wrote: “That book is full of violence and war, with Jesus leading the charge.” Richard, I admire your knowledge of the Bible, but be careful regarding the true nature of Jesus. I agree with you that Revelation does appear to have been written by a deranged person who was so fanatically entranced with a vision of God’s retribution that words are written in such a way that it could not have been Jesus.

You will note in Revelation that the first three chapters appear to make sense and we have direct words spoken by Jesus to John. However, from chapter 4 to the end of Revelation, we have a fanatical exposé written by a person who always introduces himself as “I” starting with, “After this *I* looked, and behold, a door was opened in heaven: and the first voice which *I* heard . . .”

It appears that somebody got hold of Revelation and wrote his vision which detracts from the most significant words spoken by Jesus; and that, my dear friend, is the Revelation of Jesus whereby he proclaimed for those that hath an ear, that Amen was, **“the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.”**

Richard W., January 8, 2012, 6:34 p.m. EST

It was not heresy to claim to be “son of God.” Jesus used it in the sense that anybody who possessed the spirit of God was a son of God. Even the opening to the Lord’s Prayer, which begins “Our Father who is in heaven . . .” is a claim to being a son of God.

When Jesus told his followers in Matthew 10:20, “For it is not you speaking, but the Spirit of your Father speaking through you,” was he not telling them that they were sons of God?

In Matthew 18:10, Jesus refers to “my Father in Heaven,” then speaking to the disciples in verse 14 he says, “your Father in Heaven.” In the first case he makes himself the son of God. In the second case, he makes his followers the sons of God. But in both cases, it has a spiritual sense.

Jesus was called “the Anointed” (“Christos”). Remember what happened to David when he was anointed:

So Samuel took the horn full of olive oil and anointed him in the presence of his brothers. The Spirit of the Lord rushed upon David from that day onward. (Sam. 16:13)

Thus, David became a son of God, but that is by adoption, not biological.

“You are my son! This very day I have become your father!” (Ps. 2:7)

When Jesus refers to himself as the “Son of Man,” remember that in Hebrew, the word for “man” is “Adam.” In Luke 3:38, Adam is called “the son of God.”

Jesus was obviously familiar with the Book of Daniel, and it is likely that Jesus was referring to the reference in Daniel’s vision:

I was watching in the night visions, And with the clouds of the sky one like a son of man was approaching. He went up to the Ancient of Days and was escorted before him.

To him was given ruling authority, honor, and sovereignty. All peoples, nations, and language groups were serving him. His authority is eternal and will not pass away. His kingdom will not be destroyed. (Dan. 7:13-14)

This is another reference to the messiah who would restore the kingdom of Israel, which Daniel talked so much about.

Richard W., January 8, 2012, 7:40 p.m. EST

Nicholas: “You will note in Revelation that the first three chapters appear to make sense and we have direct words spoken by Jesus to John. However, from chapter 4 to the end of Revelation we have a fanatical exposé written by a person who always introduces himself as “I.”

You are correct about the use of the word “I” in the chapters following Revelations 3, but take another look at Revelation 1. Here, the author also seems to have a problem with “I” as shown below:

I, John, your brother . . . 1:10 I was in the Spirit . . . when I heard
1:12 I turned to see . . . when I did so, I saw . . . 1:17 When I saw him
I fell down . . . as though I were . . . (Rev. 1:9)

That is nine times that the author referred to himself as “I,” plus five times when it was used by another speaker.

In chapters 2 and 3, the author is taking dictation, but the person giving the dictation seems to have a case of “I.” It is himself. In chapter 2, the person giving the dictation uses the word “I” twenty-five times. And in chapter 3, the word “I” was used at least twenty-four times.

Nicholas Ginex, January 8, 2012, 10:56 p.m. EST

Hello Richard,

Thank you for the clarification about the use of “I” in John’s Revelation. I was only trying to point out that from chapters 4 and on, it appeared that the style of writing became very fanatical, and this was not the case in the first three chapters. I thought you might confirm if Revelation was written by more than one person.

Regarding the Son of Man reference made by Jesus, if he was indirectly referring to an association with Adam, a man, we have confirmation that he did not think he was the Son of God in any physical sense.

It appears that we have strayed away from the topic of this post, which is to discern “Has Jesus always existed or was he created?”

Richard W., January 9, 2012, 2:05 a.m. EST

One thing that we are in agreement about is that Jesus did not think he was the Son of God in any physical sense.

As regards the topic of whether Jesus always existed or was created, my position should be clear that he was born just like anybody else.

Nicholas Ginex, January 9, 2012, 9:13 a.m. EST

Dear Richard,

Please refer to my response dated January 9, 2012, 9:06 a.m. EST at the end of this post. It reveals why I spend time writing about God and hopefully get more people to learn about “the beginning of the creation of God.”

Scott, I support Zionism, December 13, 2011, 3:27 p.m. EST

Richard, in your December 13, 2011, 1:32 p.m. EST response to Nicholas:

You know as much about Jesus the Christ as you know about purple pretzels that lay between the hills of Mars. If there was an award for knowing nothing, you would win hands down. It's rare to see such absence of wisdom in a person.

You're amazing.

Nicholas Ginex, December 14, 2011, 2:36 a.m. EST

Hello Richard,

You are a wonderful student of the Old and New Testament, and I am impressed with your ability to analyze and think with an open, objective mind. From what you have revealed to me, I would think that you may have taught Judaic/Christian lessons, for your knowledge of the scriptures is greater than mine.

My exposure to the scriptures is really limited to the Torah, Gospels and Revelation, and the Koran. These scriptures were studied line by line because I was obligated to show that the religious beliefs of the ancient Egyptians greatly influenced the development of the Torah, which in turn provided a gateway for the development of the Christian and Islamic religions.

Thank you for the information that lent much insight to why Jesus rode on the back of a donkey, overthrew the money changers in the temple, and believed he was the messiah by leading his followers up to the Mount of Olives on what was to be the "Day of the Lord." This day was to initiate the revelation of Zechariah, which stated,

Then the Lord will go to battle and fight against those nations, just as he fought battles in ancient days. 14:4 On that day his feet will stand on the Mount of Olives which lies to the east of Jerusalem . . . Then the Lord my God will come with all his holy ones with him.

Richard, you make a valid point that Jesus was just a man, for he never sat on the throne of David and did not restore the kingdom of Israel.

This conclusion of yours strongly indicates that Jesus did not “always exist” but was “created” and was a man of God.

To me, Jesus was a man who was fully committed to the teachings of the Torah and believed in God to the extent that he had a mission to teach the Word of God. The greatest command in the Bible was stated in the last Gospel of John as a command three times—love one another. It is my hope that the religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions embrace this one command and teach it in all its ramifications to our sisters and brothers of every nation.

For this to happen, the Christian leaders must acknowledge the words of Jesus where he proclaimed in Revelation 3:14 that Amen is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.” These words validate that the greatest Egyptian god, Amen, who was worshipped two thousand years before the birth of Jesus, is the “common root” of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions.

Jesus’s words are indeed a revelation and a challenge for the religious leaders to all realize that they sprang from the beliefs of a very spiritual people that developed the concept of one universal God over thousands of years. I end this reply by hoping Judaic, Christian, and Islamic leaders will unify their beliefs, for there is only one universal Creator God. Such unity will shatter the walls of bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of our sisters and brothers.

Clarke M., December 14, 2011, 6:59 a.m. EST

“Of the three religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, it appears that Christianity, especially during the Christmas season, receives negative criticism from the liberal media and intellectuals who believe religion is a myth and it is better to focus on love of humanity than of God.”

Nicholas, really, what are you thinking?

When they had finished eating, Jesus said to Simon Peter, “Simon son of John, do you truly love me more than these?”

“Yes, Lord,” he said, “you know that I love you.”

Jesus said, “Feed my lambs.”

Again Jesus said, “Simon son of John, do you truly love me?”

He answered, “Yes, Lord, you know that I love you.”

Jesus said, “Take care of my sheep.”

The third time he said to him, “Simon son of John, do you love me?”

Peter was hurt because Jesus asked him the third time, “Do you love me?” He said, “Lord, you know all things; you know that I love you.”

Jesus said, “Feed my sheep.” (John 21:15-17, NIV)

Nicholas Ginex, December 14, 2011, 11:13 p.m. EST

Hello Clark,

The quotes from John 21:15-17 present a wonderful lesson from Jesus. In response to Peter’s reply, “Lord, you know all things; you know that I love you,” Jesus stated, “Feed my sheep.” Is Jesus saying to love him or did he say instruct my children to follow the Word of God? I believe that Jesus was given to mankind to deliver the Word of God, for which reason Jesus is also known as the Word. Jesus gave the last command from God in John’s Gospel and stated it three times—*love one another*.

Jesus does not, as one with God, need your love. Jesus wants all of us to feed everybody the Word of God—*love one another*.

Clark, you asked me, “Nicholas, what are you thinking?” I think as Jesus did, and that is “to focus on love of humanity than of God.” This phrase reflects the Word of God in different terms.

Peter Joseph Swanson, December 14, 2011, 11:20 a.m. EST

Myth is not a bad word. Myth does not mean “false.”

I bet Isis really existed too as a real person, once. But then, the stories get turned into “religion” along the way. Myth, and not because they are lying. It’s a way of talking about things like that. And now that everything has gotten so literal and we expect a modern journalistic style out of everything, we don’t know how to really think about old writings the way they thought about them back in the day . . .

(And it would be really nice to have it in the original language, and it not be a dead language too.)

Nicholas Ginex, December 15, 2011, 1:30 a.m. EST

Hello Peter,

Your bet that Isis really existed as a real person is a good bet. The stories or events of true life happenings may have been distorted over time. But there have always been good storytellers, and the impressive people may have taken front stage in the storyteller's mind to create a memorable fantasy people would believe in.

I believe that the Egyptian priests had a great deal of knowledge about human reactions and relations. Over several hundreds of years, they were able to devise concepts that many still believe in today, such as the concept of a soul and a hereafter, where one may join their God after living a righteous and moral life.

Optimus Paradigm, December 14, 2011, 11:56 a.m. EST

The answer is contingent on one's own conceptualization of spiritual understanding. In my opinion, the answer is "both" a divine dichotomy, if you will. As a matter of fact, we all are "both."

There is only "One" divine conscious Entity that consumes and permeates all things seen and unseen. The biggest lie ever is that we are separate from the divine and each other. There is no escaping the divine One, conscious Entity, the Is That Is.

Before all things seen and unseen down to the atom was first thought of, the divine Consciousness "thought" all things before it became. So I too can claim that I Am before Abraham, as I was once thought before matter was conceived. We all were. And I can claim also that I and the divine Consciousness are *one*, because in reality, that is all there really is, *one* divine Consciousness playing out billions upon billions of scenarios throughout the cosmos from all the planets, moons, and stars to the miniscule atom. However, they are at the same time continuum, separate and aloof of it all.

Blessings.

Nicholas Ginex, December 15, 2011, 2:11 a.m. EST

Dear Optimus,

Your belief that “there is only ‘one’ divine conscious Entity that consumes and permeates all things seen and unseen” cannot be disputed, because there are no facts to dispel such a belief.

I have written a post titled, *Does Consciousness Pervade Our Universe?* This post is very much in agreement with your beliefs about a divine Entity that pervades the universe with a consciousness that I believe is inherent in all matter but comes to express itself in organic living matter. That consciousness is characterized as a force or energy that we have no idea what it is or how it came to be, but I sense that consciousness as the Spirit of God, whom Jews and Christians refer to as the Holy Spirit that pervades the universe.

This unknown force seeks to materialize itself in higher forms of life that begin to search for the origins of that force or energy. We humans have reached that level of mind capable of seeking the unknown entity we refer to as God. But make no mistake, at this point in our development, we are constructing that Entity in our own minds and applying attributes and moral commands that we believe are what this Entity wants of us.

So far, we have broken the ice by writing scriptures that are used to define the Entity we call God. But I contend we have only begun to understand ourselves and our purpose in life and for the universe. The scriptures are in dire need of being revised, because so far, they have created much division among different groups of people, whereby they have become bigoted, hating, causing violence, and killing innocent people.

The book *Future of God Amen* was written to assist in revealing how mankind first came to conceive the concepts of a soul, a hereafter, and one universal God. The name of that God is still announced in temples and churches as Amen. It was Jesus, one who was a man of God, who proclaimed that Amen is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.” No truer words have been spoken by Jesus, who is regarded as the Son of God and by others as God Himself. But

in spite of this “revelation” by Jesus and his announcement of the *Word of God—love one another*, religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic faiths continue to put their heads in the sand. The book may still be too much ahead of its time, and it may be necessary for a Third World War to occur before all people realize that they have missed the *Word of God*.

Sandi S., December 14, 2011, 3:13 p.m. EST

I’d say always.

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,
and the Word was God. He was with God in the beginning.
Through him all things were made; without him nothing was
made that has been made. In him was life, and that life was
the light of men. The light shines in the darkness,
but the darkness has not understood it.

There came a man who was sent from God; his name was John. He came as a witness to testify concerning that light, so that through him all men might believe. He himself was not the light; he came only as a witness to the light. The true light that gives light to every man was coming into the world.

He was in the world, and though the world was made through him, the world did not recognize him. He came to that which was his own, but his own did not receive him. Yet to all who received him, to those who believed in his name, he gave the right to become children of God—children born not of natural descent, nor of human decision or a husband’s will, but born of God.

The Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us. We have seen his glory, the glory of the One and Only, who came from the Father, full of grace and truth.

John testifies concerning him. He cries out, saying, “This was he of whom I said, ‘He who comes after me has surpassed me because he was before me.’” From the fullness of his grace we have all received one blessing after another. For the law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ. No one has ever seen God, but God the One and Only, who is at the Father’s side, has made him known. (John 1:1-18)

Sorry to post so much!

You asked if this argument (always existed or created) is why some people don't accept Christianity. I don't think so.

I think one reason could be that it requires us to reach out to something greater than ourselves for help, which may be seen as weakness. Also, the need for forgiveness is a stumbling block. If we need forgiveness, it means we have sinned. I think that's the hard part. Many people are offended at being called sinners.

Nicholas Ginex, December 15, 2011, 2:48 a.m. EST

Dear Sandi,

Your post is welcomed, for it reveals why many Christians believe Jesus is not only the Son of God, but is God. According to John, God always existed, but the dichotomy that Jesus as the Word also existed with God confuses many people, and for me, shows an inconsistency in the concept of God.

First, God came first, not the Word, thought to be Jesus.

Second, God did not need a Son at the beginning of time to create the universe.

Third, according to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Jesus was "created" by being born upon Mother Mary conceiving by the Holy Spirit of God (not Jesus).

Fourth, Jesus was never needed on the earth until man was created and God saw fit that mankind needed to be guided by Jesus, who is the Word of God.

Fifth, it was Jesus that announced the Word of God as a command in the Gospel of John three times—*love one another*.

Sixth, Jesus could not have always existed, because he was truthful to proclaim in John's Revelation 3:14 that Amen, the greatest Egyptian god for more than two thousand years before his birth, is "the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God."

What Jesus revealed as a revelation for all mankind is that God was created by a very spiritual people over thousands of years, whereby the Priesthood of Amon wrote *Amon as the Sole God*. This belief was conceived by the priesthood during the reign of Ramses II before Moses left Egypt about two decades later in 1250 BCE.

Sandy, although I respect your belief that Jesus “always existed,” I am convinced that Jesus was a man of God who was highly knowledgeable about the Torah and Jewish prophets, whereby he believed he was the messiah. In any case, Jesus to me was the greatest man of God, for he delivered to mankind the *Word of God*.

Sandi S., December 15, 2011, 8:04 a.m. EST

Interesting, though I don't see these things the way you do. But thank you for your courtesy in reading my comment. God bless you, Nicholas.

Char H., December 25, 2011, 6:23 p.m. EST

Nicholas, you would totally rewrite the plan of God, primarily based on a misuse of one phrase in Revelations? It is easy to see why the learned Jewish leaders completely missed it. I am glad they did, which opened the window for the grafting in of the Gentiles, but this too was part of the plan.

Jerry Kays, December 26, 2011, 2:53 a.m. EST

Biblically, we are all of the tribes of Israel. There were twelve, but only one “portion” claimed the “Chosen” title (originally anyway) and thus denigrated the Goyim (Gentile) . . .

Clarke M., December 26, 2011, 11:54 a.m. EST

The highly developed Indian and Iranian religions were more ancient than the Sumerian or Egyptian and not written down for thousands of years. The greater accuracy of oral teachings compared to the written is well known. Recently, a Buddhist monk recited sixteen thousand pages of the texts correctly. The full teachings of the world religions were transmitted orally. The written ones were partial for many. The Bible contains keys to its meanings, but these are not easily found.

There are forty thousand Christian denominations! Christianity is the restatement of a very old doctrine. The Gospel narratives are dependable because they are integrated with the spiritual revelation of the past and are being reinterpreted today in the terms of “Christ.”

The Bible tells us the Law of Moses was partial with the appearance of Jesus and introduces more of the original teaching to complete the covenant with Adam. Jesus’s priesthood needed to be like Melchizedek’s (who appeared in Genesis to point to the future change) so he could bypass the weaknesses of the Levitical order. Jesus has both the office of king and priest (which the Aaronic priesthood could not have), like Melchizedek, and serves for life.

By the way, there is a tradition that Seth represents the pneumatic or spiritual understanding of reality; Abel, the psychic or soul level; Cain, the hylic or material understanding—children of the first earthly androgynous being, Adam/Eve. The three represent the types of human beings present on earth at this time.

Char H., December 26, 2011, 12:44 p.m. EST

I am sorry, but I recognize Cain as a different bloodline. The perfect genes of Adam and Eve conceived Abel (son of God). They were born twins, Cain first. Read Genesis. It’s all there. The Bible even tells you, “Cain (son of man) who was *of* the wicked one.” Using a lexicon, the word “beguile” used there means “to lie with a woman.” The serpent was the missing link and has been changed. They can dig all over the earth for the leap from beast to man. They will not find it, as that beautiful beast who had the ability to procreate carnally with man is gone. Call it silly. I sure did, until I went through Genesis, and it was there, plain as day.

That’s why the Lord, in order to rise above that carnal sin, was born a Son of God again, like Abel, but no pure genes were available, so Mary conceived by “The Word made flesh,” the Logos that Nicholas would deny. This is the exact thing that is “denying of Christ.” Of course, to be responsible for knowing, you must “hear.” And have eyes to see. You, whoever you are, hearing now, please read it with new eyes. Just look. It is there. The perfect came to die for the imperfect, reconciling the carnal back to the immortal just like they were in the Garden before the fall.

Char H., December 26, 2011, 12:57 p.m. EST

By the woman, mankind fell, and even in that childbearing, through woman, the redemption had to come.

Char H., December 27, 2011, 12:52 p.m. EST

Nobody will even tell me I'm crazy. Interesting.

Nicholas Ginex, December 27, 2011, 5:58 p.m. EST

Hello Char, Clark, and Jerry,

I just read the dialogue beginning with Char, dated December 25, 2011, 6:23 p.m. All of you have made certain claims about your interpretations of the Bible, and I am not an authority to dispute your beliefs. We all are exposed to many kinds of inputs in our lives, and the way we construct our beliefs will be different for all of us. The way we digest information will depend upon our disposition, intellect, experiences, and how sources of information has been fed to us. I would be foolish to try to dissuade you from your beliefs in a back-and-forth debate as to who is right or wrong. My purpose is to bring to you information that few people have acquired because of lack of history regarding the ancient Egyptian religion and how the God Amen has had a profound influence on the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions.

The title of this post is *Has Jesus Always Existed or Was He Created?* To answer this question, I have referred to the Torah, Gospels, and Revelation, which are the core Scriptures of the Bible. Second-hand documents such as Acts, Romans, Corinthians, Timothy, etc. do not carry the weight of those words that reveal what was spoken by God and Jesus. This being said, I will try to answer your questions and comments with an honest and sincere heart.

Char, you raised a significant question: "Nicholas, You would totally rewrite the plan of God, primarily based on a misuse of one phrase in Revelations?" That phrase was spoken by Jesus in Revelation 3:14, where he proclaimed that Amen is, "the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God."

Char, could it be that Jesus is telling the truth so that the path the religions have taken seriously needs to be redirected? Could it be that

learned Jewish leaders and theological scholars have missed a true and valid understanding of Jesus's words because of one of two reasons:

- They did not have sufficient learning of the history of the Egyptian religion to understand how Amen rose from the year 2,000 BCE, a local god among many, to become known as the one universal God during the reign of Ramses II.
- They knew Amen was an Egyptian god but would never acknowledge that he was developed within the minds of men and recorded by the Priesthood of Amon as the one universal God, Creator and Maker of all that is.

Either reason will cause religious leaders to misinterpret and misconstrue the words of Jesus by teaching that Jesus was himself Amen. But this would be making a liar out of Jesus, because if indeed Jesus "always existed" as defined by the Trinity, then he cannot be Amen, who was "created" as told by Jesus saying Amen is "the beginning of the creation of God."

Char, I believe you may find the above reasoning very difficult to accept because of your beliefs. That's OK. My mission is to inform people of what I have learned by reading many books by respected Egyptologists and religious scholars in addition to the Bible. If you desire to read what has surfaced over the past one hundred years concerning what has been discovered about the Egyptian civilization and the impact of their religion on the development of the Judaic religion, please click on www.futureofgodamen.com

Jerry, I do not believe the biblical history that the twelve tribes of Israel are the progenitors of the human race. Note, the significance of stating the tribes are all from Israel. The Bible was written by Hebrew priests for the Hebrew people and do not take into account the many races of people around the globe. To believe the tribes of Israel were able to populate people in many areas around the globe with different skin color and physical characteristics is really very infantile. The first draft of the Torah was written by Hebrew priests during the reign of Solomon around 950 BCE for the Hebrew people who were known as Israelites.

Clark,

Once again you hypothesize and create information for our readers that may be true, but you do not provide verifiable evidence that the

Indian and Iranian religions were more ancient than the Sumerian and Egyptian religions. Yes, you may be praised for stating that oral information has been handed down and found to be highly accurate.

However, the Indian and Iranian religions that may be more ancient may not have provided the kind of high level religious beliefs as developed in the written records of the ancient Egyptians. I would rather see you compare the beliefs of these religions with that of the Egyptian religion than simply make assertions that cannot be studied and assessed.

You then appear to denigrate the Law of Moses by introducing a nebulous high priest and king by the name of Melchizedek, a person that the Bible gives no full account of as to this priest's beliefs and contributions to the religious beliefs of the Hebrews. You also speak of Jesus's priesthood and that it needed to be like that of Melchizedek's, which is a hypothetical assertion as well. Jesus did not belong to a priesthood or was he king of the Jews but was the messiah, a man of God. Can you reveal which priesthood Jesus belonged to? Yes, Jesus was highly knowledgeable about the Torah, but to say he conducted religious ceremonies as an ordained priest is a stretch of the imagination.

Your characterizations of Seth, Abel, and Cain to represent the types of human beings on earth at that time does not convey any knowledge that may be applied for today. Please be specific when writing by referring to references when trying to establish a point.

As a final comment, I would like to return to Char's comment about Mary conceiving by the Holy Spirit of God and giving birth to "The Word made flesh." I do not deny that Jesus was born of the Virgin Mary by the intercession of God's Holy Spirit. I believe that God gave Jesus to mankind as a gift to deliver the Word of God. To say Jesus is the Word is to identify Jesus as a person; but what was the Word of God? It is an action that few Christians have been taught by their religious leaders. It is the last and new command stated by Jesus three times in the Gospel of John. This is not simply a "shall not" command; it was a command where Jesus said:

*A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another;
as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. (John 13:34)*

*This is my commandment. That ye love one another,
as I have loved you. (John 15:12)*

These things I command you, that ye love one another. (John 15:17)

One last thing, and this is for Char. Mankind did not fall due to a woman. Woman is man's greatest partner in life and should not be blamed for the downfall of mankind by old, misguided, righteous men who have lost respect for the greatest gift given to man by God.

Char, you are not crazy, but perhaps you inflict guilt upon yourself thinking it was a woman that caused man's downfall. The idea of redemption for the first sin committed against God by a woman is nothing more than the priesthood introducing the concept of sin and blaming it on a woman. Wake up! We are all responsible for our own actions and we commit many mistakes in life. Some mistakes are of value to teach us how we can be better persons the next time around. Knowledge does not come to us by sitting in a closet or reading the good Bible but by facing the challenges of life and learning from them. The Bible provides a moral code of conduct, but it is how we respond to each other with the Word of God to make this a peaceful world.

Jerry Kays, December 27, 2011, 6:49 p.m. EST

Nicholas, I think we all agree on some things and disagree on others . . . I think the whole world does. I as much as said that in my most recent comment further up thread.

If one is going to put all their trust (called faith) into only certain religious books and ignore all of the information both dug up and revealed since, then they will naturally refuse and refute all of the rest.

I intend to keep an open mind and seek only the highest truth . . .

Nicholas Ginex, December 29, 2011, 3:19 p.m. EST

Hello Jerry,

Thank you for your comment, for it is worthwhile for all of us to keep an open mind and be willing to read new facts and findings as we learn more about ourselves and the past. The Bible and other scriptures followed by people who are searching for God must not be the only way to improve our lives.

What is the highest truth? Truth is what one can think and speak of in honest terms and covers many, many topics of interest. Even to say “God is Love” is a truth that may be questionable. It is only after the birth of Jesus that love has become an attribute of God. Truth is always evolving, for we still need to know more about ourselves and our relationship to God.

Faith is a wonderful thing and is based on what we have been taught to believe. God for one people is different as taught to another people. So it is humanity that is still evolving in trying to understand God. We are coming close with the words of Jesus when he announced the Word of God to—*love one another as I have loved you*. For the first time, God, through Jesus, has given us a key command, announced three times by Jesus to have us understand that only by loving our sisters and brothers of any country are we children of God.

Char H., December 28, 2011, 4:24 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

First, I am assuming no guilt. I would rather look further into how you can claim that Christ was not created in the beginning, even as the generations of Adam, and indeed all mankind through him, next with Eve, from him. Remember, they called his name Adam, in the day they were created. Eve was not born or even separate, yet she was created, and Adam held Abraham, and through Abraham, all of the tribes on the day of the promises and even before. “When you were a twinkle in your Daddy’s eye” is our expression for it.

This same God:

1. thinks,
2. says, and is,
3. instantly irrefutable throughout the Bible, beginning to end.

This is how I judge principles as true. It must fit throughout, and that spirit of truth that guides me gives pause when I am unable to see the beginning to the end in any doctrine. When you say it is the Egyptians who created God, and not He who created us, something is wrong with that doctrine.

You go back and forth between supernatural, spiritual, and material. You support your beliefs with the New Testament, then dismiss the

New Testament when it does not agree with what you seek to teach. You either realize that the material form of existence is a lower form to the theophany we are to have in perfection or not. You either realize you are, by the carnal act, born into death and need redemption to perfect spiritual resurrection, and you accept the consecrated sacrifice of millions of lambs looking forward, unto the final Lamb, the *only* begotten Son of God, even Christ Jesus, or you don't.

You cannot gain eternity by recognizing the sanctity of the Virgin birth but rejecting the sacrifice thereof. However, I don't judge you, but this visible line of thought. I don't even know if Christianity is the only faith under which this sanction exists or whether some may even inherit eternity by works as you seem to think. I say that you think this because you say we must learn truth through experiences, not by the word. I do not choose this path. I know I am flawed and by my mortal nature will err. However, I see where God accounts kindness "to the least of these," so I leave to God the judging. I see, however, contradictions in every paragraph you write.

If you continue in learning by experience, the Bible teaches that we in our mortality will never live without sin. Sin cannot stand in the face of a holy God, which is why Jesus is the intercessor, why he descended into hell after he rose, etc. The Bible says: "How then should we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" Please see the fall from spiritual, to mortal, to being raised immortal. The only way to get back is the door, Jesus Christ, because he was born without sin, and yet died for *our* sins. Eve and Adam took on physical (dust to dust) reproduction. And then the Word conceived a Son Of God again.

Therein lies our only hope. Imnsho. Also, what is to say that when the Hebrews came into bondage in Egypt, they did not begin to teach the Egyptians of the one God of their promise and that the wonders they saw brought them to whatever their monotheistic belief was?

Nicholas Ginex, December 29, 2011, 4:31 p.m. EST

Hello Char,

Thank you for your comments. However, I will again make it very clear to you that I do not advocate belief in any one religion. I respect the beliefs of those that believe in the doctrines they have been taught by their religious leaders using scriptures believed to have been inspired by God.

You wrote: “I would rather look further into how you can claim that Christ was not created in the beginning, . . .” Char, I need not be captive to any book written by man, inspired by God or not. Belief in God is a very personal thing. My god is the God of all creation, of the universe, and all other life forms. Only God created “all there is” and did not need a Son to do so. This is my belief, and as I respect your belief, I expect you to respect mine.

Any person who understands that God created other life forms in the many galaxies consisting of stars and planets also understands that God created other intelligent life. In fact, mankind may have been created much later than many life forms in other parts of the universe. To say God made man in His image is incorrect and only an arrogant assumption by righteous men who were trying to identify their people with God. In the life of these arrogant men, the world was much smaller and knowledge was limited, for which reason they believed God only created them in His image.

Char, you also wrote: “When you say it is the Egyptians who created God, and not He who created us, something is wrong with that doctrine.” This is not my doctrine. It is a fact that the Egyptians were a very spiritual people, and it was the Priesthood of Amon that wrote scripture praising Amen (Amon) as the one universal God, Creator of all that is. Excerpts of their belief in one universal God is provided in *Future of God Amen* and provided under the title of *Amon as the Sole God*.

Char, you believe Jesus existed in the beginning with God. But think. Why would God need a son in the beginning to help Him create the universe? Does it not make more sense that God created Jesus after He created mankind because Jesus was sent to deliver the Word of God? You dismiss all of the other life forms that God also created throughout the universe. Is it because the Bible does not reveal God created the universe but only heaven and earth?

Each life form on other planets as they reach a high level of intelligence will begin to wonder about God and how they fit into God’s plan. To limit your view of God to only mankind is not keeping up with the knowledge we have acquired over the past two to three hundred years. This is why I wrote *Future of God Amen*, to have people understand that we are still evolving in learning about ourselves and God. Jesus was a man of God who was given to us to help direct mankind by announcing the Word of God—*love one another*.

Char, you wrote: “What is to say that when the Hebrews came into bondage in Egypt, they did not begin to teach the Egyptians of the one God of their promise, and that the wonders they saw brought them to whatever their monotheistic belief was?”

To answer your question, Char, I recommend you read *Future of God Amen*. This book conclusively reveals that the Egyptians were the first to conceive the concepts of a soul, a hereafter, a son of God, and finally, after thousands of years, one universal God. If you choose to only use the Bible as the only way to understand why you believe in God, that is your choice.

Char, I am not a minister but simply a man of God who has read the Torah, Gospels and Revelation, and the Koran. I have found that these scriptures were a start for mankind to understand God. However, these scriptures, inspired by God, have caused more holy deaths and misunderstanding between different groups of people. Religious leaders and rulers have used these scriptures to cause bigotry, hatred, violence, and the killing of our sisters and brothers in many countries.

I prefer to end my communication with you until you have other books besides the Bible to better understand the culture of the Egyptians. If you refuse to do so, then continue with your beliefs for nothing I write can change your thinking; it must be an effort by you alone to seek God and your purpose in life.

Char H., December 29, 2011, 1:40 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

If Jesus is not a savior, what do you make of John 14:6? It is his own words. What about the narrow path he spoke of?

Another question, do you honestly believe mortal man can ever live a perfect life? Perfect enough to stand in the face of a holy God?

Nicholas Ginex, December 29, 2011, 4:57 p.m. EST

Dear Char,

Please refer to my response of December 29, 2011, 4:31 p.m. I do not wish to debate if Jesus is not or is a savior, or if any man can live a

perfect life. You have your beliefs and I respect them because I respect you as a person. We are all taught by others to believe certain things, and I am one who does not believe everything that is written or told to me.

Regarding Jesus, I believe he is a Son of Man as he repeatedly stated seventy-six times in all four Gospels. I also believe Jesus communed with God and delivered the Word of God for mankind to follow. Few Christians have been taught the Word of God, and yet it was a command given by Jesus from God and stated three times. This is why Jesus should be known as the Word.

I will again say, as I have in *Future of God Amen*, that Jesus was the greatest man of God, and for me, he did not die for our sins. He gave his life to deliver the Word of God. Sins, or mistakes, call them what you may, will be made by all people; it is part of growing up. The important thing to always remember is that we are always honest, truthful, compassionate, and loving toward each other, for these are the elements in following the Word of God—*love one another*.

Char H., December 30, 2011, 1:28 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

So, you cannot explain why you use the scriptures conveniently, accepting as the Word of God those that support your premise, while dismissing those that oppose it. I also feel we cannot any longer make progress, as your perspective seems to shift as needed to push forward a “new” belief that seems, to my mind, a twisting of belief to fit the theory, rather than a revelation or further understanding. I can only hope you will someday think back to how and why the Virgin birth changes anything. How did it fulfill the scriptures so early given? Why? There is no other name given under heaven by which men may be saved. Jesus said, “I came not to do away with the law . . .” (Matt 5:17). I will remember the admonishments of love therein as well, and perhaps our communications will not have been in vain. God Bless you!

Char H., December 30, 2011, 1:41 p.m. EST

Oh, one final question for you. Does God, as you understand him, accept intercession? Do you believe in prayer, or are we just talking to ourselves? Do miracles exist?

Nicholas Ginex, December 30, 2011, 6:35 p.m. EST

Dear Char,

Thank you for the blessing by God. Your devotion to your belief in God is respected, for we are what we are taught. My purpose is only to reveal to people around the world how mankind first came to conceive in a soul, a hereafter, a son of God, and finally, one universal God. In the book *Future of God Amen*, you will find that it provides a history of a spiritual people that deserve credit for the development of our belief in God.

I will end our discourse, not because I cannot answer your questions; it is because you are devoted to your beliefs and I do not care to change them. As I have stated, I only desire to share knowledge of history that has only surfaced over the past one hundred years with the dedicated efforts of Egyptologists and religious scholars.

Regarding your final questions, "Does God, as you understand him, accept intercession? Do you believe in prayer, or are we just talking to ourselves? Do miracles exist?"

God exists for those that believe in Him. Prayer is a very positive way to reach out to God, for it is by the Holy Spirit of God that an answer from God is possible. Only by sincere, deep thought is it possible for reflection to arrive at an answer from within your being. Whether the answer comes from God or a person's own ability to see the light is not for me to determine. In the same way, miracles are real to some and not to others. When my mother passed out and we had to call the medics to revive her, I felt it was a miracle from God that he allowed her to regain consciousness and have her be a part of our lives for a few more years.

Char, I know you are devoted to God taught to you, and that is fine, for that belief can only make you a better person. It is the fanatics that believe they have the only "true" God that I run away from, for they are the ones causing hatred and are killing people in the name of God.

I wish you well and hope just as I have received you into my confidence you will have an open mind to visit the website, www.futureofgodamen.com. God bless you and I wish you a healthy New Year with lots of love.

Mike Voyce, December 30, 2011, 8:50 a.m. EST

After your long conversation with **Clarke M.**, may I return to your original piece?

In the West, Christianity, in its many forms of protest against Catholicism, is still the main religion and as such is targeted as standing for all. It is interesting that a similar protest against Islam, at least in the Middle East, would not be tolerated.

What runs right through the sectarian divides both within and between the various religious groupings is a fanatical obsession with dogma, in which the Word of God is all but drowned out by the human voice of “devout” religionists.

It is little wonder that uncommitted and rational minds turn against religion as being itself a vice and an evil. What such rational minds miss is that the fault lies not in God, or even with the religions, but in the bigotry of believing that each sect’s dogma carries the only true and eternal word of God.

Once the hate and fear of this purely human dogma is taken out of our consideration and divinity is approached in true love and true humility, the beauty of all religions and their common origin (as common origin they must surely have) will appear to confound the materialism of this world.

Nicholas Ginex, December 30, 2011, 8:03 p.m. EST

Hello Mike,

Thank you for joining this post, for you bring up a very valid point that has caused many people to be disenchanted with religion and thereby do not believe in God. You wrote: “What such rational minds miss is the fault lies not in God, or even with the religions, but in the bigotry of believing that each sect’s dogma carries the only true and eternal word of God.”

Is it somewhat strange that devout Judaic, Christian, and Islamic followers of God believe that their scriptures were inspired by God, but these very scriptures have caused division between people? The differences in the dogma of these scriptures do not provide a consistent

and unified belief in God; for which reason, they are the cause for bigotry, hatred, violence, and killing of innocent people.

People cannot but question if God is responsible for inspiring scripture for different groups of people that cause much of the turmoil in our world. Perhaps a truthful and honest answer is that scripture was written by righteous men who defined God and a set of moral laws for their own people. As we look back into history, we find that the first belief in one universal God was developed by a spiritual people over thousands of years. It was not inspired by God overnight within the minds of righteous men but conceived after many generations, where the belief in many gods became a personal belief in one God, the Creator of all there is.

It was the beliefs of a soul, a hereafter, and one universal God that developed in ancient Egypt and were adopted by the Hebrews. It is no accident that Amen, the greatest Egyptian god for over two thousand years before the birth of Jesus is announced in temples, churches, and mosques. The Moslems do not permit Amen to be announced in favor of allegiance to their god Allah. But Amen has subconsciously continued to exist in the minds of men, because he was indeed the first god to be revered and worshiped not only in Egypt, but in Syria, Palestine, and Nubia.

But to return to Mike's valid point that it is the different dogmas of these religions that have divided people in the belief of God. Only when people around the world come to realize that there is only one God and honor man's legacy of that God was first conceived within Egypt will there be a solution to resolve their differences. The most honest and truthful man of God was Jesus, who acknowledged Amen as, "*the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God*" (Rev. 3:14).

The question did God always exist or was he created is the topic of this post. An answer I submit is that God was created within the minds of men, and we still need to visualize that God as the one God of all people. God may be a hypothetical concept, but also, a possibility of an unknown energy that created "all there is" throughout the universe. How mankind utilizes the vision of God to benefit all of humanity is what our religious leaders need to ponder. Perhaps, they need to sit down and break bread with each other to agree on scripture that can be accepted by all people. This is an awesome task and will require

the loving hearts and perceptive minds of daughters and sons of God. Jesus has said there will be others who will do even greater works than he (John 14:12). To learn about the history of man's concept of God, visit the Web site www.futureofgodamen.com.

Clarke M., January 7, 2012, 12:39 a.m. EST

“Clark,

Once again you hypothesize and create information for our readers that may be true, but you do not provide verifiable evidence that the Indian and Iranian religions were more ancient than the Sumerian and Egyptian religions. Yes, you may be praised for stating that oral information has been handed down and found to be highly accurate.

However, the Indian and Iranian religions that may be more ancient may not have provided the kind of high level religious beliefs as developed in the written records of the ancient Egyptians. I would rather see you compare the beliefs of these religions with that of the Egyptian religion than simply make assertions that cannot be studied and assessed.”

Nicholas,

You have not done much research or looked into the sources I referred you to two several years ago. This is similar to your claim of authorities on Egyptian textbooks that are more than one hundred years old and have long since been shown to have made many errors in interpretation. The fact that much of your book makes claims that are not credible is simply the way it is. I have tried to show you this in the name of responsible scholarship.

The study of the Bible and other ancient texts as well as ancient cultures and their achievements is fascinating, and there are many discoveries to make. We have much to learn about what our ancestors understood and did. Our appreciation of history has increased a great deal since the nineteenth century, when many scholars and thinkers, especially in the West, believed that our ancestors were “uncivilized” and believed in superstitions and created stories to explain the real world. I can expand a bit on what I wrote about learning from the past. The Christ figure can be found in all the world religions described in different

ways. This does not deny that Jesus was not an historical figure or his mission was not performed on earth at a certain time and place.

The ideas of the Enlightenment have become diluted and distorted as has the application of the scientific method as a means of impartial inquiry. The attention was turned outward to the material world, and many lost an awareness of the spiritual world and how to cultivate the human faculties that enabled its perception. The visible world became seen as the real world and human beings as limited to physical bodies with the reasoning, rational faculty living in the natural world. The lack of vision of the real world can be corrected through the practice of right methods of cultivating, without sacrificing the rational faculty, rather by including it in an impartial way as a tool. The vision and perception of the world that former civilizations had can be regained. Mystics throughout the ages have described higher worlds in symbolic ways. But to experience them consciously requires development of the mind and the whole human being. This involves discipline and practice and is a learning process. We are discovering that former civilizations knew much we don't about the real world.

Contemporary humans are not able to achieve what some former civilizations—those that we have learned about and studied—could, for example, in the arts and sciences and technology. We are in a state of amnesia regarding much of the past. Former civilizations were able to know as one knowledge (what contemporary fields separate as science, art, philosophy, the religion(s), etc) which they expressed in different forms or branches: buildings, paintings, technology, cosmological teachings, rituals, and so on. Astronomers are discovering galaxies and planets that ancients knew of and described accurately. Modern astro-archeological investigation has demonstrated a consistently high awareness of astronomical phenomena in ancient Druidic, Mayan, Vedic, Greek, and Egyptian cultures that included not just solar, lunar, and eclipse cycles, the timing of solstice and equinox alignments, but in many cases the twenty-six-thousand-year cycle of the precession of the equinoxes. This awareness is not limited to major “high” cultures and sites like Stonehenge and Newgrange or speculations about the Great Pyramid. It appears in Ice Age Paleolithic art dating back thirty-five thousand years in Siberian geometric carvings. It shows up in Neanderthal cave paintings in France, where the ribs of horses marked lunar cycles. This Paleolithic art is increasingly viewed as expressing the ability to count the cycles of the sun, moon, and the synodic periods of certain highly visible planets like Venus. The

ability was nearly universal in early human cultures around the globe, suggesting an innate capacity in humans to observe and codify the cycles of nature.

Some of the ancient teachings were recorded in written language, but most of the content of the teachings was kept secret and transmitted to a few and only partly written down or coded. The keys and the practical methods of how to use the knowledge were guarded: Knowledge was not to be given to those who were not prepared to use it wisely.

The Bible is relatively recent compared to other sacred texts. The Indian are considered the oldest—with India the cradle of civilization—by most scholars, followed by the Iranian. However, the origins of the Asian religions may be older. The Middle Eastern and African/Egyptian religions appeared after the Indian and Iranian.

Modern people do not see the world as people of the past did, even since Shakespeare's time. Most today have lost the vision of higher worlds and beings that was once common. Some now do not believe Jesus did the things he did or think they were "miracles," not based on science and knowledge.

When moderns read ancient texts, most do not realize they contain different levels of meaning. If we accept the tradition that there are seven levels of humans, then some texts contain levels for humans 1, 2, 3, 4, and so on. The rational faculty of the mind that is highly cultivated now cannot comprehend higher levels of consciousness, whose content cannot be conveyed by words without the awareness to understand and experience some of their meaning. Few contemporary academics are qualified to interpret ancient texts because they haven't the training to understand states of consciousness. The fact that there are literally forty thousand Christian denominations indicates that people understand the Bible in many different ways. In all the world religions, including the Christian, the members are described as being on different levels of understanding. Those who are "believers" have less understanding than those who have "faith," for example. It is a question of experience and capability. The practices and rituals, together with reading, speaking aloud, and meditating on the words of sacred texts in all the world religions were designed and can enable all members to become more balanced and moral human beings and restrain their passions. When religious organizations become too dogmatic and fail to provide what they were created and structured to

do for humans, they may foster conflict and mix the wish for serving the welfare of the whole with the selfish desire to have power and be in control.

Jesus spoke to the multitude in one way, in parables; to his disciples, in another language. Believers—the multitude—according to the traditional teachings, may develop themselves through practice and experience an individual, deeper understanding beyond “belief,” termed “faith.” Mystics of all cultures demonstrate a common awareness of the deeper meanings of the teachings. Literal-minded researchers and translators who lack this capacity often do not understand the words and their meanings.

A single work of art created by conscious men—a statue of the Buddha, a Persian rug, a Tibetan *tangka*, the Chinese emperor’s robe, a temple dance—can contain a whole teaching. (Schools of philosophy often express their teachings as single ideas that altogether constitute the unity of the whole teaching.) These conscious works of art may touch everyone who sees them, yet according to the individual level of understanding they have and bring to them.

Those who practice different religions, read their texts, and participate in their rituals still can receive the benefit of their content (provided the forms and texts have not been too distorted or diluted and so retain enough of their original content) according to their level of development. We have forgotten what it means to be normally developed, balanced humans. In rediscovering ourselves, we can acquire the consciousness of reality that we have lost. In the past, great teachers appeared to provide complete teachings about the cosmos and how to live in it. Humanity is faced with the challenge of beginning as we are to relearn what our ancestors knew. The prison of the rational mind has self-condemned many to pessimism, despair, and a lack of a sense of meaning for their existence, but not for some creative people, like Arthur C. Clarke, inventor and author of *2001: A Space Odyssey* (1968), who said on his ninetieth birthday in 2007, “I have great faith in optimism as a guiding principle, if only because it offers us the opportunity of creating a self-fulfilling prophecy. So I hope we’ve learned something from the most barbaric century in history—the twentieth. I would like to see us overcome our tribal divisions and begin to think and act as if we were one family. That would be real globalization . . .”

Since the Enlightenment, over the last three hundred years, many have neglected the care and cultivation of the soul and inner being and have become attracted to ideas of progress, liberty, equality, and fraternity in society and have come to think humanity even has authority over the Creator. They have made a “God” in their own image, which is akin to a tail imagining it wags the dog. But many still find death a mystery and seek answers to questions of good and evil, human suffering, whether there is a “heaven and hell.” They feel something is not quite right when their lives endure moments of unexpected pain and disappointment.

While discoveries in nature and technology have speeded up, real knowledge of life and being has decreased. Change in how people live in the world has speeded up but also become more chaotic and without direction or meaning. There is a separation from reality. As change in linear time has increased, positive change in real time and the real world for humanity has slowed as men have lost their relation to the sacred, with the result many become less human and fail to be able to relate to a creative source of love, hope, and charity in their lives. Increasing barbarism, as Arthur C. Clarke noted, that even threatens to end our civilization has been a consequence. It seems that only through positive and intelligent efforts to wake up from this hypnotic state can humanity restore hope of it avoiding destruction through willful ignorance of itself. If the conditions continue to be as they are, life for humans will become more abnormal and “upside-down,” life, such as it is, “may resemble a place where the dead go for vacation,” a theater for “dead souls” to exist like robots. Such a “virtual reality” will lead to social chaos. The correct kind of human relations is an enduring challenge for society and its individual members. There have been periods in history when there were no wars, but for most of what is known of the past, this has not been so. The twentieth century was marked by two world wars and in the twenty-first, as we are becoming a global society, nations are competing for control of the planet’s resources.

Education in consciousness and self-awareness, the care of the soul, is necessary. The cultivation of consciousness through practice is possible—with proven, safe, and sure methods that have been taught in all cultures—which are available to many today. Among various teachings, the world religions have preserved knowledge of the means and methods, and they provide one source of knowledge and guidance available to people of any or no religious inclination or belief.

The saying “The mind is the slayer of the real” points to the obstacle that contemporary education and society has created. People are taught to become successful, responsible, and well-adjusted according to what society demands. As individuals, they must conform to what society wants or have failed lives. People learn to be useful to society to survive and care for their families and maintain a civilization that serves the shared needs of the whole body politic. They learn to accept the ideas about life and reality that they are taught. As Carl Jung, the proponent of individual development, once said to a leading church leader who admitted that he taught dogma to the masses because they couldn’t accept more, “There is no such thing as the masses. There are only individuals.”

People learn to suppress from childhood their development of the capacity to think for themselves and reach the age of maturity conditioned to accept the ideas that they are taught. They become prisoners of what they believe are their own thoughts about the nature of reality, whether or not they are true. This applies to highly educated ones regarding science and religion as well as the less educated. They think their thoughts are their own and do not realize that most of what they think is purely learned, mechanical, habitual reactions to their daily impressions, their feelings, sensations, and perceptions, which may have little relation to reality. They are enveloped in a world of changing “phenomena” in which they themselves do not exist as persons aware of having an individuality, in a semi-conscious state akin to hypnosis in which they dream they are the various roles (sometimes competing multiple “identities” not known to each other) they have become conditioned to play in life.

Humans are born with the potential to become self-conscious, yet many do not develop to become “normal” humans and live their lives in a semi-conscious state. Shocks in life, as the death of a parent or friend or an encounter with danger, may wake them up for a moment. But usually, they forget those moments and continue as before. The fact is we are dual. To see and accept the contradiction between our two natures always brings discomfort. We imagine we are the person who acts in ordinary life and do not relate to our human essence that is the ground of individuality. Our birthright gave us the possibility of becoming “normal” humans. A few do not forget and deny what they saw in those moments. Through repeated moments of “waking up,” they begin to realize that most of the time they live in a semi-conscious state. By self-study they can increase moments of self—consciousness. This

work can foster the development of an inner life that is able to relate to their essence, which contains the germ of a potential individuality, as the Upanishads call it “a self of one’s own.”

In the New Testament, Jesus often begins his speeches to his disciples with the phrase, “Fear not, . . .” He recognizes their duality, their two natures, and knows the pain of contradiction that humans feel when, at moments, they begin to wake up to this condition. He seeks to teach them how to be aware of their situation and to undertake the work of knowing and taking responsibility for both sides of their condition so that the higher part may become master of the lower part. The goal is to become sons of the Son. The selfish part, like the ego, fears losing control and does not wish to hear the call of the higher to serve it and not believe it is master. In the Koran, Satan is characterized as “whispering in our breasts.” We are told not to listen, that is not to allow ourselves to be beguiled by selfish desires that can control us and make us their slave.

Nicholas Ginex, January 8, 2012, 8:06 p.m. EST

Hello Clark,

Thank you for your response. It shows a deep concern about man’s spiritual development being compromised by the fast pace of science and technology. But also, with the luxury of more time being afforded by advances in technology and agriculture, people appear to become self-absorbed in material and sensual gratification.

I do not dispute your scholarly observations that many cultures of the past have developed high levels of understanding of their world by being more closely aligned with the spiritual aspects of Creation. Being not as technologically advanced as we are today, they were more in touch with their inner selves as they thought about how they fit in the scheme of Creation. I do not know to what level of thought these people of more than twenty thousand or more years have been, for we have no concrete evidence of their ability to reason on many different issues.

However, as I reflect on some of the writings of the Vedic Age, in particular, the hymns of the Rig Veda, which were composed by the early Indo-Aryans around the last half of the second millennium BCE, I am impressed with the Aryan priests’ speculation about the origin

of Creation. Clark, I would like to share their search to envision God because I agree with you that man has always been in search of his existence and purpose. The following are extracts of the 129th hymn of the tenth Rig Veda book from *Man's Religions* by John B. Noss, 5th Ed. I provide it because it reveals the depth of thought given by the Aryan priests, who were on the cusp of defining God. However, I stress that as remarkable in reflection as this hymn is, it does not surpass the conception of one universal God provided by Amenhotep IV, *The Hymn to the Aton* and the Egyptian priesthood hymn, *Amon as the Sole God*. Extracts of both hymns are provided in *Future of God Amen*.

That One Thing (*Man's Religions*, Page 93, Early Hinduism: The Passage from Ritual Sacrifice to Mystical Union)

Then there was neither being (Sat) nor non-being (Asat):

There was no air, nor firmament beyond it.

Was there a stirring? Where? Beneath what cover?

Was there a great abyss of unplumbed water?

There was no death nor anything immortal;

Nor any sign dividing day and night.

That One Thing, breathing no air, was yet self-breathing;

No second thing existed whatsoever.

Darkness was hidden in a deeper darkness;

This All was as a sea without dimensions;

The Void still held unformed what was potential,

Until the power of Warmth (tapas) produced the Sole One.

Then, in that One, Desire stirred into being,

Desire that was the earliest seed of Spirit.

(The sages probing in their hearts with wisdom

Discovered being's kinship to non-being.

Stretching their line across the void, they pondered;

Was aught above it, or was aught below it?)

Bestowers of the seed were three; and powers;

Free energy below; above, swift action.

Who truly knows, and who can here declare it?

Whence it was born, and how this world was fashioned?

The gods came later than the earth's creation:

Who knows then out of what the world has issued?

Whether the world was made or was self-made,
He knows with full assurance, he alone,
Who in the highest heaven guards and watches;
He knows indeed, but then, perhaps, he knows not!

Note: The Rig Veda was likely composed between roughly 1700-1100 BCE, making it one of the oldest texts of any Indo-Iranian language, one of the world's oldest religious texts. It was preserved over centuries by oral tradition alone and was probably not put in writing before the early Middle Ages.

What is striking about the Rig Veda hymn above is that even the Aryan priests were not certain of their speculation about the existence of God. We note that the close of the Vedic period comes around the same period of time when the Priesthood of Amon wrote *Amon as the Sole God*, circa 1270 BCE, written before Moses left Egypt around 1250 BCE.

Clark, I share your aspiration of a future whereby mankind will be able to attain a higher level of understanding and a greater sensitivity to their purpose in life. You had stated that "Education in consciousness and self-awareness, the care of the soul, is necessary." I am in total agreement, but how that is to be achieved will be by the world religions to become proactive and not sit on their laurels of scripture that have become archaic, full of myths, inconsistencies, and abominations of the Word of God.

As I have stressed in many of my responses in various comments made to many members on Gather, the scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are in dire need of being improved upon. We must admit that these very scriptures have caused much division, separation, bigotry, hatred, violence, and the killing of innocent people. Yes, their intention was noble to raise the moral and ethical level of how we treat one another. But also, they were written by a unique people who wrote their scriptures for their own kind, influenced by their own traditions and culture.

The differences in the major religious scriptures are so great that we have not only documented the atrocities of the past, but we are beginning to see the possibilities of a Third World War. To say the scriptures were inspired by God is simply a lie. They are a compilation

of moral laws learned through years of experience and written by priests to insure stability and eliminate disharmony within their culture. Today, the world is much smaller, and people are beginning to interact with their bias and differences that have been taught through their religious institutions.

Clark, the saving grace will be via technology, whereby through communication via the Internet, people will learn more about each other and walls of suspicion and bigotry will be coming down. But to insure such a process, should not the religious leaders themselves be proactive? They must have some common sense that they have all got to work together to resolve their differences and unify their belief in God. To do otherwise, their religious institutions will eventually crumble and die. We will have to recognize that if the religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions do not work with our educational system to improve our relationships morally and ethically, then so be it—humanity will have to proceed without them.

What religious leaders and educators alike need to do is put their energies to work to devise a moral/ethical system that improves human development from the early stages well into higher learning institutions at professional levels. I see it as a two-pronged approach, which involves both religious and educational institutions. But the question is will the rulers of each country allow people to become self-independent thinkers that can easily discern corruption, dishonesty, and arrogance? Herein is where the people themselves must demand changes in their religious, educational, and political institutions whereby they seek the highest levels of integrity which is based upon truth, compassion, and love for others.

Clarke M., January 25, 2012, 8:51 a.m. EST

Nicholas,

The Vedas are thousands of years older than most academics claim. We have little knowledge of civilizations before twelve thousand years ago, and we should not assume they were not more advanced than the ones we know something about since. That there were enlightened beings in the ancient civilizations we are learning more about seems clear because we have learned we haven't the technology and knowledge to do what those civilizations we can study could do. The correlations between what scientists are discovering about the

universe and what ancient texts say is evident, but the knowledge of consciousness and mind that the ancients knew has not yet begun to be understood and studied by contemporary scientists. The development of consciousness is possible, and some do develop it and transmit the knowledge to others. The decline in intelligence over the centuries of the majority is what needs to be reversed: We are in a “dark phase” of human civilization as the ancients described it, as they conceived of four phases, each spanning many thousands of years, moving from gold to iron. It is true that right relations among people is the greatest challenge, but only through developing the consciousness can society become more human. The religions have lost what knowledge they once had, and materialistic thought and science can only bring about further decline. People have the potential of developing but most fear change. When conditions become more difficult, that may make more people wish to learn and seek to develop.

Jerry Kays, January 26, 2012, 1:44 a.m. EST

“To say the scriptures were inspired by God is simply a lie.”

I must respectfully disagree with that statement, Nicholas. To say that proves to me that one has *not* yet met *God* (not God nor gods) . . . Once that happens to one, they will forever know without a doubt that *God*, the Spiritual Realm through their own soul, can most definitely inspire them with truths which were before unknown to them. That all which has been written claiming such inspiration is true though is false . . . some is, much is not.

IMnsHE and O.

Nicholas Ginex, January 26, 2012, 2:43 a.m. EST

Hello Jerry,

My statement “To say the scriptures were inspired by God is simply a lie” may sound like I have little regard for the spiritual inspirations that mankind is capable of. Please understand that I believe that the Spirit of God pervades the universe and we are part of that Spirit trying to reach out and understand our beginning in the scheme of Creation. Is it God or is it mankind that develops higher and higher concepts of a Creator God? The God we conceive has been developed, at least to me, by man himself. In our arrogance, some religions have

conceived God in the image of man. I am honest in that I do not know the mysterious, incomprehensible, and unknowable God. We humans can only conceptualize our God, and depending upon our exposure to dogmas and beliefs of existing religions, we use that knowledge to extend our own feelings, beliefs, and inspirations of God. Every human being has a different view and vision of God depending upon their sensitivity, intelligence, and disposition.

Yes, I believe in God, but the truths I acquire in life have come to me only by reason, analysis, and hypothetical thought based upon experience of what works and has been proven throughout the ages. Thoughts are developed in the minds of those who love to reflect and try to understand ideas that may become reality. Did Einstein think of relativity, or did God inspire him with a hypothetical idea that became real?

I truly believe that mankind has a spiritual nature and he is responsible for creating the image of God we worship today. But our image, our concept of God, is still in its infancy. I pray and appeal to our daughters and sons of God to assist religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions to work together and unify their belief in one universal God. To fail at this challenge, we will remain at a static level of spiritual development with dogma and scripture that is in dire need of being improved upon. There is much knowledge to be gained by reading *Future of God Amen*, for it reveals how mankind has come to revere the God we envision today.

Nicholas Ginex, January 9, 2012, 9:06 a.m. EST

Hello Richard,

Thank you for your direct response, for I also believe Jesus was born from a mother and father. Actually, I must say that I have always found myself in agreement with your comments. You have added to this post in an admirable way with your in-depth knowledge of the Bible.

I would like to express why I am committed to revealing what I have learned about the belief in God. It is my feeling that mankind does have a spiritual nature, in that there will always be a search for how did the universe come into being? This question will not be clearly understood until science has learned how the first atom was formed. Was it matter or energy, resorting to Einstein's equation, which began

the beginning of the universe? I am of the belief that it was energy that somehow materialized into matter in order to express itself.

We, organic life, one of many other kinds of life throughout the universe, are the product of that force that has materialized itself into consciousness that seeks to have us learn of its beginning. I call that force God. The idea of God is not a bad thing, nor can God be defined, for God is mysterious, unknowable, and incomprehensible. However, there is that force of desire to exist and such existence can only be accomplished by the unification of many atoms that finally breeds organic life. The force therefore appears to have the element of love to cause the creation of life.

My objective is to preserve our spiritual nature. Thousands of years have given mankind a belief in God. That belief will always exist, even after science has learned how that force began the universe. The spiritual experience of many men who have desired to have us commune with their vision of God has led to a fundamental command given to us by Jesus, which is the Word of God—love one another. Love is the underlying principle that is inherent and sustains the force in all of us. It is my hope that mankind will learn the fundamental rule to love one another, and that is why I now know why I wrote *Future of God Amen*.

Richard W., January 9, 2012, 10:39 p.m. EST

“The idea of God is not a bad thing, nor can God be defined for God is mysterious, unknowable, and incomprehensible.”

Do you want to know what God is like? God is a little man who sits on a throne surrounded by weird creatures who sing “Holy Holy Holy” to him all day and night (Isa. 6:1-4, Rev. 4:1-9).

Originally, God was created in the image of man. God lived longer than mankind, and God had a few tricks to impress people with, but He was not much different from men or women.

Today God is, as you said, “mysterious, unknowable, and incomprehensible.”

The old God is preferable. God made noise stumbling around in the Garden. God spoke to the people through prophets. God made the

sun and the moon stand still. God spoke to Moses face-to-face. God walked through the camp of the Israelites.

Today's God has no substance. He is the same as no god at all.

Nicholas Ginex, January 10, 2012, 11:43 p.m. EST

Hello Richard,

I see you are disenchanted with the whole concept of God. But is that because you prefer the "old God," stumbling around in a Garden? I think not. You have no desire to believe in God and that's OK. However, for as long as man thinks about how the universe was created and his purpose in life, he will always believe in God. It is the nature of mankind to try to understand the world and the one answer he will not be able to attain is how was the universe born?

As you know, God is a concept, a belief that is uniquely developed in the minds of those who think about what is beyond their own existence and how did the billions of galaxies form? Yes, God is a concept, a belief that provides an answer to what can mankind aspire to. The ancient Egyptians put that idea of God to good use by developing a moral code of conduct by which people can peacefully live together. The reward was an eternal life with their God.

Admittedly, educated people like you no longer believe in an eternal hereafter, because they long ago realized that the idea of hell was a stupid idea to begin with. No god would allow his creations to suffer the pains of hell for millions of years. So I understand why you reject the concept of God. But what many people have missed is that we are all made of the same substance that created the universe. We are fortunate to be organic, whereby we have developed the capacity to think. What was the force or energy that brought both inorganic and organic matter into being? Was that initial force the will to express itself in living matter? Are we reaching out to understand that force or energy many of us characterize as God? What is the underlying principle, beginning with the atom, that causes the bonding of matter into inorganic and organic compounds? Is there a will, a desire, perhaps love that exists to finally express itself in the highest form of matter capable of thinking about where and how did it all start? Could there be a God? We don't really know, but we are always reaching out to explore that unknown.

When we no longer have the mind to think about our purpose in life and how we can better relate with one another by conceiving a God that was the Maker of all things, then we have become gods who only believe in ourselves. We become robots who no longer care to imagine and create within our minds the joy of understanding the unknown, incomprehensible, and mysterious God.

Richard W., January 9, 2012, 3:46 p.m. EST

The problem with the New Testament's use of the word "love" is that it uses the Greek word "agape," which is the sterile "brotherly love," which doesn't mean much.

I prefer the more energetic "eros," which is lacking in the New Testament. This may be because of Paul's disdain for women.

On the other hand, the Old Testament does talk about erotic love, especially in Song of Songs. The wordplay in the poem is tremendous. I'm always learning something new about it.

Do not stare at me because I am dark, for the sun has stared at me.

My the sons of my mother burned in anger at me; they made
me the keeper of the vineyards. Alas, my own vineyard
I could not keep! (Song of Songs 1:6)

The above translation is more literal than most. But here you can see how the first line leads into the parallelism of the second and third lines: She was dark, because the sun stared at her. She was dark because her brothers burned in anger at her. The last line refers to her virginity. Could her brothers have been angry at her because she was burned by the sun while having sex in the vineyard?

While the king was at his banqueting couch, my nard gave forth its
fragrance. My beloved is like a fragrant pouch of myrrh spending
the night between my breasts. My beloved is like a cluster of henna
blossoms in the vineyards of En-Gedi. (Song of Songs 1:12-14)

The "banqueting couch" was a divan with cushions upon which a person could lay while eating a meal. Nard and myrrh are perfume-like scents. Notice how the second and third lines are parallel with the

fourth and fifth lines (i.e. they both follow the same thought patterns: Her beloved . . . myrrh . . . between her breasts—her beloved . . . henna blossoms . . . in the vineyards of En-Gedi.) En-Gedi is a triangular desert oasis on the shore of the Salt Lake. It has a stream coming out of the rocks which waters it's lush vegetation. In other words, the king is between her legs.

Like an apple tree among the trees of the forest, so is my beloved among the young men. I delight to sit in his shade, and his fruit is sweet to my taste. (Song of Songs 2:3)

The NET Bible commentary goes to an extreme length to explain why the above does not refer to oral sex. In actuality, oral sex plays a large role in the Songs.

Below is a male lover comparing his beloved to a garden:

You are a locked garden, my sister, my bride; you are an enclosed spring, a sealed-up fountain. Your shoots are a royal garden full of pomegranates with choice fruits: henna with nard, nard and saffron; calamus and cinnamon with every kind of spice, myrrh and aloes with all the finest spices. You are a garden spring, a well of fresh water flowing down from Lebanon. (Song of Songs 4:12-15)

The next verse is her reply:

Awake, O north wind; come, O south wind! Blow on my garden so that its fragrant spices may send out their sweet smell. May my beloved come into his garden and eat its delightful fruit! (Song of Songs 4:16)

And the man replies back:

I have entered my garden, O my sister, my bride; I have gathered my myrrh with my balsam spice. I have eaten my honeycomb and my honey; I have drunk my wine and my milk!

Eat, friends, and drink! Be drunk on love! (Song of Songs 5:1)

I love those last two lines.

There are several more beautiful passages, but it will take too long to go through them all. Maybe I should do a post on the Songs.

Nicholas Ginex, January 11, 2012, 1:45 a.m. EST

Hello Richard,

I enjoyed the several Song of Songs, and your posting an interpretation of some of them would be very delectable. I read some of them many years ago and was also impressed with their erotic connotations. It shows that Solomon had a voracious appetite for sexual amours, and with a large number of women, he enjoyed many types of fruits. I especially enjoyed a few verses you did not include, which were from the Song of Solomon 4:3-6:

Thy lips are like a thread of scarlet, and thy speech is comely: thy temples are like a piece of a pomegranate within thy locks. Thy neck is like the tower of David built for an armory, whereon there hang a thousand bucklers, all shields of mighty men.

Thy two breasts are like two young roes that are twins, which feed among the lilies. Until the day break and the shadows flee away, I will get me to the mountain of myrrh, and to the hill of frankincense.

Like you, I refer to love in all its ways; be it brotherly or sisterly, a mother's and or father's love, or the love of somebody you are able to share physically, emotionally, and mentally. It is love that makes the world go round. I can still remember the words of the song I would sing at nursing and care centers for the elderly, *Love Makes the World Go Round*.

I believe it is this kind of love Jesus meant when he said "love one another." It was a command from God, and Jesus announced it three times in John's Gospel. Yet, you hear few religious leaders teach this to their people. Is it because the religious and ruling (R&R) leaders know that if people would truly learn to love one another with respect, honesty, and compassion, they would lose control of their group to kill another group of people for either resources, wealth, and power that they wish to attain?

Richard W., January 11, 2012, 3:04 a.m. EST

I extended the commentary and posted it under the title *Biblical Erotic Poetry*.

Clarke M., January 26, 2012, 5:38 a.m. EST

It is not reasonable to think that humans originated on earth. The atoms in one's left hand may have come from one star, while those in the right came from another. We are all made of stardust. Intelligence creates different forms in the universe that depend on their existence for their changing relations with all other created forms, a continual process occurring to all and everywhere. There is only a constant movement up and down throughout the whole scale. This process pertains to humans as to every other form. We process in ourselves everything always.

Clarke M., January 31, 2012, 3:42 p.m. EST

Through working with the mind, we can study the whole universe in ourselves as well as outside ourselves. The mind is not the brain, which a physical organ formed by intelligence as everything else in the universe.

Nicholas Ginex, January 31, 2012, 10:31 p.m. EST

Hello Clarke,

Your two comments dated January 26 and January 31, 2012 do not address the topic of this post. However, out of courtesy to your thoughts, I will try to respond.

I find myself in agreement with your statement that we are all made of stardust which creates different forms of intelligence throughout the universe. We are made up of the atoms that form both organic and inorganic matter. However, each form of life that reaches a level to communicate with their species attains an intelligence that may not be uniform among the planets that circle other stars.

Intelligence, as you say, is a continual process occurring everywhere, but the level of intelligence is formed by the environment that is conducive to thinking and reflection. Is there an intelligence that pervades the universe, or is it the life forms that are created that are able to exhibit intelligence? Yes, the possibilities are endless for life to become so advanced that it begins to question its very existence and if there is a purpose for its existence. We humans have reached such a level, but we are still at the infancy of understanding how best

we can live with one another. Until that goal is achieved, a greater understanding of that force or intelligence we many times refer to as God will materialize.

Since I am not a scientist or a psychologist, I can only hypothesize, but I enjoy thinking of possibilities even if they may never materialize.

Clarke M., February 1, 2012, 8:07 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

We should have a more balanced perspective on humanity and its evolution. We tend to “glorify” our importance in the scheme of things and foolishly use the world religions to do so. Humanity is still far from evolved and has a long way to go to become truly “human.” This is evident with those who interpret the Bible and Jesus’s teaching in terms of our own limited knowledge and understanding. Our individual experience of the truth of scripture may indeed guide us to work for the transformation of ourselves and others with humility and acceptance of the power of God’s grace. But as we still are, we know nothing relative to the wisdom of God or Higher Intelligence. We know former great civilizations had greater knowledge of science and technology and the arts than are own: We are unable to do things they could do. We are discovering more and more about this. The Bible was given to groups that were tribal in nature, not on the level of the advanced civilizations that had preceded them. Yet this teaching represented a new dispensation of the one source of knowledge intended to further humanity’s evolution “for many tomorrows.”

We are still just beginning to evolve as humans, as even the most avowed secularist can admit when considering the barbarism of the twentieth century, the irresponsible use of technologies, and the degradation of the Earth and now possibly other planets as we venture into space. We have much to rediscover and learn from past civilizations that had a deeper understanding of the laws of the universe and were able to work to balance and harmonize the planet with the forces of the sun, planets, and stars. The arrogance and selfishness that is supported by the materialism of our times is also evident in the lack of right relations among peoples of all cultures and religions today. The cries for justice and freedom from the tyranny of the few over the many are valid. In this regard, the teachings of the religions in their essential form offer guidance and wisdom. We know that Jesus brought “not peace but

a sword” and instructed his disciples to do likewise as they traveled from town to town with him, condemning some towns, separating individuals from their families. Yet his message was that we learn to love our neighbor as ourselves. We still crucify him every day, weak as we are, yet we also may feel remorse and seek mercy. That is our situation and we can work with it, if we have the courage and wish to persevere.

Clarke M., February 1, 2012, 8:35 p.m. EST

You seem to assume that intelligence does not exist in every created form in the universe and that all forms do not relate and “communicate” with each other always and everywhere. We are subject to the influences of everything in the universe. They pass through us, and we transmit them and transform them up and down the scale of Creation just as everything else does—angels or stones. Consider that our ancestors may have been on earth for more than 2 million years. Some scientists suggest all life was eliminated at least once, perhaps 400,000 years ago. The oldest communities archaeologists have excavated date from 900,000 years ago (as in Crete and North Jordan). There have been many earth changes. All the world religions that we know of tell of great floods. What materialistic scientists can observe is only 4 percent of the universe. They do not see the world as it is. Those with vision do.

Nicholas Ginex, February 2, 2012, 2:19 a.m. EST

Hello Clarke,

I find your ideas about our evolution very interesting and would like to pursue them further. You stated, “We should have a more balanced perspective on humanity and its evolution.” Then you amplified this idea by stating “Humanity is far from evolved and has a long way to go to become truly ‘human.’” Then you referenced the Bible and Jesus’s teaching, implying we have limited knowledge and understanding of his purpose on earth.

If you have read *Future of God Amen*, you will know my position regarding the Bible, which encompasses the Torah and New Testament. I have critiqued these scriptures as well as the Koran. My conclusions were that these scriptures were written by righteous men for their own people. These scriptures compile ideas about morality that were

acquired, as you say, by wise men many generations ago and perhaps former great civilizations that we unfortunately have no knowledge of their intelligence or contributions.

As a practical man who tries to be a realist and deal constructively with findings and evidence that we can interpret and analyze, I do not share your belief that there were former “great civilizations” that had greater knowledge of science, technology, and the arts. Even if this were true, there are no written records that we can decipher and compare with the knowledge we have attained today.

However, as portrayed in *Future of God Amen*, we have been fortunate enough to have had some of our brilliant minds decipher the hieroglyphics of the ancient Egyptians. Here, we do find a trail of how our ancestors developed a vision of one universal God. The Hebrews were exposed to and influenced by the concepts of a soul, a hereafter upon living a life of righteousness and morality, a Son of God, and finally, after many generations, by the time we arrive at Ramses II reign, the Priesthood of Amon wrote scripture that reveres one universal God, Amen, the Creator of all there is.

Jesus was schooled in the Torah and learned of the Egyptian god for, perhaps, unwittingly or purposely, the priests who wrote the Bible left in the New Testament the most profound words of Jesus in Revelation by John. I shall repeat them here because few people understand the impact and meaning of his words. Jesus proclaimed to those who “hath an ear” in Revelation 3:13 the following astounding revelation in 3:14 few people are capable of comprehending, which is:

These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness,
the beginning of the creation of God.

Jesus verifies a core theme of the book *Future of God Amen*, which concludes Amen is the God of truth that has never lost His influence on the minds of men, for His name is announced in temples and churches and sung with holy reverence even today.

So yes Clarke, you are correct in that we humans still do not truly understand the purpose of Jesus as a representative of God. In John’s Gospel, Jesus announced a command three times, and our religious leaders do not acknowledge this command as the “greatest command” given to mankind—*love one another*. Like you, religious leaders

always refer to “thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,” which was learned by Jesus from Leviticus 19:18; a command given by God to Moses. However, *love one another* is much more inclusive in that it goes beyond one’s neighbor but includes all our sisters and brothers of any country.

Again, Clarke, you are correct in that we humans are still at our infancy in our development. Until we learn to love our sisters and brothers from any country, how can we learn to love God that is a vision and construct of the mind? This Intelligence you write as being God we have no comprehension of; for God is mysterious, incomprehensible, and unknowable. It is only through the intelligence of mankind can we learn to fully appreciate this unknown Force of the universe we call God.

Clarke, in your comment of February 1, 2012, 8:35 p.m., you wrote: “You seem to assume that intelligence does not exist in every created form in the universe and that all forms do not relate and ‘communicate’ with each other always and everywhere.” In reply, I do not believe intelligence exists in every created form in the universe because I do not know how you define such intelligence. The life form of a bee, a flower, and a stone has atoms that shape their existence, but to any degree the questions of whether they exhibit any intelligence to communicate on a high level of hypothetical thought is improbable. As much as you may give credence to the civilizations that existed 900,000 years ago, there is no evidence that they reached the level of communication and scientific achievements as our present civilization. Did they develop television, electric light, aircraft, and show any evidence of going to the moon? Today, we have some of the greatest writers and scientists that have learned from the knowledge they acquired from the past. Let us not be so arrogant as to not acknowledge the amount of knowledge we have all around us.

What humans have got to learn is that our scriptures are out of date with inconsistencies and abominations that have caused division, bigotry, hate, and violence between people of the different religions. An appeal in *Future of God Amen* is given for our sisters and sons of God, those with loving hearts and perceptive minds, to assist courageous religious leaders to work together and improve their scriptures so that there is unity in our belief in God. To not meet this challenge, the religions will eventually crumble and die as mankind stays at a stagnant level of development. If the challenge is undertaken and succeeds, humans will “become truly human” by being able to advance to the next level of their spiritual development.

Clarke M., February 2, 2012, 10:36 a.m. EST

For a materialistic state of mind, the universe is merely physical matter, limited by linear time, not omnipresent, containing many worlds and beings. “From beginning to end,” there is always present what all the world religions recognize as “Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.” Electric light, aircraft, nuclear bombs, etc.? There are artifacts indicating former civilizations had these and much more. We cannot understand how they created things they did and cannot duplicate what they did. It’s our turn to carry on for better or worse. We may make worse mistakes or fewer than those before.

Clarke M. February 2, 2012, 3:06 p.m. EST

Religions call to the many and there is no need to “change” any of them, although we realize their leaders may fail to understand them and even distort them. Humanity evolves slowly, but always there are individuals who are able to undertake the “rapid” path of self-evolution, which serves the general evolution. This answers your question (as I already have) as to whether “Jesus has always existed.” The “Son” has always existed as he says, as Alpha and Omega.

“All humans share a physical body with Adam—and that physical body will die—but through Jesus, everyone is offered a spiritual body,” (1 Cor. 15:44).

The connection between Jesus and Adam is fundamental to Christian doctrine and holds together the entire Christian system or “salvation story” in all its stages—“election, redemption, atonement, justification (acquittal), regeneration, and sanctification.”

This agrees with the fundamental teachings of other traditions. As individuals, we have the potential of creating a second body or soul in this life which survives the death of the physical body.

Nicholas Ginex, February 2, 2012, 11:06 p.m. EST

Hello Clarke,

Thank you for returning to the topic of this post, *Has Jesus Always Existed or Was He Created?* In reference to your February 2, 2012, 10:36 a.m. comment, I find you making assertions that are not realistic.

First, you wrote that the universe is merely physical matter and not omnipresent, but then get to your central thought that “from beginning to end,” there is always present what the world religions recognize as “Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.” You then go on to write that the electric light, aircraft, nuclear bombs, etc. have existed in former civilizations confirmed by artifacts and we today cannot duplicate what they did.

Your logic is faulty in that not all religions recognize “Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.” Also, you have no evidence that former civilizations developed at the technological level as we have today and perhaps, exceeded our scientific development. You end your comment by stating we may make worse or fewer mistakes than those civilizations before us.

It appears that you are disenchanted with our present civilization by not acknowledging the advances we have made in not only science, but also the higher levels of learning, whereby we have produced many gifted writers in all fields, be they technical or associated with the arts and understanding of the human mind.

What has truly stunted the spiritual advancement of human beings is that the scriptures they so highly revere and study are archaic and sorely need to be improved upon. I contend with absolute certainty that the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic scriptures, though effective instruments for a former time, uniquely written for different groups of people, have caused bigotry, hatred, violence, and the murder of innocent human beings. There is no doubt, as the past two millennium has demonstrated, that the religious views taught by these three religions have caused many unholy deaths between the people of each religion. In fact, today we are witnessing many more deaths as fanatical religious extremists of the Islamic religion expand their interests in other territories around the world.

Still, you contend that, “Religions call to the many and there is no need to ‘change’ any of them, although we realize their leaders may fail to understand them and even distort them.” Clarke, I perceive you as a staunch believer of the Christian religion whose mind is not open to compromise. Change of the religious scriptures can benefit the human race if religious leaders work together to unify the belief in God and teach the Word of God—*love one another*.

Like you, I have great respect for Jesus as the greatest man of God who has given us the “greatest command” from God, *love one another*. This

command was announced three times in the Gospel of John by Jesus and yet, you do not hear religious leaders teaching the Word of God. I also believe that Jesus was the Son of Man, an expression he used to refer to himself stated seventy-six times in the four Gospels. Only in the last Gospel of John did Jesus explicitly refer to himself as the Son of God and that was only five times. So are we to believe Jesus or the last Gospel written when the Church Fathers became emboldened to raise Jesus to the level of a God?

Unlike you, I do not subscribe to the belief that the “Son” Jesus has always existed as Alpha and Omega. This is one of the inconsistencies of the Bible, for Jesus himself stated quite clearly that it is Amen who is, “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.” Note, Jesus says that Amen was a “creation” that finally led to the “creation of God.” This statement clearly acknowledges that the Egyptian God Amen was conceived by mankind as the first one universal God of all creation. This vision by the Egyptian priesthood led to the belief in God as existing from the very beginning of time and was not created.

Clarke, you quoted 1 Corinthians 15:44, “All humans share a physical body with Adam—and that physical body will die—but through Jesus, everyone is offered a spiritual body.” You are subscribing to a belief that is taught in the Bible regarding Adam as the father of God’s children on earth. Sorry, this is highly false from a logical point of view because the creation of Adam and Eve was estimated as 4004 BCE according to the Irish archbishop and chronologist James Ussher. We already know mankind existed in many parts of the earth millions of years before that date.

You must realize that the Bible was written by highly righteous men who were inspired to improve the morality of their people. This was an effort initially done by the first formal religion known to man and recorded on the monuments, temples, and pyramids in Egypt. The Egyptian priesthood was astute and perceptive to change their beliefs from many gods to finally arrive at the vision of one universal God. This belief was documented during the reign of Ramses II before the Moses Exodus in the hymn *Amon as the Sole God*.

It was the Egyptian religion that introduced the concepts of a soul, a hereafter upon leading a moral and righteous life, a Son of God, and after many gods, one universal God. If you are well read and open to new and verifiable facts and findings, you will easily appreciate that

the Egyptian religion was the forerunner of the birth of the three major religions existing today.

I strongly recommend you read *Future of God Amen* and become knowledgeable of the history of man's development in the belief of one universal God. To deny history that conclusively proves that the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions have their roots in the Egyptian religion is to live in ignorance and be a slave to only the religious dogma you have been taught.

Once again, I write for all those with the ability to receive and accept new information that has value based on truth to know that the scriptures of today are in dire need of being revised. Are our religious leaders so proud, arrogant, and stuck in the dogma they have been taught that they cannot work together to unify their beliefs with scriptures that do not cause divisions between people but unite them in the belief in one God?

Clarke M., February 3, 2012, 8:41 a.m. EST

Nicholas,

I will pass on further discussion. To sum up here:

Religions call to the many. They are not "all the same" any more than all humans are the same. Let each religion serve those who follow it for the good it contains. The essence of all the world religions is contained in alchemical teachings. These are for the few individuals who have the wish and will to seek and learn them through right practices and discipline. Jesus speaks to his disciples of "being born again" and being "wise as serpents and harmless as doves" and guides them to perform the "miracles" he did. He condemns those towns they visit who do not welcome them and calls for individuals who choose to follow him to leave their families. "Let the dead bury their dead." "Narrow is the Way."

Nicholas Ginex, February 3, 2012, 5:09 p.m. EST

Clarke,

Thank you for initiating a very interesting discussion. You are correct that not all religions are the same and each has benefits to teach followers morality. It is hoped that the alchemical teachings do transform many people to a higher level of compassion and love

for their fellow human beings. Jesus left mankind with the “greatest command” given by God, which he was so emphatic that he stated it three times; it is the Word of God—*love one another*.

Many believers in God have been taught to believe in the dogma of their religion and lack the understanding of the Word of God. If the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions truly intend to achieve the alchemical transformation that improves the morality of their followers, they would all agree that their present scriptures sorely need to be improved in order to eliminate the bigotry, hate, violence, and killing of innocent people.

Religious leaders of the major religions must be as flexible, astute, perceptive, and wise as the Egyptian priesthood to realize that knowledge acceptable at a former time in the past must be improved upon as greater experience and understanding of our world is acquired. If the Egyptian priesthood had perceptive minds to improve their beliefs whereby they finally arrived at the belief in one universal God, why can't our religious leaders of today do the same?

Nothing in this world remains static but must undergo change as we acquire more knowledge about ourselves and our world. Even truth, acceptable at one point in time, needs to be refined and improved upon as we learn more about ourselves and world.

To “let each religion serve those who follow it for the good it contains” is shortsighted and naive. To close our eyes for all the injustices and unholy deaths that have been precipitated by the three major religions is to be indifferent to the reality that soon we could be faced with a major war due to Islamic extremists and the Judaic and Christian followers who feel threatened today.

I had hoped that with your intellect and knowledge, you would be able to understand that the scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions have caused much division between the peoples of different countries. Certainly, God could not have inspired these scriptures which have caused so much division and unholy deaths between people. It proves these scriptures were written by righteous men for a unique group of people. And even though they profess belief in one God, their traditions and culture have caused much division in the way that God is perceived by Hebrews, Christians, and Moslems.

I hope that some day you will join me and daughters and sons of God to pressure religious leaders to work together and unify their belief in the same God. Much can be learned about the truth revealed to us by Jesus that Amen is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.” Those of you who are willing to open your minds to actual facts and findings that conclusively reveal that the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions have their roots from the Egyptian religion, place an Internet search on *Future of God Amen* or Nicholas P. Ginex.

Clarke M., February 8, 2012, 7:53 p.m. EST

I am a scientist, not a “religionist,” and I seek the truth. I think what I know and understand is “zero” relative to the Creator’s will and being. I do not doubt that Jesus did the things he did and that the accounts of his life, works, and words are essentially true. I have not questioned the sincerity of your faith or your experience. For the record, as you have spoken somewhat of your history, I had a Christian education, from Sunday school on to six years in boarding school, where we had chapel five days a week, and I was confirmed after a year’s study in the Episcopal Church and served in the altar guild and was in the choir. I didn’t begin to appreciate and love the Bible for many years, although I certainly had learned it in school and knew many hymns. Some of my ancestors had served the church: one, a bishop, is recognized for reviving the failing Episcopal Church. He laid the cornerstone of most Episcopal churches in America before 1862. I am writing a biography of him. My family members were not regular churchgoers. We didn’t discuss questions about religious beliefs and doctrines at home. We had many Catholic and Jewish friends and respected their values. I am grateful to my family for teaching me to honor those of other faiths. I have never cared for the pseudo-spirituality of New Age thinking or the ideas of “syncretic” religionists. I have spoken of traditional methods of meditation and spiritual work that have been transmitted for centuries, both within and without world religions. I have never been interested in belonging to any other faith or having “gurus.” I have met individuals in many countries whom I feel were holy souls and even saints. Their religions simply did not affect our sharing a common language and understanding. It took me twenty-five years of work to begin to glimpse the wisdom of the Bible and other teachings as well. I have worked with thousands of individuals in groups for over fifty years. We share activities and practices but rarely discuss our personal faiths. I learned from ground zero in working on myself

and with others how and why many do not wish to try to awaken to their condition and are willing to “pay the price” to do so. I feel I am a learner and have to begin again and again from nothing to become open and related to the spirit. No one can “earn” grace, but through the practice of searching to see and accept one’s helplessness, through remorse and suffering, and moments of mercy, help may appear.

Nicholas Ginex, February 8, 2012, 9:00 p.m. EST

Thank you, Clark, for sharing some of your personal life experiences in being taught the belief in God. By now, you should be aware that I am not professing a new religion but trying to inform people around the world how mankind came to develop the belief in one universal God.

If anything, I am trying to bring peace and harmony between the existing religions by getting their leaders to accept the words of Jesus that Amen, the first universal God, and the beliefs of the Egyptian religion are the foundation of their own religions.

I know this truth is very difficult for dedicated worshipers and leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions to accept. But we all must be humble and open-minded to understand we are a product of the beliefs of our ancestors. Because of pride and arrogance, many religious people will not accept that their religious beliefs are rooted in the beliefs of the ancient Egyptians. Why? Is it because they are a black race of people and it would be hard to admit they were capable of conceiving the belief in one universal God, the concept of a soul, and the belief in a hereafter upon living a life of righteousness and truth?

Like you, I was also brought up as a Christian. My exposure to the three major religions has been through extensive reading with an open mind of the writings of religious scholars and Egyptologists. After reading the Koran line by line, I realized that the scriptures themselves have caused much bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent people. If God inspired the scriptures of the Bible and Koran, He did a very poor job.

The saving grace is the words of Jesus. He gave us a revelation that Amen is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.” When people around the world are ready to accept the words

of Jesus, we may be able to realize that we all pray to the same God who introduced Himself to the Egyptians. But are we too proud and arrogant to accept the words of Jesus?

Clarke M., February 11, 2012, 12:10 a.m. EST

We owe an obligation to our parents and ancestors for our existence, and we can pay for it by preparing youth for the future. Those who don't find that is an essential part of Jesus's teaching and his life and work, I think, are denying his teaching and example. We serve God and relieve His suffering in loving one another. His mercy and compassion are infinite. We are truly helpless, but in seeing and accepting this and being in question, in realizing our "fallen" state, we may receive help from on high to serve His will. We are here to learn from each other. We only learn by raising one another and the role of teachers is to help others reach and surpass them. The more experienced learn and serve by helping others less experienced attain their place. Those who are called to work alone and pray to God are no different in serving His will and helping others. This has been known and taught in every age, long before Christianity. All the world religions today have their individual ways of approaching God. They should not be attacked or compared in the name of other religions or attempts made to "syncretize" them as though there should be "one teaching."

Jerry Kays, February 11, 2012, 2:09 p.m. EST

To claim or pretend that religions are above criticism is nothing more than the ignorance exemplified by "honor amongst thieves" . . . at least for those relatively few of us who attempt to be teachers of the esoteric message of the love of *God* as compared to the exoteric message of disinformation presented by so many orthodox religions who have yet to discover that esoteric message as they preach and instruct instead the exoteric message more similar to the dualistic egoic view . . .

IMnsHO

Jerry Kays, February 11, 2012, 2:15 p.m. EST

P.S. . . . if there were to be "one teaching," I maintain it should be that of the "perennial philosophy." ("There is only one religion, though there are a hundred versions of it.") . . . (This is an Internet link.)

Nicholas Ginex, February 11, 2012, 11:16 p.m. EST

Hello Clark and Jerry,

Jerry is astute to realize that there is a perennial philosophy, a theology that believes in a soul as a divine reality. It is a belief that places man's final end in the knowledge of the immanent and transcendent ground of all being (extracted from a phrase coined by Leibniz in Aldous Huxley's book *The Perennial Philosophy*).

What does this philosophy really mean? It is somewhat nebulous because first one needs to believe in the soul. Also, an "immanent and transcendent ground of all being" is not defined but is simply a hypothetical idea that has no basis of truth founded on reality.

It is a shame that great minds are fooled into thinking and believing in an idea that has no basis of fact. However, it is man's idea to harbor the idea of a soul that lives on after the body no longer exists. This idea was originally documented with the Egyptian priesthood, when they were able to invent writing and the concept of the soul before the first dynasty, and has found its place in many of the higher religions.

Clark appears to believe that the scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are products inspired by God into the minds of men. But it is clear that this is a fool's acceptance that the scriptures are infallible. The scriptures of these three religions have been used by religious leaders that have missed the mark of the Word of God, which is to *love one another*. It is clear that God has done a poor job in the inspiration of their scriptures for they have precipitated hate, bigotry, violence, and the killing of innocent people. These three religions are responsible for causing divisions among Jews, Christians, and Muslims. We are witnessing such divisions today.

In spite of the weaknesses of the major religions' scriptures, Clark contends that these religions "should not be attacked or compared in the name of other religions or attempts made to 'syncretize' them as though there should be 'one teaching.'"

It appears that Clark is not a practical man to realize that the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are all rooted in the beliefs of the Egyptian religion. The beliefs in one universal God, the soul, and a hereafter upon living a righteous and moral life were originated by the

Egyptian priesthood long before Abraham stepped into Egypt. It was Jesus that acknowledged the Egyptian God Amen as “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.”

There is no need for what Clark refers to as “syncretism” as though there should be “one teaching.” Their rituals and traditions may stay the same, but what is fundamental with all three religions is that they all pray to the same God; He is the one universal God; and the Word of God is to *love one another*. If the three major religions cannot agree on these fundamental beliefs and accept the truth proclaimed by Jesus that Amen is the beginning of the creation of God, then they are simply arrogant and proud leaders who will continue to lead mankind to destruction.

Clark, you believe in the teaching of Jesus but fail to understand the meaning of his words in John’s Revelation 3:14. You are an uncompromising Christian who appears to join one of the three religious groups that have caused many unholy deaths. There is no reason why the religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions cannot work together to unify their belief in one God and teach the Word of God—*love one another*. It is the arrogant, proud leaders and worshippers that believe they have the only “true” religion. This confirms that God did a poor job in inspiring the Word of God in the scriptures of these religions. Or, perhaps, it was righteous men who tried to emulate the beliefs of the Egyptians but renounced Amen as “the beginning of the creation of God” in order to found their own religion for their unique people.

Clark, deal with the truth. The truth does not mean you reject Jesus, for he was the greatest man of God who proclaimed the “truth.”

Jerry Kays, February 12, 2012, 2:31 p.m. EST

Nicholas, between Clarke, myself, and you, we have each different experiences that have led up to the way we think . . . truths on this realm are relative to the information we deem to be the truth . . . facts are but an agreement of like thinkers, thus different thinkers use different facts . . . it would probably be a very boring world if we were all the very same, though possibly more peaceful.

IMnsHO

Nicholas Ginex, February 13, 2012, 2:45 a.m. EST

Hello Jerry,

What you are suggesting is that truth is relative based upon the indoctrination and experiences we acquire in our lives. Perhaps I expect much more from intelligent human beings in that they are capable of analyzing information and able to deal with facts and findings that are real. There are those of us who would rather believe in a hypothetical idea because they believe it is true. The most difficult thinking about the ideas of others is to be honest with one's self and not be afraid to admit when one is wrong.

I am blessed with the ability to take on another's idea if it makes better sense to me. My life is in seeking the truth because I do not like being made a fool of. It is one of the main reasons why I wrote *Future of God Amen*. Too many people lack the history of our ancestors, and religious leaders will go to extremes to distort and misinterpret the truth. There is conclusive evidence that what Jesus stated in Revelation 3:14 is true. But because of pride and arrogance in preserving the status quo, they will not acknowledge that Amen is "the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God."

Clarke M., February 13, 2012, 1:17 p.m. EST

Jerry and Nicholas,

Al-Hallaj's wise words in *A Fundamental Principle** testify to his experience of the world religions being derived from a single source and being able to guide humanity to a knowledge of their purpose and destiny. Humans of every age have been guided through the practices and rituals of the world religions as well as their ideas (as expressed in texts, arts and sciences, laws, social institutions and demonstrated in the lives and works of their founders, such as the Buddha and Jesus) to learn their place in life and serve it. It shows a lack of maturity and judgment to just blame "religions" for the weakness and ignorance of humans, past and present.

Nicholas's book is based on flawed and inadequate research and study. The errors of the theories he has espoused in it are evident, as has been shown in detail. * *A Fundamental Principle* <http://www.gather.com/viewArticle.action?articleId=281474981104453>

Nicholas Ginex, February 15, 2012, 3:07 p.m. EST

Dear Clarke,

Your statement, “Al-Hallaj’s wise words in *A Fundamental Principle** testify to his experience of the world religions being derived from a single source” is very shortsighted. In what way is Al-Hallaj’s wise words truthful regarding where that single source has made itself known?

You are also misquoting me regarding the statement that the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions *are the only religions* that are causing bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent people since their inception. They have taken the religion of ancient Egypt and *adopted it for their own*.

However, it was Jesus Christ who revealed the truth that Amen is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.” Jesus has identified the single source whose fundamental beliefs have been adopted, such as the soul, a hereafter, a Son of God, and one universal God.

Nicholas Ginex, February 15, 2012, 3:16 p.m. EST

Hello Clark,

You are still very defensive about your views on religion and their sources. You stated, “Nicholas’s book is based on flawed and inadequate research and study. The errors of the theories he has espoused in it are evident, as has been shown in detail.”

You are not honest and courageous enough to actually take portions of the book *Future of God Amen* and show where the conclusions and assertions, based upon facts and findings of highly respected scholars, are flawed.

Be a man and show our readers what is not true in the book *Future of God Amen*.

Clarke M., February 15, 2012, 7:05 p.m. EST

We all may recognize there has been good and bad in all the religions as they have been practiced throughout history. Consider the contribution

of Islam: It conquered many civilizations with different decadent governments and religious institutions in Asia (including Sri Lanka and Indonesia—the largest Islamic nation today and a democracy), Africa, the Middle East, and Europe. Islam brought democratic and cultural reform to them and also showed tolerance for other religions. The Islamic empire became an advanced, synthetic civilization that included many religions, with the exception of part of Christian Europe that remained in its Dark Ages for centuries.

There are extraordinary, fine people who work within different faiths or have no interest in any faith. I have been involved in wars and revolutions in many countries for over half a century and lost many friends in them. Race and religion, I discovered, made no difference to me or to them as far as our relations were concerned. A Buddhist once told me an old tale that made the point that those who rebel against God take fewer incarnations to become free than those who worship Him faithfully. The message was that sincerity is one measure of who we are and can become. That we all have to pay the same is a question that we may not have a complete answer to, but I think that is the way things are. The teachings of the world religions essentially say this. Individuals are unique. I think the more responsible a human being is, the more is demanded and the more difficult things become. We don't really know the truth beyond the next moment. We can try and we often fail. If people believe they are only their physical bodies, they are mistaken. Consciousness is not limited. The brain is not the mind. Humans did not create religions in the purest sense, that is, the record of human history and its civilizations shows they are not the source of them. The decline of human awareness over the past centuries and the spread of materialism and partial, naturalistic ideas about evolution is evident to those who think impartially.

Religions can be a source of wisdom, but how people think and how they are educated is our responsibility as human beings. There are leaders in all the world religions who can and do serve those of their different faiths wisely as well as other humans, regardless of their beliefs. It is counterproductive to try to change others' faiths as the Dalai Lama has eloquently taught. Refer to *Generating the Mind for Enlightenment*, His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama, Tenzin Gyatso, the spiritual leader of Tibet: the official website for the Office of the Dalai Lama. www.dalailama.com/teachings/training-the-mind/generating-the-mind-for-enlightenment—Amazon.com: (9781559390323):

The Path to Enlightenment by Dalai Lama, www.amazon.com/Path-Enlightenment-Dalai-Lama/dp/1559390328

Nicholas Ginex, February 15, 2012, 8:31 p.m. EST

Hello Clark,

You have missed the whole point of the book *Future of God Amen*. It *only* deals with the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions and conclusively reveals that they *all* have common roots in the beliefs of the Egyptian religion that developed the concepts of a soul, a hereafter upon living a moral life, a Son of God, and after thousands of years, their Priesthood of Amon wrote scripture extolling one universal God.

I have not written about other religions because they do not share the close interrelationships as do the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. The fact is that the book *Future of God Amen* is an appeal to loving daughters and sons of God to assist these religious leaders to work together and unify their belief in the one universal God.

For these three major religions to continue on their present course, they will continue to precipitate bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent people as they have done so in the past. Only by accepting the *truth* of Jesus Christ, that Amen is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God,” will their proud arrogance be removed, and only then will the hope of the world see peace between these people of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions.

As a follower of Jesus Christ, you should learn to understand and appreciate his words proclaimed in John’s Revelation 3:14. Indeed! Jesus presented a revelation to the world but will they heed his words? *Future of God Amen* conclusively provides facts and findings from the highest regarded scholars and Egyptologists to reveal how the religion of the ancient Egyptians has influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions.

If you desire to criticize the book *Future of God Amen*, then read it and provide extracts that you desire to challenge as being false information. If you cannot do that, then you are wasting my time and the time of our readers.

Clarke M., February 16, 2012, 11:14 a.m. EST

The lack of using current, reliable sources in your book and the failure to present convincing credible evidence to support your theories has been covered a long time ago on another post of yours. Part of the

problem is your lack of knowledge of the history of religions and civilizations that has been made available by many researchers in various scientific and humanistic fields. I recognize you have spent much time and effort, but your work needs serious revision.

A fatal fault is that you have accepted discredited ideas about humanity's evolution and consciousness. It is true some scientists and thinkers accept similar ideas without question. They may choose to do so for various subjective reasons and often simply ignore the evidence and studies available in peer-reviewed publications. In some cases, they blindly attack and reject others' work without even reading them, simply repeating their own views as correct. Belief is not a valid criteria for asserting the validity of ideas or theories. The scientific method is the proper standard, and it furthers research and discovery and can lead to useful results.

I have noted the influence of materialistic ideas about the world and partial, naturalistic ideas about evolution in recent centuries. These views are recognized today as biased and incomplete by many scientists. Max Planck, the founder of quantum theory in 1900, clearly stated the centrality of consciousness for all scientific research: "I regard matter as derivative from consciousness. We cannot get behind consciousness." The recent discoveries of biologists regarding the nature of consciousness are often surpassing those of scientists in other fields. The science of consciousness, however, is not new. It is imperative that it be incorporated into the education of the young from the earliest ages, if humans are to learn to think critically and impartially and not neglect fully developing the mental faculties. It is time to correct our failure to do so because of the emphasis on rationalistic, materialistic ideas and thinking.

Clarke M., February 17, 2012, 4:20 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

I will add a few thoughts which may be helpful to you in understanding my criticism of your book.

The history of man's evolution is the history of his consciousness. There is a science of consciousness; it has been taught for ages. For how long? Perhaps for millions of years or since before there was "space" and "time." There is perhaps truth in both being the case. We

can at least reason theoretically that this is so. It doesn't answer the question "What is consciousness?" in a practical way for us, that is, give us a personal experience of the nature of consciousness. In any case, we can learn this science. Some contemporary scientists are studying consciousness using the criteria specified by the scientific method that has been developed in recent centuries. This is one way to study consciousness. This research has not enjoyed as much funding and support, relative to what other scientific fields have received. The term these scientists often use to describe their research in the study of "non-local consciousness." (As I said, the science of consciousness is not new, but theirs is one approach to its study.) However, aspects of work in other fields are increasing, including the study of consciousness in their research, experiments, and clinical practice.

If you don't know this, Nicholas, then perhaps that is one reason that my comments on the words in the Bible and other teachings may not convey the same meaning to you that they do to me. Others I know would understand the words as I do. What I understand in the words of some teachings is the same as I find in the words of some others. There is a universal "language" that has no words, as there are universal laws that have been expressed in different ways.

Nicholas Ginex, February 18, 2012, 5:41 a.m. EST

Hello Clarke,

You and I agree that there may be a consciousness that pervades the universe and tries to reveal itself in higher order organisms, such as humans and aliens we have not yet met. I refer you to a post I wrote titled *Does Consciousness Pervade Our Universe?*

Concerning your disagreement with the validity of the book *Future of God Amen*, I find you are not an honest person whose mind is locked in a cage of religious bias. You wrote: "Nicholas's book is based on flawed and inadequate research and study. The errors of the theories he has espoused in it are evident, as has been shown in detail." You also wrote on February 16: "The lack of using current, reliable sources in your book and the failure to present convincing credible evidence to support your theories has been covered a long time ago on another post of yours. Part of the problem is your lack of knowledge of the history of religions and civilizations that has been made available by many researchers in various scientific and humanistic fields."

Your comments reveal a dishonest approach to disparage the book *Future of God Amen*. I cannot respond to your criticisms because they are not backed up with actual parts of the book. You should indicate the pages in question and why you do not agree with what is written. In every case, my conclusions and assertions are founded on facts and findings by highly reputable scholars and Egyptologists.

You refuse to acknowledge the words of Jesus who proclaimed that Amen is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.”

This is a very clear, grammatical statement by Jesus, and those who have had read the history of ancient Egypt would understand his words are undisputedly true. It is clear that you have not read *Future of God Amen*.

I would be delighted to have you critique the facts presented in *Future of God Amen*. If you would like for me to mail you a complimentary copy, just e-mail me your mailing address via nickginex@gmail.com

To convince yourself that Amen was worshipped as many as two thousand years before the birth of Jesus, do read the book *Future of God Amen*. It has ample facts and findings that conclusively reveal that Amen was worshipped as one universal God before Moses left Egypt.

With better grounding in the history of Egypt, you will gain an understanding of the words of Jesus. My mission is to help people around the world to appreciate the truth as spoken by Jesus and not distort, misinterpret, and misconstrue his words.

You need to pause and answer the question why is it that Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders do not acknowledge the religious beliefs attributed to Amen? Is it because their beliefs are rooted to the Egyptian religion, which has largely been influential in the development of their religions? Was not the concept of a soul, a hereafter upon leading a moral life, a Son of God, and one universal God beliefs developed by the Egyptian priesthood that existed for thousands of years? Clarke, be honest with yourself and you will reach the next level of spiritual development.

Nicholas Ginex, February 18, 2012, 5:47 a.m. EST

Clarke,

You wrote: "A 'word' like 'amen' has probably been used for hundreds of thousands of years." The key word you wrote is "probably." The rest of your reasoning is nothing more than opinion and hypothetical nonsense.

Clarke M., February 18, 2012, 6:10 p.m. EST

The "amen" and "hu" sounds to indicate God is probably found in all languages. It is found in the chants, prayers, and rituals of many cultures. The "aum" and "hum" are a few of the forms of the "hu" and "amen." We are all "human."

Newton valued his extensive works on alchemy and the Bible more than his scientific endeavors, as his *Optics* and *Principia*, and he wrote more about them. This was not unusual in the seventeenth century, for others who are considered "scientific" icons today, like Newton, had similar interests and views. Newton read the texts in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. His many theological studies of different books in the Bible and writings of others like Maimonides on religion are quite dense. He believed in a personal God.

To form an understanding of Newton's concept of "God" and describe it in words, I think requires serious study of his writings. Similarly, I think reading/hearing the Dalai Lama is necessary to begin to grasp what he means by "Buddhahood." Words like "God" and "Buddhahood" are not rational, abstract ideas. They indicate and point to, fundamentally, a human being's true relationship to life and a way of life.

We can be assisted by others in learning what words like "God" mean for ourselves. But we are approaching a mystery we seek to understand all our lives and still feel we have only begun. We are learners and learn through our experience and practice. The rational faculty is a limited part of our being and mind. We have to learn how to learn with our whole being. There are proven methods to learn, but every human being is different in how she learns to practice and which practices work best for her. Monasteries and communities include a variety of

practices that train body, feelings, and mind and integrate them. Each individual has to develop his personal practice through experience. A decade or so ago, a Buddhist monk participated in a memory test. He recited sixteen thousand pages of Buddhist scriptures without errors. Reciting was one aspect of his practice. For a musician like J. S. Bach, his practice was to express the liturgical year in music “for the greater glory of God.” Aquinas’s approach was through thought; but when he got beyond that, he laid down his pen, wrote no more, and remained in contemplative silence for the rest of his life.

I certainly have provided you with a detailed critique of your book, and your denial that I have is ridiculous.

Nicholas Ginex, February 18, 2012, 7:25 p.m. EST

Hello Clarke,

You have responded to my posts and shared your ideas, which I am grateful for. However, you have not read *Future of God Amen* and provided critiques of any of its conclusions and assertions by indicating the pages in question.

I have offered to provide you with a complimentary copy, but it appears you would rather keep yourself pure from other ideas that may have you question your own beliefs. You must understand that my efforts in writing the book are to bring people to a truthful understanding of a history that has not been provided in our schools. Religious leaders and political leaders prefer to keep our young minds in ignorance and maintain the status quo.

Nicholas Ginex, February 19, 2012, 2:35 p.m. EST

Hello Clarke,

It will do us both some good if you will write a post that offers you and our readers an opportunity to analyze and critique my book *Future of God Amen*.

This post deals with a specific topic for you and our readers to share their thoughts. I would be very pleased for you to present a post to our readers so that you can share or explain why you disagree with portions of *Future of God Amen*.

However, for you to attempt this exercise, you must be honest by actually indicating the pages and paragraphs that you differ with. You may even provide the actual text so that our readers are given a fair assessment of why you disagree with the ideas presented.

I welcome your efforts, for if you and our readers are able to demonstrate where there are inaccuracies or needed changes, I will gladly revise *Future of God Amen* and put out another publication release.

A suggestion for your post is: *A Critique of Future of God Amen*.

Ben Surbana, February 15, 2012, 11:32 p.m. EST

Has Jesus always existed or was he created? Answer: Jesus, as a Christ, has always existed; only his body is a creation solely from matter.

In the Book of Revelation, there are six messages given to six cities by the Christ, an incarnation of the *Logos*. Remember that the *Logos* is the controlling principle of the universe. (It would be helpful for readers to get a copy of the Bible and read each message to each city at this point.) Keep in mind that Revelation was an apocalyptic dream or vision John had and is open to many interpretations. It can be noted, however, that this writer has had dreams of an apocalyptic nature which did come true in his own lifetime. I suggest that John's may be applicable, firstly to himself and then to others, who may find its content relevant to their own lives and potential apotheosis. Only time will tell if it will unfold as a literal, historical event involving all people of the earth.

Please note that six is a number associated with "Christ." The six cities and their name meanings are:

Ephesus, which means "desirable."

Smyrna, meaning "myrrh." (The associated message is clearly about a healing and myrrh associated with great healing powers.)

Perganum means "height or elevation."

Thyatira means "sacrifice or labor."

Sardis means "prince of joy."

Philadelphia means “brotherly love.”

Laodicea means “just people.”

It is in this message the name “Amen” is mentioned as “the faithful and true Witness, the Beginning (source or origin) of the creation of God . . .” (The *Logos* is the Witness and Source or Origin.)

Interpretation: Because God (oblativity Love) is just, the Son was with the Father, before creation, in a potential state. The Son became flesh (the creation of God or “God was created”) through matter (i.e., mater, mother).

Therefore, it can be concluded that the “Amen” is none other than the *Logos* in human form, Christ, the Anointed. The association with the meaning of “Amen” with “so be it” or “may it be so” becomes evident, for a Christ is an incarnation of the Father, as a son.

Indeed, each city’s name signifies an attribute of Christ!

Most importantly, there are many who have confirmed, through personal revelatory experience/gnosis, that the Christ or Chrestos, indwells all human beings. When we listen and become conjoined with “Him,” we, as Jesus did, become like the Father. Only through a “son” is the Father comprehensible.

And therein lies our personal redemption; any person who becomes like his divine Parent can deliver similar messages, as in Revelation, to others with authority, wisdom, and compassion, and have done so throughout human history.

Thank you, Nicholas (“people’s victory”), for your wonderful and inspiring post!

Nicholas Ginex, February 17, 2012, 7:57 p.m. EST

Hello Ben,

Thank you for your contribution to this post, whereby your answer is “Yes” Jesus has always existed from the beginning of time. Your discourse is an opinion of your own interpretation of the Bible. I prefer to use facts and findings that have surfaced over the past two hundred

years that have given us much more information about the history of religion concerning the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions.

I would be delighted to have you critique the facts presented in *Future of God Amen*. If you would like for me to mail you a complimentary copy, just e-mail me your mailing address via nickginex@gmail.com

There is much distortion and misinterpretations about Amen. Yes, we all agree that Amen refers to “truth” or “so be it” or confirmation of what is said as true. However, it is a shame that few scholars and theologians are well schooled in the history of the ancient Egyptians.

I will not try to convince you or my readers that Amen was worshipped as many as two thousand years before the birth of Jesus. The book *Future of God Amen* has ample facts and findings that conclusively reveal that Amen was worshipped as one universal God before Moses left Egypt.

More importantly, it was Jesus, a man of God who can only speak the “truth” that proclaimed Amen as “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation God.” With better grounding in the history of Egypt, you will gain an understanding of the words of Jesus. My mission is to help people around the world to appreciate the truth as spoken by Jesus and not distort, misinterpret, and misconstrue his words.

We need to pause and ask the question why is it that Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders do not acknowledge the religious beliefs attributed to Amen? Is it because their beliefs are rooted to the Egyptian religion that has largely been influential in the development of their religions? Was not the concept of a soul, a hereafter upon leading a moral life, a Son of God, and one universal God beliefs developed by the Egyptian priesthood that existed for thousands of years?

Yes, Ben, my name implies “victory or victorious,” and I will try to bring to the people the words that Jesus has proclaimed in their true sense. Thank you for the compliment.

Ben Surbana, February 17, 2012, 8:33 p.m. EST

Thank you, kind sir, for your offer. I respect highly your work and devotion to these questions about God and His children.

If your studies bring you closer to God's Kingdom, continue them. Time will tell. Nevertheless, we are told that it is our childlike trust and willingness to sacrifice everything of this world which allows us to enter His Kingdom, regardless of our scholarly knowledge and analysis of facts.

Since you have a great interest in ancient Egyptian religion, you may enjoy this excerpt from the Gospel of the Egyptians (Nag Hammadi library):

The Saviour said to Salome: Seek not for good in the flesh, for so long as the flesh is filled with longing the soul knows not God. There shall be tribulation as long as you women give birth, for I have come to abolish the work of generation. I am the voice of awakening in the aeon of eternal night, henceforth I begin to expose the power from the chaos so that it may be seen in its terror. For I have not sown children to the archon, but have torn up his root: I have come to gather together the limbs scattered abroad, and I know thee who thou art, for I am of those Above. I am of the heavenly race, that neither marries nor brings to birth, and such you shall become also.

May God's Light be the result of all of your endeavors!

Nicholas Ginex, February 18, 2012, 4:13 p.m. EST

Hello Ben,

Thank you for introducing me to the suppressed *Greek Gospel of the Egyptians*. An Internet search indicates that perhaps it was written in the second quarter of the second century and was already cited in Clement of Alexandria's *The Stromata*. It was also mentioned by Hippolytus, who alludes to "these various changes of the soul, set forth in the Gospel entitled according to the Egyptians" and connects *The Gospel of the Egyptians* with the gnostic Nazarene sect.

As such, it appears that the Nazarenes were a very spiritual people that acknowledged the contributions of the Egyptian priesthood for the formulation of the beliefs in a soul and a hereafter upon living a moral life. This fact may also lend credence to the fact that Jesus, being a Nazarene, was knowledgeable of the religious beliefs originated by the Egyptians and hence, his acknowledgment of Amen as "the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God."

Ben, I am perhaps a child of God, for I never thought I would write a book that tries to substantiate the words of Jesus. *Future If God Amen* has as its themes the Word of God, love one another, that Amen is the “beginning of the creation of God,” and an appeal to religious leaders and worshippers to work together to unify their beliefs in one universal God. My efforts in seeking and revealing the truth to believers in God may have been borne out of my love for humanity and an endeavor to establish peace and love among the people of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. Few people are willing to compromise their indoctrinated religious beliefs to agree on a fundamental belief—the existence of one universal God whose presence pervades the universe.

Lea and . . . c., February 18, 2012, 1:11 a.m. EST

Until you find paradise at your own center there is not the smallest chance that you may enter. oh vanity and the sea of words

Until you lose your me you cannot see God’s face the moment you recover it you fall from grace.

Ben Surbana, February 18, 2012, 1:36 p.m. EST

Wisdom speaks through you, Lea!

Nicholas Ginex, February 18, 2012, 4:31 p.m. EST

Dear Lea and . . . c,

Thank you for gracing this post with sonnets of God. I have missed your spiritual presence with the words you express yourself with.

I live with one desire to love people of all races.

This love is both physical and spiritual; for it was given to us by God.

Just as God has given the flower its beauty and fragrance,

He has endowed his creations to *love one another*.

This ability to love on a physical and spiritual level

Is the birthright of living creatures.

The soul of each creature is enhanced when love is given sincerely between two lovers.

God is pleased when

His creatures have learned to love.

Jerry Kays, February 19, 2012, 12:45 a.m. EST

Love is truth and truth is love, each the essence of *God* . . . nothing else is needed as much.

Nicholas Ginex, February 19, 2012, 1:55 p.m. EST

Hello Jerry,

Thank you for simplifying that love and truth is the essence of God. Does God provide love and truth? Is it God's creations that provide love and truth to each other? Jesus has it right with his command given three times in John's Gospel—*love one another*. Yes, the essence of love and truth may be given to his creatures as part of their birthright, but it is the creatures themselves who exercise love and truth, not God.

A Challenge for Judaic, Christian, and Islamic Religious Leaders

January 25, 2011

Jesus Christ performed many miraculous works which allowed him to inspire apostles and a following. But what was most inspiring about Jesus was that he offered a new approach in the belief of God. The simplicity of his teaching reduced multiple commandments, ordinances, and judgments of the Old Testament to one simple command—love one another. This was his last command, announced three times in the Gospel of John. As with the Egyptian priesthood, worship of multiple gods being replaced with the belief of one universal God by Amenhotep IV (Ikhnaton), the Jewish priesthood were also challenged by Jesus's simplified command and his approach to include people of all nations in the worship of God. This threat to the Pharisees' and Sadducees' dogma caused them to scheme the death of Jesus.

It is a great challenge to introduce a new perspective in God. The Bible is sorely outdated for today's educated and discerning people. Actually, the concept of God will never change for he remains unknowable, incomprehensible, and mysterious to all of us. This is the reason why Catholic religious leaders have raised Jesus to the level of a God. In that way, people can relate to God through His son, by visualizing the image of a man.

I believe a religious renaissance is needed in the near future because the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are doing a poor job of teaching our sisters and brothers from every nation to love and assist one another. Muslim extremists are bringing about the possibility of a world war that will be damaging not only to human life but our planet. People around the world can stop this insanity by being proactive and pressure these religions to unify their beliefs. The book *Future of*

God Amen has many recommendations for religious leaders and their worshippers to reverse the trend toward world destruction.

Those of you who wish to become proactive in initiating a religious renaissance may visit the Website www.futureofgodamen.com

Do you think people of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions should do nothing and hope religious leaders solve the inconsistencies of their scriptures or do you think it is the worshippers themselves that need to be proactive to begin a religious renaissance?

Comments and Responses

Estefan G., January 25, 2011, 11:18 p.m. EST

I think most of religion is precisely about money. And I thought that was what Larry thought about a lot more than I.

Larry M., January 26, 2011, 6:51 a.m. EST

Estefan,

If you want to talk about the Church or about religious organizations, that's where the money comes in. Theology, what one should believe, is a different matter.

And I do think about how money works quite a lot.

Estefan G., January 26, 2011, 6:12 p.m. EST

Should?

I don't know. I reckon greed and survival are at the core rather than . . .

Nicholas Ginex, January 27, 2011, 2:21 p.m. EST

Hello Estefan and Larry,

I don't understand where money is the basis for the survival of Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. It is true that some of these religious

institutions require dues over the year's participation, but not in all cases. I go to a Catholic church and am not required to put a dime in the collection box.

Although I am a believer of God, it is not the same God taught by the above religions. What I do believe in are the moral and ethical beliefs taught by these religions. Unfortunately, their scriptures were written so long ago that many of the myths and inconsistencies are no longer believable by educated and discerning people. That is why, from a practical standpoint, I advocate they work together to revise their scriptures. If the Egyptian priesthoods were flexible to revise their beliefs in gods to finally formulate the belief in one universal God, then there is the idea that scripture is not cast in concrete, never to be updated.

The thing we should be concerned about is not money because you do not have to donate it to your religion, but the important thing is how effective the religious leaders are to teach our children morality and ethics.

Larry M., January 27, 2011, 2:49 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

It is not for the survival of the faith but of the Church as an institution in agricultural and othersocieties. You will note that the churches have buildings and paid staff. This has been the case for thousands of years (and in the case of Islam for over one thousand years). You will note that many of the buildings are elaborate and indicate the use of much wealth in their construction. The "holy men" (priests, ministers, imams) are often quite wealthy in the money they control. The history of the Catholic Church and the Judaic religion when it was dominant in Israel shows that money was very important to the functioning of those churches. The selling of indulgences, the driving from the temple of the money changers, and I'll wager there are similar events in Islam, though I am too ignorant of their history to cite examples, show that the use of money tended to corrupt. One can see the influence of money especially well in the Catholic Church, since it was dominant in Europe for so long and left a written history. But the same influences on Protestants and evangelicals are also clear to see. In every case, if there were no money, the churches would become quite local and "go their separate ways" (see Baptists).

Note that money has nothing to do with the faith. That is a separate thing. Money has caused the churches to be what they are but it has not shaped the faith to the same degree. There are elements of the faith such as the biblical support for slavery and evasions of the “no rich people in heaven” and other influences of interpretation, but those do not strike to the heart of the faith in Jesus as the Son of God and such.

I agree wholeheartedly with your final paragraph.

Nicholas Ginex, January 27, 2011, 7:17 p.m. EST

Dear Larry,

Thank you for informing me of the strong role money has had in the functioning of the religious organizations. It is clear that the Muslims are making a strong move in the United States with the many mosques being built on a grand, extravagant, and magnificent scale. The Muslims are establishing a foothold within our country without our government prohibiting their practice of Sharia law, which includes civil and criminal law. I mention this development because the Islamic and Arab countries have accumulated enormous wealth via oil enterprises and they are looking to buy up a lot more property to boost their religious image. The 9-11 site is one such example.

Some states, like Wyoming, are passing bills to prohibit Sharia law so that Muslims adhere to the criminal and civil laws of our country. State Rep. Gerald Gay (R) proposed the constitutional amendment “as a ‘preemptive strike’ to ensure judges don’t rely on Sharia in cases involving, for example, arranged marriages, ‘honor killings,’ or usury cases.”

Oklahoma dealt with a similar measure last year, a prohibition of Sharia that was passed through a ballot amendment in November but soon thereafter blocked by a federal judge.

I have to agree with you that it is money that continues to keep the religious machine (institution) in business but, unfortunately, for all the wrong reasons.

Getting back to the question in my post, what are your thoughts?

Col. George W., January 25, 2011, 5:05 p.m. EST

The Bible is not outdated if you read it correctly. Everything in it up through the Gospels is the history of what is now called the Christian religion. Read it that way and it makes sense.

What you suggest might work if Islam was a religion. It's not. It's a political philosophy.

Nicholas Ginex, January 25, 2011, 6:57 p.m. EST

The Bible was written by righteous, well-meaning men who were inspired to transform their communities with guidance to lead their people in a harmonious way. The Bible was written after the Hebrew people were exposed to the religious beliefs of the ancient Egyptians. The Hebrew priests emulated many passages found in the hymns and scriptures that were preserved on Egyptian temples and holy shrines of worship. What has been learned from the Egyptians has been improved upon by the Hebrew priests. In fact, several ideas are restated in the Genesis Creation story of the Bible.

There are myths in the Bible that are no longer accepted by educated and discerning people who truly desire to believe in God. For you to find only the New Testament valid as the Word of God is to cause conflict with Judaic worshippers. You also condemn the Islamic religion as being a political philosophy. You fail to understand that people from all nations are sisters and brothers, who are also children of God. That God is worshipped differently by different nations because of different cultures, traditions, and religious dogmas. What the religious leaders of the three major religions fail to acknowledge is that Amen is the beginning of the creation of God. This was proclaimed by Jesus Christ in Revelation 3:14 and yet, you as a believer in Jesus, deny his words. Jesus stated that Amen is: "The faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God."

There is a definite need to reveal this truth to Judaic, Christian, and Islamic worshippers, which means their scriptures need to be consistent to bring all worshippers together in the belief of God.

James Stemmler, January 26, 2011, 10:03 a.m. EST

Nicholas,

Pardon a quibble. *Actually, the concept of God will never change for he remains unknowable, incomprehensible, and mysterious to all of us.* I believe you got a little sloppy with that sentence. The concept of God changes continuously. Some of the changes can be gleaned from the Bible. The concept changed from a tribal and fairly bloodthirsty God to a God of love and forgiveness. Or maybe these concepts coexisted, though I hope not. A lot of concepts about God coexist today. My hope is the tribal and bloodthirsty concepts will fade faster than the others.

The canonization of the Bible did not end the evolution of the concept of God, though now it takes the form of reinterpretation of Scripture. For some reason, many feel compelled to base their concept of God on the Bible, this in spite of a big load of information not available to the writers of Scripture. I say we don't need no stinking Bible. We should declare our independence. We should start afresh. We can connect with God to the same degree as the writers of Scripture. OK, maybe not all of us, but embedded in our population, in the current population of the planet, are some gifted people who can. This age is no different from that in the category of connecting with God. God most likely has not changed. God still connects, though God is ineffable. I say the time is ripe for new Scripture, not that we should throw out the old completely, just parts. Keep the good stuff. Just accept full enfranchisement. We don't need to connect with God through Scripture or Church or any antiquated concept, but we should mine all these sources in charting our way.

Cheers.

Jim

Nicholas Ginex, January 26, 2011, 11:31 p.m. EST

Hello Jim,

You're a man after my own heart. I agree with you that we humans have the intelligence to want to know our beginnings. As we gaze upon the stars, we learn that there are galaxies that have even greater numbers of stars in our vast universe. I do not believe science is

capable of learning how mass first came into being because they do not know how the first atom was formed. So I still maintain that God is unknowable, incomprehensible, and mysterious. Yes, man has been able to form in his mind the belief that there is a God responsible for the creation of all there is. But this is a man-made belief that has evolved through many centuries, starting with the religious beliefs of the ancient Egyptians.

The belief in God is possibly the best view of our being and purpose in life. To believe in a higher Force capable of the creation of the entire universe and that that Force created us as part of His design is a noble and worthwhile idea to continue to pursue and improve upon. But the belief in God serves no purpose unless we are able to link our belief in the higher attributes we humans would like to attain; they are: love of our sisters and brothers, integrity, truth, and compassion for those who need a helping hand.

Yes, I agree with you that our Judaic, Christian, and Islamic scriptures are poorly written and need to be updated to reflect a more educated and discerning public. The book *Future of God Amen* provides many recommendations for a religious renaissance and ways for worshipers of the three religions to work together to pressure religious leaders to wake up and develop a unified belief in God and moral behavior.

Will Religious Leaders Respond to the Challenge?

Gather Post by Nicholas P. Ginex—December 11, 2011

I would like our Gather readers to think if the future belief in God depends on the challenge presented below.

Please know that I have consistently shared for others the conclusion that scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are not complete. There are many inconsistencies because the written words were not written at one point in time but by different groups of people who have tried to define God for their own people. There is always room for improvement to our Scriptures. However to do that, religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions have got to learn how to work together to preserve the belief in God. Right now, the scriptures of these three religions have caused hate, bigotry, violence, and the killing of innocent people. If the Egyptian priests were smart enough to rewrite their scriptures, why not the religious leaders of today? Are they so entrenched in religious dogma that they have missed the whole conception of God and the Word of God—to *love one another*?

One unfortunate answer to those questions is that humans, be they priests, scholars, or followers, portray an arrogant notion that they believe in the “true” God. This arrogance has caused many discerning people to shun religious dogma and develop their own beliefs in God. I strongly believe there is more to learn if we use science and faith as instruments in parallel in our quest to know God. Though science is based on facts, it is faith that ennobles the human spirit and allows the mind to improve our relationship with one another. If we succeed, we may yet learn about God from other life forms we may meet in the universe. But can our religious leaders meet the challenge?

Comments and Responses

Richard Regener, November 22, 2011, 5:52 p.m. EST

If religions were actually about altruistic motivations in establishing a balance for everyone, Nicholas, then I would say the possibility did exist. Since religions were originally designed as an extension to an existing power base in many cultures, the likelihood of mutual cooperation between them is highly unlikely in the extreme.

Religious leaders are more afraid of losing their secular power base than any concept of a god they might superficially acknowledge.

Nicholas Ginex, November 24, 2011, 4:08 p.m. EST

Hello Richard,

And thank you for providing a practical and realistic response. I feel I have to agree with you that although the religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic faiths all profess an altruistic view of teaching their followers the attributes of morality using God as the authority, it has become obvious that they have all missed the fundamental words of wisdom—*love one another*. These words of love for one another were spoken by the most respected man of God, Jesus Christ, and yet, these religious leaders are so intent on expanding their own dogma and power base, they remain arrogant with the belief that their scriptures are infallible, never to change, and they cling to the belief that their God is the “true God.”

You indicated that the religious leaders are afraid of not only losing their power base, but also, they are afraid to acknowledge one universal God that they can all pray to. You couched your assertion with the word “superficially,” which implies that even if they were to acknowledge one universal God with a common set of beliefs, they may do it in a superficial manner. Could that be because they all do not truly acknowledge one God that “created all there is” or the possibility of their working together for the common good of all God-loving people is not realistic because arrogance will dominate?

It is for the reasons and questions that have surfaced that I strongly believe that change in the belief of one universal God by the religious

leaders will have to be initiated by God-loving people around the world, which include those of the Judaic, Christian, or Islamic faiths. Only with a groundswell of people who are educated and no longer can believe in myths will there be any hope for change. *Future of God Amen* is a book that not only reveals how man first conceived one universal God, but it offers recommendations for God-loving people to initiate change. If they do not rise above the myths and inconsistencies of their present dogma, change will not occur and people will continue to believe in worn-out, misguided beliefs that constrict their mental development. And yes, people will be duped to exhibit bigotry, hatred, violence, and the killing of their sisters and brothers in the name of God.

Inmate 702, November 22, 2011, 7:21 p.m. EST

Ha, ha, ha, Nicholas, you don't want to get it . . .

God and religion are two different things . . .

Religions are not the answer to finding Go-d. Religions are just businesses run by business people, more or less skilled, and the followers are not really interested in God but in finding a justification for their petty lives and uselessness on this Terra . . .

Who needs the scriptures to find Go-d . . . would be better off reading a dirty magazine, at least the results are immediate and can be even very wet . . .

Nicholas Ginex, November 24, 2011, 4:28 p.m. EST

Hello Inmate 702,

Thank you for your astute response and pointing out that I "don't want to get it," which is your assertion that God and religion are two different things. You do realize that without religions to teach their followers about God, there will be no God to construct within their minds. As you can see, you need religions in order to teach certain dogmas and beliefs about God. Without the existence of the Judaic, Christian, Islamic, Hindu, Buddhist, etc. religions, the idea of God would not occur in the minds of a growing child, including you.

You then made the statement that people do not need scriptures to find God and would be better off reading a dirty magazine where they can get immediate results, and maybe a very wet one. Nice. You show a

distain for religions and scriptures. Do you believe in God or have another set of moral attributes that you live by and hopefully will teach your children? If you have recommendations to replace the concept of God and ways to establish a morality for people to live by, please share your knowledge with us. I am always willing to learn from those who are wise and learned something in their life.

Inmate 702, November 24, 2011, 7:00 p.m. EST

Ha, ha, ha . . .

Nichlolas, you are getting so deep now, and I am afraid that we would not have time to solve this topic . . .

The first people who came up with the idea of gods did not have scriptures, did not have classes; they just had an unexplained fear they tried to explain.

Short of a logical explanation, they came up with this idea of an unknown, powerful Force who can do anything as a result of a special power . . . Then it was a different Force, maybe a brother, a sister, an other relative that they could rationalize, and they gave that new force a new personality . . .

Being powerless in front of the forces of nature, the first humans thought that by performing certain rituals for those who control their lives, they could please them and they could make them less dangerous . . . So we got the religious rituals, which were nothing more than a manifestation of worship toward the gods . . .

It was not the religion who invented the gods. It was the human who invented the gods and came up with the religion in support of the gods . . .

By the time the Jews came up with the idea of a unique, single force, the gods had been around for a few millennia . . .

The Jews replaced all those gods who created the heaven and the earth by one single Creator of the universe, a Go-d, a supreme Being who was doing nothing more than telling the mortals to behave . . .

Go-d shifted from the petty lives of the gods into a watcher of moral standards . . .

The scriptures are nothing more than some of those political commentators who interpret what the president says after he gives a speech . . .

Jimmy Baker talked the Scriptures for twenty years, and finally people found out that he was just a smart guy taking advantage of thousands of people who needed moral support.

Jimmy Sweggart did the same thing; only he did it between sessions with prostitutes when he looked at their anatomy . . .

I don't even mention the priests who were preaching the Scriptures . . .

Before you ask me and anyone else if we believe in Go-d, try first of all to make sure that you, yourself, understand Him and can make the difference between a personal concept and an ideology developed to control the ignorant masses!!

Nicholas Ginex, November 25, 2011, 4:50 p.m. EST

Dear Inmate 702,

Thank you for a comprehensive response that reveals you completely understand how humans finally came to conceive one universal God. Your response was detailed but you neglected to answer one basic question I thought you would have the courage to answer. It was: Do you believe in God or have another set of moral attributes that you live by and hopefully will teach your children? If you have recommendations to replace the concept of God and ways to establish a morality for people to live by, please share your knowledge with us.

Since you have given much thought about morality, ethics, and integrity, you very likely do have recommendations to replace the concept of God, which is used as the moral authority within the dogmas of many religions.

You need to be better read as to who were the first people who conceived one universal God. You have stated, "The Jews replaced all those gods who created the heaven and the earth by one single Creator of the Universe, a God, a supreme Being who was doing nothing more

than telling the mortals to behave . . .” It is clear that you are poorly knowledgeable about ancient history. But I should not fault you for your lack of knowledge about the ancient Egyptians because it has only been a little over one hundred years that Egyptologists have been able to decipher the hieroglyphics carved on the walls of their temples and pyramids. Prior to Moses walking out of Egypt with over 600,000 followers, the Priesthood of Amon wrote scripture titled *Amon as the Sole God*. If you care to read about how mankind first developed the concepts of a soul, a hereafter upon living a righteous life, one universal God, and of course a Son of God, I recommend you visit www.futureofgodamen.com

Thank you, Inmate 702, for your response, for our Gather members can learn points of view from our discussions that may widen their concept of God and also his possible nonexistence.

Inmate 702, November 25, 2011, 5:58 p.m. EST

Nicholas wrote: “Do you believe in God or have another set of moral attributes that you live by and hopefully will teach your children?”

I did not want to be redundant, and I hoped that you already had your question answered by the way I spelled His name . . .

I have more values that I teach my child, but they are more universal than the Scriptures and have nothing to do with divinity . . .

Nicholas wrote: “If you have recommendations to replace the concept of God and ways to establish a morality for people to live by, please share your knowledge with us.”

I never said or implied that. Morality is one thing and the concept of God is one thing, and religion is a third separate thing . . .

Morality may have common rub-offs with religion at times, however it is more than religion . . .

The Christian religion caused deaths in the name of its religion during the Crusades; it destroyed an ancient civilization in South America, and it may be responsible for the death in the Middle East and Far East right now . . .

And if you or anyone else reading these lines had the feeling that I am against the concept of a Creator of the universe, you are totally wrong. Anyone can have his own belief. I am against passing this belief as a universal truth, imposing it on those who don't have it, and I am against religious indoctrination . . .

As far as Egypt goes, you are right. I don't know too much . . . I went to school before the hieroglyphics were deciphered . . .

As far as Amon, I believe he was the "god Sun," his life was very limited, a subculture which lasted a few hundreds of years, was limited to a very restricted area, and was developed by a pharaoh who wanted exclusivity . . . Besides, he was not a nonexistence who created the Universe. His representation was the sun . . .

While the pre-Christian theologies were based on very earthly forms endowed with supreme powers, having human feelings and human behavior, being bought out by different ways, the Go-d of the Jews is something that no one saw, or dared to see, is an Author of the laws, and if you break them, you can buy your sins out. You have to pay for what you did, and you should remember in the future that it is not wise to commit another sin again . . .

His possible nonexistence.

I never supported that. I always said that He is in my heart and could be in anyone's heart.

Again, what I reject is the "worshiping circus," more commonly known as religion . . .

The pleasure is all mine, Nicholas. I have to admit that, at times, the topics are interesting and intellectually stimulating . . .

Nicholas Ginex, November 25, 2011, 11:14 p.m. EST

Dear Inmate 702,

Thank you for being open and honest about your beliefs. You are also a stimulating person to communicate with. I wasn't sure when you opened your comments with a laugh, but I now know you are a man of integrity who has thought deeply about God and morality.

I was encouraged to learn that you have a fatherly responsibility to teach your child values that would set in place the attributes of integrity, morality, and compassion for others. You are right in that you don't need God to teach such values in a young mind. God does not do for your children what you and your wife can do in providing a common sense grounding that prepares your children for the challenges in life.

When you get to know me better, and I believe we have shared views before, you will find that we both share the same views about God. I do not reject the belief in God because I understand the need to believe in something that does give hope and courage for many people. It does not mean that they are weak but they have a resource that they can turn to. The power of the mind is what comes into play where a belief in God can be a positive force to face many disappointments in life.

Nobody knows God and nobody can really say if a "Creator God of all there is" exists or not. But it is a sound concept as long as people do not abuse it by having a specialized religion state they have the "true God" and are willing to become bigots of those who believe in God differently. It is the differences that the various religions create in their dogma that cause divisions between people to the point of breeding hate and violence whereby they will even kill another person in the name of God.

So it may be that the different religions are not necessarily a good thing due to the differences they have created between people. That is why I wrote this post for people to reflect on the need for God, if it is a good belief to keep for humanity. Do the religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic faiths need to reassess their dogma so that their beliefs in God are consistent?

Thank you again for your response.

Sue B., November 22, 2011, 10:25 p.m. EST

Geez, Nicholas, I don't know. The year 2011 was the future when in 2009, or thereabouts. You mailed the 123 copies of your then-published book that your Web site claims were mailed to religious leaders. Have any responded to "the challenge?" You'd know the answer to your title question better than anyone else, I think.

Nicholas Ginex, November 24, 2011, 5:10 p.m. EST

Hello Sue,

It's always nice to have you in a discussion. Thank you for your comment. Yes, Sue, you bring up a very worthwhile point about the 123 copies of *Future of God Amen* being mailed to religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic faiths. The results were not good. I received an acknowledgment from Archbishop William Joseph Levada in Rome, Vatican City, and a response but a no to joining the Council for Religious Unity from Archbishop Timothy M. Dolan of the Archdiocese of New York. Of those two responses, 34 books were mailed to Catholic leaders, 27 mailed to Conservative and Progressive Judaic leaders, 22 books mailed to Islamic leaders, and 40 mailed to Christian leaders (excluding Catholics).

The answer is clear, that although I am not a well-known author and for that reason alone ignored, I strongly believe that it is only from God-loving people around the world that changes to outworn, inconsistent scriptures can be made. It is the people themselves who have become more educated and discerning about why they believe in God that can bring pressure on religious leaders to unify their beliefs in the one universal God.

I must agree that change to outworn scriptures to be initiated by people worldwide is almost an impossibility. It is my hope that people with your ability to think independently and with a heartfelt desire to see our sisters and brothers throughout our earth learn to love one another by accepting their differences and understanding there is only one universal God—will change take place.

But it takes courage to stand up against authority and realize that scriptures are not cast in concrete. Only continued arrogance by religious leaders and their followers will perpetuate the arrogant view that they have the “true religion.” It may take a World War III between the motivated fanatical religious and political leaders to teach us all a lesson that we are indeed sisters and brothers that must let go of the arrogance that has caused destruction and come together in love and peace.

Marilyn M., November 24, 2011, 5:18 p.m. EST

Outworn Scriptures? I'm sure God loves hearing that you've decided that His words are not useful.

Sue B., November 25, 2011, 10:06 a.m. EST

I pay no attention to that kind of remark from him anymore, Marilyn.

Nicholas Ginex, November 25, 2011, 5:05 p.m. EST

Dear Marilyn and Sue,

You both need to keep an open mind about the many inconsistencies and myths in the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic scriptures that tell the story about man's conception of God. If you have read *A History of Egypt* by Breasted and have read *Future of God Amen* for a detailed history of how the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions have their roots in the formal religion of ancient Egypt, you will begin to "see" that there is much more for you to learn about how man came to conceive one universal God.

Remember, knowledge is a wonderful gift—Ginex.

Lori F., November 22, 2011, 10:25 p.m. EST

I just came cause someone said you had beer here . . . do you?

Sue B., November 22, 2011, 10:26 p.m. EST

Three olives vodka. Sorry.

Joseph H., November 22, 2011, 10:31 p.m. EST

I have some . . . come on over

Nicholas Ginex, November 24, 2011, 5:13 p.m. EST

Hi, guys and girls,

I myself would like a vodka martini with two olives. Who's buying?

Ian Thorpe, November 25, 2011, 10:25 a.m. EST

Lori,

Beer? I thought you were sophisticated. I've just taken delivery of a case of Chateau Beaucasel (not quite in the same league as Chateau

Petrus, but very drinkable, and a case of Chablis Premier Cru). Or do you prefer champagne? I stick up with that every time daughter dear passes through Epernay and visits the caves for us, so that will be next week. But if you're not a lover of fine wines, I guess it's just going to be me and Sue.

One thing about us Northerners, we know how to throw a party!

Nicholas Ginex, November 25, 2011, 5:27 p.m. EST

Hello Ian,

You show a great deal of knowledge about wines, but I hope you did not drink yourself into a stupor because you have missed the entire topic of this post. You may want to return to this post after you have come to realize that by trying to submarine this post with stupidity is really a poor reflection on your integrity and, gee, ability to think constructively.

I know you are an intelligent man and I do look forward to why you are pro or con with the possibility that religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are indeed arrogant by not acknowledging they all pray to the same God. Yes, they like to worship the same God differently because they wrote scriptures that fit their own people thousands of years ago. But, hey, isn't it about time they get over their arrogance and unify their beliefs, or are they going to try to continue to make fools out of their followers?

John Knight, November 24, 2011, 6:19 p.m. EST

Brilliant psycho-logic there, Nick; try to convince people that the God they believe in is not the true God, so they will no longer take His admonition to love one another seriously, since it's not really a directive from a real God. Satan is smiling on you, no doubt.

Nicholas Ginex, November 25, 2011, 5:49 p.m. EST

Hello John,

It's always nice to have you join in a discussion. What I am saying is that the followers of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions all pray to a "true God," but what they do not understand is that there can

only be one universal God and therefore it is the *same* God they all worship. It is just that the religious leaders of these religions are too arrogant to realize that since there is only one God, why not unify their beliefs in that one God? Is power and control of their base of followers more important?

When will the general public become smart enough to understand that they are being duped to think they have the only “true God.” From the comments I have received on this post alone, it is clear that many people are disenchanted with the dogma as taught in old, worn-out scriptures. Only a dope does not realize that the present scriptures cannot be improved upon. The number of inconsistencies, myths, and abominations of the present Scriptures have caused much bigotry, hatred, violence, and murder of innocent people. Thank God there are many people who do believe that there must be improvements by loving and perceptible men and women who are much brighter than many of the original writers of Scripture.

By the way, those who believe in Satan probably still believe in Santa Claus as a real entity. To think we have a Satan to blame all our failures and faults is somewhat a loss of taking responsibility for your own actions. Is it somewhat infantile to think there is a Satan waiting for you at the entrance to hell and is more than happy to see you burning for the next million years? Now wait, is it God or is it Satan that promises the fires of hell? Do you see, John, just how ridiculous are many parts of the Scripture we believe was written by the hand of God?

Matt Suttles, November 24, 2011, 6:32 p.m. EST

I don't believe in any god, and I don't need a god to tell me how to be a decent person.

John Knight, November 24, 2011, 7:41 p.m. EST

I certainly wish you well in that pursuit (I assume) of being a decent person, Matt, but surely even Mr. Hitler felt he was a decent person. I'd bet . . . sometimes people overestimate themselves, you know? Life is very complex, and I think people need all the help they can get to remember to love one another . . . Without that “admonition” from a truly believed-in God, I fear many more would . . . forget, if you catch my drift.

You know, Jesus said he came not to save the righteous but to call sinners to take being righteous more seriously (repent of unrighteous doings). Since being convinced a few years ago that God most certainly is real, I certainly take being righteous more seriously. I mean, I really believe He really is observing and keeping track, so naturally, I am more inclined to be honest, fair, caring about others, and so forth more seriously. I mean, more seriously than I otherwise would, nothing to brag about necessarily, just more than if that idea was not hanging around in my mind, not more than anyone else, just me without that belief.

The “person” whom I call my Lord (Boss of all bosses) tells me that it is His “command” that I somehow learn to care about others in the same way I naturally care about myself. Why anyone would want to convince me (as an example) to stop believing my Boss is real, or that I can trust that this really is His commandment . . . I cannot fathom. Why would someone want me to be less mindful of being fair to and caring about others? It makes no sense to me.

Nick reminds me of His command to behave like that (as much as a worm like me can manage anyway), but he tells me not to believe it’s from God . . . just some stuff some old farts wrote . . . This is “pretzel logic” to me. However “evil” Christians might (or might not) be now. Why in the world would you want them to stop believing there is an all-powerful God commanding them to shape up?

I’m not seeing the wisdom of this plan or preaching or . . . ?

(I think Satan would be pleased, though)

Matt Suttles, November 24, 2011, 9:07 p.m. EST

John K. wrote: “I certainly wish you well in that pursuit (I assume) of being a decent person, Matt, but, surely even Mr. Hitler felt he was a decent person.”

And he was an atheist right? Actually, Hitler was a Catholic.

John K. wrote: “Life is very complex, and I think people need all the help they can get to remember to love one another. Without that ‘admonition’ from a truly believed-in God, I fear many more would . . . forget, if you catch my drift.”

Anyone who would literally just forget to be a decent person if they didn't believe a god told them to is someone I don't feel safe hanging out with.

If you think your God commanded you only to be good, then you obviously either haven't read the Old Testament or don't take it seriously, because the God of the Old Testament is the antithesis of Jesus.

Also, whether or not a belief teaches people to be good has no bearing whatsoever on whether or not that belief is true.

PS. I don't believe in Satan either.

John Knight, November 24, 2011, 10:01 p.m. EST

Matt wrote: "Actually, Hitler was a Catholic."

He even said so, right? Said he was a decent person too, no doubt . . . Lot of things were said by that fellow, and a lot of other folks, that are not true. Propaganda is the name . . . lies. He said some really harsh things about Christians in private and harsh things about what my Lord taught. To me, it is rather obvious that he didn't believe in an all-powerful God that was keeping track, so to speak, certainly not One that commands him to love others as he loves himself. The man was obviously a psychopathic egomaniac, a megalomaniac, not a servant of any Lord but himself.

Under his regime, many thousands of Christian "religious leaders" were murdered in cold blood. I have never read a serious historian describe him as anything but a pagan that flirted with occultism. Check it out in Wiki or something. This is common knowledge with tons of evidence justifying it. Yep, he was a "Catholic" schoolboy . . . must have been what messed him up.

Matt wrote: "If you think your god commanded you only to be good then you obviously either haven't read the Old testament or don't take it seriously, because the God of the Old Testament is the antithesis of Jesus."

In comic books, maybe, but not in the Book. Same Guy. Christ was Him in the body of a man, here for a specific purpose, and at no point

does he in any sense criticize or contradict the God of Abraham. He tells us he is here to fulfill what God had set in motion. Rumors of some sort of change at the Management level are greatly exaggerated, I assure you.

Matt wrote: "P.S. I don't believe in Satan either."

I didn't believe in you until a few hours ago, Matt.

Matt Suttles, November 24, 2011, 10:56 p.m. EST

Since neither of us can read minds (much less the mind of a long-dead Nazi dictator) all we have to go on is what he said himself. Your assertion that he was lying about his Christian beliefs is unsubstantiated, and the idea that he was a Christian doesn't seem a stretch to me. The Bible can be used to justify many contradicting opinions, including both love and violence. I'm not saying all Christians are evil or violent. Most of my friends and family are Christians and great people, but you can use the Bible to justify very evil things depending on the verses you take seriously.

John K. wrote: "In comic books maybe, but not in the Book. Same Guy. Christ was Him in the body of a man, here for a specific purpose, and at no point does he in any sense criticize or contradict the God of Abraham. He tells us he is here to fulfill what God had set in motion. Rumors of some sort of change at the Management level are greatly exaggerated, I assure you."

Well, I'm not going to get into a discussion about the Bible with you because honestly, I'm bored of arguing with believers about their Holy Book. It never changes either of our minds, so there is no point. I will just say that reading the Bible is the reason I became an atheist. I just couldn't justify belief in a God that did the things the Old Testament God supposedly did. That's to say nothing of the numerous contradictions, both with other parts of the book and with what we know scientifically about reality.

I have no interest in getting into a lengthy discussion about religion and your Bible with you. We can both have our beliefs and coexist peacefully.

John Knight, November 25, 2011, 5:19 p.m. EST

Oh, I see . . . you just want to trash the Word, and the God it presents, but don't wish to engage in any lengthy discussions about it . . . and to dictate that "all we have to go on is what (Mr. Hitler) said himself" . . . without any regard for the history of his psychopathic behavior or notorious deceptions and betrayals . . . So that we can both have our beliefs and coexist peacefully . . . With you dictating to me what the Book is and says, and "all we have to go on" with me accepting whatever you say without any dispute . . . for the sake of peace . . . Ya Vol, Commandant.

Matt Suttles, November 25, 2011, 6:13 p.m. EST

John K. wrote: "Oh, I see . . . you just want to trash the Word, and the God it presents, but don't wish to engage in any lengthy discussions about it . . . and to dictate that 'all we have to go on is what (Mr. Hitler) said himself' . . . Ya Vol, Commandant."

I'm not "dictating" what your book says. It's there in plain English. All you have to do is read the "holy" Bible for yourself to see that it's not all about love and peace, and it's certainly not all good. For instance, it calls for a rape victim being forced to marry her rapist.

If a man is caught in the act of raping a young woman who is not engaged, he must pay fifty pieces of silver to her father. Then he must marry the young woman because he violated her, and he will never be allowed to divorce her. (Deut. 22:28-29)

It also includes a lovely story in which a man summons bears in the name of your God to maul some children for making fun of his bald head.

And he went up from thence unto Bethel: and as he was going up by the way, there came forth little children out of the city, and mocked him, and said unto him, Go up, thou bald head; go up, thou bald head. And he turned back, and looked on them, and cursed them in the name of the LORD. And there came forth two she bears out of the wood, and tore forty and two children of them. (2 Kings 2:23-24)

That's just two examples of the evil in the Bible. Of course, that says nothing of whether it's true or not (I don't believe it is by default cause there is no evidence) but do you really think it right to worship the God depicted in that book?

Matt Suttles, November 25, 2011, 6:22 p.m. EST

As for Hitler, I did not disregard his psychopathic behavior, quite the opposite actually. Like I said before, the Bible can be used to justify peace or war, love or hate, good or evil. It all depends on which verses you take seriously.

No matter how you look at it, you can't take the whole Bible seriously because it contradicts itself on telling you how you should behave, and it contradicts basic scientific knowledge.

Matt Suttles, November 25, 2011, 6:27 p.m. EST

Nicholas wrote: "Is it somewhat infantile to think there is a Satan waiting for you at the entrance to hell and is more than happy to see you burning for the next million years? Now wait, is it God or is it Satan that promises the fires of hell?"

That raises the absolute worst moral problem with the Bible. Why would a just and loving God create a place where most of humanity will be sent to be tortured for eternity just for being born? That's not loving or merciful. That's barbaric and sick.

Nicholas Ginex, November 25, 2011, 6:47 p.m. EST

Hello John,

Thank you for providing your views about God and that, apparently, you believe in the Christian God as the "true God." I will say outright that Matt has many misgivings about the God described in the Bible, and it has caused his disenchantment with outworn beliefs to become an atheist. Let it be known that there are many, many other people who are educated and discerning as they read outworn Scriptures. The Scriptures were written in a time where wise men were just beginning to conceptualize God, and they groomed that God for their own people. People today no longer can accept the inconsistencies and myths of Scriptures that were easily accepted by people who were less educated and knowledgeable.

Mr. Knight, I admire your belief in God, but also I am disappointed that you are not able to “see” that there are indeed great improvements needed in the scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. I commend you to read *Future of God Amen* in spite of your desire to shut your mind from any facts and findings that have surfaced over the past one hundred years.

Be fair to yourself and read how man came to believe in one universal God, the Creator of all there is. Do not think that Satan is going to possess you by your taking the initiative to inform yourself of the greatest legacy given to us by the ancient Egyptians. Their God, Amon/Amen, was worshipped for over two thousand years before the birth of Jesus Christ. Actual facts are provided in the book, and it is Jesus who confirms in Revelation 3:14 that Amen is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.”

Now, you can either believe in Jesus or you can believe in your religious leaders who will misconstrue and misinterpret his words. Only by reading the book will you clearly understand that the Hebrews imitated many of the beliefs of the Egyptian priesthood. Their God was the God of all countries, not just for a unique people as was conjured up by the Hebrews. Thank God it was Jesus who opened the belief in God for all people. But you must understand that the religions have always catered to a unique people, and their dogma is not consistent whereby our sisters and brothers have been duped into bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent people.

John, please do not shut out knowledge because you may fear that Satan is going to take you away from God. You are too smart for that to happen.

Matt Suttles, November 25, 2011, 7:08 p.m. EST

Nicholas wrote: “I will say outright that Matt has many misgivings about the God described in the Bible and it has caused his disenchantment with outworn beliefs to become an atheist.”

Actually what caused me to become an atheist was a lack of evidence that there is any God, Christian or otherwise. An all-powerful God, who (depending on who you ask) always existed and created everything we see, is an extraordinary claim, and extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence. The default position is to reject the claim until sufficient evidence presents itself.

I only point out the moral problems with the Bible, specifically because John is a Christian and I hope to make him start thinking about his beliefs.

Jerry Kays, November 25, 2011, 7:23 p.m. EST

Well said, Nicholas . . .

Jerry Kays, November 25, 2011, 7:24 p.m. EST

Well said, Matt . . .

Nicholas Ginex, November 25, 2011, 7:33 p.m. EST

Hello Matt,

I understand your position or view about the nonexistence of God because there is no evidence to substantiate such an Entity. Unlike you, I look at the big picture and our personal relationships with our sisters and brothers throughout the world. I like the idea that the very creation of God was not just one of fear of the unknown, but it was wise men who foresaw the benefits in establishing a uniform code or rules of morality. It was the priesthood of the ancient Egyptians who were intelligent enough to find a way for their people to abide with rules of conduct so that they could be accepted into a hereafter with their God.

Few people know that the concept of a soul, a hereafter, one universal God, and even a Son of God were developed by the Egyptian priesthood. That is why I continually advertise my book *Future of God Amen*. I don't give a damn about making any money on the book. In fact, I give free copies to those who desire to learn about facts and findings that have surfaced only in the last one hundred years.

My goal is to inform people how mankind developed the concept of God. It was not handed down to us out of the sky but written by exceptionally wise men who were aware of the need for a moral structure within a growing community. My offer is open to anybody who wants a free copy. Just e-mail me your address at nickginex@gmail.com

Knowledge is a wonderful gift—Ginex.

Nicholas Ginex, November 25, 2011, 7:34 p.m. EST

Thank you, Jerry. Good to see you have been following the dialogue.

John Knight, November 26, 2011, 7:36 p.m. EST

I don't give a rat's ass what you are saying, Nicholas. You are a deranged, hateful maniac, as far as I'm concerned.

Nicholas Ginex, November 26, 2011, 11:33 p.m. EST

Dear John,

When a person writes a mad reply, it means that person has no logic or facts to respond with. I hope you feel better after a good night's sleep.

John Knight, November 27, 2011, 8:44 p.m. EST

Ain't nothin' "mad" about that response, Nicholas, just truthful.

Nicholas Ginex, November 25, 2011, 7:12 p.m. EST

Dear Gather members,

Thank you for making this a worthwhile discussion. However, you have not answered the fundamental question stated in this post, which was:

If the Egyptian priests were smart enough to rewrite their scriptures, why not the religious leaders of today? Are they so entrenched in religious dogma that they have missed the whole concept of God and the Word of God—to love one another?

To put the question another way, "Why can't Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders meet the challenge to improve their scriptures so that all followers of the one universal God can share the same belief system?"

It is my hope that the consensus of opinion is that they are not arrogant to realize that change is necessary.

I need to agree with Matt that there are infantile stories and myths that are so unworthy for God-loving people to believe that more and more

people will decide that it is better to leave their religion and believe in their own personal God or become an atheist.

I leave for an option another question to ponder; if we no longer believe in God, in what ways will the leaders of every country instill the attributes of love for our sisters and brothers of any country, integrity, honesty, and morality that is the foundation of justice and fairness toward each other? This is a very difficult question. Like all things difficult, it may lead to the need for the belief in God. This is interesting.

Matt Suttles, November 25, 2011, 7:17 p.m. EST

I think the biggest problem with religious people unifying their beliefs is that the leaders of those religions have convinced them that they will anger God by even looking into other belief systems or anything that contradicts what they were taught about god in general. People don't question their beliefs because they've been taught to fear eternal torture in hell, so if they have doubts, they push them aside quickly.

Nicholas Ginex, November 25, 2011, 8:48 p.m. EST

Hello Matt,

You bring out a point that I have not considered. You are entirely correct. In fact, the Scriptures were written with the admonition that not a word is to be altered, for it is the Word of God. But this is a ploy of many of the Babylonian scriptures whereby any changes will bring ultimate death. At the end of the New Testament, threats are stated to not add or take away words of the prophecy in Revelation:

If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of this book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book. (Rev. 22:18, 19)

With this kind of fear and brainwashing that God will cut off any believer from his graces and inflict plagues for altering any portion of the Bible, followers are conditioned to keep the status quo. However, I still believe that mankind will rise up against ignorance and will demand there be revision to the three scriptures and if not, they will continue to fall away from any belief in God.

Matt Suttles, November 25, 2011, 9:04 p.m. EST

Whether they admit it or not, most American Christians have already altered their Holy Book, at least in the sense that they don't take most of it seriously. They like the part about Jesus, but they pretend all the evil in the Old Testament isn't there.

Nicholas Ginex, November 26, 2011, 6:40 p.m. EST

You make another observation about most religious people. However, in addition to Christians, you must not ignore that Judaic and Islamic worshippers are just as close-minded to the faults in their own scriptures. The Torah, Gospels, Revelation, and the Koran have been written by men who desired morality for their people, but in the process, the leaders used the belief in God to grow their numbers and take by force the resources and lands of other people. It is power and control that both the religious and political leaders of a country exert on their followers. In fact, although the Bible has its abominable verses against nonbelievers, killing is sanctioned in the Koran for all nonbelievers of Allah. Islamic leaders are at least outspoken and honest that they use both religion and politics under their system of government; control of their followers is much more effective that way.

Ruta Skadi, November 25, 2011, 11:59 p.m. EST

With utmost respect, Nicholas . . . Many sincere people have thought about "God" with honesty and objectivity and come to differing conclusions. To assume that some accurate "Word of God" can even exist is also to assume that every human's interpretation of God, and even that their acceptance of the existence of God, will manifest itself in some set of matching, human-created words. And this, you must expect, will happen regardless of individual culture, language, need, physical condition, or personal knowledge. This, by definition, cannot possibly be the God of any textbook, whether written by madmen or by sages.

If God exists (and I am not arguing that God does not exist), then I would assert that the truth of God is either far beyond the ability of mere human consciousness to comprehend, or else God is already fully accessible to anyone, in any condition, and at any time. Thus to reduce God to an anthropomorphized "Grand Puppeteer," "Benevolent Mother," "Fearsome Father," or any other manifestation of mere human

language is to deny the light of personal discovery of something far greater.

Unless one has come to the conclusion that God is dead, or that God is unknowable, or God simply doesn't care, then it is not new dogma or superstition that we need. If a God that through faith inspires is to be found, it will be in the absence of all inherently insufficient *human* constructs. God, in God's true nature, must be found by each individual . . . and in silence.

Nicholas Ginex, November 26, 2011, 7:05 p.m. EST

Dear Ruta,

You have provided a most perceptive and interesting view that people, for the most part, construct their own personalized God. Like you, I do not know if God truly exists, and if so, I have no concept of God. To me, God is mysterious, incomprehensible, and unknowable. I agree it is somewhat arrogant to believe that God has created us in His image; it is certainly the other way around.

However, I do believe that the belief in God is a great breakthrough in man's ability to extend the ability of the mind to develop moral and ethical attributes. But also, this belief is a source of power for many who look for strength within themselves and derive hope for better outcomes in the future. The mind is a wonderful thing and belief in something greater than one's self can provide that inner strength to face disappointments or achieve greater goals.

Still, God is not easily constructed within one's mind without some initial teaching from parents or religious leaders. God is a personal construct within one's mind, and His true nature is the inner nature of one's disposition to love; love of one's self and indeed, love for others that add to the beauty and love of life itself.

God is a sublimated belief that can give within one's person a false or wonderful perception of life. As you eloquently stated, God is found in silence—reflection of one's purpose in life and how God can be proud of a wonderful human being.

Ruta Skadi, November 27, 2011, 3:33 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

Thank you for your honest response.

It seems to me that you are taking the position of the “Christian realist” or that of Reinhold Niebuhr, that God may be unknowable, but that a framework based in something real to humans is necessary for our “guidance” toward something more beneficial to coexistence.

My objections to this approach, however, are two-fold:

Firstly, the entire ethic of leading spiritual groups with human images is disturbingly analogous to religious propaganda. And while admittedly an extreme example, the State Shinto of Imperial Japan demonstrates the depths to which this approach may sink. In point of fact, it might be argued that much of religion in general, and Western religion in particular, is based in a propagandist principle of justifying one group over all others by divine right. The result of this is easily demonstrated (even by the accepted histories of the religions themselves) to have resulted in much terrible suffering and destruction. Even the notion of divine “love” can be used to support the concept of “just war” through judgment against those deemed “less loving,” manifesting the ultimate end-justifies-the-means failure for the individual of any value that is dictated by dogmatic principle.

Additionally, I question the long-term value of such an approach, regardless of its immediate influence on spirituality. The failing of religion in general is that it is a necessarily static phenomenon in a world of constant change. What is known or accepted about reality inevitably comes into conflict with dogma, eventually leading to the collapse of a religion’s credibility as a guide to “true understanding” (assuming that it was such in the first place). Thus, theologians may seek to “update” the accepted dogma (whether through a counsel, reformation, or “divine revelation”), but any benefit is merely transitory. This is demonstrated repeatedly in the endless evolution of religions into barely recognizable fragments of their original selves—from the memory of a single man emerge Catholics, Mennonites, Anglicans,

Baptists, Evangelicals, Adventists, Latter Day Saints, Unitarians . . . and that among only those groups who claim to follow the wisdom of Jesus *and* which *still* exists.

I wish you well, and I believe that your idea is well-intentioned and sincere. However, I also think that such an approach is at best destined to fail, and at worst has the potential for great harm. I have no desire to live in a world where people who wield such great power as we Americans are even less compelled to think for themselves. So while it may not be particularly easy or comforting to confront a reality that has no instruction manual, it is certainly better than trying to live by any one set of arbitrarily constructed rules.

Jerry Kays, November 27, 2011, 3:45 p.m. EST

“So while it may not be particularly easy or comforting to confront a reality that has no instruction manual, it is certainly better than trying to live by any one set of arbitrarily constructed rules.”

Such a reality is possible when one seeks only highest truth and uses their intuition to find it. IMnsHO and E.

John Knight, November 27, 2011, 9:04 p.m. EST

Ruta,

“To assume that some accurate ‘Word of God’ can even exist is also to assume that every human’s interpretation of God, and even that their acceptance of the existence of God, will manifest itself in some set of matching, human-created words.”

I see absolutely no reason to think that. Why couldn’t a real God cause such Words to exist? Why would it be necessary in any sense that all supposedly inspired writings be caused by such a Being, or none? Wouldn’t such a One be free to do whatever that One chose to do?

Ruta Skadi, November 27, 2011, 10:08 p.m. EST

John,

Many people sincerely believe that “God” did, in fact, create or inspire a book of divine wisdom. However, there are a multitude of books

claiming such divine authorship with few compatible instructions for living between them. Even among followers of the same sacred texts, there exist arguments regarding the correct interpretations and meanings of those instructions.

The historical result has been either irreconcilable conflict *or* the inability of both individuals and societies to criticize religious ideas or ideologies regardless of their absurdity or maladaptive consequence. Dogmatic religion also requires that societies lie about or pretend not to notice incompatibilities between religious faith and rational thinking.

I am not arguing that God has never revealed Himself to anyone, only that no religious dogma has ever proven universal in its benefit. Peaceful coexistence must be based in a willingness to objectively consider new evidence and new arguments; however, dogmatic religion embodies the passionate unwillingness to engage in just such a process.

John Knight, November 27, 2011, 11:07 p.m. EST

I asked a question, Ruta. I wanted an answer . . . You see, I figure if a person can't do basic logical reasoning, there's really not much point in listening to their lectures . . . Will you give me one? Will you dialog with me?

“Why would it be necessary in any sense, that all supposedly inspired writings be caused by such a Being, or none? Wouldn't such a One be free to do whatever that One chose to do?”

Ruta Skadi, November 27, 2011, 11:46 p.m. EST

Of course, John, if God decides to give some “special” person or group exclusive rights to the Big Picture, certainly the One could choose to reveal whatever He wants to whomever He wants. But what's the purpose of such a revelation within the context of what Nicholas is asking about? Which group has the real inside scoop? Who should we follow? Why should I believe them? What's the litmus test for such a spiritual truth?

In the end, it all just comes back full circle to what you end up deciding for yourself.

John Knight, November 28, 2011, 5:04 a.m. EST

“Of course, John, if God decides to give some “special” person or group exclusive rights to the Big Picture, certainly the One could choose to reveal whatever He wants to whomever He wants.”

There is no apparent logic in what you said, to my mind. The One could obviously “choose to reveal whatever He wants to whomever He wants,” whether He “decides to give some ‘special’ person or group exclusive rights to the Big Picture” or not. Does not this “logic” render the same “conclusion?”

If God decides not to give some “special” person or group exclusive rights to the Big Picture, certainly the One could choose to reveal whatever He wants to whomever He wants.

Isn’t the statement “God could choose to reveal whatever He wants to whomever He wants, simply true?”

And if such words have been generated in the writings we call the Bible, wouldn’t pretty much everyone have access to any “Big Picture” it offers? I mean, you do realize that people all over the world believe it is authentic, and there’s no exclusivity to any “special” person or group involved, right?

John Knight, November 28, 2011, 5:27 a.m. EST

Ruta,

“Who should we follow? Why should I believe them?”

We? Them? No, I’m talking about an “it,” the Book. The actual thing one can hold in their hand and read for themselves.

“What’s the litmus test for such a spiritual truth?”

You read it and see what it suggests. If it is genuine, then whatever it suggests you do (if it does suggest) would by definition be the only potential “litmus test” . . . Yes? I mean, it’s going to be up to Him to provide any sort of “proof” to the person looking for evidence, right? If He’s real, He could do that . . . just as I think we established with my

question. That's sort of my point; He can reveal whatever He wishes to reveal, to whomever He wants to, if He is real.

Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice,
and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him,
and he with me.

There you go, more than a suggestion, a promise. (And some clumsy knocking as well)

Nicholas Ginex, December 7, 2011, 12:09 a.m. EST

Hello Ruta, Jerry, and John,

I just read your comments that started with Ruta's response to some of the ideas I presented in a November 26 response where I wrote: "Dear Ruta, you have provided a most perceptive and interesting view that people, for the most part, construct their own personalized God." You noted that I take a practical and realistic view in the use of religion. I never read Reinhold Niebuhr, but I see he agrees with what the Priesthood of Amon stated about God being "unknowable, mysterious, and incomprehensible." Yet the concept of God provides a framework to establish "guidance" or a moral code for the coexistence of people within a society.

Ruta, I agree with you that God is a very personal thing, a construct that is developed based upon the parents' beliefs, indoctrination in a particular religion, and the people that enter one's life that allow one to think about many other points of view from those who are of a different religious persuasion. As such, even when a person is born into a religious belief of a particular God, that person, due to his or her ability to think and question what was taught, will very likely deviate from the set dogma taught by their religious leader(s).

I would like to address you first of a two-fold objection, which concerned the use of human images as religious propaganda. I agree that this is a fault that was first committed within the Judaic Torah, Genesis 9:6, wherein it clearly states "in the image of God made He man." Then the Christian Church fathers developed the Trinity to pronounce Jesus as not only a Son of God, but an extension co-equal and co-eternal with God. To make matters worse, they included the Holy Spirit as a "third person," which shows little imagination to

understand that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God, a Spirit that I tend to believe pervades the universe.

Again, Ruta, you are right. To personalize God with the arrogant belief He created us in His image is foolish in light of our new view of the universe and the likelihood that other life exists on other planets. But also, people are becoming more intelligent to realize that it is “we” that created God in our own image.

Ruta, your second objection is well founded in that as you stated, “The failing of religion in general is that it is a necessarily static phenomenon in a world of constant change. What is known or accepted about reality inevitably comes into conflict with dogma, eventually leading to the collapse of a religion’s credibility as a guide to ‘true understanding’ (assuming that it was such in the first place).”

Thank you, Ruta, no truer words from your perceptive mind. It is true that each religion has dogma that they are unwilling to change because they fear it may cause their followers to think that the belief in God were made-up revelations.

This is where the dilemma unfolds and becomes difficult to overcome. Why? The religious leaders did not have the foresight to deal with “truth.” All three major religions, Judaic, Christian, and Islamic, were offshoots from the “first formal religion” in the world—the religion of the ancient Egyptians. Once again, Ruta, I have to remind the followers of these three religions that it was the Priesthood of Amon that developed the concept of a soul, a hereafter upon living a righteous life, one universal God, and of course, a Son of God.

Ruta, I end this reply by thanking you for being a perceptive and wise being. Your comments are addressed in the book *Future of God Amen*. It provides how the beliefs in a soul and God originated; why they were adopted by the Hebrews; a critique of the Torah, the Gospels, and the Koran; and most importantly, it provides recommendations for religious leaders of the major religions and their followers to unify their beliefs and revise their scriptures. The need is highly apparent today as we see religious fanatics killing people in the name of God because they are convinced they have the only “true” God.

Ruta, I will be honored to mail you a free copy of *Future of God Amen*. Just e-mail me your mailing address via my e-mail: nickginex@gmail.com

Your participation in this discussion is deeply appreciated.

Ruta Skadi, December 13, 2011, 10:58 p.m. EST

Hello Nicholas,

I just wanted to let you know that I read and very much appreciate your response. While I don't know that I would necessarily agree with your approach, you express a great deal of insight and wisdom. I will give your offer some consideration.

Gilbert S., November 26, 2011, 8:44 a.m. EST

First of all, there are sincere people who believe and NEED to believe in God for their own acceptance of life.

However, when you state: "I strongly believe there is more to learn if we use science and faith as instruments in parallel in *our quest to know God*," it seems to me you reversed the world. If we do have such a quest, it would be because we question about God, his existence, and even, if He sees and thinks the way we do!

This is really arrogance, whichever is our belief.

On the other hand, if this is right, then it would be a confirmation that God is in fact "our own and personal projection into an expected and perfect *self* image."

If so, whatever our religion is, we would be living in peace without any type of profiling. But we would, as well, accept non-monotheistic religions—which anyway have more adepts than monotheistic ones.

Nicholas Ginex, November 26, 2011, 10:49 p.m. EST

Hello Gilbert,

I fully agree that sincere and honest, loving people have a deep belief in God. That God may be worshipped as a Judaic, Christian, or Islamic God, and as you stated, non-monotheistic beliefs such as Hinduism and Buddhism are just as viable in the belief system of many people.

When I stated, "I strongly believe there is more to learn if we use science and faith as instruments in parallel in *our quest to know God*,"

I was alluding to faith based upon “truth,” which then allows such a belief to qualify to be as reliable as science in trying to learn more about God.

Presently, the religious leaders of the three major monotheistic religions do not acknowledge that they all have their roots in the first formalized religion, which is the ancient Egyptian religion. It is no accident that Amen is announced at the end of a prayer, supplication, giving thanks, and singing the name Amen. Certainly, followers of God are not singing “so be it” or “verily, verily.” Amen was worshipped more than two thousand years before the birth of Jesus Christ, and in areas of Africa, Amon is still acknowledged as God. Why, even Jesus in Revelation 3:14 stated that Amen is, “the faithful and true witness, *the beginning of the creation of God.*”

It is this the “truth” of Amen that needs to be acknowledged by the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions? Again, with religious “truth,” it qualifies with science and together mankind will have a greater understanding of their own nature and be able to relate to God as the universe unfolds its mysteries. I do not believe that my statement is an arrogant one but reveals a “truth” that religious leaders in their own arrogance will not admit. It is clear, with the facts and findings by Egyptologists over the past one hundred years, that it is the beliefs of the Egyptian religion that have been emulated by the Hebrews, such as the belief in a soul, a hereafter, a Son of God, and one universal God. At least one to two decades before Moses walked out of Egypt, the Priesthood of Amon wrote *Amon as the Sole God*. The book *Future of God Amen* provides a detailed history, based upon the facts and findings of some of the most renowned Egyptologists and provides several excerpts that the Egyptians worshipped Amen as the God of *all* people including countries other than their own.

For you to believe the “confirmation that God is in fact ‘our own and personal projection into an expected and perfect *self* image’” is wishful thinking on your part. Be honest with yourself, for nobody knows God except for the mental constructs created by several wise men who realized that such a construct would be of great benefit to have a community of people live together in peace and harmony. It is the arrogance of religious men who have created God in man’s image. Even the Egyptian priesthood was astute enough to state that God was mysterious, unknowable, and incomprehensible. Why, scientific minds

don't even know how the first atom was created. How can anybody know if God exists or not?

Dear Gilbert, I am in favor of our belief in God, but it is the God of all people. Mankind has developed many stories that make up his existence and some concepts are of benefit as long as they are developed along the lines of truth. For example, Jesus Christ stated seventy-six times in all four Gospels that he was the Son of Man, and only in the last Gospel of John do others state Jesus is the Son of God six times. Wow, seventy-six versus six times in favor of being a Son a Man. Are the religious leaders misleading their followers only to raise the authority of Jesus and, of course, their religion? Here, you may pause and think. In any case, how many people will follow Jesus if he were thought to be a man and not God? I, for one, will still follow the words of Jesus, the greatest man of God, for he gave us the greatest command in the last Gospel of John that few Christians are aware of; he stated it three times—*love one another*. It is the hypocrites that say they believe in God, and yet they don't even know the Word of God.

Clarke M., November 26, 2011, 9:26 p.m. EST

Whether one believes in one god or many gods or an unknown Creator, the evidence of supernatural faculties has been the common knowledge of peoples of all times and cultures. For Christians, the life and works of Jesus, including his relations with Old Testament prophets and angelic beings before his crucifixion and after his resurrection were witnessed by many. His transferal of many of his powers to his disciples was also recorded. While his life and work was historically unique, what he did was in many respects similar to what other world teachers did both during their earthly lives and after their passing on. Of many other humans as well, there is overwhelming evidence of bilocality, mind-to-mind transmission, and energy transfer at a distance (as in cases of healing and the imparting of knowledge from a teacher to a pupil), “mental telepathy” of various kinds (as is not uncommon still among all humans and notably among some groups, like modern Scandinavians who share common blood lines) and also among humans and animals. Such faculties have been recorded for thousands of years, long before Jesus lived or the Bible was composed. It is only a tiny number of members of humanity who have thought that these faculties might not exist and even claim they don't, although they cannot possibly prove so. A real science or knowledge of these things

does exist but obviously not the science that is limited to observing only visible matter.

That some contemporary humans have “eyes of flesh, not eyes of fire” and a darkened consciousness regarding the invisible world is a recent historical phenomenon, brought about by the spread of materialistic ideas and a focus on the natural world over the past few hundred years. This has helped to create a civilization in which humans cease to have an identity in the world except as physical beings who are not even related in a normal way to the life of the natural world. Past civilizations that became focused on partial ideas about the world and then distorted and misused them for selfish aims have all failed, often through becoming suicidal or sterile. Associated with the possession of healing and other enhanced powers, there has always been the notion of hierarchy, that is, the greater completeness of some humans than others and that moral and ethical laws are based on the wisdom of the most developed in governing those less developed. The major world religions were originally formed based on a conscious knowledge of what forms were most appropriate for different cultures and peoples.

Nicholas Ginex, November 26, 2011, 11:18 p.m. EST

Hello Clark,

I enjoyed your thoughts about the spread of materialistic ideas and a darkened consciousness of the invisible world, that is, humans have lost some of their inherent abilities, such as “mental telepathy.”

What I found interesting and made sense was your closing thoughts, which were: “Associated with the possession of healing and other enhanced powers, there has always been the notion of hierarchy, that is, the greater completeness of some humans than others and that moral and ethical laws are based on the wisdom of the most developed in governing those less developed. The major world religions were originally formed based on a conscious knowledge of what forms were most appropriate for different cultures and peoples.”

Your final thoughts are very much in agreement with the reality that it was more highly developed humans, shall we call them wise men, who devised patterns of behavior or morality under a hierarchy of god(s) to govern their people. Your last sentence sums it up, “The major world religions were originally formed based on a conscious

knowledge of what forms were most appropriate for different cultures and peoples.”

Thank you, Clark, for rendering a sound set of ideas that are “true.”

Gilbert S., November 26, 2011, 11:25 p.m. EST

Related to previous comment of yours:

May I disagree?

Nicholas Ginex, November 26, 2011, 11:29 p.m. EST

Hello Gilbert,

Of course you may disagree, but first state what you do not agree with so that I can appreciate your point of view.

Clarke M., November 27, 2011, 10:19 p.m. EST

“I enjoyed your thoughts about the spread of materialistic ideas and a darkened consciousness of the invisible world. That is, humans have lost some of their inherent abilities, such as ‘mental telepathy.’”

I said mental telepathy was not uncommon, and that includes not just between humans but also with animals (and other life forms, as plants). As with some healers, telepathy has many levels, from conscious to instinctive. It is not cultivated as part of general contemporary education because of an emphasis on rationalistic reductionist thinking.

“Your final thoughts are very much in agreement with the reality that it was more highly developed humans, shall we call them wise men, that devised patterns of behavior or morality under a hierarchy of god(s) to govern their people. Your last sentence sums it up, ‘The major world religions were originally formed based on a conscious knowledge of what forms were most appropriate for different cultures and peoples.’”

The keys to understanding the meaning of the original texts and rituals that the world religions contained have been forgotten or distorted by the leaders of different religions. But knowledge doesn’t change, and it has been transmitted by a small number, sometimes in new forms

and language. There is no benefit in repeating what has become dogma or words that no longer make sense to contemporary people. It is a question of rediscovering the lost knowledge through educating people in the language they have learned, whether this be in terms of contemporary science or philosophy. Knowledge doesn't change, but the capacity of individuals to acquire it is relative. Through education, many can learn to acquire knowledge. If the leaders don't know, they can't teach, but those who know can.

Gilbert S., November 27, 2011, 10:45 p.m. EST

Maybe I should change the word "wise" men with "clever" men spreading their power?

How many slaves, wars, killings, rapes in the name of such "clever" men who were spreading their superstitions as we do with pepper sprays?

Yes, civilization (?) provoked a loss of communication with the environment just because it is painful, but far easier, to deal with reality . . .

Thomas E., November 27, 2011, 10:49 p.m. EST

"How many slaves, wars, killings, rapes in the name of such 'clever' men who were spreading their superstitions as we do with pepper sprays?"

I don't know. Probably far less than what atheists have done to spread their beliefs on others.

Clarke M., November 27, 2011, 11:19 p.m. EST

"Yes, civilization (?) provoked a loss on communication with the environment just because it is painful, but far easier, to deal with reality . . ."

The separation of mind and body isolates humans from nature and the inevitable result is a loss of identity or a sense of self: humans become "lower than the animals." "The problem of the nineteenth century was that 'God is dead.' The problem of the twentieth century is that 'Man is dead,' " as the psychoanalyst Erich Fromm noted some sixty years ago.

Nicholas Ginex, November 28, 2011, 2:51 a.m. EST

Hello Clark,

You pose some interesting thoughts to pursue, because they definitely relate to humans and their ability to know themselves and enhance their relationships with others. To state that humans become lower than animals because of the separation of mind and body may have some merit. Why? It depends upon what kind of religious dogma has been accepted by the mind whereby the mind begins to think it is a sin to enjoy the pleasures and passions of the body. The body is a most wonderful asset of a human being in that it responds to pleasure and finds an inner release when shared with somebody that one loves. The mind is part of that experience, and it is the mingling of the mental senses of two minds that can experience a great oneness with one another, which is greater than self-gratification.

There is taught by some religious dogma that the enjoyment of the senses is a baseless and sinful desire that separates the mind from the body; this is nonsense. It is this very sense of guilt of enjoying the pleasures of the body that causes normal human beings to develop psychotic problems. And yes, by alienating the body from the mind, we do indeed become animals, because it is only when both the mind and body share in the intimate relationship physically and mentally that both partners can rejoice in a feeling of well-being.

Clark, the problem of the nineteenth century that “God is dead” is simply a stage of human development whereby educated and discerning God-loving people no longer can believe the myths and inconsistencies of religious dogma as taught by the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. This does not mean that the belief in God is dead; it means that the religions themselves are dead because they have not kept pace with the development of human beings. Then to say “Man is dead” in the twentieth century is the logical response of there being a loss in the belief in God; this is also nonsense.

What has happened is humans have become more materialistic and consumer-oriented, but worse than that is the loss of respect of human beings for one another. This is due to a poor upbringing starting with the conception and birth of a baby devoid of love. The materialistic aspects have become more of an attribute as one seeks a mate for a

lifetime. Gone are the attributes that are formed by the mother-father love instilled in a child that become the cornerstones of integrity, honesty, sincerity, compassion, and love for others.

So if people can define the problem, then they can solve the problem. This is not easy. Why? We have a distorted understanding of love. There are many people, for example, due to their misinterpreted religious convictions, that believe that abortion is evil, a sin, and is not in accord with the Word of God, which is love one another. However, these same people will sanction the birth of a baby conceived without love, will permit the rape of a woman to bear the baby, and will rather have that woman pay for the rest of her life to accept a baby from a man who has no love for her but was a mistake committed in the heat of passion. Here, we have religious people that want to bring into this world a baby that was never intended to be loved; this is the greatest sin, for this mindset perpetuates stupidity whereby more unloved children are brought into this world and they become the likely candidates to perpetuate this arrogance. This is a misapplication of the Word of God to *love one another*.

A solution is that the scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions sorely need to be updated and improved to eliminate myths and inconsistencies. Many improvements are possible when the religious leaders are in accord with a unity of belief in one universal God and all people have a better set of moral and ethical teachings to live by the Word of God—*love one another*.

Clarke M., November 28, 2011, 2:58 p.m. EST

Nicholas wrote: “Clark, the problem of the nineteenth century that ‘God is dead’ is simply a stage of human development whereby educated and discerning God-loving people no longer can believe the myths and inconsistencies of religious dogma as taught by the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. This does not mean that the belief in God is dead; it means that the religions themselves are dead because they have not kept pace with the development of human beings. Then to say ‘Man is dead’ in the twentieth century is the logical response of there being a loss in the belief in God; this is also nonsense.”

I think you are misunderstanding Fromm’s analysis. The notion that any religious dogma that is phrased in the language of former times

can make common sense to most contemporary people seems wrong. As I wrote above: “There is no benefit in repeating what has become dogma or words that no longer make sense to contemporary people. It is a question of rediscovering the lost knowledge through educating people in the language they have learned, whether this be in terms of contemporary science or philosophy. Knowledge doesn’t change, but the capacity of individuals to acquire it is relative. Through education, many can learn to acquire knowledge. If the leaders don’t know, they can’t teach, but those who know can.”

I think Fromm and Karl Jung were seeking the “lost” knowledge of which I wrote, although they only found a part of that perennial knowledge, which does not and cannot “change.” They were seekers, not “knowers.”

Fromm was a therapist, and his diagnosis of the ills of society was valid insofar as he recognized the abnormal behaviors of individuals and their social institutions, whether secular or religious. He was a secular humanist and scientist in orientation. Karl Jung, also a therapist, agreed with Fromm’s analysis of Western society of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. However, Jung was a mystic whose orientation was religious. Jung stated that he never had a patient over thirty whose problem was not essentially a religious one. Where they agreed was that the loss of authority of the Church led to the rise, as Jung put it, of the scum to power, that is, governments in which the masses of the people became dominated by leaders who sought power and control over others. The people in general were more sane, morally responsible, and balanced than their leaders. For Jung, very few individuals had the wish or will to undertake the work to become mature and conscious individuals. Most only wished to adapt or adjust to the abnormal societies in which they lived that were run by inferior types, some psychopaths who craved power and control over the masses. Fromm, on the other hand, had social democratic ideals and sought to educate the people to become normal citizens who were not susceptible to the tyranny and greed of self-serving leaders who often served the interests of the rich, not the welfare of the people or even their nations. The situation in the United States today, in which the multinational corporations own the politicians, the universities and other institutions, and are able to write the laws and control the courts is one example. Whereas Jung would say, “There is no such thing as the

mass man. There is only the individual,” Fromm stressed a humanist agenda. In his best-known work, *The Art of Loving*, he writes:

Love is not a sentiment which can be easily indulged in by anyone, regardless of the level of maturity reached by him. All his attempts for love are bound to fail, unless he tries most actively to develop his total personality, so as to achieve a productive orientation; that satisfaction in individual love cannot be attained without the capacity to love one’s neighbor, without true humility, courage, faith and discipline. In a culture in which these qualities are rare, the attainment of the capacity to love must remain a rare achievement. Or—anyone can ask himself how many truly loving persons he has known.

If two people who have been strangers, as all of us are, suddenly let the wall between them break down, and feel close, feel one, this moment of oneness is one of the most exhilarating, most exciting experiences in life.

It is all the more wonderful and miraculous for persons who have been shut off, isolated, without love. This miracle of sudden intimacy is often facilitated if it is combined with, or initiated by, sexual attraction and consummation. However, this type of love is by its very nature not lasting.

The two persons become well acquainted, their intimacy loses more and more of its miraculous character, until their antagonism, their disappointments, their mutual boredom kill whatever is left of the initial excitement. Yet, in the beginning they do not know all this: in fact, they take the intensity of the infatuation, this being “crazy” about each other, for proof of the intensity of their love, while it may only prove the degree of their preceding loneliness. There is hardly any activity, any enterprise, which is started with such tremendous hopes and expectations, and yet, which fails so regularly, as love. If this were the case with any other activity, people would be eager to know the reasons for the failure, and to learn how one could do better—or they would give up the activity.

The first thing we have to learn is that love is an art, just as living is an art; if we want to learn how to love we must proceed in the same way we have to proceed if we want to learn any other art. Maybe here lies the answer to the question of why people in our culture try so rarely to learn this art, in spite of their obvious failures: in

spite of the deep-seated craving for love, almost everything else is considered to be more important than love: success, prestige, money, power—almost all our energy is used for learning of how to achieve these aims, and almost none to learn the art of loving.

Clarke M., November 28, 2011, 5:39 p.m. EST

“But, of course, I am lazy and find myself far more comfortable when dealing with ‘my’ (because it is only ours) reality than with others’ dreams and expectations.”

Gilbert,

The notion that “I” exist, that “my reality” is real is a dangerous illusion. Apropos, Fromm has noted, “The deepest need of man . . . is the need to overcome his separateness, to leave the prison of his aloneness. The absolute failure to achieve this aim means insanity, because the panic of complete isolation can be overcome only by such a radical withdrawal from the world outside that the feeling of separation disappears—because the world outside, from which one is separated, has disappeared.”

Nicholas Ginex, November 29, 2011, 2:55 a.m. EST

Dear Clark,

Your response is very much in accord with a solution I proposed (**Nicholas Ginex**, November 28, 2011, 2:51 a.m. EST) that deals with love. Thank you for providing the excerpt by Eric Fromm whereby his last point was that love is something that needs to be understood and experienced like anything else we try to learn about. He stated, “Maybe here lies the answer to the question of why people in our culture try so rarely to learn this art, in spite of their obvious failures: in spite of the deep-seated craving for love, almost everything else is considered to be more important than love: success, prestige, money, power—almost all our energy is used for learning of how to achieve these aims, and almost none to learn the art of loving.”

I am in agreement with Mr. Fromm, but I seek a solution whereby love starts with the admiration of two people for the qualities each possess. True, physical aspects play a great role where tall people are attracted to shorter people to compensate for being extraordinarily tall

and vice versa. In most cases, beauty and handsome gifts play a prime role, but what is most important are the qualities that people “see” and “respect” in each other, which are sincerity, integrity, thoughtfulness, compassion, and the ability to communicate on the same mental level. It is these qualities that two people in love desire to transfer into their baby, which will be the combination of what they admire in each other.

That is where I depart from Mr. Fromm’s analysis, but I am certain he will be first to agree with the solution that has been stated very simply by the greatest teacher, Jesus, who in the last Gospel of John stated three times the Word of God—*love one another*. These three words by themselves require much to be learned about human nature and to value the attributes of integrity, honesty, and compassion for others. However, one does not need religion to attain these attributes nor does one need to believe in God.

My contention is that love starts with two people who are attracted to each other because of the quality attributes they admire in each other. It is the parents of the baby they bring into this world that provide the basis for love. They, not God, feed, clean, love, and care for the baby. This love is felt by the baby, and as the years go by, it is the continuing love of the mother and father that forms a youth with confidence in itself and the ability to love others, for it has had the upbringing whereby it was surrounded with love.

This is why I strongly support abortion. For if a woman becomes pregnant due to rape, a foolish mistake whereby there was never any desire to join their lives together with love, then I contend that to bring that baby into this world without the love that should initiate a life-long relationship of love, the idea of abortion is much better than to have a baby born without love. Oh sure, the holy hypocrites that are pro-life raise a loud outcry, but they have ignored the command given by Jesus to “love one another.” Are they standing in line to adopt a baby that may have been fathered by a mental deficient, a rapist, a person who forced his sexual appetite on a woman; to adopt a baby conceived without the basic ingredient of love? What fools these mortals be!

I agree with Mr. Fromm that love must be taught and experienced, but it starts with a kiss between two lovers that desire to join their attributes in the birth of a baby. With a solid grounding starting with the care the mother takes to eat the right foods to nourish the baby to

be born, that baby, as it becomes an adult, will have an affinity to love and rightly so with the attributes taught to respect honesty, sincerity, and to admire integrity in oneself and in others.

One last point concerning knowledge: Knowledge is a wonderful gift. However, knowledge is like truth. It may be accepted today, but tomorrow, there may be a modification or improvement in the knowledge one has acquired. The ancient Egyptians are a prime example whereby the Priesthood of Amon consisted of wise, intelligent men who were astute enough to revise their conception of many gods and finally reach a belief that has given mankind an answer to the creation of all there is, one universal God.

Nicholas Ginex, December 7, 2011, 11:59 p.m. EST

Hello Ckark, Gilbert, and Jerry,

I completed reading the interchanges between Clark and Gilbert. It appears they are both trying to solve questions between themselves about man's relationship with God and the nature of the body verses that of the soul. This conversation appears to be a two-way dialog that appears to separate our readers from the topic of this post, namely, *Will Religious Leaders Respond to the Challenge?*

In my response under Nicholas Ginex, November 29, 2011, 2:55 a.m. EST, I raised a very down-to-earth assertion, which was "That is where I depart from Mr. Fromm's analysis, but I am certain he will be first to agree with the solution that has been stated very simply by the greatest teacher, Jesus, who in the last Gospel of John stated three times the Word of God—love one another. These three words by themselves require much to be learned about human nature and to value the attributes of integrity, honesty, and compassion for others. However, one does not need religion to attain these attributes nor does one need to believe in God."

It is surprising to find that there has been no rebuttal to the above assertion. Also, I was surprised that there was no comment to my contention that knowledge is like truth. What is accepted today, based upon more experience and learning about ourselves and the world, may need to be modified as we find ourselves changing along with our development in a changing world. This means that the scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are in dire need of being

improved upon, because people have become much more educated and discerning about what they read and ingest into their mental framework. To believe that the scriptures are set as truth for eternity is counter to the knowledge people are attaining with every generation. Let's face it. The scriptures have caused bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent people. Yes, the Priesthood of Amon was astute and wise enough to revise their beliefs in God until they arrived at the concept of one universal God. This means that beliefs can and must change.

To have today the monotheistic religions not agree on the *same* God and have a uniform belief in that *same* God is the height of stupidity. Everybody knows, at least today, that there is only one Creator God of "all there is." So let us entertain the subject of this post, "Will Religious Leaders Respond to the Challenge?"

Gilbert S., December 8, 2011, 9:57 a.m. EST

"To have today, the monotheistic religions not agree on the same God and have a uniform belief in that same God is the height of stupidity. Everybody knows, at least today, that there is only one Creator God of 'all there is.'"

This seems to me contradictory: about two persons out of seven adhere to a monotheistic religion: a same God and different ways to reach Him.

"Everybody knows that there is only one Creator God of 'all there is.'"

In fact, this is a projection of a feeling shared by many (about 2 billion against 7 billion), but even if this could in some way be related to the big bang—thanks to Unicity—this belief is in no way universal and is the assertion of something we do feel but has not yet been proved because it remains "personal."

Clarke M., December 8, 2011, 6:32 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

But I have already expressed my disagreement at length on your previous posts on your ideas:

"Let's face it, the scriptures have caused bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent people. Yes, the priesthood of Amon was astute

and wise enough to revise their beliefs in God until they arrived at the concept of one universal God. This means that beliefs can and must change.

To have today, the monotheistic religions not agree on the *same* God and have a uniform belief in that *same* God is the height of stupidity. Everybody knows, at least today, that there is only one Creator God of “all there is.” So let us entertain the subject of this post, “Will Religious Leaders Respond to the Challenge?”

The Priesthood of Amon were representatives of a late, decadent phase of Egyptian culture which was dedicated to preserving the physical body in the afterlife through rituals dramatizing a God with two “faces”—one the bright side of the sun, the other the dark side—who had power in this life and the afterlife. Early Western researchers and thinkers like Freud misread the texts and projected Judaic ideas, including the mission and teachings of Moses, upon the Egyptian texts. Scholars have since been able to correct these errors through the discovery of new texts and artifacts that provided a truer knowledge of Egyptian history and beliefs. The development of the Hebraic monotheism from Abraham was a separate development from what happened in Egypt.

Your view that the Bible and Koran “have caused bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent people” does not apply to what is contained in those scriptures, which depict the struggle of human beings to overcome their failings and learn to obey the law and serve God. That people have used scriptures to practice bigotry, hate, violence, and kill innocent people is part of the history of religions, but it is a distortion of the true teachings, and it is true today of some of the “religious leaders” you think should learn from the Egyptian texts that you have wrongly understood. The notion that “Amen” in the Bible has any relation to Egyptian teachings is wrong. I have noted above, “The Arabs have a saying that there are as many ways to God as there are children of Adam.” The monotheistic religions speak of Adam as the first human: Adam’s mission was to bring higher knowledge into life. The Old Testament makes this clear and the New Testament affirms everything in the Old: the two constitute one story. The connection between Jesus and Adam is fundamental to Christian doctrine and holds together the entire Christian system of election, redemption, atonement, justification (acquittal), regeneration, and sanctification. The stations or stages “election, redemption, atonement, justification

(acquittal), regeneration, and sanctification” describe the “salvation story” from Adam to Christ in this world. The Egyptian cult is about preparing humans for their passage in the afterlife, accompanied by replicas of their earthly belongings, including their pets! There are thousands of dogs and cats in their tombs.

Nicholas wrote: “To have today the monotheistic religions not agree on the *same* God and have a uniform belief in that *same* God is the height of stupidity. Everybody knows, at least today, that there is only one Creator God of ‘all there is.’ So let us entertain the subject of this post, ‘Will Religious Leaders Respond to the Challenge?’”

This sort of radical preaching resembles fundamentalist cant. I have indicated above that monotheistic religions have no better claim to serving and experiencing the Creator than other world faiths, including Buddhism.

The contemporary Buddhist Thich Nhat Hanh has said, “But just as . . . suffering is present in every cell in our body, so are the seeds of awakened understanding handed down to us from our ancestors.” We are all children of Adam, imperfect “sinners,” who thanks to the sacrifice of our parents and the prayers and good works of those who have preceded us, have the possibility of working out our salvation and preparing the young to have a future.

Nicholas Ginex, December 10, 2011, 3:50 a.m. EST

Hello Clarke,

I will not debate but accept your Judaic-Christian beliefs. It is not my intention to dissuade you from your beliefs but to reveal to you documented and verified evidence and facts that have been brought to light by Egyptologists and religious scholars. It appears that you have not yet read *Future of God Amen*, and this is most surprising, because as a staunch believer in the Old and New Testament, I thought you would have the discipline and curiosity to read what has surfaced over the past one hundred years.

You will find that all the conclusions contained in *Future of God Amen* are supported by facts and not hypothetical revelations. You appear to be gullible in accepting the thoughts of the contemporary Buddhist who stated, “But just as . . . suffering is present in every cell

in our body, so are the seeds of awakened understanding handed down to us from our ancestors.” This Buddhist is partially correct in that knowledge is handed down from our ancestors, but to say suffering is present in every cell in our body is an unverified assumption. He could just as well stated that in every cell in our body are the joys of life, but as you can see, the Buddhist is a product of contemplating only the negative aspects of human nature.

It is good that you acknowledge that “the Egyptian cult is about preparing humans for their passage in the afterlife, accompanied by replicas of their earthly belongings, including their pets!” You are verifying that it was the Egyptians that were first to develop the concept of heaven whereby they may join their God upon living a righteous life. Of course, you are well read to know that Abraham and his people assimilated many of the beliefs of the ancient Egyptians. Are you aware that the marvelous concept of a soul originated within Egyptian beliefs as well?

Notice how you denigrate the Egyptian religion by referring to it as a cult. However, Jesus thought differently, for he was a man of truth. Jesus proclaimed that Amen is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the beginning of the creation of God.” You refuse to acknowledge the words of Jesus, even though you believe that he is co-eternal and co-equal with God. This would mean that Jesus “always existed” with God from the beginning and was “never created.” This means that if Jesus was “never created,” he cannot be Amen, who by Jesus’s own words was “created.” Jesus proclaimed that Amen is “the beginning of the creation of God.” By not acknowledging Jesus for propounding a truth, indeed “a revelation,” you do not “see” the inconsistency of the view that Jesus revealed in Revelation 3:14 and the misrepresentation of today’s religious leaders, who either say Jesus was Amen or Amen means “so be it.”

It is clear that if followers like yourself, who may be highly intelligent and educated, cannot “see” the truth of Jesus words, then there is little hope for religious leaders to rise above their arrogance and accept the words of Jesus that Amen was indeed God’s way of introducing mankind into the belief of one universal God. Yes, you and religious leaders believe that the concept of one universal God started with the Hebrews, but due to lack of Egyptian history and fear to acknowledge the truth, the idea that *Amen* existed two thousand years before the birth of Jesus is too much to bear. Let me again reference the document

that conclusively proves that the Egyptians believed in one universal God *Amon as the Sole God*. It was written before Moses walked out of Egypt with the concept of one God. We have got to learn to accept the truth of the past, or indeed, the religions of today will crumble and die in years to come. It is great loss of the human spirit to believe in something greater than oneself.

Jerry Kays, November 27, 2011, 3:34 a.m. EST

I do *not* agree that nobody can know *God* . . . to know the unconditional love of what resonates as the highest truth knowable by mankind *is* to know, at least, of *God* . . . IMnsHO and E.

I would stake my very life on what I have come to call the BET (Basic Equation of Truth) signified by the triad of (+=-) . . . which is in effect a new revelation (compared to the dualist (+/-) version) of *God* (not God nor gods) as being rather *neutral* (which *is good* to me).

Nicholas Ginex, November 28, 2011, 3:22 a.m. EST

Hello Jerry,

Thank you for sharing your experience whereby your unconditional love of God has given you the feeling that you know God. You are much more fortunate than most people who have all to do to believe in God. I believe you at one time admitted that you were an agnostic. However, I believe in your own way, that through an unconditional love of God, you feel His presence within your being.

This experience of yours is not uncommon. Many worshipers of God have felt the presence of God, and it is the wonderful aspects of the mind that is capable of constructing a vision of God that becomes very real to them, real enough to feel they can commune with God through prayer. There is such a thing as consciousness that pervades the universe; some refer to it as some unknown force or energy that has brought into existence matter throughout the universe. Another hypothetical thought is that consciousness is the Holy Spirit of God. Why? Because nobody knows God. He is mysterious, unknowable, and incomprehensible.

The love we feel in our hearts and minds can be sublimated to believe it is God, but that depends where you initially got such thoughts

of God instilled into your mind. If you were born a Muslim, your conception and beliefs in God would be different than that of a Hebrew or Christian believer. But isn't this a shame of it all to have people believe in God, but they all are at crossroads with each other and have all to do to tolerate each other. My, my, the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders have all missed the boat, for they have missed teaching the Word of God—*love one another*. When will they learn that they all pray to the same God?

Gilbert S., December 8, 2011, 9:32 a.m., EST

Unfortunately, Nicholas, at least as far as I am concerned, this statement of yours is wrong: "It appears they are both trying to solve questions between themselves about man's relationship with God and the nature of the body verses that of the soul."

First of all: IMO, religions are a way to channelize and set up some type of standardized behavior in a personal way to deal with our own projection into God. Religions are a vehicle, while leaders may be their driver, chauffeur, or cab man, as you wish.

As far as "love one another," this means that each human being should be tolerant in regard to all others. We could remain blind, but such a tolerance is already quite restricted (Katrina: one parish was not helping a "stranger" to it; if the religions differs, such a tolerance seems to disappear, etc.).

On top of it, what is truth for someone may not be truth for somebody else. The absolute truth is not existing. This is why tolerance is so complex to be accepted and applied.

Nicholas Ginex, December 10, 2011, 4:38 a.m. EST

Hello Gilbert,

Thank you for your response. You are correct about truth. It may be acceptable today, but tomorrow, due to more knowledge about ourselves and the world, we may need to modify what we thought was "unchangeable truth."

Your view about "religions are a way to channelize and set up some type of standardized behavior in the personal way to deal with our own

projection into God” is true. You also wrote: “Religions are a vehicle, while leaders may be their driver, chauffeur, or cab man, as you wish.” This is true, for as with any discipline, there must be teachers to reveal the best information available. However, the religious teachers/leaders may be somewhat misguided and a reassessment may need to be performed (such as a need to improve their scriptures).

When Jesus stated God’s last command three times in John’s Gospel to “love one another,” he meant much more than “tolerate” one another. This is another aspect of God’s command not fully understood, and it is because love is “an art,” it is taught from the moment a baby enters the world. It is the love of a mother and father, their care in feeding, clothing, protecting, instructing, and preparing the newborn for the external world. Love must be continued to be taught as the child enters the various levels of education, and that is where such qualities as integrity, honesty, sincerity, and compassion for others become part of the development process. Certainly, the words of Jesus, “love one another,” is a phrase that requires lots of work by parents, teachers, and religious leaders.

All of the wonderful attributes can be taught without the belief in God. But this would be a short-sighted mistake. The belief in God, an Entity that is a personal construct in one’s mind, has many positive benefits, for it allows the mind to expand into higher and nobler thoughts that help form a better human being, a being that has the hope for a better life and is able to find strength in a Power that can lift one from despair. There is nothing wrong with the belief in God. What is wrong are the distortions, lies, and deceptions in fabricating an image of God and upholding that God as the only “true” God. Such fabrications will lead to one group of people isolating themselves from another group, causing bigotry, hatred, violence, and the killing of innocent people. We witness such stupidity today, which occurs around the world.

The question remains, can our religious leaders meet the challenge to unify their religious beliefs and teach the Word of God—love one another?

If we succeed, we may yet welcome other life forms that exist in the universe. That would be a great achievement to meet other forms of life created by God. I look forward to such a future. Yes, I am an optimist, because I love human beings and will try my best to set them on a successful journey.

Clarke M., December 10, 2011, 5:11 a.m. EST

Nicholas wrote: “It appears they are both trying to solve questions between themselves about man’s relationship with God and the nature of the body verses that of the soul. This conversation appears to be a two-way dialog that appears to separate our readers form the topic of this post, namely, ‘Will Religious Leaders Respond to the Challenge?’”

Unfortunately, Nicholas, at least as far as I am concerned, this statement of yours is wrong: “It appears they are both trying to solve questions between themselves about man’s relationship with God and the nature of the body verses that of the soul.”

First of all: IMO (in my opinion), religions are a way to channelize and set up some type of standardized behavior in the personal way to deal with our own projection into God. Religions are a vehicle, while leaders may be their driver, chauffeur, or cab man as you wish.

All the world religions have a common aim. They also teach of the perfection of man and humanity. I have worked with thousands of people from many faiths who contributed much to their societies and neighbors, of all classes and types, in both material and intellectual ways. Were it not for such people, humanity might have destroyed itself long before now or become reduced to barbarism. If you do not know some humans have powers that are termed “miraculous,” as I have described, so be it. They exist. They have also been described in the texts of the world religions. There is reason for humans having these powers as well as for the various religious teachings. How humans understand this varies according to their individual understanding.

Gilbert wrote: “As far as ‘love one another,’ this means that each human being should be tolerant in regard to all others. We could remain blind, but such a tolerance is already quite restricted (Katrina: one parish was not helping a ‘stranger’ to it; if the religions differ, such a tolerance seems to disappear, etc.)”

People’s behavior varies, whatever their beliefs or understanding. “Love one another” is taught in all religions as a higher value. But we know that humans often believe that what they do is “good” at the time, even when they kill others.

Gilbert wrote: “On top of it what is truth for someone may not be truth for somebody else. The absolute truth is not existing. This is why tolerance is so complex to be accepted and applied.”

Precisely. But to assume that truth is not an absolute is to believe we can know what truth is.

Jerry Kays, December 11, 2011, 3:22 p.m. EST

We *can* believe what we know truth to be . . . *but* . . . unless we realize that it is subjective and relative and that another can have a different truth due to a different perspective, there will not be peace associated with truth.

Nicholas Ginex, December 12, 2011, 4:09 a.m. EST

Dear Clark and Jerry,

Thank you for a few thoughts on truth. Jerry, truth is knowledge about something that we find is stable and not suspect to change. But as demonstrated in the past, what was considered truth can be replaced by new discoveries, be they on a material or personal level.

Regarding Clark’s interpretation of “love one another” meaning each person should be tolerant to all others, I take exception. Love is a word that encompasses many aspects on a mental, emotional, physical, and spiritual level. Love is taught and learned from the start of birth as a mother and father provides such love in many ways. I have already discussed this and cannot agree with Clark’s statement, “Love one another is taught in all religions as a higher value. But we know that humans often believe that what they do is ‘good’ at the time, even when they kill others.”

Such a statement shows a lack of understanding that, because scripture, namely the Koran, incites bigotry, hate, violence, and killing of people who do not worship the same God, it does not mean these misguided people are doing “good.” In fact, to believe that they are doing “good” by killing innocent people is a failure of the religious leaders to teach the Word of God—love one another.

Your response reflects many of your own views about religion and God, but you really should concentrate on the question this post has

raised, which is: Can our religious leaders meet the challenge to unify their religious beliefs and teach the Word of God—love one another?

Marilyn M., December 12, 2011, 8:59 a.m. EST

The Bible is God-inspired and God-breathed. How in the world do you think you can make something better than God? How arrogant.

Nicholas Ginex, December 13, 2011, 2:21 a.m. EST

Hello Marilyn,

Thank you for validating your belief in the Bible. In reality, the Bible has many myths, inconsistencies, and abominations that have caused bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent people. If God inspired men to write the Bible, He could have done a much better job. Man has yet to know God, for he still does not know the Word of God. Jesus stated the Word of God three times as a command in the last Gospel of John, and very few Christians know what it is.

←—**free2binspired4u**—→ **CLMareydt**, December 26, 2011, 5:14 p.m. EST

Not to change the subject . . . *but* . . . was wondering if anyone would like to add any comments concerning:

Bible Code Matrix or Matrices

Nicholas Ginex, December 27, 2011, 10:40 p.m. EST

Dear Free Two be Inspired Four You,

I clicked *bible code matrix* or Matrices and was not transferred to that link. I went to your Home Page to see if I might find such a post. After several attempts clicking through the many articles you have written, I gave up. However, I was impressed with the many articles you wrote, as they showed a wide range that tells me you are not only imaginative, but also a perceptive and gifted writer.

Please click on the link *Future of God Amen* to learn what some of my objectives are about the future of our beliefs in God. If you feel I could be helpful to your matrix project, do keep in touch.

What is the Soul? by Bent Lorentzen

A Gather post by Ann Marcaida (trueemptiness.com),

September 14, 2009 02:19 p.m. EDT

Yeah, what the heck is “it?”

Honestly, I haven’t got a clue.

And so what! thinks my intuitive side, in simple conjunction with my analytic side. It’s not such a big deal . . . well, except, it really is.

For when any concept connected to “soul” or “God” becomes forced within human society, it can really go very wrong for everyone and everything. Just consider Sarah Palin and her Tea Party’s autocratic impacts on the unbiased scientific evidence for the anthropogenic factors driving global warming . . . and the millions of humans and global ecosystems slowly suffering an agonizing death at this exact moment in time . . . just so a few can perhaps feel a delusional sense of power over whatever drives their fears. And think of the simple humanity that is becoming adulterated by such behaviors, when the poor child in the ghetto, as in Elvis’s beautiful song, gets sick, is taken to a hospital, is denied good treatment, and shipped off to an understaffed, overworked county hospital several hours away.

Every single human culture, no matter how isolated by time and geography, has developed some form of answer. To me, this hypothetically means that all our societies have posed the question: *Where do we come from, why are we here, and to where do we go?* To me, this means “it,” the soul, is a central feature to human social evolution and the brain’s neurosynaptic architecture. This is a simplification of the interplay between nurture and nature. Without getting bogged down into a boring debate over anthropomorphism, we find evidence of the beginnings of such ideas among other highly

advanced social mammals, such as many primates, wolves, elephants, and cetacea (whales, dolphins, etc.), as they deal with the death of kin or even care for their invalid.

Many anthropologists consider the human entanglement for an answer here to be a *primary drive*, on par with sex, eating, etc. Primary drives, if we become very stressed, can so easily get entangled with our brain's functional reward system, thus priming us for unhealthy and addictive thinking/behavioral patterns. What you think, like what you eat, is what you become.

Philosophically, we can consider Plato's ideas of a common but difficult-to-reach core within human enterprise, which healthily and naturally guides thinking and behavior in a subtle and empathic way but which goes very wrong when the soul or other similar concepts, like "God," become encrusted through a religion, governing system, or other sorts of socioeconomic controls over resources, including human.

We can consider what evolved from the Indus Valley societies long ago, which later helped influence the Hebraic, Christian, and Islamic core values that ended with monotheism, the Atman. The soul of the soul, so to speak, where even one word brought to bear in order to capture the concept *is* the fundamental mistake. In recent decades, among university academics in India and elsewhere, this idea has integrated itself with various sciences, including quantum mechanics and neuroscience's unprovable top-down theories of conscious awareness within the notion of non-dualism (advaita), where the subject-object paradox is philosophically pondered.

But no amount of empiric analysis has found any evidence for a viable soul or any concept to do with an infinite and omnipotent, creative/wrathful God. Nor will it ever, I am convinced. For the more we empirically explore the cosmos of the very small and the very large and natural life itself, the more we naturally dissolve much of what was written into synthetic evidence during various meetings of a select few men with pointed hats, many desiring to capitalize a corner of a growing empire's power base and resources. They declared that the words came directly from God, imposing it as a proof that cannot be denied, often under the threat of a slow, tortured and very public death. So it doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out why a whole lot of people very quickly mimicked piety and agreed with this evidence. Then there was this king from Scotland several hundred

years ago—when Shakespeare in Oxford began analyzing the drama and penned a couple of plays about it—who learned how to enjoy burning midwives at the stake from a Danish king, and he went on to orchestrate the writing of his own translation of what those men in peaked hats had put to words in their meetings in that city to the south where all roads once led to. It's said that this book historically has the world record for being on the top ten list.

My direct experiential memory of anything goes back to when I was just over two years old. In that first memory, I was eating a slice of dark rye bread with jam and cheese in a little cottage overlooking Roskilde Fjord, where ancient Vikings had once launched their dragon ships to invade the British Isles. My first memory linked to some sort of "soul idea" began a year later, when I embraced my little sister, now deceased, as she was screaming in fear over something. At that moment, I was not thinking about myself but another person, or at least, whatever was linking me to that person, though I am also qualified to state that that might simply have been neurologically driven as an attempt to soothe my own distress triggered by my sister's angst. She stopped crying, by the way, and smiled so sweetly at me. Another Dane, who lived much of his life in America, loved to play the piano while fooling around with punctuation marks—which began in his youth as a way to deal with stage fright—and died ten years ago. He said often that the shortest path between two people is a smile.

Not to influence anyone's response here, but I do have a deep faith in something that cannot be analyzed, but which has safely navigated me through some very difficult terrain in life. I honestly do not see a conflict between what can be empirically analyzed in the universe and what constantly moves just a hair's breadth in front of any attempt to capture it empirically. "It" *feels* as natural as a swarm of shooting stars on a dark starry night, a symphony of songbirds from atop a forested, extinct volcanic peak at sunup, being loved by a beloved, or even sharing, with as little ego as possible, my thinking here. The more I attempt to influence or manipulate "it," the less it becomes "it." There seems to be an inverse relation here.

I consider this question of the soul to be paramount to my life and the lives of most on this planet.

I consider it of even greater importance to never ever impose on anyone else one's own definition or denial of the soul's existence.

Fairy tales, like Hans Christian Andersen's *The Mockingbird*, do a good job here, since they only allude to "it" via simple metaphors that do no harm but inspire. In the concluding paragraphs of H. C. Andersen's story, the emperor is at death's door due to being depressed and virtually suicidal over not being able to "capture" the "soul." The mockingbird is in the middle of a conversation with the emperor. The despondent man had been futilely attempting through the whole story to capture, cage, manipulate, and otherwise synthesize the mockingbird's heart-wrenching singing. In that final scene, with the emperor's life on the line, he was begging with even the crown jewels for the little bird to stay and sing for him so that he would live. He finally promised to smash the mechanical bird, to which the little bird responds:

"Enough with that nonsense! All which you've done with creating the synthetic bird is fine in its own right. But I can't live confined to your castle. So let me come and freely sing to you when I wish, as is my nature in the evening, from a branch in the tree outside your window. This is the only way I can sing to you, to bring you joy, and trigger your insights. I will sing to you of those who are happy and of those who suffer. I will sing to you of what is good and of what is evil, all of which hides its faces from you in shadow. A songbird can fly everywhere and see all, from the poor fisherman out to sea to the farmer bound to the land, and to distant places far away from your domain. I love your heart far more than your crown, though even that crown holds the essence of something sacred. I promise to come and sing for you. But you must promise me one thing!"

"Anything at all!" replied the emperor, as he rose, clothed in his imperial garb. Drawing his heavy golden sword, he placed its tip to his heart.

"I ask only that you tell no one that you have a little bird who sings songs to you that reveal everything. If you can do that, then everything will work out better."

With that, the nightingale flew away.

At that moment, the emperor's personal servant came in, thinking he was to attend to the emperor's death. But there stood the emperor, very alive, who greeted him, "Good morning."

(The italics above is my own precise translation of the original story in Danish.)

I may share my analysis of that story at some future point here, but I'd prefer to read what comes from others' thinking. Those five short paragraphs above are rich in deep, and thus powerful, symbolism. Since the very first sentence of the story invokes "China" three times, it is no wonder that our informal national symbol, *The Little Mermaid*, was a phenomenal hit at the World's Fair in Beijing this year.

Now imagine the harm that would result in the world were H. C. Andersen's words above to be taken as a literal scripture from some god a thousand years from now, much like many people now are fighting to the death of themselves and the planet over their relative translations of another original story. Imagine also how ancient peoples gathered around their comforting fires, with serious predators lurking and fearful noises coming from beyond the shadows illuminated by that fire, and an empowering story of Creation and a beautiful paradise free of suffering and fears began to be told. Consider now a several-thousand-year-old history of that story going from person to person, like around a circle, and being brought to distant other circles. The original telling, and especially its intent, is something entirely different from the story now unfolding in its current expression in troubled parts of the world, including even within some crystal cathedrals of our most modern lands.

Just like in today's often dangerous economic concrete and iron jungles, we can slip into a cinema and be temporarily released from all sorts of worries while being fully absorbed in a great story, where we might vicariously become some emerging hero that succeeds against all odds.

Are our ideas about the soul based only on evolutionary interactions that resulted in specialized functions in our brain and the enculturated nurture acting there? Or is "it" something entirely different?

What do you think?

- *Note by Ginex*—Five paragraphs by Bent Lorentzen dealing with Denmark politically voting to become a socially apartheid nation and a loss of common sense in a Denmark court to judge fairly the wrongs committed by people are omitted as they left the subject of *What is the Soul?* . . .

Don't worry; be happy. It'll all work out, even if we collectively behave anthropogenically and impact the planet like that meteor which hit

the Yucatan some 65 million years ago. Those huge dinosaurs, who'd evolved rather very specialized survival strategies, left their carcasses beneath that cold dust. And when the worldwide shadow of that event slowly subsided, there emerged from underground these cute little furry things, who invested much more time nurturing their young.

If we don't heed our soul's subtle little song, we may contribute our collective little behinds to the fossil fuels that could be exploited by the next group of intelligent creatures to evolve, to try and try again. But at some point in cosmological history, no one in our universe will give a hoot as it collapses back into a singularity less complex than a proton and perhaps primed for a new Bang, or less likely, inertially inflates into the dream of nothingness. But who really knows? With every question from quantum mechanics answered, new questions arise. From my perspective then, the deepest level of the soul would be beyond the grasp of such relatively powerful mechanics, the whole of the universe much like that mosquito that briefly got sucked into your mouth as you were jogging. What we do know is here we are, and we are propagating a lot of wanton suffering all over the place despite the growing number of mockingbirds who are singing a symphony of warnings.

I believe that heeding our soul's song can take us to exquisitely creative places, where we can boldly go where no person has gone. But that's my feeling, and after all these words in having briefly broken the silence, I would so much more like to absorb what others here think and feel. I'm hoping no one will get aggressive, and if inclined to do so, write what you must in a file, let it sit a bit without posting it here as a comment, and then look at what you wrote. Most important, really listen to what others share, for a mockingbird does not make its appearance known when humans are yelling. And to be perfectly honest, there actually is a living breathing mockingbird that occasionally likes to sing from a tree not far from my bedroom window. It is a beautiful, beautiful experience to hear its song, and it would be so sad if someday there would be no one in Denmark to hear her. H. C. Andersen's *Little Mermaid* came back to Denmark from China the other day.

For Anjani

Comments and Responses

Nicholas Ginex, November 19, 2010, 4:15 p.m. EST

Dear Bent,

You gave a marvelous six-page rendition to allow readers to examine “What is the Soul?” However, I need to take issue with your statement, “To me, this hypothetically means that all our societies have posed the question: Where do we come from, why are we here and to where do we go? To me, this means “it,” the soul, is a central feature to human social evolution and the brain’s neurosynaptic architecture.”

To give your opinion about the soul is commendable, but your hypothetical belief does not mean all societies relate the concept of a soul to the wonderful “life” questions of: *Where do we come from, why are we here, and to where do we go?* You feel the soul or “it” is a central feature to human social evolution and the brain’s neurosynaptic architecture, and I disagree. Not all societies and religions have any use of or understanding of the soul. However, your life questions are relevant and common to the thinking processes of human beings. It would be instructive to begin our analyses of “What is the Soul?” with an understanding of where did the concept of a soul originate and who were the people so advanced in social evolution to have made this concept a central theme in their attempt to answer the “life” questions?

I could provide an extract from a book I authored, *Future of God Amen*, to explain how the concept of a soul originated within the ancient Egyptian civilization before the start of the first dynasty, circa 3500 BCE, but I’d rather simply summarize in a few sentences how this idea of a soul came about. Those of you who would like to be informed about how man first conceived God and how that God profoundly influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions, I encourage you to place an Internet search on *Future of God Amen*, which will also bring up some press releases and articles about the book.

In Subsection 3.4 of *Future of God Amen*, the concept of a soul is described as evolving from *The Creation by Atum*, a hymn to the Egyptian god of creation of all there is. The following extract reveals

that all created things are protected by the *Ka* of Atum-Kheprer, who put his own vital force into his first creatures (from *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, ed. By James B. Pritchard, Page 3):

Thou didst put thy arms about them as the arms of a *Ka*,
for thy *Ka* was in them.

To be endowed with an internal force or spirit called the *ka* from the creator god Atum must therefore have had extreme importance. This vital source must be what gave the created object its unique characteristics/its special force. Scholars of Egyptian history believe that the *ka* represents the alter ego, a guardian spirit, or the vital force of personality. Since the god Atum put his *ka* into his creations, it identifies their unique characteristics and attributes, that is, the *ka* provides those attributes that uniquely form the totality of a living or material substance. In essence, the *ka* represents the total makeup of glandular, physical, and mental functions that defines humans and their personality.

The idea of the *ka* as a life force and protector was shown in a bas-relief group of Amenhotep III in the Great Temple of Karnak. This relief shows the pharaoh followed by his *ka*, which stands behind him in human form. The *ka* carries the “ankh,” the symbol of truth, in one hand and in the other, the customary staff terminating in a bust of the king. Over his head is engraved “The *Royal Ka*, Life of the Lord of the Two Lands.” The bas-relief of Amenhotep expresses that the *ka* was envisioned as the life force of the king and also his guide as he protected Egypt. By the time Amenhotep III reigned (1411-1375 BCE), the belief in the *ka* had already found its acceptance by the nobility and common man. This is verified by the common man’s belief of sustaining the *ka* after the death of a loved one with food until it is united with the *ba*.

The *ba* came into existence only after death. It was normally represented in the form of a bird, sometimes with a human head. It would visit the tomb wherein the mummy lay, bearing air and food to the *ka* to whom it belonged. It could move about but always returned to the body to which it belonged. Spells enabled the *ba* to *assume any shape it wished*. It partook of the offered nourishment and seems also to have had creative powers.

It was the local priests and, in some cases, the survivors of the deceased who accomplished the transformation of the dead person

into a soul that would live in the hereafter. In particular, it was the mortuary priest who performed indispensable ceremonies to win the favor of the gods for the deceased. The *ka*, which constituted the individual's uniqueness and provided protection during life, passed into the hereafter under the guidance and protection of the *ba*. Initially, the *ka* was the exclusive possession of kings, but eventually, through the priest's role in performing elaborate ceremonies witnessed by the public, all Egyptians came to believe they too, possessed a *ka*.

To our Gather readers, I hope the mystery of how man came to conceive the concept of a soul is satisfied. The Egyptians were unique because they developed their spiritual faculties in an isolated region, free from interference from other cultures. It is to be noted that the Egyptians did not force their religion upon the people; it was a natural outgrowth of thousands of years of humans learning to live together as one nome absorbed or overtook another in an environment isolated from the rest of the world.

As a child, I always thought about where did God come from, why did He give us the ability to rule the animal kingdom, and why did He give us the instincts to love but also kill one another? As a man of seventy-five years of age, I have met people from many races and enjoyed their company in laughter, play, and communicating and appreciating our differences. I wrote *Future of God Amen* to help bring the religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic faiths to strive for unity by acknowledging the weaknesses of their scriptures. But it also provides recommendations to religious leaders and worshippers of these religions to recognize that these differences can be overcome by acknowledging that they all pray to the same God. That God is announced in temples, churches, and mosques by the name Amen. This God is the *common bond* between these major religions, for even Jesus Christ proclaimed that Amen is "the faithful and true witness, the being of the creation of God," (Rev. 3:14).

The God question does link the concept of a soul, and that is why the Egyptians have created the greatest religious concepts still in effect today. The purpose of the God concept, long thought out by the Egyptian priesthood, was to provide a set of moral and civil codes of conduct that allowed their civilization to grow and advance over four thousand years before being corrupted by foreign people. Truth and righteousness were the prime qualities of their God and used to influence the behavior of the Egyptian people. With a clearer

understanding of the soul, can we visualize and project if this concept has meaning in our lives or a life beyond death?

Nicholas Ginex, November 25, 2010, 4:29 a.m. EST

Hello Bent,

I noted the title of the link you provided for ancient Egyptian culture referred to “/bigmyth/myths”: http://www.mythicjourneys.org/bigmyth/myths/english/eng_egyptian_culture

You must admit there is a belittling connotation to the use of myth in regard to the ancient Egyptians. Here are a people that worshiped a God Amen for over two thousand years, and our bright scholars refer to their religion as a myth. Few people know that it was the Egyptian priesthood that wrote a wonderful piece of scripture titled *Amen as the Sole God*. This scripture verifies that the Egyptians conceived the concept of one universal God before the Moses Exodus. If historians and theologians define the Egyptian religion as a myth, they ought to be fair and define the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions as myths. What do you think?

Below are some extracts of Egyptian scripture that describe the Egyptian God Amen.

The following extracts from *Future of God Amen* reveals that Amen was worshipped as the one universal God of all there is.

Amen, the Universal God—the following excerpts from a Hymn to Amon-Re, from the Boulaq Papyrus residing in the Cairo Museum, are dated sometime in the eighteenth dynasty. It indicates acknowledgment and joy in praise of Amon-Re to the height of heaven and the width of the earth.

Extract from the Hymn to Amon-Re:
The chief one, who made the entire earth . . .
Jubilation to thee for every foreign country—
To the height of Heaven, to the width of earth,
To the depth of the Great Green Sea!

Ikhnaton was more specific in his praise of Aton as the god of other countries and ultimately, the entire earth. The following extraction

clearly states Ikhnaton's perception that God is a universal force for all mankind:

Extract from The Hymn to the Aton:
The countries of Syria and Nubia, the land of Egypt,
Thou settest every man in his place,
Thou suppliest their necessities:

In *The Hymn to Amon-Re*, the God Amen-Re is viewed as the supreme God that creates and sustains life. The following excerpts are provided to emphasize Amen as the "Creator and Maker of all that is," the God of Creation.

Hail to thee, Amon-Re, . . .
Lord of what is, enduring in all things, enduring in all things,
Lord of eternity, who made everlastingness . . .
Who made what is below and what is above . . .
The chief one who made the entire earth . . .
Thou art the sole one, who made all that is,
(The) solitary sole (one), who made what exists . . .
Father of the fathers of all the gods,
Who raised the heavens and laid down the ground,
Who made what is and created what exists . . .
Maker of all mankind, Creator and Maker of all that is . . .

Revisiting *The Hymn to the Aton*, the eloquent pharaoh and poet Ikhnaton wrote:

How manifold it is, what thou hast made!
They are hidden from the face (of man).
O sole god, like whom there is no other!
Thou didst create the world according to thy heart.

The above words of Egyptian religious beliefs are excellent in describing the one universal God. What do you think?

Bent Lorentzen, November 25, 2010, 6:45 a.m. EST

Nicholas wrote: "You must admit there is a belittling connotation to the use of myth in regard to the ancient Egyptians."

Nicholas, I'm not quite sure why you would remotely suggest that.

In the study of anthropology, “myth” is well defined even in the context of a common etymological search:

Myths are “stories about divine beings, generally arranged in a coherent system; they are revered as true and sacred; they are endorsed by rulers and priests; and closely linked to religion. Once this link is broken, and the actors in the story are not regarded as gods but as human heroes, giants or fairies, it is no longer a myth but a folktale. Where the central actor is divine but the story is trivial . . . the result is religious legend, not myth.” (J. Simpson and S. Roud, *Dictionary of English Folklore*, Oxford, 2000, p. 254)

And here is a wealth of myth-related information addressed:

http://www.archaeolink.com/creation_myths_religious_anthrop.htm

Nicholas Ginex, November 25, 2010, 6:15 p.m. EST

Thank you, Bent, for your distinction of what is a myth. Yes, you are correct that a civilization that existed for thousands of years in a belief of gods to explain much of what they could not comprehend and even the belief in one universal God Amen could be regarded as a myth. However, you avoided the two questions that I am sure you are able to give great understanding and insight to, but you also did not respond to my original comment which indicated how the concept of a soul originated. Since this is the topic of your post, I am sure you just had an oversight and would like to address the fact that the idea of a soul was first created by the ancient Egyptians. I refer you back to my write-up that described the *ka* and *ba*.

My last comment provided several pieces of scripture, documents that reveal the beliefs of the ancient Egyptians, that clearly present that the God Amen was the first one universal God of all Creation. That God, as presented in the book *Future of God Amen*, has profoundly influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. We note that Amen is announced in temples, churches, and some mosques in giving thanks, praise, and singing Amen with deep reverence. It is no accident that Amen has persisted in the minds of men for thousands of years and into the present. As you mentioned in another response, Jung has felt that there are unconscious data that may be inherent in our genes and passed on to be relevant in the present.

For ease of reference, the questions that I have alluded to are below in their original context:

- (1) The God question does link the concept of a soul, and that is why the Egyptians have created the greatest religious concepts still in effect today. The purpose of the God concept, long thought out by the Egyptian priesthood, was to provide a set of moral and civil codes of conduct that allowed their civilization to grow and advance over four thousand years before being corrupted by foreign people. Truth and righteousness were the prime qualities of their God and used to influence the behavior of the Egyptian people. With a clearer understanding of the soul, can we visualize and project if this concept has meaning in our lives or a life beyond death?
- (2) Few people know that it was the Egyptian priesthood that wrote a wonderful piece of scripture titled *Amen as the Sole God*. This scripture verifies that the Egyptians conceived the concept of one universal God before the Moses Exodus. If historians and theologians define the Egyptian religion as a myth, should they be fair and define the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions as myths also, since they follow the same belief that originated with Amen?
- (3) The above extracts of Egyptian religious beliefs are a small sample in describing the one universal God Amen. There is no doubt that the Hebrews were greatly influenced by Egyptian religious beliefs. Scholars have verified that there are many verses that have been extracted or emulated from the Egyptians and entered in the Bible. What do you think?

Nick,

It is noteworthy to consider that if the God Amen is an Egyptian myth, the belief in Amen as the one universal God is also a myth. This belief is one of the greatest beliefs given to mankind, and are we to think it is a myth? If so, we may also consider that the one God belief of the Jews, Christians, and Muslims is also a myth. But we need to be reminded that Jesus Christ in Revelation 3:14 in the New Testament proclaimed that Amen is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.” Is Jesus speaking about Amen the God, Amen the myth, or Amen as meaning “so be it?”

Farmer Slim dancing barefoot in the mud, September 15, 2009, 8:35 a.m.

Many people believe they can describe the “soul.” Many believe in the existence of a soul . . . but none can support their belief with verifiable evidence. The soul can exist without the existence of verifiable evidence, but only within the speculations of those who believe the soul exists can the soul be excused from the demands of verifiable evidence. From MacDougall’s 21 grams to the argument that because we have free will . . . we must have a soul or we wouldn’t be different from each other . . . to the exclamation “I have felt the presence of a soul” . . . no evidence has suggested that life (in this case, a continuance of life as a soul) exists beyond the physical brain’s creation of our uniqueness, our personality, nor that life can exist in a non-physical form.

I think most people who believe the soul exists do so because they must use the soul as a tool to sew together their speculation (and hope) that life continues after death. We know the body dies and rots away . . . so there *must* be a mechanism that will allow eternal life in order to substantiate the argument for eternal life . . . The mechanism offered is the soul . . . a life separate from the physical life.

The argument can be made that at some point in the future, scientists will discover facts that support the existence of the soul (and therefore, life after death). But this argument is both speculative and weak in that natural laws are supported from observation . . . observations of cause and effect . . . the cause “Why did it happen?” and the effect . . . “What happened?” The best the proponents of life after death can do is offer a “proof of impossibility” theorem that would require negative proof to support the theorem . . . and that is not logically sound.

Personally . . . I do *not* say that there is *no life after death*, but rather that I *do not believe* that there is life after death. To claim one is certain . . . one way or the other . . . is not logically sound.

Jerry Kays, September 17, 2009, 6:47 p.m. EDT

Boy, it has taken me forever to read down this far . . . all the while I wanted to interject this and that . . .

But in the final analysis (up to this moment), I will simply say that Slim, you and I have been over most of this before, and what I have

said then still stands, it agreeing pretty much with everyone else here except yourself.

We make our own reality and you have decided to make yours an ego-related one limited to five sensory experiences only, at least as to how you “value” such potential experiences.

I and others, many others, have allowed the subjectivity of spiritual interconnectedness to be a part of our reality(s).

You ask for solid scientific “proof” based upon basically only five senses, logic, and rationality. I have offered such a “proof” to you before in the form of my health records which have tracked my diseases, pathologies, and whatever . . . both before my meeting my soul (spiritual awakening) and ever since . . . such would be “proof” for some, but I suspect would never satisfy you.

So be it.

What is the Word of God?

February 13, 2011 07:47 p.m. EST

Many people believe in God. Yet, few people know the Word of God. Many men were inspired by God in the Bible, but it was Jesus Christ who announced the Word of God. It was the last command given by Jesus in the Gospel of John. He proclaimed the Word of God three times, *love one another*:

A new commandment I give unto you, That ye *love one another*; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. (John 13:34)

This is *my commandment*. That ye *love one another*, as I have loved you. (John 15:12)

These things *I command you*, that ye *love one another*. (John 15:17)

In the entire Bible, there is no greater command given by God through His surrogate, Jesus Christ. Jesus states it is his commandment, which places him as the authority to speak for God. For this reason, Jesus is the Word of God. But is Jesus God, a Son of God, or a Son of Man? There is much confusion because many people have been taught dogma called the Trinity developed by the Church fathers. Promulgated by Pope John Paul II, in the second edition of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, Page 902, the Trinity is defined as: “The mystery of one God in three Persons: Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit.”

There is a valid reason for the Church fathers to adopt the Trinity as Christian dogma because in the very first lines of John’s Gospel, he states: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,

and the Word was God.” But many contradictions surface why this is not true and are enumerated below:

1. John writes the Word exists in the beginning, which is a fallacy. The only idea acceptable by religious and non-religious people is that only God existed in the beginning. If Jesus Christ is the Word, then he preceded God, which is false.
2. Jesus announced the Word of God—*love one another*. This does not make him co-equal and present with God in the beginning because he was first created within the womb of the Virgin Mary by the intercession of God’s Holy Spirit in accordance with Matthew and Luke:

Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. (Matt. 1:18)

And the angel said unto her, fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favor with God. And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and he shall be called the Son of the highest: and the Lord shall give unto him the throne of his father David: And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end. Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered and said to her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. (Luke 1:30-35)

It is clear that Jesus did not exist until the intercession of God’s Holy Spirit with Mary. Why did John choose to elevate Jesus to be the beginning of all creation as the Word, make him co-equal with God, and then write he is God? This is poetically and majestically inspiring but is in sharp contradiction with Matthew and Luke, who clearly state Jesus was conceived by the Holy Ghost and created within the womb of the Virgin Mary. This has more validity than John because Jesus was not required or needed to speak the Word of God *until mankind came into being*. The Word was intended for mankind as God’s final command to—*love one another*. There was no use for the Word in the beginning because mankind did not appear until God made the billions of galaxies with their billions of stars and numerous planets whereupon other life could evolve. The Word was only meant for man, not for other life forms in the universe.

The only logical explanation for John to fuse Jesus with God and His Holy Spirit was to promulgate the idea that Jesus is God. During the period that the Gospels were written, the belief that men could be worshipped as gods was easily accepted as demonstrated by the line of Caesars who were believed to be gods. Also, by the time John wrote his Gospel, estimated around 90 to 120 CE, the Church had gained many followers, which emboldened him to raise Jesus from a Son of Man to be envisioned as the Son of God; but more profound are his opening lines, which implies Jesus is God.

This effort by John, who wrote one of the more noteworthy sayings of Jesus, contradicted the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. But also, only in John do others state six times that Jesus is the Son of God. Yet in all four Gospels, Jesus stated he is the Son of Man seventy-six times. In further support of Jesus being related to the line of David and not specifically God, he states in Revelation 22:16:

I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in
the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David,
and the bright and morning star.

Here, Jesus makes it clear he is from the root of David, a child of Mary who was also from the line of Abraham; no mention of God is stated. I therefore leave you to ponder the contradictions and whether you believe Jesus is God, the Son of God, or the Son of Man. One thing is true, the *Word of God* is to love and assist your sisters and brothers from every nation.

If you follow God's Word as a believer, an agnostic, or an atheist, you will be embraced by God, who will be very proud of you as one of His creations. Do you agree that God's greatest commandment is the *Word of God—love one another?*

Comments and Responses

Richard B., February 13, 2011, 8:55 p.m. EST

Null, as god actually has no need to speak.

G. M. Jackson, February 13, 2011, 9:43 p.m. EST

As long as you get the "love one another" part, the rest is just commentary. I find I can love my fellow man without evoking God

or his bastard Son (God never married Mary). Evoking those two only complicates the issue and causes men to do terrible things to one another in the name of God/Jesus.

Nicholas Ginex, February 16, 2011, 2:42 a.m. EST

Mr. Jackson, thank you for responding. I agree that Jesus was a man of God who was perhaps the greatest moral teacher of all the prophets. You are correct. If we could try to love our sisters and brothers of any nation, this would be a happy and peaceful world. It is, in my mind, the greatest command given to mankind.

Ron Hall, February 13, 2011, 10:33 p.m. EST

What Richard said. Explaining away stuff is a human thing.

Nicholas Ginex, February 16, 2011, 2:48 a.m. EST

Thank you, Ron. Knowledge is a wonderful gift. It is attained by reading and examining other points of view even if you disagree with them. I used to believe in many things, but now as a grown man who has listened and thought about the views of others, I no longer believe in the written word of any book unless it makes sense.

Jerome K., February 14, 2011, 8:01 a.m. EST

Well, you put forward a very good piece after a very interesting and challenging title, which is, may I remind you, a question.

If there are any flaws in your explanation, it is that you quote from the Bible in an attempt to justify its existence. That's like saying that "this is a good car because it has ejector seats, a box full of fruit on the backseat, and that the driver's instruction manual says it's brilliant." It is not an objective argument.

Many people will be given many sources of information throughout their lifetimes; the Bible could be one of them. It may fascinate them, bore them, leave them interested in history, and question the facts which are presented within it to further find out more of its background.

Many others will just take it all in, discuss it with others who like it, and read it from cover to cover, becoming experts in its chapters, its phrases, and be able to quote whole chunks of it at random. Wonderful. But it

has to be seen in context. When was it written? Who wrote it? Was it an accurate reportage of events and dialogues? How reliable were the authors? What happened to the book on its way to the present day?

The poetry within the title of “the Word of God” is brilliant, but it masks the fact that man, or men, wrote the words. People are apt to have the illusion of an old man in a grey beard reaching down from the heavens and actually write all the words; not true. People are apt to believe that some scribes sat and wrote like reporters just after the events and dialogues, getting the real spark of the occasions they were writing about; not so. People are apt to think it was all written at once; not so. Yet there are many in the world who do not question anything about its origins and take it on face value, then they invest their lives, their values, their very being in what this historic document says. It’s all very commendable, but a little misguided; not by the document itself, but by the people who persuade them that the truth about everything is within its pages. Yes, of course, it can be used for inspiration. Some people take it a stage further and contrast one phrase with another, pointing out its contradictions; commendable but misguided. There are many sources from which any reader can find inspiration for sorting out a problem, getting uplifted when depressed, or generally seeing a way through life. The Bible does not have to be “the only one” or even part of the list at all.

Man has written the Bible. Man has taken a wide range of documents which appear to be historic, translated it, selected some (by an emperor), rewritten it, tweaked it a little (deleted some documents to suit certain people’s tastes), made alterations, printed it, then printed it again. The documents themselves were written during a different time to ours, where the people believed in certain things, some of which we would now question. The roles of science, philosophy, medicine, health, sanitation, and astronomy have changed, been developed, making us more knowledgeable about all of them. Therefore, it is healthy, wise, and sensible to question the background, the sources of any documents which come our way. There are still a few who are determined to stick their “heads in the sand” and maintain a mindset which was suitable for another age. There are still a few, for example, who believe the Earth is flat, others who believe man walked with dinosaurs, that there is a real “man in the moon.”

I’m not suggesting that the ideas in the Bible should be discarded, but the attitude of “being kind to your neighbor,” not stealing, and others are attitudes which were developed thousands of years before.

Be aware. Be aware that the Bible has a history; that many things have been done because some people decided that what they were doing was right and inspired by God; see Prof. Bartlet's *The Medieval Mind*, David Kertzer's *The Kidnapping of Edgardo Mortara, Prisoner of the Vatican*, and many others.

Finally, in order to get "belief" in context, to see how we got "from there to here," this is worth watching: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BNf-P_5u_Hw

Peace.

Nicholas Ginex, February 16, 2011, 3:12 a.m. EST

Dear Jerome,

Your response is highly appreciated, and I agree with everything you wrote. There are few people in this world who have your ability to think and search for the truth. I believe even truth changes with time as we learn more about ourselves and the universe.

I was compelled to write about my understanding of what is the "Word of God." Many people read the Bible and have no idea what is the greatest command given by Jesus. Most people think the Word is the Bible. This is of course nonsense because if any brilliant mind was to distill the meat of the Bible, they would know it is to "love one another."

Again, thank you for sharing points of view I agree with. By the way, I also want to commend your perception that the Bible was written in a distant age. In *Future of God Amen*, one of my recommendations is that the religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions work together to unify their beliefs. This means that there is much in their scriptures that need to be revised and portions eliminated due to the many myths and inconsistencies that cause confusion and division among people of these faiths.

If you have further interest in exploring how man first conceived one universal God and how that God profoundly influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions, place an Internet search on *Future of God Amen*.

Jerome K., February 14, 2011, 11:10 a.m. EST

Yes, Dorine. It's well thought out, apart from the question of where these words come from; not thin air, but the Bible. Where does the Bible come from? Not thin air, but man. It could be said, in spite of you trying to hang on to beliefs which you can easily repeat in the usual stereotypical fashion, that God was created in man's image. It's man that has the idea that there is such a thing as a "deity." And the Romans had many gods. What happened to the redundant ones? Who chose the documents we finally see as "a Bible?"

It *is* possible to be a good person without the rituals that others insist upon. And why do they insist upon them?

Try thinking outside the box; it won't hurt a bit.

Peace.

Dorine H., February 15, 2011, 5:59 p.m. EST

The Bible does not come from man, but from God.

I have done a great deal of thinking outside the box during the past fifty years. I have reached what I believe through long weighing and evaluating.

Nicholas Ginex, February 16, 2011, 3:28 a.m. EST

Thank you, Dorine. At first, after reading your response, I thought you were a young lady because you must know that highly religious men wrote the Bible. Mark, Matthew, Luke, and John were Jewish holy men who were inspired to write about Jesus Christ. If you think about God truly, nobody knows what God looks like, and in fact, everybody has a different vision of God. God was created by man in his own image because he has no real conception of God.

However, I will agree with you that God created all there is. However, we must appreciate that God created Jesus within the womb of Mary upon being conceived by God's Holy Spirit. If this is so, Jesus as the Son of God was not existing in the beginning with God. More importantly, if God made Jesus within the womb of a woman, Jesus is not God but at most, a man of God.

You may believe what the Church leaders taught you if it gives you comfort.

Jerome K., February 16, 2011, 6:55 a.m. EST

Yes, everyone is entitled to their beliefs. Nicholas is trying to put across his view and I am trying to reply to that. Dorine's poetic look at things is beautiful, but she still doesn't seem to understand the metaphors used, both in the Bible and in her statement "The Bible does not come from man, but from God."

The words on the pages of the Bible did not arrive as if by magic. They had a process, a history, to get from the words written in the various documents by people through to the printed book you might see before you. That is simple logic and you can research that for yourself through various ways which are decidedly independent. The same thing happens today. People write down their thoughts on paper in a certain way. Those pages are put through other various processes until we get the book. It is helpful to question all that journey as well as criticize the author or authors who wrote down the original words. How, for example, did they come up with the ideas within the piece of writing? Were they there at the time of the event, actually writing down fresh their reactions and the dialogues which they heard? Did they reflect upon their piece afterwards, alter it, add to it? Did they write it long after the events, whereby the events were less sharp, less accurately written about? Were they there at all?

The origins and history of the Bible, as well as how and by whom the documents were chosen (and why some were left out), are all things we should know. Following without question any document or groups of them is not a sensible or logical reaction to dealing with the challenge of how to live our lives. Further, what things were done in the name of religion often by those who had their own reasons for doing so?

Dorine, I invite you to read carefully my previous reply and to research the sources I have included. A little knowledge, they say, is a dangerous thing. A lot of knowledge means we are more prepared to make informed decisions. We are all capable of making decisions in our lives, without others telling us what to believe; it's OK to be a shepherd.

Peace.

Nicholas Ginex, February 16, 2011, 2:58 p.m. EST

Dear Jerome,

I admire your ability to write clearly with an objective sense to arrive at common sense logic and reasoning. Are you an author? I would be interested in any book you may have written that deals with human nature and themes that allow people to think. Please provide some books I may be interested in for my thoughts are on the same wavelength as yours.

Peace and a life of health and happiness to you.

Nicholas Ginex, February 16, 2011, 4:14 p.m. EST

Hello Jerome,

I forgot to address one of your comments, that is “If there are any flaws in your explanation, it is that you quote from the Bible in an attempt to justify its existence. That’s like saying that ‘This is a good car because it has ejector seats, a box full of fruit on the backseat, and that the driver’s instruction manual says it’s brilliant.’ It is not an objective argument.”

You must understand that the only source document that I had to use was the New Testament, not because of its validity, but because that is where John introduces the “Word.” I am a very practical man. You and I know, and I am not being too presumptuous, that most people around the world will believe in God as the Creator of all there is. Religions, such as those of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic faiths, will continue to exist. Their very existence has caused much holy deaths, division, hate, and violence between people of these faiths as well as other religions. It is for this reason I wrote *Future of God Amen*. It provides a history of how man first conceived one universal God and how that God profoundly influenced the development of the three major religions.

I used the source documents of the Torah, the Gospels, Revelation, and the Koran to show these religions all obtained their core beliefs of the soul, the hereafter, a moral and civil code based on truth, justice, and righteousness, one universal God, and the Son of God from ancient Egypt. It was in the Gospel of John that I became knowledgeable of

the Word of God. As you logically indicated, man learns from thoughts conceived from the past and builds upon them. As we become more knowledgeable about ourselves and our world, our views change. Unfortunately, too many people believe the Scriptures are cast in concrete for they gullibly believe it was given by God. *Future of God Amen* has the recommendation that these scriptures must be updated and revised just as the Priesthood of Amon rewrote their beliefs until they arrived at the concept of one universal God.

I quoted from the Bible not to justify its existence. It already exists. What I am trying to do is inform people that they have been misled by religious men who do not emphasize the greatest command, whether given by God or man—*love one another*. This command is greater than the Jewish Shema (Deut. 6:4,5), “The Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.”

God would rather have His children love one another than bow down to Him, for He does not need to be loved, glorified, and worshiped. God would accept any atheist, agnostic, and believer that follows His command to love the sisters and brothers of any nation. God is all powerful and is only proud of His children and accepts them if they love one another. He is not a needy and weak God that requires His creations to bow down to Him, but obey Him.

Jerome, it is my desire to inform people of the past history of our belief in God and improve our conception of God if He is to be the moral standard we desire to emulate. If you believe there is a better alternative than God and religions to teach a consistent moral and ethical code of conduct, I am willing to assist you in such an effort. Until then, I believe it is foolhardy to throw out the baby with the bath water and lose moral knowledge accumulated from the past.

Again, thank you for stimulating a conversation that may be useful to others.

Do You Know the Word of God?

September 08, 2011 06:27 p.m. EDT

Hello, this is a beginning to start a very interesting conversation, which I hope will be answered with a desire for honesty and truth. I will not try to circumvent any question but try to get at the true meaning or root of the answer. If I am wrong, I do appreciate any efforts to share your reasons why and hopefully gain a clearer understanding of your perspective.

How many Christians know the “Word of God?” Some Christians will provide the following answer by stating John 1:1-5:

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not.

To get to understand the Word of God, in the beginning was the Word. Was this Jesus? If so, then it is a person or a God. But what is the Word of God? That is the question. We know John associates Jesus with the Word that was with God in the very beginning of all creation. But Jesus is an entity. We still need to know the Word of God. It is what God instructed Jesus to tell the world.

I believe I understand the light that shineth in darkness and that the darkness comprehended it not. That light is not just a figure of a man, or of a god, it is what gives meaning to leading a life of morality, truth, and love. Jesus or God means nothing without understanding the Word of God—for that is the light for all mankind to follow.

What does the following verse mean to you?

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,
and the Word was God.

I believe John's opening line in his Gospel needs to be understood on a basic level. First, John is not correct with the phrase "In the beginning was the Word." If Jesus is the Word, he does not come before God in the "beginning." A correct statement would be "In the beginning was God." It would be rather infantile to believe that the Word, namely Jesus, existed before God. The Son cannot precede the Father or God or have any reason to exist with the Father in the "beginning." But also, how could Jesus come before God or even exist with God when mankind was not yet conceived and created by God? Is John saying that in the beginning there was a Son of God that existed before, or with God, that created the billions of galaxies, stars, and planets that can sustain life in other parts of the universe? Of course not.

John was operating on the original philosophical term "Logos." To be fair, John was referring to the power of God, the Logos, which was God and it was God that created all there is. Who ordained that the power of all creation was other than God? This would be a lie and I would call it heresy to inflict upon believers that Jesus was a product of God before being born upon the conception of the Virgin Mary by the Holy Spirit of God. The first three Gospels have it right in that Jesus was not known to mankind until God felt that His creations needed direction. That direction was provided by a man of God called Jesus. To say Jesus was with God at the beginning of time is nothing more than a lie by the Church fathers.

What if John's verse read, "In the beginning was God, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." This makes better sense in that God could only exist in the beginning, and He knew that the Word of God was fundamental to the survival of His creations. John associates Jesus with the Word. Jesus is the conduit, an entity, but it is the Word of God Jesus gave to mankind. Still, many Christians are not taught the Word of God. But "the darkness comprehended it not."

There are many inconsistencies, myths, and lies that are within the scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. These religions will continue to deny the words of Jesus when he proclaimed

Amen is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God. (Rev. 3:14)” This very sentence runs counter to the opening line of John’s Gospel. Why? Jesus is truthful and provides a past history of how mankind first came to conceive the one universal God. But of course, these religions, in their arrogance and desire for the power they have amassed, will ignore, misinterpret, and misconstrue the words of Jesus.

The Christian religious leaders will not cite the words of Jesus that there will be other sons of God because that will deny the sanctity of the only Son of God. But for your inspection, let us look at another verse by Jesus, which is ignored by the Christian leaders:

Verily, verily, I say unto you, he (they) that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he (they) do also; and *greater works* than these shall he (they) do; because I go unto my Father. (John 14:12)

I added (they) because I believe Jesus also meant to include daughters as well as sons of God will do even *greater works* than he.

To gain an understanding how mankind first came to conceive one universal God, the concepts of a soul and a hereafter based upon living a moral life, you may click on the title: *Future of God Amen*.

Comments and Responses

Mike Voyce, September 9, 2011, 1:46 p.m. EDT

Is it not self-evident that Jesus was not manifest as an incarnate human being “in the Beginning”; that is not to say Jesus did not exist but it is spurious to debate as there is neither information nor relevance?

May I suggest the “Word” may be translated as vibration and long predated the existence of the planet?

In short, I rather think you’re “pushing on an open door.”

Nevertheless, good luck. There are open doors which should be pushed on.

Nicholas Ginex, September 9, 2011, 6:28 p.m. EDT

Thank you, Mike, for your stimulating response. You are correct that it is not self-evident that Jesus existed as an incarnate human being “in the beginning,” for there is no relevant information that he existed with God “in the beginning.” The only passage in the New Testament that alludes to Jesus existing in “the beginning” as the Word appears in the Gospel of John. In the post, I presented reasons why John poorly stated such an idea that the Word, meaning the essence of Jesus, could and should not precede God.

My purpose of the post was to enlighten Christians as to “what” is the Word of God and not “who.” We already know that the Word is associated with Jesus in John’s Gospel, verses 1:1-5. But reading these lines carefully, it appears nebulous as to whether it was God or was it Jesus that created all there is. Because “him” is not in capital letters, we know that the Church fathers fully intend to teach it was Jesus that created “All things and without ‘him’ was not anything made that was made.”

So we have a dichotomy whereby God is taught to consist of two diverging branches where one is the human form of Jesus that worshipers can relate to and the other is the unknown, mysterious, incomprehensible God. However we examine this dichotomy, it is a pure polytheistic view of God. Here, it can be debated if, in fact, the Church fathers endorsing John’s Gospel have retreated to the infantile view of multiple gods worshipped by the Egyptians. The one outstanding feature of the Church fathers is that Jesus and God are considered the same God and together with the Holy Spirit make a threesome as one.

Although I am one to try to arrive at the truth of the essence of God, I must admit the New Testament does not provide a clear understanding of God because of the ambiguity created by the Church fathers in advocating Jesus is God, which further adds confusion to the Gospels validating Jesus is the Son of God. This has been a problem with Christian dogma, and the Church fathers have tried to resolve the multiple view of God by endorsing the Trinity concept, which was approved nearly three centuries after the death of Jesus. In spite of the Trinity dogma, many people have been disenchanted with the idea that God exists in multiple forms and is not simply one God that created “all there is.”

Sorry to have spent time in trying to clarify my understanding of God. What is of greater significance is that Christians learn to respect the words of Jesus for he was God's representative for mankind. God gave Jesus the *last command* that appears in the New Testament. It was stated three times in John's Gospel. It is the Word of God—*love one another*. This is the one command in the entire Bible that has greater relevance than the two great commandments on which hang all the law and the prophets.

Mike Voyce, September 9, 2011, 7:11 p.m. EDT

That is a most handsome reply. Thank you for your time, trouble, and clarity.

Nicholas Ginex, September 10, 2011, 11:03 p.m. EDT

Hello Mike,

I visited your Gather Home page to learn more about you and was impressed. I read that you have an endearing interest in history, reincarnation, law, mysticism, and writing. This prompted me to go to your website <http://www.edwardstafford.co.uk/>

After reviewing your website, I was again impressed with the layout of information and ability to link to several of your works. It appears you had your website professionally done. I clicked on the link to read the extract provided as a download for your book titled *Edward*.

I must say I was intrigued with your book and the tension built up between the lawyer and the lovable, intelligent hypnotist Sarah. As a fair trade, I would like to send you a complimentary copy of my book, *Future of God Amen*, if you will send me a copy of your book. We can exchange our mailing addresses via e-mail. My e-mail address is: nickginex@gmail.com

It is an honor to have you as a friend on Gather. Thank you for your responses to some of my posts. Yes, religion is a controversial topic and many people are horrified if their religion is questioned. But once people get to know me, they will find that I am not about to change their beliefs but give them the opportunity to gain knowledge how mankind first came to conceive one universal God and how that God has influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions.

Mike Voyce, September 11, 2011, 6:32 a.m. EDT

Nicholas, I think what you're doing is very similar to what I'm doing. You can offer inspirations, but it is up to other people how, if at all, they pick them up. Like you, I believe those who are willing to learn will.

I'm sending you a PDF of *Edward*. You can have it in other formats if you like.

Also, thank you very much indeed for your kind words.

Nicholas Ginex, September 11, 2011, 3:49 p.m. EDT

Hello Mike,

Thank you for sending me a PDF copy of *Edward*.

I have decided to rewrite this post with the title "God's Last Command." This post was far too long and was providing more information that was off the topic with another avenue of thought or topic.

One thing to keep in mind is that an article will get more responses if you deal with one topic at a time and keep it to no more than three to five paragraphs.

Mike Voyce, September 11, 2011, 4:16 p.m. EDT

I look forward to it.

John D., December 27, 2011, 1:35 a.m. EST

You say that "In the post, I presented reasons why John poorly stated such an idea that the Word, meaning the essence of Jesus, could and should not precede God."

Is that not against the belief that the Bible is the Word of God, which was inspired by the Holy Spirit and given to men, who wrote according to that inspiration? Either the Bible is God-inspired and perfect or it is man-made and imperfect. Which one do you believe?

Nicholas Ginex, December 27, 2011, 11:29 p.m. EST

Dear John D.,

By reading the rest of this post, both the comments and responses, you will find that I am very much in favor of the scriptures of the Torah, Gospels and Revelation, and the Koran being improved upon.

Scripture is that sacred to be cast in concrete, never to be improved upon. Why, the Egyptian priests, who were in existence for more than two thousand years before the birth of Jesus wrote and rewrote their scriptures until they finally came up with the concept of one universal God Amen. This development took thousands of years and was not conceived overnight by several priests who may have had revelations from the Holy Spirit of God.

The Bible is not perfect nor is the Koran. These scriptures have caused bigotry, hatred, violence, and the killing of innocent people because they do not relate a consistent vision of God. My dear man, do not think your Scripture is the only “true” scripture, for it is that kind of thinking that has caused people to kill one another with the belief they have the only “true” God.

Man is not perfect, but it is man that conceived the vision and belief in God. Yes, I believe that the Holy Spirit of God pervades the universe and evokes in all higher level intelligent life the desire to know how they were created and to one day meet their Creator.

Neither the Bible nor is man perfect is my answer to you. Mankind has still to learn the Word of God—*love one another*. It’s funny how few people who believe in God know the Word of God. It was given by Jesus as the last command given by God and it was stated three times in the Gospel of John. Yes, Jesus is the Word and the Word of God is—*love one another*.

The Word was given by God, who created Jesus to deliver the Word. To say Jesus existed with God from the beginning of time and created the universe is infantile thinking and a distortion of the “truth.” Jesus himself stated that Amen is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.” This means that God was indeed created within the minds of men, namely the Priesthood of Amon,

with the documented scripture extolling Amen as the one universal God, Maker of all that is.

John, you could deny history and believe the Hebrews were first to develop the belief in God. But you would be calling Jesus a liar, for he knew that the Egyptians conceived the one God belief before Moses left Egypt. To read a history of how the Egyptians conceived one universal God, a good read is *Future of God Amen*.

Mike Voyce, December 30, 2011, 6:28 a.m. EST

May I just endorse this comment?

The problem with all humans is we identify with the ideas our egos throw up; often we are prepared to kill (or die) rather than admit some quirky detail of these is wrong, and we blind ourselves even to the most infantile of errors in order to uphold what our ego has chosen.

The problem with religious ideas is faith in them (*not* faith in God) becomes essential to our “salvation.” Otherwise good and intelligent men have killed entire populations to uphold this delusion.

If God restored the life of Jesus because Jesus was his only Son, this means nothing to me. Only if I am Christ’s brother and likewise “son of God” could there be a promise which might extend to me. This true inspiration of Christianity has eluded popes, archbishops, and 99.9 percent of their followers, utterly destroying the Christian message, all to support the egotistical desire to make Jesus “special.”

It would not do for the egotistical aggrandizement of Jesus if we are all special, and yet it is the entire point of religion that we are all special.

I hope, and, Nicholas, I do have faith, that your book will provide the context for those with an honest desire to understand God and religion to leave the hell created by religious egos and discover the heaven of true understanding.

Nicholas Ginex, December 30, 2011, 5:38 p.m. EST

Hello Mike,

Thank you for your endorsement of a book that was written to reveal how mankind came to conceive God. It was written to provide history

that has been misinterpreted or ignored because other groups of people felt the need to rewrite history and provide a belief in God for their own people.

I am touched with your faith that *Future of God Amen* can be of help for those with an honest desire to understand God and religion. This book not only provides a history of mankind's legacy of a belief in God but it was written to reveal to all people that there is a dire need to have perceptive religious leaders work together to unify their belief in God with its basic purpose, which is to teach the Word of God—*love one another*.

Rather than push my book, because it serves no purpose, I prefer those who really care to read history of man's development of God to visit the website and decide if it is worthwhile reading. Just click on *Future of God Amen*.

The Atheist, September 23, 2011, 8:30 a.m. EDT

The real lie is using “the word” and “God” in the same sentence. Instead, use “the word of humans” to get at the truth of it all.

Nicholas Ginex, September 23, 2011, 3:40 p.m. EDT

To the Atheist, I sincerely understand your objection because I believe, like you, that it was wise, morally gifted humans that perceived the need to follow social forms of conduct.

However, as a practical man, I also perceive that it was through the development of the Egyptian religion that their beliefs included a social order of behavior implemented by the authority of their rulers and their priesthoods.

It is a fact that people have a natural desire to believe in God, and the major religions of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam will exist for a long, long time. However, as the author of *Future of God Amen*, I have tried to share the knowledge I have acquired in my lifetime concerning how mankind came to believe in one universal God.

In addition to revealing why the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions all have their roots in the beliefs developed by the Egyptian priesthood, I have provided recommendations to the religious leaders and worshippers of these religions to unify their beliefs to eliminate

bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent people that their differences have caused in today's world.

Since my book deals with the major religions and a critique of their scriptures to reveal that they are sorely in need of being brought up-to-date due to their myths and inconsistencies, I had to emphasize the Word of God announced by a Man of God, Jesus.

You are correct that it was wise men who naturally understood and perceived the dangers of a poor moral upbringing in any society. All of the commandments were not given to the human race by God but developed through experience about "what works" to have peace and order in a society. The commandments of social behavior were first developed by the ancient Egyptians and were followed religiously in order to join their god(s) in the hereafter or eternal life.

So yes, you are correct it was human beings that established how we should learn to live with one another. However, you must not forget that the moral code developed was enforced with the belief that upon living a moral and righteous life, one will attain immortality and be with their God.

Again, for all people, be they atheists, agnostics, or believers in God, there is a command given by Jesus in the Gospel of John that sums up the entire law of all scripture, which is—*love one another*. I have elected to stress that this is the Word of God because it was stated by a son of the Hebrew people that understood that unless we, as human beings, can learn to love our sisters and brothers, from any country, we can never established a harmonious world. It is this command that is more important than the worship of a God. And even if God does exist, He would rather have His creations love one another before they worship Him, because quite frankly, He does not need to be worshipped with the power He possesses.

So my dear Atheist, I understand your point of view, but you must understand mine as a practical man. People will always believe in God, but the most important command of God that underpins that belief is the Word of God—*love one another*. Yes, you can say the Word of Man, but that would be rather foolish because there is no man people can emulate—except the Man of God, Jesus.

I commend all atheists, agnostics, and believers in God to visit my Web site to evaluate if they would be interested in reading how mankind

came to conceive one universal God. It is a historical novel that provides facts and findings by religious scholars and Egyptologists over the past one hundred years. Simply click on *Future of God Amen*.

The Atheist, September 23, 2011, 5:32 p.m. EDT

I think you are just trying to do an unnecessarily complicated end run around the issue. Much simpler, more direct, and with greater chances of a successfully evolving and more advanced society is to let go of mankind's childhood fantasies and myths altogether . . . and simply lose the belief in the supernatural. If I can do it, anyone can!

Plus, I think you are bound to fail in your purpose because not everyone is a monotheist—not everyone is a Christian, Muslim, or Jew. There are plenty of other religions out there, some having multiple gods/goddesses, some with simply superior beings. For example, Mormons believe anyone can become a god and have their own “Earths” to rule over, and that means, of course, multiple gods. So I don't think you have a snowball's chance in Hades of succeeding.

The Atheist, September 23, 2011, 5:41 p.m. EDT

For better clarity, I suggest that it's time for mankind to grow up and grow out of believing in gods. Mankind succeeded at finally growing out of Zeus, Thor, Mars, Venus, Poseidon, etc. We got past it. But we fell victim to the other gods of Christianity, Islam, and Judaism, and a plethora of other beliefs. It's time we grew up some more and grew out of those things too. Morality has never been a result of any religion! It is simply evolution, nothing more. The root of morality is in our brains, not our religions—to think otherwise is just a factual mistake that too many people fall prey to.

Nicholas Ginex, September 23, 2011, 7:44 p.m. EDT

Hello Atheist,

I must say, you appear to be much more practical a man than I regarding the belief in God. But you have heard of the expression that the psychosis must be cured using “baby steps.” As I look into the future, I foresee millions of people who subscribe to a belief in God or many gods, and to have them educated to understand that the belief in God was a man-made belief is too difficult for them to accept.

You may not agree, but I believe that the belief in God by Judaic, Christian, and Islamic worshipers will exist for several more centuries. Therefore, I have tried to provide a book that substantiates how mankind came to believe in the one universal God they all pray to by revealing, with actual facts and findings that have surfaced over the past one hundred years, that the Egyptian God Amen has had a profound effect upon the development of these three religions.

Only with knowledge can human beings let go of the fascination to worship a god and come to realize it is a mental construct of a myth devised by some fairly wise guys that knew how to control the actions of people. Only through knowledge that allow human beings to understand how the belief in God originated can there be a rejection of the myth. However, even though it is proven that God is a mythical construct of the mind, there will be resistance by people to persist in the belief. A prime example is that the theory of evolution has not replaced the teaching of the Bible Creation story in many schools in our country. So you see, there is an effort by the establishment to preserve the idea of God because the political leaders realize it helps to maintain a civilized society. The ancient Egyptian kings and priesthoods were a joint operating authority to promulgate the idea of achieving an eternal hereafter by living a moral and righteous life. And would you know, the political rulers of advanced civilizations adopted that approach to enforce morality through the authority of an all-powerful God. The Islamic religion incorporates both the theological and political systems together rather than separate as done with other governments.

Therefore, Atheist, you have got to realize that the theological concepts of God will persist because it is in the interest of governments to foster the belief to help stabilize a society with moral standards. As a consequence, I must take the “baby steps” approach to educate and inform people throughout the world a fundamental “truth” of how mankind came to believe in God. But after providing that “truth,” I have provided in the last chapter many recommendations whereby the leaders and worshipers of the major religions can unify their beliefs and teach the mandate of their profession, which is to teach the fundamental command provided by a man of God—*love one another*. You and I believe Jesus was a Son of Man as did Jesus; for Jesus stated he was the Son of Man seventy-six times in all four Gospels, and only six times did others say he was the Son of God in the last Gospel of John. During John’s writing of the Gospel, the Church fathers decided to make Jesus a God by referring to him as the Word in John’s opening lines.

Dear Atheist,

Thank you again for stimulating my passion to reveal the “truth” to people around the world. Knowledge is a wonderful gift (Ginex) and those who desire to learn the “truth” have an opportunity by clicking *Future of God Amen*.

Nicholas Ginex, September 23, 2011, 10:01 p.m. EDT

Dear Athiest,

I may have neglected to respond to the following comment you wrote, “Morality has never been a result of any religion! It is simply evolution, nothing more. The root of morality is in our brains, not our religions—to think otherwise is just a factual mistake that too many people fall prey to.”

To say morality has never been a result of any religion is an overstatement that shows a lack of the history of how mankind came to believe in gods and used that belief to establish moral codes of conduct. It is unfortunate that many people lack an understanding of how the ancient Egyptians evolved the belief in one universal God. To say the “root of morality is in our brains, not religions” is partially correct. First of all, morality is taught by those who recognize the usefulness of a moral code; such as our mothers and fathers and teachers, who have been trained to inculcate behavior that facilitates the promise of a harmonious society. The religions are simply institutions of the political system to teach codes of behavior to maintain a stable society. The idea is to understand the scheme of things that have worked for centuries by those in power, namely the rulers and religious leaders of the established system.

Is this bad? I would say no! It is counterproductive to eliminate a system that works. However, it is “truth” that must be at the root of all behavior and that is the knowledge of “how mankind first conceived God and why it persists within an established civilization.” To call the belief in God a factual mistake is to dismiss the inherent nature of human beings to wonder about their beginnings and the beginning of the universe. This wonder has resulted in philosophical thought that developed the belief or concept of God. And it will persist until both science and faith arrive at an answer that is based upon experience and truth.

The Word in John's Gospel

July 11, 2011, 06:51 p.m. EDT

There is a need to clarify what John meant in the opening line of his Gospel because the Church fathers appear to have misinterpreted the “Word” as being Jesus. The opening line of John’s Gospel states:

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,
and the Word was God.

So what was the Word and what made the Church fathers associate Jesus with the Word? The original Gospel of John used the term Logos, which was later changed to Word by the Church fathers. It is an important term in philosophy, beginning with Heraclitus (ca. 535-475 BCE), who used the term for a principle of order and knowledge. Ancient philosophers, such as Aristotle, applied the term to refer to “reasoned discourse” in the field of rhetoric. Stoic philosophers identified Logos as “the divine animating principle pervading the universe.” This idea was applied by Philo (ca. 20 BCE-40 CE) into Jewish philosophy. By 90-120 CE, John wrote his Gospel and used Logos in his opening line to mean the divine or theos, through which all things were made.

It is apparent that John used Logos to describe God as the divine animating principle pervading the universe. This original meaning is not consistent with the Church fathers’ belief that Jesus is the Word, because in John’s verse stated below, he clearly indicates God created Jesus:

And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us,
(and we beheld his glory, the glory as the only begotten of
the Father,) full of grace and truth. (John 1:14)

The Word became flesh by the Holy Spirit of God in the conception of Mary as God's gift to mankind and was named Jesus. We see that John's rendition of the birth of Jesus is in concert with the Gospels of Matthew (1:18-20) and Luke (1:28-31). John stated that the "Word is God" and God created flesh, a Son of Man to deliver what may be the Word of God. However, the Church fathers have associated the Word with Jesus as being co-equal with God. This appears to be a compound error for several reasons. The Church fathers misinterpreted the Word, which was originally Logos. Secondly, a Son of God could not exist in the beginning with God, because it contradicts the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John. All three Gospels validate that Jesus was created flesh as the Son of Man by God. Of greater if not obvious importance, Jesus was never needed from the beginning *until God created mankind*. God gave Jesus to mankind to deliver the last command given in the Bible. So emphatic was this command that it should be known as the "Word of God." It was stated by Jesus three times—*love one another* (John 13:34, 15:12, 15:17). Yes, Jesus was imbued with the Spirit of God but was not God.

It is unfortunate that common sense has eluded the Church fathers in their zeal to raise Jesus to the level of God. The Trinity, fabricated by the Church fathers, is complex and has caused many God-loving people to resort to their own personal belief in God. The Church Fathers may have unknowingly failed as stewards of God because many followers now believe that "Jesus is God" who "created all there is." This is heresy, for there could only be God in the beginning. Whether Jesus is worshipped as a Son of God or a Son of Man, God-loving people will still follow the Word of God.

The Trinity is not mentioned in the Bible. Early Church writers such as Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Novatian, Arnobius, and Lactantius were very explicit in affirming that the Heavenly Father alone is the supreme God and that Jesus is completely subordinate to His authority and will. It was Arius, a preacher from Libya that initiated the debate as to whether Jesus was co-equal with God or created. He taught that the Son of God was not eternal and was subordinate to God the Father. His bishop, Alexander, strongly opposed him by insisting that the Son was truly God, in as absolute a sense as the Father was.

To settle the debate, it was in 325 CE that the Emperor Constantine convened the Council of Nicea, attended by 220 bishops, and the

Nicene Creed was formulated; it states that the Father and Son are co-equal and co-eternal. This disagrees with the words of Jesus, “my Father is greater than I (John 14:28).” Below, Jesus confirms he is the *Son of Man* and does what his Father has taught him because he always does those things that please his father.

When ye have lifted up the *Son of Man*, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father has taught me, I speak these things. And He that sent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please Him. (John 8:28-29)

The fabricated Nicene dogma was extended to include the Holy Spirit in 381 CE by the Catholic Church at the Council of Constantinople. The definition of the Trinity as three persons appears to be poorly defined by the Church fathers because they did not understand that the Holy Spirit is the spirit of God that pervades the entire universe and Jesus is the only entity that can be identified as a “Person.” The polytheistic fusing of three entities into one God has caused many Christians to believe Jesus as being God, “the Creator of all there is.”

Hopefully, given the above facts, Christians will reevaluate the meaning of the Word. Jesus was a man of truth. He explicitly stated he is the Son of Man seventy-six times in all four Gospels, whereas only six times in John’s Gospel, others stated he is the Son of God. But never did he explicitly say he was was the Son of God or that he was co-equal or co-eternal with God. To consider the “Word” further as it relates to God, Jesus confirms an even greater revelation concerning God and that is, the Egyptian God *Amen* is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God (Rev. 3:14).” With exposure to Egyptian history, the words by Jesus will make sense to the enquiring reader by clicking on the link: www.futureofgodamen.com

Do you think the Church fathers’ interpretation of the Word as being Jesus is valid?

Ginex afterthought (November 11, 2011): Jesus is indeed the Word by announcing the Word of God, *love one another*, but do you believe Jesus is co-equal and co-eternal with God whereby Jesus is God?

Comments and Responses

Jerry Kays, July 14, 2011, 5:36 p.m. EDT

The entire issue when interpreted solely by “the word” (the literal words) of the One Book (OT and NT) has little relationship on the esoteric truth which can be refined down to the BET (Basic Equation of Truth + =—) which *is* Trinity explained (when understood) . . .

Thus *God* (not God nor gods) is the “relative” (+) as compared to “His” creation (which includes *all* people) being the relative (-), and thus the “Synthesizer” that “bridges” that void between is the Spirit of *God* as the (=) . . .

Thus any from the lower realm who wish to relate to the upper realm must do so “through the Spirit” (=) . . .

Jesus was but a man (-), as are all (or women) who have received the Spirit (=) of *God* (+) . . .

Key Point: . . . as far as we are concerned, it is all spiritual . . . *not* a matter of specific human beings being any more or less divine than was Jesus or any other who had made the *real contact* with *God* (done through Spirit).

Only *God* knows for sure . . . and nothing else matter near as much . . . if one thinks they can get it all only from the Book mentioned, they are fools . . . IMnsHO.

Nicholas Ginex, July 16, 2011, 7:36 p.m. EDT

Thank you, Jerry, for your response, and if I understand you correctly, I must say I agree with your view. My understanding of what you said is that there is one God and His creations (men and women) are connected to God through the Holy Spirit, namely the spirit of God. You appear to also say that Jesus is no more imbued with the spirit of God as are His creations through the Holy Spirit. If I am interpreting you correctly, I will say, “I like it” and agree your interpretation is in agreement with my views.

Jerry Kays, July 17, 2011, 1:57 a.m. EDT

Thank You, Nicholas. I feel I can say we are in agreement.

Richard Regener, July 11, 2011, 11:43 p.m. EDT

Rather well articulated, Nicholas.

Nicholas Ginex, July 12, 2011, 5:39 p.m. EDT

Thank you, Richard. I hope to clarify what has been distorted and misconstrued by the Church fathers. Even holy men can make mistakes.

Jerry Kays, July 14, 2011, 5:38 p.m. EDT

Yes . . . well done!

Jay Breeding, July 12, 2011, 12:01 a.m. EDT

Hello Nicholas,

Sometimes I wonder if you ever get a headache from banging your head against a wall. I suppose it would be OK if it were a wall flimsy enough to crumble with sufficient force, but I fear you have naively taken on a principle that is so rock solid and firm that your efforts will end in severe head injury rather than its toppling. Accepting that Jesus is God is not a prerequisite to becoming a disciple of Christ, but a love for Christ and appreciation for what He did for you is hampered in its development if you do not eventually grasp this truth about Jesus as His follower. However, I find at least three erroneous suppositions that seem to pervade your argument, only the last of which I will try to respond to.

First, you infer the Church fathers are only able to use this verse to support the claim that Jesus is God. It is not. Second, you imply that this is a belief that only began with the council of Nicea. Besides being woven throughout the fabric of the Scriptures, it is found both implicitly and explicitly in the writings of the early Church fathers. Third, you assume that your discourse on the term “Logos,” translated “Word” here, somehow counters the very clear wording found here that Jesus is God.

In fact, much of what you said I agree with, but you remarkably come to a completely different conclusion than where the verses are clearly leading you. “Logos” is indeed a word that when rendered to English loses much of its impact, however its lackluster translation does nothing to take away from the fact that the term “Logos” is being applied to Jesus and that Jesus as the Son was in the beginning, and that He was with God, and that He was God; but, as verse 14 reveals, that same Logos—that same Word, that same Jesus—became, or was made, flesh. It is here that you seem to most be confused. You feel His being made “flesh” indicates he couldn’t be from the beginning and therefore can’t be God. This is true in the sense that the Son, which had been with God as God, came down to earth at this point in the fullness of time as flesh, i.e., a man, and was called Jesus. Therefore, this Jesus is unique in history, being fully God and fully man. As the Son, He was before creation and not made, but as the man, He came into being. This is what the combination of verses 1 and 14 clearly tell you. John’s use of the word “Logos” in these verses is brilliant because of its deep meaning for both the Jews and the Greeks. It implies to both that this “Word” is the essence of the creative force while also being the source of all wisdom and knowledge. The Church fathers got it right.

IMHO

Nicholas Ginex, July 12, 2011, 6:25 p.m. EDT

Jay, thank you for your response. It was very interesting, but more importantly, you made me laugh. However, I do take seriously when people start to strongly believe Jesus is God because I do not like to be made a fool of, and I cannot stand by and see other people being made into fools.

When John clearly indicated the Word was made flesh, the Word = God gave mankind a gift through the inception of God’s Holy Spirit by the birth of Jesus. This does not mean Jesus was God, since it was God that allowed the creation of Jesus by being born a Son of Man. You are saying Jesus was God in the very beginning and created himself again as a man. This is false because Jesus was never needed until God created mankind. To say Jesus was a Son of God and also God is also incoherent thinking, for only God existed in the beginning. You stated of Jesus, “As the Son, He was before creation and not made, but as the man, He came into being.” Your beginning of this sentence is false reasoning because God did not exist as a Son before creation.

The ending of your sentence is also false because you made man come into being as a “He,” which you assume is God.

It is amazing that believers in God cannot accept the words of Jesus unless he is worshiped as a God. If this is so, the Church fathers should simply call Jesus God and not Son of God, because the polytheistic concept they have created, the Trinity, is not defined in the Gospels. The Church fathers have committed heresy by not being consistent with the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John. They have misconstrued and misinterpreted the Word to mean Jesus and not the creative Logos that was God.

Jay Breeding, July 14, 2011, 11:59 a.m. EDT

Dear Nicholas,

I wish you were living in my neighborhood. Besides you probably being a great neighbor, I would relish the opportunity to sit down and move through the passage together to see where it is we exactly depart ways. However, I will be thankful just for the opportunity to make you my blogging neighbor, though the process becomes more tedious. This can get long, so I think I will break this down into a few posts. I will post the Scriptures in bold print and my comments in regular font. Let's start from the beginning, shall we?

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,
and the Word was God.

You seem to focus your discussion mostly on this one verse here. I will say that if this verse were lifted from here and placed almost anywhere else besides the beginning of one of the Gospels, your point would be more valid. You stated that I miss an important insight here that also eluded many perceptive and intelligent people through the ages. However, I think you forgot to apply the common sense of context. There are at least seventeen more verses to follow that are important to the context, not the least of which is verse 14 (which I will get to later). But before we examine even those verses, let us consider the fact that John is introducing his Gospel of Jesus Christ. The topic is Jesus Christ. It would be an odd way to start his Gospel about Jesus if he were discussing some philosophical aspect about God without it being related to Jesus.

In the beginning was the Word . . .

This beginning takes us to the beginning literally (Gen. 1:1). The word translated “was,” from what I have learned, comes from the imperfect tense of the Greek word “eimi,” which describes continuing action from the past, implying that this “Logos” was always there. As stated earlier, I accept with you the impact the word “Logos” had on many Greeks at the time, especially the philosophers. It referred to a word that was an abstract principle of reason and order in the universe, carrying a connotation of a creative force and source of wisdom. This also related well to Jews who saw the Word of God as that creative force and wisdom. In Genesis 1, God spoke and the universe came into being. God spoke His wisdom directly to the people of Israel through His prophets. Though to the Greeks this principle was impersonal, to the Jews it was personal. However, John is about to make it personal to the Greeks as well.

... and the Word was with God . . .

The Greek phrase “pros ton theon” is also lost to us in its impact when translated to English. Much more than meaning that this “Logos” merely existed with God, the phrase portrays two persons in intimate relationship. This is where we begin to depart, because while you interpret the “Logos” as purely an abstract principle, I and others are already seeing this “Logos” as an actual person separate from but in relationship with the other person we call God. However, again, John is about to identify more of who this second person is.

... and the Word was God.

Not much clearer than that. Although, John has not firmly declared the identity of the second person, it seems that these are at least two who make up a Godhead. Is this polytheism? You may say yes, but I know it is not so. They are not two personalities that sometimes oppose one another—making us have to wait out what their decisions will be—but they are one. They are united in purpose and thought. They are of the same essence and never in conflict. One, we will see, is the exact representation of the other, but for another post.

Jay Breeding, July 14, 2011, 12:03 p.m. EDT

V.2 He was in the beginning with God.

If there were ever a doubt about whether this “Logos” was personal, it is now no longer in question. This “Logos” now is given a personal

pronoun. (Ginex: According to the King James Version, verse 2 is stated without a pronoun with, “The same was in the beginning with God.”)

“v.3 All things were made through Him, and with Him was not any thing made that was made.” (Ginex: According to the King James Version, verse 2 is stated, “All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.”)

Going back to the creative force theme, we see that through this personalized “Logos” was the entire universe made. This is echoed in Paul’s writings to the Colossians, “He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation. For by Him (Jesus) all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or authorities—all things were created through Him and for Him. And He is before all things, and in Him all things hold together” (1:15-17). Also, the writer of Hebrews writes: “. . . but in these last days He (God) has spoken to us by His Son, who He appointed the heir of all things, through whom also He created the world. He is the radiance of the glory of God and the exact imprint of His nature, and He upholds the universe by the word of His power . . .” (1:2-3a)

“vv. 4-5 In Him was life, and the life was the light of men. The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not overcome it.”

This verse brings us back beautifully again to Genesis 1, where darkness was upon the face of the waters and God’s first recorded words of creation were, “Let there be light,” and light chased away the darkness. This “Logos” is the light of men, but is also life. John will later record in his Gospel that Jesus said that He is the light of the world (8:12, 9:3) and the life (14:6).

The next few verses deal with John the Baptist. I will put that on another post.

Ann Marcaida July 14, 2011, 12:03 p.m. EDT

Hi Jay!

It’s nice to see you again. You write very well—I hope you will consider an article or essay for LYR!

Jay Breeding, July 14, 2011, 12:28 p.m. EDT

“vv. 6-8 There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. He came as a witness, to bear witness about the light, that all might believe through Him. He was not the light, but came to bear witness about the light.”

I hope we can both agree that these verses are about John the Baptist. John already assumes the reader is familiar with John the Baptist and his role. So it is important to note here that John the Baptist's role was to prepare the way of the Lord, to introduce and initiate the ministry of Jesus. So by the inclusion of these verses, although John has not formally pronounced that who he has been talking about so far is Jesus, it is obvious to the reader that such a pronouncement is about to come.

The true light, which enlightens everyone, was coming into the world. He was in the world, and the world was made through Him, yet the world did not know Him. He came to His own, and His own people did not receive Him. (John 1:9-11)

John brings his readers back to the topic of the light that he was referring to before his statements about John the Baptist. Notice in verse 10, John reiterates that this One he is talking about is the same creative Force that created the world that He is about to enter. Logic follows that He was the Creator of this world and that even though He is was in the world, He must have existed before He was a man on earth. The verses also indicate that the world will not recognize Him as their Creator and even the Jewish people, as a whole, will not accept Him. Again, John is giving you a good indication that he is talking about Jesus here, even though he hasn't specifically named Him yet. For Jesus was rejected and crucified by the men of His world. This was prophesied in Isaiah 53, “He was despised and rejected by men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; and as one from whom men hide their faces he was despised, and we esteemed him not.”

But to all who did receive Him, who believed in His name, He gave the right to become children of God, who were born, not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God. (vv. 12-13)

John once again makes it clear, although not naming Him, that he is talking about Jesus, for he echoes this thought when referring to the

purpose of his Gospel found later in 20:31, “. . . but these are written so that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life in His name.”

The ultimate revelation of who he talking about is found in these final verses in which I will discuss in the next post.

Jay Breeding, July 14, 2011, 1:14 p.m. EDT

And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us,
and we have seen His glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father,
full of grace and truth. (v. 14)

(I could have skipped straight to this earlier, but I tried that once before and you did not catch it, Nicholas.) John comes back to the Word, the “Logos” that he began his gospel with. I’m not sure why I have to say anything more, but I feel that I still must. This “Logos,” who was in the beginning, was with God, and *was* God is not clearly identified as Jesus, the one he and all the other Gospel writers refer to as the Son of God. He became flesh, i.e., became a man. He was from the beginning God and so is fully God, but He is now in the flesh and fully man. Notice this Son of God is “full of grace and truth,” the same words he will use in verse 17 when he specifically mentions the name and title, “Jesus Christ.”

(John bore witness about Him, and cried out, “This was He of whom I said, ‘He who comes after me ranks before me, because He was before me.’”) And from His fullness we have all received, grace upon grace. For the law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ. (v. 15-17)

Besides reminding you of what I just said—that John ties the “Logos” of verse 14 to Jesus Christ by use of the terms “Son of God” (which I hope we can agree is a reference to Jesus) and the phrase “grace and truth”—I only want to add that just as John the Baptist said that He (Jesus) was before him, even though John was born first and started his ministry first, Jesus made a similar claim when making probably the most overt claim of his deity found in any of the Gospels. In chapter 8 of John’s Gospel, Jesus says to a crowd:

“Your father Abraham rejoiced that he would see my day. He saw it and was glad.” So the Jews said to him, “You are not yet fifty years old, and have you seen Abraham?” Jesus said to them, “Truly, truly, I

say to you, before Abraham was, I Am.” So they picked up stones to throw at Him, but Jesus hid Himself and went out of the temple.

I’m sure you are aware that “I Am” are the words that come from YHWY, the personal name that God gave Himself when addressing Moses on Mt. Sinai. The point is Jesus is addressing a fact that you have had a problem with from the beginning, which is, how could He have been born on this earth but still existed before? And yet here He is saying that He existed before Abraham and that He was “I Am” at that! No wonder the Jews wanted to stone Him!

No one has ever seen God; the only God who is at the Father’s side,
He has made Him known. (v. 18)

Although it says here that no one has ever seen God, later in John 14:9, Jesus says to Philip, who has asked Jesus to show them the Father, “Have I been with you so long, and you still do not know me, Philip: Whoever has seen me has seen the Father . . .” Finally, notice the words I emphasized. “. . . the only God who is at the Father’s side.” The God that is at the Father’s side is Jesus.

Again, Nicholas, whether you accept John’s testimony or not is up to you, but I don’t think you can say that John is not referring to Jesus as God. He may be wrong, or maybe some imposter wrote this and is lying, or maybe John is lying, but the text clearly indicates that the writer thinks Jesus is God. Also, if John is right, it is immaterial as to whether you understand what the Son’s role was before the creation of the universe and man. I think you have to realize that you will never fully understand the height and depth of the fullness of God. God reveals to us those things He wants and needs for us to know. “(God) has made everything beautiful in its time. Also, He has put eternity into man’s heart, yet so that he cannot find out what God has done from the beginning to the end,” (Eccl. 3:11).

Nicholas Ginex, July 13, 2011, 2:06 a.m. EDT

There are many things about God and religion that I respect, but when there are myths and inconsistencies that need to be believed on faith, I then depart. I cannot believe, for example, that God created a flood to kill all human life except Noah and his family, because the Egyptian civilization existed before and after God’s Flood. In the same way, I cannot accept that God needed a Son in the beginning to create all

there is because somebody thinks that the Word is wisdom and not God. If you believe in God, He has all the wisdom any entity could possess and therefore He alone was the Word or Logos.

And then, the most obvious reason why Jesus could not exist in the beginning is that Jesus was never needed as a Son of God until God created mankind, who needed direction, which was given by Jesus when he stated the Word of God three times—*love one another*. Perhaps the obvious did not occur to the Church fathers as they ignored the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John that Jesus was a gift to mankind upon his mother conceiving by the Holy Spirit of God.

The problem with many religious people is that they are fixed on a set of beliefs in Scripture that they believe is from God. This is false because it was holy men, priests, that wrote many of the passages in the Bible. The inability of our religious leaders to improve Scripture is due to arrogance and pride. The Egyptian priesthood was far more advanced and was open to change as they transformed former beliefs in many gods to finally write scripture extolling *Amon as the Sole God*. Change is good, for it shows an ability to learn and develop one's intellect. To stay stagnant and transfixed with Scripture that is old and outworn with myths, inconsistencies, judgments, and ordinances is to wear the suit of arrogance.

The truth must be told about the fact that the scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions must be revised to teach a unified belief in one universal God. After all, they all pray to the same God. Still, arrogance and pride will continue to exist until we are engaged in the bigotry, hate, violence, and killing of innocent people and our earth comes to near destruction. Perhaps the God belief is just a phony idea because the people of the three major religions do not respect God and His Word—*love one another*.

To read why the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions all stem from the same roots of a spiritual people and attain a valid history of how mankind first conceived the belief in one universal God, visit the following link: www.futureofgodamen.com

Ben Surbana July 13, 2011, 10:53 a.m. EDT

If you take everything in the Bible literally, you will find yourself in trouble. We must elevate our understanding of it by metaphor so as to make it useful to our soul.

The story of Noah and the ark, for example, is more meaningful if you see it as a metaphor for your own soul. Water is often the symbol of human emotions, which, if uncontrolled, can drown a person. Noah's name means "repose or consolation." The ark is like a womb which protects him until he is made new and emerges victorious. The animals represent not only healthy instincts, but because they are paired, they represent the opposites necessary for life itself. They are brought together so as to be reconciled and unified by wisdom (the ark).

All of these experiences are symbolic in the story of what the soul undergoes when she is conjoined with God and His wisdom.

Yes, Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are connected. Like every efficacious religion, their root is the *Logos*.

Nicholas Ginex, July 14, 2011, 2:34 a.m. EDT

Hello Ben,

I read the written word of the Bible and know when to take its meaning literally and when it is a myth or consists of inconsistencies. Not everything that has ever been written is sacred because they are inspired by the experiences, teachings, customs, and traditions one has been exposed to.

You must be careful to not be deluded by what you have been taught such that you will defend what you read by reinterpreting the written word. Your analogy of Noah's Ark is an opinion that you have constructed to convince yourself of the significance of God's Flood. So is the case of Adam and Eve another myth that can be hypothesized into relevance to the believer. However, I believe that if inspired by God, the words will ring true and clear to anybody that reads them. This is not the case. Many different ministers, rabbis, priests, and mullahs give a different interpretation of God's Word. Why? To suit the times and the listeners into believing something that may apply to them. But all this is nothing more than supposition to inspire and direct their followers.

This is not to say that teachers of their religion are insincere, for they are people who dedicate their lives in directing their sisters and brothers to lead decent and wholesome lives. I have great respect for those that devote their lives to teach the Word of God. Unfortunately,

of the many services I have attended, I never have heard a minister, rabbi, priest, or mullah expound upon the words announced by Jesus three times in the Gospel of John—*love one another*. This is the great command even greater than love your God, because God would never accept you unless you have learned to love your sisters and brothers from any nation.

Ben Surbana, July 14, 2011, 1:08 p.m. EDT

Expounding the words to love one another is not sufficient. We must *live* them.

I fail to see the importance of calling God any other particular name, Nicholas, than “God.”

Wisdom tells us that any name only points to the Ineffable and the Nameless.

May your path be made smooth and filled with Light!

Nicholas Ginex, July 14, 2011, 2:26 p.m. EDT

Hello Ben,

You are correct that to love one another is an action to be lived. Regarding the name of God, it is not necessary because people from many different cultures have their own names, but what is significant is that they believe in gods or God. Who is to say your religion is the correct one? They all serve the same purpose, which is to conduct our lives in a manner that God would be proud.

The reason I bring up the name Amen is because this is the first time in the history of mankind that a spiritual people developed the belief in one universal God documented by the Priesthood of Amon as *Amon as the Sole God*, the creator of all there is. Let us have respect for our past and not shove it under the rug as has been done by the religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions.

To acknowledge and understand why Jesus said Amen is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God,” you need to read the history provided in the following link: www.futureofgodamen.com

Ben Surbana, July 14, 2011, 6:01 p.m. EDT

Nicholas, I praise your efforts for promoting unity among religions.

However, without a healthy prayer life and the authentic love it obtains, the intellectual approach is useless and short-lived.

Therefore, let us pray with sincere hearts for the compassion needed toward all humankind. Then a lasting unity shall naturally follow . . .

Thank you again for your fine work!

Nicholas Ginex, July 14, 2011, 11:14 p.m. EDT

A response to Jay's comments of July 14, 2011, 11:59 EDT:

Hello Jay,

Thank you for furthering the discussion about John's Gospel's opening line. Let me be honest in that I do not seek to change your beliefs about Jesus being God. However, I indulge you to understand why I cannot share your beliefs. You wrote the first phrase of the first line and appear to agree with me that the "Logos" was in your words, "an abstract principle of reason and order in the universe carrying a connotation of a creative force and source of wisdom." I was a bit stronger in the use of Logos by John as meaning at that time, "divine or theos, through which all things were made." Originally, the philosophers conceived Logos as "the divine animating principle pervading the universe." Actually, both ideas connote one God that possesses the ability to create all things. The Logos is therefore an attribute or power of God.

However, in the second phrase of John's opening line, namely "and the Word was with God," we depart in the interpretation. You wrote, "Much more than meaning that this 'Logos' merely existed with God, the phrase portrays two persons in intimate relationship." You have just made a supposition or an assumption because you have identified a principle or power to create to another entity, which is quite disingenuous. Here, I strongly disagree and do not appreciate your attempt to identify the creative power of God as another God, which you believe is Jesus. You try to cement your reasoning by writing further, "I and others are already seeing this 'Logos' as an actual person separate from and but in relationship with the other person we call God."

You and “others” are misconstruing John’s original phrase by identifying the creative power of God as another “person.” This is akin to the fabricated concept of the Trinity, where the Church fathers described God as “The mystery of one God in three Persons: Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit.” This is a poor conception on God for several reasons: one, God is not a “Person.” He is unknowable, mysterious, and incomprehensible; second, only Jesus is a “Person”; and thirdly, the Holy Spirit is not another “Person” but the soul or spirit of God.

Let us now examine the last phrase by John and see what you propose for “and the Word was God.” Here, you wrote: “Not much clearer than that. Although, John has not firmly declared the identity of the second person, it seems that these are at least two who make up a Godhead. Is this polytheism?” My answer is yes, but you wrote two contradictory sentences. You indicate it’s “Not much clearer than that,” and add, “John has not firmly declared the identity of the second person,” concluding with “it seems that these are at least who make up a Godhead.” Your analysis is faulty by saying John has not declared the identity of a second person, but yet you conclude there are two entities who make up the Godhead.

To convince yourself and the reader that you have reached a profound conclusion, you further try to cement your belief by writing, “They are not two personalities that sometimes oppose one another,” and also “They are of the same essence and never in conflict. One, we will see, is the exact representation of the other.”

From John’s opening line, there is no indication that there are two personalities. The essence of God is the “Logos” or divine animating power of God to create all there is. For you to misconstrue the words of John by implying there are two personalities instead of God alone with the power to create is to fall in line with the Church fathers fabricated concept of the Trinity. It is nonsense to believe God needed another entity, for He was capable to create without any help. We therefore open the debate whereby many well-respected religious leaders, mentioned in my opening post, claimed that “the Heavenly Father alone is the supreme God and that Jesus is completely subordinate to His authority and will.”

You have been indoctrinated to believe Jesus is co-eternal and co-equal to God. This may be acceptable to many believers, but then to say Jesus is God is, forgive my analogy, taking the whole cake instead of

being humble and agreeing that Jesus is a Son of God. You miss or ignore the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John, who are consistent with my contention that Jesus was created as a gift from God to direct mankind to follow the Word of God—*love one another*. You cannot deny that it was the Holy Spirit of God that came upon Mary so she could conceive a son to be called Jesus. You also ignore the words of Jesus when he said, “My Father is greater than I,” (John 14:28). Do not make a liar out of Jesus, for he confirmed he is the Son of Man in John 8:28-29 and does what his Father has taught him because he always does those things that please his father.

When ye have lifted up the Son of Man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father has taught me, I speak these things. And He that sent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please Him. (John 8:28-29)

Nicholas Ginex, July 14, 2011, 11:51 p.m. EDT

Hello Jay,

I will be honest with you in that when discussing Jesus, I only refer to the New Testament and Revelation. All other scripture is, as far as I am concerned, second-hand, and though written by righteous men, they all had a personal reason for doing so. The Torah is useful, but it is written for the Hebrew people and not for mankind because they never spread their love of God to other people or children of God but kept it to themselves.

I will agree with much of the New Testament in that Jesus “is the light of the world (8:12, 9:3) and the life (14:6).” That is why I spend my energy and time to inform people worldwide that the Word of God is “love one another,” the last command given by Jesus three times in the Gospel of John.

All things were made by God, not Jesus. Why? Jesus is the incarnation of the image of man and was given to mankind through birth by Mary upon conceiving by the Holy Spirit of God. Since man was created much, much later than the universe with all its galaxies, stars, and planets, it is common sense that God created all there is and Jesus was never needed in the beginning until given to mankind.

But this may be a consequence of common sense eluding those who strongly have a belief they cannot revise based upon ingrained teachings.

Nicholas Ginex, July 15, 2011, 8:21 p.m. EDT

Ginex to Jay's Response of July 14, 2011, 12:28 EDT:

Hello Jay,

You identified some wonderful lines in John's Gospel, especially that Jesus was the light and I totally agree. However, there is much concern that the later English translations that changed "Logos" to "Word" has been done by the Church fathers to misconstrue the original intent of John. This concern prompted me to search for one of the oldest translations and I recommend you visit the link: http://www.v-a.com/bible/john_1-7.html#JOHN#1 or <http://www.v-a.com/bible>

The introductory paragraph of the above link gives a short summary of the Aramaic Bible and it is included below to give our readers the significance of this Bible translation.

Jesus the Messiah spoke in the Galilean dialect of the ancient Aramaic language. This is the language in which the disciples and the apostles preached the Gospel and the scribes recorded the Scriptures. The New Testament has been preserved in this sacred, scribal language since the Apostolic Age. The whole Bible was originated in this language. The translation that you find on this website is made from the original ancient Aramaic Scriptures directly into English, bypassing the errors of translation introduced in the Greek Original, the Latin Vulgate, and all the Western translations made from them. This is an attempt to rekindle the Apostolic Faith in the name of Eashoa Msheekhah (Jesus the Messiah) throughout the world.

By referring to John's Gospel's opening line in the Aramaic Bible, you will clearly "see" the original intent of John's meaning is very close to that of the "Logos." The Aramaic John's opening line is included with several other verses to insure its context is clear:

1. In the beginning (of creation) there was the Manifestation*; And that Manifestation was with God; and God was (the embodiment of) that Manifestation.

2. This was in the beginning with God. 3. Everything was within his power*, (otherwise) nothing would ever exist.* 4. Through him (there) was Life* and Life became the spark* of humanity 5. And that (ensuing) fire* lights the darkness and darkness does not overshadow it.

In the above translation, John only refers to God, the manifestation of God was God from the beginning and nothing would ever exist without His power. There is no hint of a Son of God in the beginning.

It is clear that the Church fathers have misconstrued John's original conception of God, because by 325 CE, they were intent on using another interpretation, which is to use the "Word" to associate another entity, namely Jesus. This new idea by the Church fathers allowed them to teach Jesus is co-equal and co-eternal with God. Then in 381 CE, fifty-six years later, the Church fathers included the Holy Spirit of God to form the concept of the Trinity. The Trinity is a deception of the original intention of John and an act of heresy.

Jay Breeding, July 17, 2011, 1:09 a.m. EDT

Nicholas, I think you misunderstand my intentions. I understand that many don't share my beliefs. I am not expecting you to apologize for it, nor do I expect you to accept a Trinitarian perspective of a sole universal God. You just seem to be on a relentless crusade to show that Church leaders were purposely twisting the words of John to make Jesus God. You also are parroting the accusation that the Christian belief that Jesus is God did not arise until the fourth century AD., a charge that has become popularized by misinformation on the Internet. You made the bold assertion that the "early church writers such as Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Novatian, Arnobius, and Lactantius were very explicit in affirming that the Heavenly Father alone is the supreme God." Yes, Nicholas, they all affirmed that there is only one God. That was never in dispute. However, most of these you named here have in their writings explicit references to Jesus as God. For my part, I tried to make it as clear as possible what these early Church leaders saw in Scripture, especially in these verses from John, to lead them to this truth. I was mistaken in thinking you could at least recognize that clear teaching even if you couldn't accept it as a true teaching. I know that Paul tells us that a veil remains over our understanding of Scripture that can only be lifted in Christ. I suppose it is truer than I thought.

You admitted earlier that you did not have much use for OT scripture. That is too bad, because it might give you more context to understand just how Jesus in all of the Gospels was claiming to be God, including His use of the Son of Man title that you ironically keep pointing out thinking it actually helps your argument that he was just a man. There are many things in OT Scripture that helps the believer better understand the true nature of Jesus and why He had to be God.

Nicholas Ginex, July 17, 2011, 6:59 p.m. EDT

Ginex to Jay Breeding's Reply dated July 17, 2011, 1:05 am EDT:

Hello Jay,

Thank you and Ben for correcting my last reply in that I meant to address it to you and not Ben. I hope you were able to retrieve your aspirins, because I could see by your sentences there is a lot that needs clarification. You wrote: "I don't know what the role of the Son was before creation but it doesn't matter. God hasn't revealed that to us in Scripture and anything else would be pure speculation. It might be fun to speculate, but in the end it doesn't matter whether we understand that or not. Besides, we are not saying that God decided to have a son so that He could create the universe, we are only saying that it was the Son who did it. And we are saying it is the Son who did it because Scripture says it was."

It is clear that you believe that it was God that reveals scripture to us. This is an opinion of yours. I believe it was Hebrew priests that wrote the Torah, because there are too many inconsistencies and myths to believe God would write ambiguous scripture that gets lots of people mixed up about what He wants us to know. But you also say, "We are not saying that God decided to have a Son so that He could create the universe, we are only saying that it was the Son who did it. And we are saying it is the Son who did it because Scripture says it was." Here again, you claim the Son created the universe because Scripture says so. But you also claim Jesus is God because who else but God could create the universe?

I cannot refute your reasoning because you believe in the written word of the Bible with a different interpretation from mine. I rather reply by saying continue to believe as you have, for that is what makes you content. As for me, I believe there is only one universal God, and

God created Jesus after He created mankind because humanity needed direction by receiving the Word of God—*love one another*. Perhaps I am a simple man, and the Trinity being three “Persons” is too much of a stretch for my limited mind.

Speaking about the Trinity, you wrote: “I am saying that the concept of the Trinity was something held from the beginning of Christianity and is found in the Scriptures, even if they didn’t have a term for it yet.” Here again, you are speculating or being presumptuous to believe at the time of Jesus, Christians believed that God consisted of three entities. You tend to push your agenda to convince others of your beliefs with unsubstantiated statements.

Jay, I had written that Jesus first appeared to mankind through the conceiving of Mary by the Spirit of God by writing, “This is a truth if you believe the Holy Spirit made Mary conceive to have baby Jesus. This statement affirms that Jesus makes his entrance into the world as flesh but that statement does not indicate Jesus was with God at the beginning of time. This is a poor concept of God having or needing a son when that son only came to mankind through the womb of Mary.” What many believers in the Trinity miss is that Jesus was introduced to mankind by the Holy Spirit of God. There was only God that produced or created Jesus for the first time, and God’s purpose was to have Jesus teach us the Word of God—*love one another*.

Yes, Jay, Jesus was a Son of God in accordance with the Scriptures, but Jesus is not God. Why, even Jesus in John stated:

Verily, verily, I say unto you, he (they) that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he (they) do also; and greater works than these shall he (they) do; because I go unto my Father. (John 14:12)

These are marvelous words coming from Jesus. They substantiate that he was a Son of Man and that those who believe in him will do even greater works than he. Jesus exhibits his greatness as a teacher of righteousness, for he makes it clear that other “Sons of God” can come forth and do the works that he did. Even more astounding, by reading the words of Jesus, it is heresy to believe Jesus is God when he clearly says he goes to his father, and Jesus in John 14:28 reminds us again:

I go into my father; for my father is greater than I.

Jay Breeding, July 17, 2011, 1:10 a.m. EDT

Finally Nicholas,

There are many other things I would wish to say, but I wouldn't know where to start or how to end. So I will close with some things in which we both agree. First, we both believe in one universal God. There is only one God who deserves our worship and praise.

You may be surprised at this next one; I believe the Son of God was and is, as Jesus, subordinate to the Father. The Son did this willingly in order to reconcile man to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as God. I think if you examine the attitudes of the bishops of the Nicene Council, you will find the vast majority of them believed the same way. (This did not make Him any less God by humbling Himself in such a way, but it demonstrated God's great love for man.)

You pointed out that Jesus promised that we (His disciples) will do greater things than He. That is already true. Great things are being done all over this world every day in the name of Jesus.

Finally, you also stated that one of the problems the Hebrew people had was that they kept the law and God's blessings to themselves. I see that as well. For in so doing, many fell into the trap of legalism, which ultimately leads to cold worship and cold hearts. All legalism does that, whether it is Jewish, Christian, Muslim, Hindu, or whatever. The story of Jonah, while I believe it literally happened in history, also served as an allegory for Israel's attitude in doing God's mission. They were to be a light to the Gentiles but in the end failed. Though that promise was fulfilled in Jesus, they had it in their grasp to be that light as well. They were blessed to be a blessing but did not share the blessing. The Church today, especially in America, often traps itself into that same inward thinking. Soon it needs to turn its eyes back to that ancient promise made to Abraham by the one and only true God, passed on by Abraham's seed first to the Jews, then through Christ to the Gentiles and to all who call on and believe in His name.

Nicholas Ginex, July 17, 2011, 7:16 p.m. EDT

Hello Jay, I was very pleased to see that we agree on a number of things about God, Jesus, and even how the Hebrews used their enlightenment about God to serve their people and excluded their neighbors from

learning about God. I can see that you do have an open mind and are willing to consider other avenues of thought. Please know that I respect your beliefs as I do for all those who have a belief in God. I am certain that nobody conceives God in the same way, in spite of the guidelines or intent of the Bible writers.

You have truly been blessed by God. Thank you for such a stimulating discussion. You have made me much more appreciative of your point of view about the beginning of God.

Nicholas Ginex, July 17, 2011, 3:39 a.m. EDT

There is much controversy over the Word versus the Logos in the opening line of John's Gospel. Some people associate the Word with Jesus, and others associate the Logos as being God. There is in the minds of most people that in the beginning, there was only God. Perhaps, the Trinity concept would be acceptable if John stated his opening line differently from what he wrote below:

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,
and the Word was God.

If John began his opening line with God, as shown below, it may seem more acceptable.

In the beginning was God, and the Word was with God,
and the Word was God.

To say the Word, that is Jesus, existed before God is nonsense, which is why the original intent of John in referring to Logos as "the divine animating principle pervading the universe" is much more understandable and acceptable because it can only mean God or theos, through which all things were made. I must admit that changing the opening line with "In the beginning was God" would give the Church fathers that formed the Trinity concept much better reason to believe a Son of God accompanied or existed with God. But again, to believe God was capable of creating the universe without a Son is much more palpable than believing God needed a Son to create the universe.

The above change of John's opening line appears to be an improvement, but to believe God did not have the full potential to create the

universe by Himself still appears to be unacceptable and belittles the omnipotence of God. What do you think?

Nicholas Ginex, July 17, 2011, 7:38 p.m. EDT

One of the most beautiful Gospels is that by John. He has introduced the concept of the “Logos,” which means “the divine animating principle pervading the universe,” meaning God or theos, through which “all things were made.” However, translations from Greek into English has caused a change from Logos to “Word.” As a result of this opening line in John’s Gospel, namely, “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God,” many Christian priests and ministers teach their congregations that “Jesus is God.”

“Jesus is God” appears to be a gross misinterpretation of John’s original intention of his opening line. John as well as the Gospels of Matthew and Luke make it clear that Jesus was created by the conceiving of Mary by God’s Holy Spirit and made flesh. This is the first appearance of Jesus to mankind and Jesus was proud to exclaim in Revelation 22:16, “I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches, I am the root and offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.”

It is clear from the three Gospels that Jesus was created within the womb of Mary by conceiving through the Holy Spirit, which signifies that Jesus was a product of man by the grace of God. This is the first time that Jesus enters into the spiritual history of mankind. To say Jesus existed before his birth as a Son of God is to misinterpret and misconstrue the original intention of John’s opening line. Why? Jesus was formed by God into a Son of Man with the genes of the Hebrew people and never could have existed as the man we have come to know as “full of grace and truth (John 1:14)” until born as a gift for mankind from God. Therefore, to say the teacher of love who taught the “Word of God” co-existed as the Word with God is a lie and a distortion and does not agree with the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John. This is an egregious deception by the Church fathers and is the height of heresy to exclaim “Jesus is God” that created the universe because it strips away the omnipotence of the unknowable, mysterious, and incomprehensible God.

There is perhaps a logical purpose by the Church fathers to have Jesus co-exist and be co-eternal with God, and that is it becomes an easy

matter for people to identify with and visualize God as a man. In fact, in Genesis 9:6, God said to Noah and his sons, “Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made He man.” Here in the Bible, we are told by God that he created man in His image. But is this not an arrogant statement the Hebrew priests wrote for God to say?

We already know that God created many worlds by the many galaxies made up of stars and planets. It is highly conceivable that God has created other life forms in other worlds. To say God created man in His image is perhaps wrongly stated due to arrogance and lack of the scientific knowledge we have gained today. Man’s lack of knowledge and self-centered consciousness has man conceive God in his image. But this is foolish, because nobody knows God; for though He is believed to be the Creator of “all there is,” He is mysterious, unknowable, and incomprehensible. This is a view of God by the Egyptian Priesthood of Amon, and perhaps they were far more advanced in their conception of God than most people know. It is for this reason that I recommend for those who desire to learn how a spiritual people first came to conceive in the belief of one universal God and why Jesus proclaimed Amen as “the beginning of the creation of God” to read *Future of God Amen*. Simply click on the title or enter an Internet search on the title.

What Did Jesus Christ Reveal to the World?

January 24, 2010, 08:06 p.m. EST

This post was motivated by a comment that belittles the crucifixion of Jesus Christ and his being worshipped as a Son of God. It was this statement that was somewhat belittling, “Not much of a sacrifice to me! For if I knew I could live eternally in heaven by suffering a few days, I would choose this in a heart beat.” My response to this logic was to point out that the thrust of my post was to reveal a truth that few people are aware of, which is the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions all stem from the God initially created by the Egyptians, Amen. It is no accident that worshipers of these three religions all announce Amen at the end of a prayer, supplication, or giving thanks and praise to God.

It appears that many people are hung up with the Christian dogma that regards Jesus’s crucifixion as God’s sacrifice of His only Son for the sins of mankind and that he is co-equal with God. This dogma is difficult to accept and has resulted in very strong opposition from nonbelievers in God. It is understandable that this dogma is hard to accept, and only with faith, unproven concepts, and distorted ideas can it be believed.

To help clarify the past history of how Jesus was raised to the level of God, I included in the book *Future of God Amen* the motivation and findings that actually reveal that Jesus regarded himself as a Son of Man. It was not until the fourth Gospel of John, some sixty-five to ninety-five years later that the Church advocated and supported the idea that Jesus is to be worshipped as the Son of God.

Future of God Amen reveals that all three major religions are connected to the *same* God. There are differences in the belief in the same God by groups of people from other countries, but the root of their god is the Egyptian god Amen. The Christians have made the greatest difference by employing the idea that God has a son, Jesus Christ. However, the Father, God of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions is the same Father.

In spite of the conception of Jesus as the Son of God, Jesus gave to the world the greatest commandment—*love one another*. More importantly, Jesus has revealed to all people, God-fearing people and otherwise, that it was Amen who was, “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.” Can our religious leaders be as honest and truthful as Jesus Christ? If they are capable of understanding that they are all linked to the worship of the same God, they may be able to make a breakthrough and unify their scriptures. Such an effort would definitely eliminate the bigotry, hatred, violence, and killing of innocent people around the world.

People today do not seem to give any credit to the truth told by Jesus. He has revealed the truth about a wonderful legacy the human race has inherited from the Egyptians—the belief in one universal God. Though there are some people who do not believe in the concept of God, it is irrelevant, because this idea that will always linger in the minds of people until science has determined how the universe has been created from nothing or from energy we know nothing about.

Future of God Amen was written to share information learned over a lifetime of communication with people from many walks of life and being fortunate enough to be exposed to the findings of historians and Egyptologists. Hopefully, this book will make many people think about and appreciate the past. There are many messages for us to learn from if we are objective enough to keep an open mind.

The book recommends that a moral belief system is essential to provide people with the framework to lead productive lives and make intelligent choices. Much can be learned from former generations, and *Future of God Amen* provides an objective view of the findings made by Egyptologists over the past one hundred years. Perhaps astute intellectuals have many recommendations to instill a uniform code

of ethics and morality within a civilization. However, it seems that intellectuals prefer to throw stones at the concept of God because they have figured it all out on how to lead wholesome and productive lives. What is disconcerting is that they never seem to recommend their ideas that could replace the concept of God and implement a moral belief system in a practical way.

Are there readers of this post who have any good ideas to replace the concept of God? If not, ideas to replace and implement a moral system of beliefs to help people to conduct their lives and make wise decisions would be greatly appreciated.

Comments and Responses

Gary (The Eclectic) Timothy, January 24, 2010, 9:26 p.m. EST

Jeeppers, Nicholas, you could have at least given me credit for the quote!

My suggestion is that mankind does not need any ideas to replace and implement a moral system of beliefs to help people to conduct their lives. This is because there is really nothing to replace. Human morality, as I have indicated in previous comments on your other posts, does not arise from belief systems to begin with! I would strongly suggest you do some science research, easily enough done with Google these days, on the origins of morality. You will find that you are under some major misconceptions.

I really do think you need to regroup and rethink some of your assumptions. One of those assumptions is that the religious figure Jesus actually existed. Do you have any evidence that he did outside of Scripture? You do know that just because someone says something doesn't make it true, don't you? And just because it is written somewhere doesn't make it true either.

And what about the Gospels that were never canonized? Have you forgotten them? The Gospel of Mary? The Gospel of Judas? These gospels contradict some major points in the canonized versions. Or do you consider them invalid simply because some priest from long ago decided they should never see the light of day by trying to have them all destroyed because they didn't fit in with his own man-created vision of God/Jesus?

Gary (The Eclectic) Timothy, January 24, 2010, 9:38 p.m. EST

By the way, did you ever take a look at the big bang theory link that I provided in my comment on one of your other posts?

Nicholas Ginex, November 9, 2011, 11:25 p.m. EST

Hello Gary,

I must apologize for responding a year and ten months later. I have been reading many of my posts to review many of the comments, and I was impressed with yours.

First, I must say that every one of your points about the veracity of the Scriptures are quite valid. You emphatically indicated that “morality does not arise from belief systems to begin with!” You may be right; however, a moral belief system does provide many benefits, such as a consistent code of ethics for a society to live by. Consider, without any indoctrination by religious organizations of how to live a moral life, can you assure that a society will live to a set of rules that will benefit their relationships? Perhaps for a small tribal community, the leaders of the tribe will be successful in demanding a certain kind of morality. However, in a multicultural country, such as the one we live in, you have many different groups of people with many different views on how they should conduct their lives.

The many differences of the mixed groups of people will very likely cause conflicts that lead to bigotry, hatred, violence, and the killing of innocent people. A prime example are the very different set of moral codes that are extremely strict within the Islamic religion. For a woman or man to indulge in sex outside of marriage or commit adultery would result in an honor killing of the participants by the parents. This is an unacceptable way to handle such acts by more reasonable and understanding people of other cultures.

Your points about the scriptures, such as the Gospels, Torah, and Koran, are all valid in that can we be certain that they were inspired by God or were they devised by wise men who, through experience of human interactions, realized that a consistent moral code was necessary?

I contend that the codes of behavior that were established by the Egyptian priesthood over two thousand years before Abraham entered

Egypt were a start in the right direction, for they built the greatest empire that excelled in engineering and the arts, whereby their monuments and temples continue to be in awe today. The Egyptians were the first people to develop the concept of one universal God, but few people have been fortunate enough to have been exposed to their writings and their beliefs. It is for this reason I wrote *Future of God Amen*, to reveal to people around the world that the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions have their roots in the Egyptian religion.

Lastly, I will not debate whether Jesus Christ was a real person, or if he was, that he was the Son of God physically or spiritually, or indeed, if he is God. However, I will say that he was the greatest Man of God for having given us the greatest command—*love one another*.

Are the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic Gods the Same God?

January 20, 2010, 12:26 a.m. EST

This post was motivated by a recent Gather comment that the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic God is not the same God we all pray to but are different gods. What needs to be clarified is just how different and to what degree are they different? This dissertation contends that there is only one God but that same God is viewed with different perspectives. A simple answer is—there can only be one God.

Yes, over the centuries, religious leaders of these major religions have adopted other perspectives of God, but it was to create a new perspective that will generate, for different groups of people from other lands, an increasing number of followers for a new religion. It was the Hebrews that borrowed the concept of one universal God from the Egyptians. They were exposed to the Egyptian God as early as 1500 BCE when the brilliant pharaoh Thutmose III conquered Palestine and Syria. The sons of captured Semitic and Hebrew dynasties were brought back into Egypt to learn of their beliefs and God. By the time of Ramses II's reign, the Priesthood of Amon had written *Amon as the Sole God*, which described this God as the one universal God of all creation. This concept of one God was given by Moses to the Hebrews around 1250 BCE.

By 950 BCE, the Hebrews had created their first Scripture that unified the Jewish people as God's chosen ones. This Hebrew God later became accepted as the Christian God and is why the Bible provides both an Old and New Testament. What made the Christian God so different and when did it happen? The Jewish-Roman war, which started in May of 66 CE and ended by September 8, 70 CE, left the Jewish nation of Israel totally destroyed, its people decimated and

scattered. Flavius Josephus estimated that over 1,100,000 Jews died and 97,000 were captured. It was during this period and after that the Gospels were written by Jewish holy men to preserve the one treasure and precious identity of their people—the belief in one universal God. The birth of the Christian religion began by the creation of the Gospels written by Jewish holy men.

Jewish holy men from the Essene sect had the perception that to keep their Judaic religion intact, they had to open up their religion to the Gentiles. The Essenes survived over the Pharisees and Sadducees, who comprised the Zealot uprising, which ended in complete disaster for Israel. But now, Jewish holy men made one key change. They used the death of Jesus Christ, a man that had a great following and was loved for his acceptance of other people, to promulgate a new religion. To do this, the Gospels initially made Jesus a Man of God, whereby he explicitly stated seventy-six times in all four Gospels that he was the *Son of Man*. However, by the fourth Gospel, the new religion not only simplified the Torah with a very simple commandment—*love one another*, but had other people state Jesus was the *Son of God* six times.

What happened with the Jewish God was that now the new Christian religion took the *Son of Man*, Jesus Christ, and raised him to a level of God. Note that the Trinity did not exist during the composition of the Gospels and Revelation. This was a concept developed by the Church fathers to strengthen the new religion and belief in God. So we have a God that now has a Son of God. This is an emergence of a belief created by the Egyptian priesthood, whereby the pharaoh was taught to be worshipped as a son of God. This ancient idea was easily accepted during this period of time, for even Julius Caesar was worshipped as a son of God by the Romans after his death.

You can see that the God of the Hebrews and the Christians are interrelated, except that the Jews, being the chosen ones, still object to the idea that Jesus is the Son of God. This is an understandable objection, for there are people who believe that Jesus was a Son of God spiritually not genetically.

Regarding the Muslims, there is no doubt that the Islamic God is the same one God that the Jews worship; there is no Trinity involved. However, the Islamic religious leaders generated their own scripture for the same God, the Koran. So as you can see, we do not truly have

three distinct Gods. What we do have are different groups of people that interpret the same God differently. There is however an underlying, common bond of their God. It is Amen, the unacknowledged God of the Egyptians. However, Jesus Christ let the world know the truth in Revelation 3:14 that Amen is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.”

It should become obvious that the God Amen was the original God of all creation and that all three major religions have their roots in the religious and moral beliefs of the Egyptians. Some people believe that there are three different Gods. But they are only different in the way different people view the *same* God. The common bond worshipped by the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions is the God Amen. The name they all announce at the end of a prayer or giving thanks to God.

Comments and Responses

Richard Regener, January 20, 2010, 1:47 a.m. EST

Keep up the good work, Nicholas! You’re doing great! I do agree with the above, however my agreement stems from my practice as an exorcist, where I have been involved with exorcisms concerning people from the above noted religious backgrounds.

Dale, January 20, 2010, 2:30 a.m. EST

Your consternations regarding Jesus as just another guy and accusing the early Christian Church of falsifying what actually was/is gets a bit tedious. Men do not become martyrs for something they know is a lie.

Nicholas Ginex, January 20, 2010, 6:57 p.m. EST

I respect the sentiment and concern of Dale’s comment, for it was written by a true believer in Jesus Christ as the Son of God. However, there needs to be some clarification as to who has fabricated a lie that Jesus is the Son of God and why. In another post titled *Was Jesus Christ a Martyr and for What?* I have discussed whether Jesus was a martyr and if we truly understand why he died.

Was Jesus Christ a Martyr and for What?

January 21, 2010, 01:18 p.m. EST

In a response to the post “Are the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic Gods the Same God?” a comment was made:

Your consternations regarding Jesus as just another guy and accusing the early Christian Church of falsifying what actually was/is gets a bit tedious. Men do not become martyrs for something they know is a lie.

I respect the sentiment and concern of this comment, for it was written by a true believer in Jesus Christ as the Son of God. However, there needs to be some clarification as to who has fabricated a lie that Jesus is the Son of God and why. Let us examine if Jesus was a martyr and if we truly understand why he died.

It is hard to be open to new perspectives about one’s own religion. Jesus did not want to become a martyr of his own volition. The council of Pharisees and their chief priests condemned Jesus to death because he was being followed by people in great numbers. This fear of Jesus starting a new movement was expressed by the council of Pharisees in John 11:47, 48 and is provided below:

What do we? For this man doeth many miracles. If we let him thus alone, all men will believe him: and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation.

Then the high priest of the council, Caiaphas, stated in John 11:49, 50:

Ye know nothing at all, nor consider it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people and that the whole nation (Israel) perish not.

Caiaphas then prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation in John 11:51, and in John 11:53 it was decided, "Then from that day forth they took council together for to put him to death."

It is clear that Jesus did not intentionally want to die to be a martyr. He was put to death because he was a threat to the established religion of Israel. Jesus had no choice but to become a martyr. It was done by others in power.

Many people and religious leaders worship Jesus but yet refuse to accept his words when he proclaimed that Amen is "the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God." By reading *Future of God Amen*, you will be able to understand why Jesus Christ said Amen was "the beginning of the creation of God." Unfortunately, many people have not been exposed to the knowledge that has been brought to light by Egyptologist findings over the past one hundred years. There should be no fear in learning about the history of God, because with knowledge, you can still believe in God.

Jesus was an honest and truthful man. How is it in all four Gospels, he stated explicitly that he was the Son of Man seventy-six times, but it was only in the last Gospel that others, not he, said he was the Son of God six times? Is it because the Church, many, many years after the death of Jesus, had grown in power and was emboldened to raise Jesus to the level of God? Did the Church leaders fabricate a lie by developing a Trinity concept to make Jesus the Son of God? Does the Church emphasize that Jesus died to spread the Word of God or died for forgiveness of sins?

A more profound question is: Would you honor and follow the *Word* of Jesus if he was just a man and not a God? For your knowledge, few people are aware of what is the *Word*. Jesus stated it three times in John—*love one another*. My answer: I will follow the *Word* and always try to love and assist all people.

One last thought for you to ponder: Did Jesus die for our sins or did he die to spread the *Word* of God? Christians need to ask these questions because the Church has strayed away from the original emphasis to believe in God and what He represents to us; is it truth, honesty, sincerity, integrity, and to love your sisters and brothers of every nation?

Those of you who are open to acquiring knowledge recently obtained over the past one hundred years, I recommend *Future of God Amen*.

This book provides the beginning, development, and future of God Amen. Press releases and the Web site may be accessed by placing an Internet search on the title.

Comments and Responses

***Carol ~Bronx Southern Belle D.**, January 21, 2010, 1:21 p.m. EST

Jesus is God. Jesus is the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

Nicholas Ginex, January 22, 2010, 2:57 p.m. EST

Hello Carol,

I know you have a strong belief, so I will not try to convince you otherwise that Jesus acknowledged that it was Amen, an Egyptian God, that was the beginning of the creation of God. Jesus spoke words of truth, and yet you do not believe in his words. Only by learning the past will you be able to really understand the words of Jesus.

Richard Regener, January 21, 2010, 1:51 p.m. EST

Some people become martyrs because they believe their own or someone else's lies.

Suicide bombers, for example.

Gary (The Eclectic) Timothy, January 22, 2010, 11:34 p.m. EST

Jewish folk don't believe Jesus was the Son of God, and they obviously believe in God, and they follow Jesus's words as a prophet.

But the whole Jesus crucifixion scene makes no sense to me. By suffering in the Garden of Gethsemane and then on the cross, he was supposedly sacrificing himself for the rest of humanity. But according to what Christians believe, Jesus knew what was going to happen. And he knew that after a few days of suffering and dying on the cross, he would spend the rest of eternity in the glory and magnificence of heaven. Not much of a sacrifice to me! For if I knew I could live eternally in heaven by suffering a few days, I would choose this in a heart beat. It's like giving up a frail, flawed, temporary house for a

fantastic mansion for the rest of eternity, and all that for just a few days of suffering! And even the suffering wouldn't be anything to the Son of God. Can't a god handle a little pain? Therefore, I say, big freaking deal! So what!

Nicholas Ginex, January 23, 2010, 3:49 p.m. EST

I believe you missed the point that Jesus was not put to death by his own volition but by the determination of the council of Pharisees in John's Gospel. You were also informed in the post (*Was Jesus Christ a Martyr and for What?*) that Jesus, a man of truth, stated he was a Man of God seventy-six times in the four Gospels, and only sixtimes in the last Gospel of John did others say he was the Son of God. The post provided the knowledge that the Church fathers endorsed the fourth Gospel, after sixty-five to ninety-five years after the death of Jesus, to raise Jesus to the level of a God. You should realize that it was the Church religious leaders that made Jesus into a God with the concept of the Trinity. This concept was never alluded to in the Gospels. In fact, Jesus made it clear in John's Gospel, chapter 14 verse 28, that "I go to my Father: for my Father is greater than I." This statement implies that Jesus was not co-equal and one with God.

Another remarkable statement by Jesus was what he revealed in Revelation 3:13 and 3:14. There, Jesus proclaimed that Amen was "the beginning of the creation of God." Jesus Christ has proclaimed a truth ignored by religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions, because by accepting that it was an Egyptian God that initialized the concept of a universal God—their religious dogma is challenged.

The above facts should make you realize that Jesus was not godly, and therefore, to say he could handle a little pain is a misstatement or an arrogant comment. For you to say "So what!" is disconcerting, because you are pooh-pooing what the Egyptians have conceptualized after thousands of years—the concept of God and a belief system of morality that has proven to make their civilization productive and advance far greater in technology and the arts than any of their neighbors.

Gary (The Eclectic) Timothy, January 23, 2010, 4:45 p.m. EST

Nicholas, I wish you would stop saying that I've missed some point! I assure you that I have not! It is *you*, sir, that just do not get what I am saying.

I have *no* illusions about Jesus and the history behind religion! My comment was about the concept of the Christian God *today!* In my previous comments elsewhere, you also have not been able to pick up on that apparently.

I am not about to get into a lengthy exchange with you attempting to explain myself. I've said what I've said, and it's pretty clear.

So, with that in mind, I will ignore the rest of your reply, because you obviously misunderstand the context of my comment. It was meant to support the misguided concepts that Christians have today—it is an argument to expose the irrational thoughts of *today, now, this moment*, of Jesus's crucifixion.

You have succeeded in making me think that it is no longer worthwhile for me to read your posts and comment on them, because you will misunderstand what I say anyway. I sincerely believe you need to come down from your enlightened mountaintop and submit to yourself that the truth as you seem to *think you know* may not be the truth as someone else sees it.

Don't get me wrong! I *agree* with you on most things, except of course your somewhat ironic duality in exposing religion for what it is while at the same time encouraging a belief system in God based on your own perceptions of how it should be. But I'm not arguing that here. But setting yourself up with the hubris of a teacher who cannot learn from those he tries to teach/inform is just not constructive to my mind!

Peace!

Nicholas Ginex, January 24, 2010, 6:51 p.m. EST

Hello Gary,

It appears that you were angered by my saying you did not get the point. For that, I apologize. I realize that you are hung up on what the Christian religion dogma is today regarding Jesus's crucifixion and his being co-equal with God. I have agreed with your logic that the Christian dogma is illogical, and that is why I don't understand your anger.

What I have tried to do was inform you, not teach you, about the past history that reveals all three major religions are connected to the *same*

God. You apparently choose to malign the Christian religion and the concept that Jesus is worshipped as a God. We both agree on the fact that the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions pray to a universal God with differences. I have only been trying to make it clear to you that these religions all stem from the belief in Amen, an Egyptian God for more than two thousand years before Moses walked out of Egypt.

The point I was making, and I will stress it again, is that Jesus Christ was an honest, truthful man that gave the world its greatest commandment—*love one another*. More importantly, Jesus has revealed to all people, God-fearing people and otherwise, that it was Amen who was “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.”

You do not seem to give any credit to Jesus who has told the truth about a wonderful legacy the human race has inherited from the Egyptians—the belief in one universal God. Whether you believe in the concept of God or not is irrelevant, because this is an idea that will always linger in the minds of people until science has determined how the universe has been created from nothing or from energy we know nothing about.

You see, I have an open mind and am willing to learn from others’ ideas that contribute to the truth. The book I have written, *Future of God Amen*, is to share the information I have learned with others, not to teach them, but to make them think and appreciate the past that has many messages for us if we are objective enough to keep an open mind.

I recommend a moral belief system is essential to provide people with the framework to lead productive lives with intelligent choices based upon what we have learned throughout the ages. Perhaps astute intellectuals have other ways to instill a uniform code of ethics and morality within a civilization. All I seem to get from intellectuals is that they like to throw stones at the concept of God because they have figured it all out on how to lead a wholesome and productive life. The strange part is that they never seem to recommend their ideas that could replace the concept of God and implement a moral belief system in a practical way.

Do you have any good ideas? By the way, Gary, I do respect your views. I have found you a very engaging individual who has motivated

me to rethink former ideas and help crystallize some of my former views. For that, I thank you.

Gary (The Eclectic) Timothy, January 24, 2010, 8:36 p.m. EST

I think you are addressing your issues from the wrong direction. I would recommend working on dissolving misconceptions from today backward. But you are trying to get people to your particular truth by taking them back to the beginning of Amen all in one fell swoop, as it were. My own process would involve disassembling the logical inconsistencies that people have now, today, the here and now, and work backward from there. I think it would be much less of a shock. That is why I keep working in the present and the here and now.

Of course, I again take issue with your contradictory message. It just doesn't seem to help your cause. It seems instead to confuse the issue. One is left wondering: wait, you say religious belief in God is based on a man-made concept, an invention of man, rather than a divine inspiration given to man. But then you propose a religious belief system as a moral imperative for society. I still don't think you can have your cake and eat it too.

I would contend, with most of evolutionary and behavioral science behind me, that morality is a natural adaptation inherent in mankind. I don't believe for a second that we need any religious belief system in order for us to be moral. The science simply does not support that. Thus a moral belief system is not necessary. Humans, by nature, by biology, by evolution, are moral. A belief in something that has no evidence supporting it is simply faith. I contend that we do not need faith. In fact, I would go so far as to say that humanity will not truly progress as a species until we forgo all mythologies and religious beliefs.

If your theory is correct that we do need religious belief to sustain our morality, then exceptions would tend to negate your entire theory. I think I am a moral person and I have passed on my morality to my own family, genetically and behaviorally. And we are all doing just fine. How would you explain that?

Richard Regener, January 25, 2010, 12:59 a.m. EST

“I contend that we do not need faith. In fact, I would go so far as to say that humanity will not truly progress as a species until we forgo all mythologies and religious beliefs.”

I have to go along with you on this, Gary. Today and tomorrow are the relevant issues; yesterday is over. That’s not to say we can’t learn from the past. Living in the past makes no sense.

Nicholas Ginex, January 25, 2010, 3:42 a.m. EST

There is a miscommunication on my part, Richard. Apparently, I seem to have given you and Gary the idea that I advocate faith. Far from it; as one schooled in logic, I believe in the real world and what we can learn from it. I have repeatedly said that we can benefit from learning from the past and not be dopes to believe in myths and lies. What we can learn is the truth about the past, as to how man came to conceive God; this is the assimilation of knowledge. Whether you believe in God or not, I have no interest. However, I have made a logical point that people will continue to believe in God until science has figured out how matter was formed from nothing or how energy came into existence to create the entire universe.

I have contended that it is morality of beliefs that still need to be taught by some organization to provide the best knowledge of getting along with one another and make better decisions in life. It would be nice if our intellectuals will stop throwing stones at religion and use their heads to think of better ways to raise society to a higher level of integrity, truth, and honesty with themselves and in their relationships with others.

If intelligent individuals believe that God can be replaced, then they should concentrate on how that can be done. Just to say “I no longer believe in myths” is not an answer. We all no longer believe in Santa Claus as adults, but funnily, we carry on that tradition because of the joy it gives to children and adults alike. Life is made up of many illusions and some are not harmful. It is when we believe in an illusion like God to kill innocent people that we really have a problem. The

illusion of God has been corrupted instead of providing a vision of truth and integrity that we can emulate. Perhaps some of our bright minds can come up with a substitute for God; it would be a valuable contribution to mankind. Let's examine and recommend solutions and stop knocking God and religion; it serves no purpose to keep kicking the can down the street.

Gary (The Eclectic) Timothy, January 25, 2010, 12:30 p.m. EST

I would propose something on the order of the Übermensch (German; English: Overman, Superman), which is a concept in the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche. So I would suggest concentrating on making/creating our own meaning and purpose rather than look to religious teachings.

When first we completely divest ourselves from mythologies and religion, then we may experience a period of hopelessness or despair. But then, we may experience a freedom like no other has been imagined before. Within that freedom, I propose that we take the responsibility of our existence onto ourselves. And once we do so, then we will have the tools and motivation to create our own meaning, purpose, morality (above and beyond that which is already biologically inherent). So, once we have accepted that we will "grow up" like adults, we can then decide what we want to do with our lives. In other words, we ask ourselves what we want to be when we grow up, so to speak.

Gary (The Eclectic) Timothy, January 25, 2010, 12:34 p.m. EST

Also, I'll stop kicking the can, as you say, when theists stop coming to my door and trying to sell me on their religion! I'll leave God alone when everyone else stops trying to push it down my throat. When they stop trying to put religion back into our classrooms, then I will desist. When they stop putting "In God We Trust" on my money, then I will stop fighting.

Until then, I will continue to try to talk sense into people!

Nicholas Ginex, January 25, 2010, 4:45 a.m. EST

Hello Gary, I will answer your questions with the hope you try to do the same. I believe you are a moral person and one who teaches that morality to your children. You are blessed genetically and behaviorally.

You have acquired a moral upbringing since childhood. If not, you must have acquired your moral beliefs through trial and error, pain and suffering, or simply from teachers in the educational system and communicating with others. You, my dear friend, are truly blessed, because many other people do not have your genetic makeup to clearly see the world for what it is and to make fairly decent decisions in life that has kept you out of trouble.

You and I are both aware of the problems with today's religions. But the difference is that I do not continually throw stones at the dogmas taught by religions. Instead, I have tried to show what they all have in common and how their religions developed from the past. What I am offering is knowledge of how man came to conceive God so that people can better understand why they believe in God.

Knowledge about why we believe in God today is very relevant because the religions have caused so many distortions about a very novel concept of God. Yes, God is a figment of the imagination, a construct people create in their own minds to believe in something greater and more powerful than themselves. Some like to call it hope and the will to trust that God will make it better for them in times of suffering, pain, and disappointments.

What intellectuals need to do is share their knowledge as to how a system of moral beliefs can be provided for people in a very diverse community? I believe there are many beliefs that we have acquired from the past that still are applicable today. However, our bright minds of today may have better recommendations that will help to guide people to lead moral lives and make decisions that are based on honesty and truth. This is where the intellectuals ought to spend their energy instead of just throwing stones at organizations that will eventually crumble and die because they are not able to deal with the truth.

You also seem to say, "Forget about the past and think about today and where are we heading." This is nice, but if we do not reflect and learn from the past, we will continue to make lots of mistakes and cause more turmoil in our world. I pound the truth into people's heads about the fact that it was Jesus Christ that revealed that Amen was the beginning of the creation of God. This truth has to reach the deaf ears of religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions—that is my message fully developed in *Future of God Amen*, a book that

presents the beginning, development, and future of God. Readers may view press releases and the Web site by just placing an Internet search on the title.

Gary (The Eclectic) Timothy, January 25, 2010, 12:48 p.m. EST

I think I addressed some of the issues you present in my previous comment above.

But I still contend that, generally speaking, morality has its very roots in biology and genetically evolved behavior tendencies of *all* people. In other words, for example, if somehow all human beings forgot everything they were taught about morality, they would still be moral creatures and have no need for myths. But of course, many would then start trying to explain the things they don't currently understand by inventing gods again. That tendency too is in our biological makeup. But I believe that we can overcome our genetics and biology—and thus start on the path of something in the vein of the *Urbemensch* that I have referred to in my comments above.

There are still remote societies existing today that have no god beliefs and they appear to live quite successfully. Some of these peoples don't have a clue about what happens after physical death, and they don't propose any theories of a religious nature at all. If anything, they simply accept themselves as children of nature and nothing else. I watch and read National Geographic a lot!

Nicholas Ginex, January 25, 2010, 3:40 p.m. EST

Hello Gary,

Thank you for your input on your contention that “morality has its very roots in the biology and genetically evolved behavior tendencies of *all* people.” This may be true, but it says nothing about how *all* people can learn to live together with a unified set of moral beliefs. If all people simply rely on their own biological behavior, which is closely linked to their genetic makeup, we would have people behaving very differently toward each other. Where do they get a solid grounding of fundamental moral beliefs? I believe people need input from experienced and intelligent people; otherwise, they are starting out with a blank blackboard of a mind.

There is a lot to be said for instructing our youth with ideas of morality, truth, integrity, honesty, and sincerity. Do we let them learn these attributes on their own? You have a lot of faith in the ability of people to make wise decisions or learn by making lots of mistakes. There is a better way to inculcate ideas and information to help people lead lives with wise decisions.

Regarding the myths of religions, I am way past that discussion. We both agree that a life of eternity is a foolish idea. The Jews have no real idea of an afterlife, but a rabbi stated it would be a joy to study the Torah with God. This is nonsense, because once entering eternal life for leading a righteous life, why does anybody need to read the Torah in heaven? There are supposed to be only good people in the afterlife. Then there are the Moslems, who envision a heaven with pretty black-eyed women (young ones, at that) and lying about on soft couches made with gold, etc. The Christians believe they simply enjoy being in the company of God for eternity. We both know these myths are foolish. In fact, I doubt you would want to live billions of years on a cloud or just floating around somewhere.

Please develop the ideas in the vein of the *Urbarmensch*. I believe you can expose me to something I would like to investigate and perhaps learn from.

Do You Know the Origin of God?

August 09, 2010, 06:46 p.m. EDT

This question is raised for your interest to learn how the concept of God originated. There are many believers in God, but also nonbelievers, who can benefit in understanding how the belief in God originated.

Many people believe it all started with Abraham, father of the Hebrews, and Moses, founder of the Judaic religion. This is due to an inadequate knowledge of history that precedes Abraham by more than three thousand years. This knowledge was only recently discovered by Egyptologists who have deciphered Egyptian hieroglyphics written on the tombs and walls of their pyramids and temples.

As a man of seventy-five years, I wrote *Legacy of a Father* for my four daughters so that they could read about many of my thoughts long after I have passed away. Briefly, the book is a historical development of how man conceived God and how that God has greatly influenced the formation of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions.

You may visit the Web site: www.futureofgodamen.com to read several book reviews and evaluate a sample of the writing in the book. I also would like to send those of you a free copy of the book if you would take the time to see if you could find the Word of God stated three times in the last Gospel of the New Testament. Just e-mail your answer via my e-mail address: nickginex@gmail.com

It is amazing that religious leaders have failed to teach their worshippers the Word of God. They say the Bible is the Word of God, but that is a nebulous answer, and as such, means nothing because the Bible deals with many topics, stories, judgments, and pronouncements.

To believers and nonbelievers, I hope you have the curiosity to learn how God has become a meaningful belief for many people. The book does not try to dissuade your beliefs nor does it try to discredit any religion. It was written to reveal the *truth about God* and hopefully preserve the belief in God for centuries to come.

Nicholas P. Ginex—*Knowledge is a Wonderful Gift*—I wish to share it with you.

Comments and Responses

Richard B., August 9, 2010, 6:52 p.m. EDT

And then there was Thor.

Nicholas Ginex, August 9, 2010, 11:07 p.m. EDT

Hello Richard,

I am disappointed in your response because it seems you still favor comic books over learning the truth about the past. I also used to love reading about Thor as a kid. But it's time to grow up.

Did you visit the Web site www.futureofgodamen.com? I believe you would have a greater appreciation of my efforts to inform people around the world how man came to believe in God. An intelligent person surely has the curiosity to learn about the nature of human beings and how they have come to develop a wonderful concept that became a belief used to guide their lives.

I hope you are ready for the next big leap in your intellectual growth from reading comics to reading factual history whereby you can learn something. Prove to me that you have an open inquiring mind by visiting the Web site and then let me know what you think. That way, I can have greater respect for your comments because you have shown the ability to read, analyze, and determine if you have learned truth or garbage. I think you know that comic books are not going to teach you about the true history of man and his development in the belief of God. You have an opportunity to learn something. The knowledge I have gained in my lifetime I am willing to share with you and others—for *Knowledge is a Wonderful Gift*.

Richard B., August 10, 2010, 6:57 a.m. EDT

I really don't care about what you say, and you know nothing of me at all.

Richard B., August 10, 2010, 9:04 a.m. EDT

Well, let's start with your education program.

The days of the week.

Sunday, the first day of the week of Creation is named after the Sun.

Saturday, or the last day of the week or the day of rest, and some call it the Sabbath, is named after Saturn the last planet or god that the ancient people saw in the night sky. The planets were all called gods because gods moved up in the night sky with no known help.

Then there is Monday, or Moon day, the feminine side of the masculine Sun.

Then there is Tuesday, or Tyr's day, also the day of Mars.

Why Tyr, a one-handed god? Well, the god of war, a powerful dude or god, from Wikipedia—Týr [ty:r]) is the god of single combat, victory, and heroic glory in Norse mythology, portrayed as a one-handed man.

Then there is Wednesday, or Wotan's day, the day of Mercury.

“Odin” is generally accepted as the modern English form of the name, although, in some cases, older forms may be used or preferred. His name is related to *ōðr*, meaning “fury, excitation,” besides “mind” or “poetry.” His role, like that of many of the Norse gods, is complex. He is considered a principal member of the *Æsir* (Norse pantheon) and is associated with wisdom, war, battle, and death, and also magic, poetry, prophesies, victory, and the hunt.

He's the god that poked one of his eyes out with a stick just because he wanted to.

Then there is Thursday, or Thor's day or Jupiter.

Thor (Old Norse: Þórr, Þunarr; Icelandic: Þór; Old English: Þunor, Þūr; Old Saxon: Þunær; Frisian: Tonger, Old Dutch: Donar; Old High German: Donar; Proto-Germanic: *Thunaraz) is the red-haired and bearded god of thunder in Germanic mythology and Germanic paganism and its subsets: Norse paganism, Anglo-Saxon paganism, and continental Germanic paganism.

Most surviving stories relating to Germanic mythology either mention Thor or focus on Thor's exploits. Thor was a much-revered god of the ancient Germanic peoples from at least the earliest surviving written accounts of the indigenous Germanic tribes to over a thousand years later in the late Viking Age.

Thor was appealed to for protection on numerous objects found from various Germanic tribes. Miniature replicas of Mjöllnir, the weapon of Thor, became a defiant symbol of Norse paganism during the Christianization of Scandinavia.

Basically, he was the god of thunder.

Then there is Friday, or Frigg's day, Venus.

Frigg (sometimes Anglicized as Frigga) is a major goddess in Norse paganism, a subset of Germanic paganism. She is said to be the wife of Odin and is the "foremost among the goddesses" and the queen of Asgard. Frigg appears primarily in Norse mythological stories as a wife and a mother. She is also described as having the power of prophecy, yet she does not reveal what she knows. Frigg is described as the only one other than Odin who is permitted to sit on his high seat, Hlidskjalf, and look out over the universe. The English term Friday derives from the Anglo-Saxon name for Frigg, Frige.

Frigg's children are Baldr and Höðr, her stepchildren are Thor, Hermóðr, Heimdall, Tyr, Vidar, Váli, and Skjoldr. Frigg's companion is Eir, a goddess associated with medical skills. Frigg's attendants are Hlín, Gná, and Fulla.

In the poetic Edda poem Lokasenna 26, Frigg is said to be *Fjörgyns mæ*r ("Fjörgynn's maiden"). The problem is that in Old Norse *mæ*r means both "daughter" and "wife," so it is not fully clear if Fjörgynn is Frigg's father or another name for her husband Odin, but Snorri Sturluson interprets the line as meaning Frigg is Fjörgynn's daughter

(Skáldskaparmál 27), and most modern translators of the poetic Edda follow Snorri. The original meaning (dubious—discuss]) of *fförgynn* was the earth, cf. feminine version Fjorgyn, a byname for Jörð, the earth. The other piece of evidence lies with the goddess Fjorgyn, who is the mother of Thor and whose name can be translated into Earth. Since Fjorgyn is not only the name of a goddess, but the feminine byname for Earth, it is relatively safe to assume that *mær*, in this case, means “daughter.”

By the way, most of the paintings that are said to be Jesus are in fact an image of Balder, a son of Frigg.

Just so you know, these are not comics. These are religion, albeit ancient and way before your time and understanding.

Jerome K., August 10, 2010, 1:16 p.m. EDT

This is a good piece of research, Richard. However, it is always good to put “references” on each piece of information you share; otherwise, shrewd people who have their lives and livelihoods well dug in the soil of religion might doubt your voracity. That being said, they will try to shake your confidence anyway.

I might say, I saw your point about Thor and could see how the response was, predictable, a knee-jerk one, without seeing the deeper implications of what you were saying.

It would be nice to assume that the question in the title was open and genuine and invited alternative views. We don’t all share the same views in everything, neither should we be expected to believe that there is only one religion, nor should we be made to feel inadequate or even guilty if we do not follow any religion. Hopefully, those days, for most of us, have gone with the passing of the Inquisitions, activities which were, by all accounts, allegedly initiated and authorized by the Vatican. Those who feel aggrieved by such a statement should do their research, study a few historical documents, follow the works of people like, for example, David Kertzer and Prof. Robert Bartlett. Indeed, rather than take on face value the things said by others who are biased and committed to a certain philosophy or religious group, people should and need to do some reading above and beyond just the agreement to enter the open doors of the organization concerned. Further, one can be a good citizen, be a brilliant friend, a helpful neighbor, a responsible

member of the community without even entering any building linked with any religion. Unfortunately, there are still a few who believe the contrary.

This video might inform and educate those who see the world as one group of people. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BNf-P_5u_Hw

Peace.

Nicholas Ginex, August 10, 2010, 3:51 p.m. EDT

Hello Richard and Jerome,

Thank you for your comments. I found them informative and am compelled to reply to both of you.

Response to Richard: Your description of the days of the week being related to various gods, such as Greek and Nordic, was of some interest. But I believe we are both past that stage of belief. I am not certain of what you believe. But by your response, I feel you have no belief in God, even your own personal God. That is of no consequence to me, because what you believe does no harm to anybody. What is of importance is your ability to have an open mind to read about the nature of man. A significant aspect of man is his values that have been developed over time. One such value is his spiritual belief in something beyond his understanding but a belief that has matured into a belief of one universal God.

The purpose of my post is to awaken your consciousness, and others, to thinking about how man came to believe in one God. The God I write about has had a profound influence on the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. Please take the time to visit the website: www.futureofgodamen.com

There, you will find several book reviews and a few words about the book. It is not my desire to neither discredit the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions nor dissuade the beliefs of any worshiper of God. My mission is to inform people worldwide about how man came to conceive the God that many people worship today.

So you see, I am trying to impart to you and others the benefit of my research and thinking of many years. I could go to the grave without

having written the book. But I realize that very few people have had the good fortune to read some very fine historians and Egyptologists that dedicated their lives to bringing us knowledge about God. I have read such authors and have been able to connect the dots about a wonderful legacy given to us by the Egyptians. I wish to share it with others because if I don't, there is little reason to believe that there is another person with the sensitivity, fairness, and rationale I try to reflect in my attempt to give you knowledge about the "beginning of the creation of God."

Response to Jerome: Thank you for "seeing" the intent of my post. I did go the YouTube link you provided, and it was very informative. Please continue to send me such information because it provides points of view and historical information I am open to considering. I love to read about new ideas or old ones that open our minds to truth and knowledge. I do not accept anything into my belief system that does not have the application of common sense and a ring of truth backed up with evidence.

Unfortunately, the YouTube link on my computer was not able to give me sound (no matter how I tried), but I was able to read many of the comments made against and for the video. It is disheartening to learn that there are so many people who are uninformed about history of the past. History opens many avenues of thought and findings that we can learn from. *Future of God Amen* provides a historical development of man's conception of God. It is backed up with references and footnotes wherever I made a conclusion or an assertion based upon evidence and logical analyses.

To Richard and Jerome, I would be honored to continue our dialogue. In fact, I would like to send you both a complimentary copy of *Future of God Amen*. Just e-mail me your address via: nickginex@mail.com

Thank you for a stimulating morning.

Nick Ginex

Jerome K., August 11, 2010, 5:44 a.m. EDT

Thanks for your response, Richard. I advise you to keep trying to get the sound; otherwise you miss the wisdom of the video. I'm not suggesting that you agree with its findings. I just like the idea that

others are learning from some of the well-researched facts, rather than taking everything at face value.

The quote of “the Word of God” is one which is often bandied about, implying that we must not question it because the great man in the sky actually wrote it, is a bit of poetic phraseology. It was written by men, translated by me, and so on. It might have been inspired by events which may have happened. In which case, much of it is a group of historic documents, all of which are subject to the interpretations of the writers concerned. Nowadays, we have learned to take the works of writers with a degree of objectivity, to see that they have opinions which filter through their works. Nevertheless, there are a few who believe, word for word, everything which has been written (and included) in the collection of documents known as “the Word of God,” which is in my view rather foolish, knowing also its poetic and metaphorical qualities.

No, man, or men, very much got involved with the writing and production of the documents, its selection, its reproduction, and its interpretations. Meanwhile, some two thousand years or less later, we still have friction, arguments, wars. We also, in spite of the various claims about the deity and his/its kindness, compassion and intentions, famine, and natural disasters, have conflicts. Perhaps we should just concentrate on being kind to our “neighbors,” rather than claiming to support one set of religious doctrines over another. We are all born the same; we all die the same; and some have more quality of life than others. Surely we should be putting our energies into those less fortunate than ourselves, rather than spending millions on clever machines which are invented to dispose of those who, in seconds, it has been decided should be permanently removed, right or wrong. The rest of us like to think that justice is being done. It’s a pity that is not thought of when the innocent get in the way of such machinery.

Nicholas Ginex, August 11, 2010, 3:16 p.m. EDT

Hello Jerome,

Thank you for your comments. I believe your impressions of the Word of God are mostly your opinions. Good thoughts, but I was trying to refer you to a specific meaning of the Word of God as stated in the Bible. It is surprising that many people say it is the Bible, but that is not an answer. The Word of God may be thought of as “one” Word. By

itself, one Word means nothing because it does not imply a message or meaning. For example, “love” is a wonderful word, but by itself, it has no relation to anything. The “Word” I am trying to reveal to believers of God is what Jesus Christ proclaimed as a commandment in the Gospel of John. Jesus stated three times in that same Gospel the Word of God—*love one another*.

Whether you believe Jesus Christ was the Son of God or the Son of Man, he was the greatest prophet of all three major religions: Judaic, Christian, and Islam. Having carefully read the Torah, New Testament, and the Koran, Jesus is the one who has truthfully given us God’s final command. Unfortunately, religious leaders do not instruct their followers to love one another, which includes all the sisters and brothers of every nation. I agree with you that to think the Word of God can be distilled from a collection of documents is foolish. The saying “It’s nice to be nice” comes very close to “love one another.” Does any worshiper of God believe he/she is acceptable to God if he/she has failed to love one another? Love one another—that, Jerome, is the final and clear command from God via his surrogate, Jesus.

You made another point which many will agree with in the following passage:

Meanwhile, some two thousand years or less later, we still have friction, arguments, wars. We also, in spite of the various claims about the deity and his/its kindness, compassion, and intentions, experience famine and natural disasters. Perhaps we should just concentrate on being kind to our “neighbors,” rather than claiming to support one set of religious doctrines over another.

It is not my intent to try to convince people whether or not there is a God. This is a wonderful belief as attested in its acceptance by millions of people for thousands of years. I am only trying to inform people how our beliefs in God originated. It was the spiritual nature of man that conceived this wonderful concept, which has evolved into a moral way for people to conduct their lives.

Richard B., August 10, 2010, 4:25 p.m. EDT

Nicholas wrote: “The purpose of my post is to awaken your consciousness, and others, to thinking about how man came to believe

in one God. The God I write about has had a profound influence on the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. Please take the time to visit the Web site . . .”

I’d rather not bother, as that would be a waste of my time, as those religions used military force to demand that the people followed them.

Other than that, you only make speculations about me that are obviously in error on your part, as it is impossible for you to judge me at all.

Nicholas Ginex, August 10, 2010, 7:57 p.m. EDT

Dear Richard,

If your excuse is that to learn about human nature is a waste of time, especially man’s preoccupation with the belief in God, then remain at your stage of intellectual growth. You are correct about the deaths of innocent people because their beliefs were different than the religious fanatics who would kill in the name of God. Today, this is very prevalent with the Muslims of the Islamic religion due to the Koran supporting such behavior. I have read the Koran line by line, and yes, it advocates bigotry, hatred, violence, and the killing of those who do not believe in their God.

Too bad you do not want to take advantage of receiving a free book to learn something in your life. The idea of God is intriguing, and to learn more about it can only give you a greater understanding about the nature of man.

Richard B., August 10, 2010, 8:52 p.m. EDT

Nicholas, you still don’t know who I am at all.

I have no excuse at all to read what you are presenting at all. It would be a waste of my time.

Those deaths of “innocent” people were in wars against the people, and it was necessary to kill them, as they would not follow what you are expecting me to read. I already have nine Bibles, and several other religious books. I need no more. Your ideas to force me are insane and I find it funny, as there is much humor there.

Yes, that is a trap, as you are easy prey.

By the way, the Hindus have believed in a single god (Brahman) many years before the Egyptian ruler Akhenaten thought up that idea of a single god. Then, as you know, Osiris piled up one side of a lake on top of the other half and walked out on it. But that was a long time before Akhenaten.

Nicholas Ginex, August 10, 2010, 11:25 p.m. EDT

Dear Richard,

Do you feel threatened that new information about the beginning of the creation of God could rattle your belief system? Please don't be alarmed. Knowledge about the past can only strengthen your beliefs. Having read nine Bibles and several religious books does not make you an all-knowing expert. There is no "trap" to confuse you but to inform you with findings and facts that have surfaced over the past one hundred years. The ideas I present are not totally mine. They are ideas that have come to my attention from very learned and respectable men. The ideas are not given to drive you insane nor are they funny. If you really think so, then you really do not know what you are talking about.

I am beginning to feel that you think I am trying to "trap" you into believing something you cannot accept. Please do not think that way. My sole intention is to inform you, and others, about a God that has definitely had a profound influence on the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. That God, Richard, will continue to live on in the minds of people around the world—his name is Amen. *Future of God Amen* provides a history founded on facts and findings that must be revealed to those who are God-loving people and desire to know God. There are people, you may be one of them, who have rejected the idea of God totally. But as you know, that is not my concern. The dissemination of knowledge is all I care about.

Jerry Kays, August 10, 2010, 6:02 p.m. EDT

God, ultimate truth . . . God and god(s), less and lesser truths.

Nicholas Ginex, August 10, 2010, 8:14 p.m. EDT

Hello Jerry,

Please explain yourself. Yes, one of the greatest attributes of God is truth. But do you know why? Read the book *Future of God Amen* and learn something in your life. The knowledge you now have appears to be outdated by your comment. What I hope to reveal to you and others is knowledge about the history of man's development of God. This is really good reading to inform yourself of many facts you are unaware of.

Jerry Kays, August 11, 2010, 12:18 p.m. EDT

Nicholas, the "link" is the entire comment that is "bold and underlined" . . . linking to my article by that title . . . I also have a book out which is reflected in my icon picture . . . free even on my Web site Spirit Calls . . .

You see, I have "met" *God* (at first I thought it was God, but when I found out that everyone else's God did not fit my experience, I upgraded mine to *God*), and I know the two most important things about *God* . . . *God* is *spirit* represented as unconditional love and highest truth . . . that being definable for us humans as the BET (Basic Equation of Truth + =—) . . . read the link above to know more.

Nicholas Ginex, August 11, 2010, 11:01 p.m. EDT

Dear Jerry,

I did go to your Web site and read your post. I must say, however, that your comment above is well stated and much clearer than your post. Your statement, "*God* is *spirit* represented as unconditional love and highest truth . . ." is very good indeed. However, you did not address the question stated for this post: "Do you know the origin of God?"

I was looking for a historical reference on how did man first come to conceive God? It matters very little what one individual thinks about regarding his or her personal belief about God. We all have different beliefs about God because it is a personal conception that we individually conceive in our own minds based upon what we have been taught and the life experiences we endure.

To show you my efforts to bring your thoughts to the surface of understanding, I have read your post and provide you with the following comments:

Dear Jerry

Upon reading your post, “God, ultimate truth . . . God and god(s), less and lesser truths,” I tried to distill some valid observations or ideas you generated about God.

One point you made: “Truth is relative on this human realm of egoic division (believe it or not), but when it comes to the *God* as the totality of everything, *God* then becomes the absolute standard for all else in the universe of which this world is but a very small part . . .”

Because I am a very simple man who believes the most complex thoughts can be presented in simple terms for people to understand, I will state the essence of your statement that “*God* is the absolute standard for all else in the universe.” This is a statement without stating in what way is God the absolute standard. You should elaborate the absolute standard that God represents. You mentioned truth; is that the standard? If so, what kind of truth are you professing? Truth, like love, by itself, means nothing. To say truth is God does not communicate meaning. But if you state truth with some substantial meaning, perhaps you would say, “God’s highest attribute is truth to deal fairly with others.” Now that has meaning. But does God have other attributes that human beings should emulate?

Another point you tried to explain to your readers is “Bottom line, god(s) help (?) people on earth to unite behind a God of their design . . . for a purpose earth related. Such god(s) are spiritual beings but *not* of the highest vibration (divine energy), yet they know themselves related to *God* and serve a useful function for the greater purpose . . .”

How many gods helped God to unite behind a God of their design? Your soulful observation or belief is not based upon any facts, which you should present to your reader. The multiple god idea has some merit. It was the ancient Egyptians that initially had many gods, but by the reign of Ramses II, the Priesthood of Amon declared one universal god, *Amon as the Sole God*. It happens that Amon is Amen, a word worshippers announce in temples, churches, and mosques. So you are correct. The belief in many gods was finally transformed into the

belief in one God. However, when you make a statement for your readers, it would be fair to state your references or justification—not a personal belief or opinion, unless you actually communicate with God and feel justified.

I could go on to critique your post, but it would detract from the main topic of my post, “Do You Know the Origin of God?” Unfortunately, your comments did not address the topic.

Jerry Kays, August 14, 2010, 2:16 a.m. EDT

Nicholas, thanks for all of the verbiage. Of course I could have said things better . . . that is why I wrote a whole book on it all and have been 24/7 on Gather writing about it all for over four years now. Read enough, just a bit more, and your questions would be answered . . . except for where *God*, God, or god(s) came from . . . because that stuff matters not to me . . . I have met *God* and via that have been intuitively informed to my own satisfaction . . . I was told by *God* to “tell others” . . . thus the reason I write as I do.

Nicholas Ginex, August 14, 2010, 5:53 a.m. EDT

Hello Jerry,

Thank you for your response. I believe you are a very devout man, and there is much to be said for being intuitively informed with your communication with God. Unfortunately, I was not told to “tell others” by God, but perhaps it was the spirit of God that prompted me to write *Future of God Amen*. I say this because as a little boy, I always thought about who God was and how did we come to know Him? After many years of inquiry, reflection, and reading the thoughts of highly respected religious scholars and Egyptologists, I was able to connect the dots about the origin of God in the minds of men.

Future of God Amen is a historical development of how man came to conceive God and how that God has profoundly influenced the beliefs of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. Amen is announced in temples, churches, and mosques, yet few people know that He was the greatest Egyptian God. It was Jesus Christ who confirmed the authenticity of Amen when he proclaimed in John’s Revelation (3:14) that Amen is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.”

The book was written to inform people about the greatest legacy given to man, the belief in God. To educate people as well, the book provides a critique of the Torah, the New Testament, and the Koran. More importantly, it provides recommendations for religious leaders and worshipers to unify their beliefs and teach the Word of God—*love one another*.

Press releases and the Web site for the book may be viewed by placing an Internet search on the title.

Gary G., November 4, 2010, 1:34 a.m. EDT

Nicholas,

I believe you have taken the “Amen” out of context. 1) The context that you are referring to in regard to the Amen is to the churches. Amen is an attribute of God. Each church receives an attribute of who God is, namely Jesus. 2) Jesus is referred to as the Amen, however, this context means “truly” and “yes.” 3) This Amen in the verse as well is spoken by Jesus witnessing of himself.

There is no other God besides Jesus, who was sent by the Father who works through us by the Holy Spirit.

The doctrine of Christianity is this:

God the Father is God.

Jesus is God.

The Holy Spirit is God.

There is only one God.

Richard B., August 11, 2010, 2:14 a.m. EDT

The history of Christianity is easy Nicholas.

Step 1. Kill all those that don't believe in it.

Step 2. Force the people to give ten percent of their earnings to the Church so the Church has the revenue to continue.

Step 3. There is no step three.

Jerry Kays, August 11, 2010, 12:42 p.m. EDT

I can excuse Richard here (but I cannot excuse a flagger whoever it was, not saying it was Richard either, may well have been someone wanting to make it seem so), because I have dealt with him very civilly in the past on these very same subjects . . . and I know what it is like attempting to communicate with someone who is a condescending “know it all” as Nicholas has come across to both of us here . . . IMnsHO.

Richard B., August 11, 2010, 2:05 p.m. EDT

I am the one that flagged this. Jerry. And you stated why. I would do the same to anyone that comes here into Gather and tries to peddle a book and not listen to any argument and answer no queries at all and to insult the person that comments.

I have run a few off before, but this is the first time I flagged another, as I thought he would harm others as well as not listen to others. He had no questions for me of any civility whatsoever. He can peddle his lack of research and incomplete information book elsewhere. I don't care, but not here.

Nicholas Ginex, August 12, 2010, 4:11 p.m. EDT

Thank you, Richard, for flagging this post as being “Harassment and Spam.” The post is a sample of Gather members showing poor respect for each others' comments and points of view. I felt so bad that I apologized to our Gather members on August 11th as follows:

I apologize for the conversation that has transpired between me and Richard. It is a shame that a topic so relevant about “How did man conceive God?” be reduced to throwing stones and insults. Instead, we should really learn to confront our fears and be open to new knowledge. There are people who are afraid to question their belief system, and there are those who are forever trying to find the truth of their beliefs.

Richard, I am pleased that you flagged this post because your inflammatory remarks have reduced what should have been an

interesting and learning discussion into a stone-throwing and cursing fiasco. Briefly, here are some of your remarks that I hope you are sorry for making and apologize for such behavior to our Gather members. In regard to reading *Future of God Amen*, you wrote:

- I'd rather not bother, as that would be a waste of my time, as those religions used military force to demand that the people followed them.
- I have no excuse at all to read what you are presenting at all. It would be a waste of my time.
- Nicholas, let me give you my first and only impression of you.

From the top, "I see you as a person that is using Gather to prostitute some damn book. I don't care what it says. I just see you as that, some damn fool trying to sell some damn book here on Gather. You may think it's great. I certainly do not."

- I would suggest, Nicholas, that because you have no idea at all of the history of religion here on this earth, that as a prostitute for your fucking book, that you take your fucking ass and go somewhere else to peddle your fucking book.

In my comments to Richard, I never resorted to cursing and only tried to have him "see" that his personal views need more exposure to other points of view. I realize now that I may have been too defensive about why I wrote the book.

I have learned a lesson from the experience with Richard on this post, and I thank him for that. In the future, I will be more tolerant of other people's views and avoid making any comments that may cause a negative reaction.

For Richard, I again apologize for pushing your buttons that brought a side of you that is not admirable. I know that some of the commentary you provided shows a great deal of intelligence and knowledge about religion, its pros and its cons. I am willing to extend my best wishes for our desire to be friends because I believe we both have a lot to learn from each other.

I hope you forgive me and yourself. It's nice to be nice.

Jerome K., August 11, 2010, 10:34 a.m. EDT

How sad to see a brilliant discussion going on which has reduced itself to mudslinging and, what's more, has been flagged.

Richard, unfortunately, has misinterpreted his use of Gather and the ways of putting forward an opinion; until then, I was agreeing with the tone of his views. I liked his awareness, his factual analysis, and his obvious knowledge.

On the other hand, Nicholas is doing what Richard suggested, that is, promoting and selling a book on Gather, a book which, it has to be said, is entitled *The Future of God Amen*, which is implicitly looking forward to where the beliefs and continuation of those organizations which promote such beliefs might be in the future; the future being that time to come. However, the title of this article is "Do You Know the Origin of God?" a question which seems to invite opinions about the source of all discussions about a deity known as, for one, "God."

It could be said that to define the term "God" is nebulous and beyond definition, simply because, for one thing, those who believe in such a thing all have views, many of them coincide largely because they belong to societies or groups which agree to the broad scope of the definition. On the other hand, those groups and organizations do not all agree about the definition or, indeed, with one another. However, while no actual photograph or graphic representation exists of the "being" known as "God," certain people have decided what that person might have looked like, largely in the Western societies' view. Indeed, without having seen the "Being" concerned, how on earth could anyone be truthful in representing something which is not proven to exist only in the minds of believers? I cannot say.

I can say that with the history, or the backstory, of beliefs in invisible "gods" comes the need to feel hope, even if the logic of that belief is erroneous and impossible to prove as fact. Then there is the guilt factor imposed on ill-educated people during and before the Middle Ages in terms of the many Inquisitions which occurred. What's that phrase about power and corruption? See *The Medieval Mind* by Prof. R. Bartlett.

So we can never define truthfully the origins of any god, apart from having the historic proof of the rituals and effigies, the paintings and relics, which, in themselves, do not make for a better person, a better parent, neighbor, or friend. What we see are material things, not what was on people's minds when they worshipped, made sacrifices, chanted, offered gifts, and so on. Nevertheless, there are experts, people who have studied the ways and materials of the past who can say what those things were used for, what rituals were performed.

If there is a future for the belief in a deity, we should first remember that we can question the beliefs and routines of the past. We no longer, for example, make sacrifices to an invisible "Being." There are many other things which have changed. We have to respect change, understand that change is how we adapted to our surroundings, coped with new discoveries, both geographically as well as scientifically, how we came to explore the earth, to discover new ways of transport, new ways of exploring the workings of the body and the mind. New knowledge does not necessarily cast out old beliefs; it just helps us to examine them more critically, more logically, so we can make a more informed decision.

I do hope that Richard has pulled himself together now and can contribute further to other Gather posts. I hope also that Nicholas can freely allow others to challenge and inform his beliefs without feeling the need to defend his own so vehemently. There is a place for humility, even on Gather. You may be right for you, but not everyone.

I hope one day you, Nicholas, may begin to think "out of the box."

Peace.

Gary G., November 4, 2010, 1:13 a.m. EDT

God has no origin; He always existed. (Gen. 1:1; Rev. 22:13)

Nicholas Ginex, December 8, 2011, 10:32 p.m. EST

Hello Gary,

Christians who believe in the Trinity are convinced that Jesus is one with God and His Holy Spirit and therefore strongly believe Jesus is God and simply another manifestation of God. As such, they propound

that Jesus was not created but existed in the beginning with God. But that would mean *Jesus cannot be Amen*, since Amen was “created” and did not exist in the “beginning” with God. Proponents of the Trinity profess that God, Jesus, and the Holy Spirit were “never created” but “always existed” and are manifestations of the one God. Therefore, Jesus cannot be Amen and he has stated words of *truth* in Revelation 3:14 that Amen is—“the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.”

Amen is the first, one universal God introduced to mankind, and the Priesthood of Amon documented their belief in scripture titled *Amon as the Sole God*.

Gary G., December 9, 2011, 9:45 a.m. EST

Hi Nicholas,

I am a Christian, more so a disciple of Jesus. This post is over a year old.

Again, as I have said before, you have taken that one verse out of context. You have not listened to any of my reasoning, nor have you provided any other scriptural context to sustain your claims.

I agree with Richard in that you don't respond to questions or provide any further scriptural support, but you simply continue to promote a book which you wrote.

Again, if you do some research, the word “Amen” means “truly, truly.” Jesus said He was the way the “*truth* and the life,” which is what that verse is referring to.

Simple theology is this:

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,
and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God.

All things were made through Him, and without Him
nothing was made that was made. (John 1:1-5)

Nicholas Ginex, December 9, 2011, 9:27 p.m. EST

Hello Gary,

Thank you for commenting after a year from my last response. I felt it necessary to clarify for you and our Gather readers what Jesus meant by proclaiming Amen is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.” The clarification is that Amen does mean, by today’s definition, truly and so be it, but Jesus did not use Amen in that way, because he said Amen was the “faithful and true witness.” Jesus is therefore referring to an entity and not an expression of today’s usage. But was Jesus referring to himself as interpreted by religious leaders of the Christian religion?

Importantly, Jesus is a man of God, to you a Son of God, and if you believe in the Trinity, he is co-equal and co-eternal with God. I understand the Trinity belief that Jesus is God, but Jesus made it clear that he is not Amen, because he stated Amen was a “creation of God.” Amen was created by a spiritual people and articulated by the Priesthood of Amon in scripture titled *Amon as the Sole God*. If Jesus is the Word and was with God in the beginning, he could not be Amen. Since you believe Jesus is God, he “always existed” and therefore was never “created.” It is clear that Jesus was referring to Amen and not himself as “the beginning of the creation of God.” Amen was therefore conceived in the minds of a spiritual people more than two thousand years before the birth of Jesus.

I hope we can agree that yes, today Amen is defined as “so be it” or “truly,” but let us acknowledge the words of Jesus who was well aware of the contribution of the Egyptian God Amen to the belief in one universal God. My writing you about this distinction of what Jesus proclaimed and what is taught by Christian leaders is to inform you of a past that few people are knowledgeable about. Jesus is a man of truth, has revealed to us in Revelation 3:14, for “those who hath an ear,” a very significant bit of history that has not been acknowledged by Judaic, Christian, and Islamic leaders.

Scott I support Zionism, December 9, 2011, 9:57 p.m. EST

Hello Nicholas,

Your question, “Do you know the Origin of God?”

God is eternal. He has no origin. He works outside of time.

Nicholas Ginex December 12, 2011, 7:08 p.m. EST

Hello Scott,

Your answer is a good one because there is no evidence to debate if you are right or wrong. The definition of God is that He is indeed eternal and has existed from the beginning of time. To say God works outside of time is somewhat debatable. Like fine wine takes time, so it is with all things including our conception of God. We have yet to learn more about ourselves, our universe, and our God. It is my hope our religious leaders do not become stagnant and stuck in worn-out dogmas reflected in their scriptures but are perceptive and courageous to make needed improvements for a more educated and discerning people.

Scott, I support Zionism, January 10, 2012, 8:17 p.m. EST

Your answer is a good one because there is no evidence to debate if you are right or wrong.

There is. You cannot know or see. You are of this world. My Father is eternal. I am not of this world. Being an adopted child of God brings many benefits. He sent his Son to save me and you.

In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. (Gen. 1:1,
NIV)

Nicholas Ginex, January 11, 2012, 2:06 a.m. EST

Hi Scott,

Jesus was given to us by God to teach us the Word of God—*love one another*. By following that command given three times by Jesus in John's Gospel, you, I, and many others will be saved.

Scott, I support Zionism, January 11, 2012, 9:41 a.m. EST

By following that command given three times by Jesus in John's Gospel, you, I, and many others will be saved.

Hello Nicholas,

Is Jesus the Christ the only way to Heaven now, in this day and time?

Nicholas Ginex January 11, 2012, 11:25 p.m. EST

Hello Scott,

If you believe in God, Jesus is not the only way to heaven; if it exists. By following the Word of God to love one another, whether you are an agnostic, atheist, or a believer in God, you become a child of God. Regarding heaven in the same way, I do not believe a hell exists. I do not believe a heaven exists. To float around in heaven for millions upon millions of years is a foolish idea.

God is a concept developed by wise men to teach their people a moral code to live by to establish harmony among their people. It took thousands of years, but these wise men visualized God as the Creator and Maker of all there is. To understand how God became a personal belief, I recommend you read *Future of God Amen*. I would be honored to mail you a complimentary copy if you provide your mailing address to my e-mail address: nickginex@gmail.com

Ken Driessen, December 11, 2011, 9:09 p.m. EST

God originated from dead tribal alphas when others began to usurp the power and wealth of the dead patriarchal dude. They would use the authority of the dead dude and nobody could question that. When the Hebrews put their own twist on the Sumerian god, the use of the myth became more sadistic than ever. Four thousand or so years later, ZioNazis, who call all other humans goyim and think of us as their chattel, finance and sell weapons to both sides of every war. The ZioNazis have a monopoly on the monetary system of the world to this day because the majority of the U.S. senators and congressmen have been guilty of treason since 1913 and going against the Federal Reserve Act. So, Mr. Ginex, I went to your Web site, and in my opinion, when you talk about "know God," to me there is a typo because it should read "No God" if we want to save the world from suicidal, homicidal people and the final judgment of extinction that is written into the three books of God, the Torah, the Bible, and the Koran you propose to unite.

Nicholas Ginex, December 12, 2011, 8:08 p.m. EST

Hello Ken,

You have brought up a very important point that my Web site “should read ‘No God’ if we want to save the world from suicidal, homicidal people and the final judgment of extinction that is written into the three books of god, which are the Torah, the Bible and the Koran you propose to unite.”

Your comment clearly rejects the whole concept of God. I sympathize with your answer because it is a long, long shot for the religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions to unite their beliefs in one universal God. They are so immersed in their old, worn-out dogmas produced in a time when people were less educated; a period that goes back to the first written set of commands, judgments, and ordinances given by the Abraham God to Moses around 1250 BCE.

I thank you for taking time to visit my Web site to get an overview of why I wrote the book *Future of God Amen*. I wrote the book after I retired to leave my four daughters with many of my personal thoughts after I have left this world. Because I am a man who does not like to be made a fool of and will not make fools of others with opinions and stories of my own, I diligently did sufficient research and reading of the Torah, the four Gospels, Revelation, and the Koran. I was dismayed at the poor quality of writing by today’s standards because I was not impressed with many stories that may be regarded as myths, the abominations of bigotry and killing of other people sanctioned against those who do not follow their God, and the inconsistencies in their dogmas used to define their God.

After presenting the religious beliefs of the ancient Egyptians, who were first to develop the concept of a soul, a hereafter attained upon living a moral and righteous life, and one universal God, I critiqued the scriptures of the three religions and provided recommendations in the final chapter for the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders and their followers to unite their beliefs and teach the Word of God—*love one another*.

I respect your view about “No God,” but as a practical man who has respect for the spiritual nature of mankind and the thousands of years

it took for a spiritual people to develop the concept of one universal God, I see the benefits that the belief in God has given for creating communities of people who live harmoniously together. That meant the need for a moral code and the authority of a God to sublimate the minds of worshipers to attain the attributes of love, righteousness, justice, and truth that they worshiped in their God.

So yes, while I respect your view, I also understand that the belief in God can be a very positive and constructive belief as demonstrated by the ancient Egyptians building monuments, temples, pyramids, and engineering channels to irrigate their crops. No other civilization, including the Hebrews and Babylonians, achieved such high levels of skill in art, building, and medicine.

My book is way ahead of its time, for it may be that a Third World War will be required for people to learn to stop killing each other and formulate a system of conduct; moral codes that are consistent for all people to live by with a great desire for truth, honesty, and integrity. The concept of God will never go away as long as our scientists are unable to figure out how the first atom was formed and how trillions and trillions of atoms began to form organic and inorganic matter, namely, our universe.

Thank you, Ken, for stimulating me to give you my thoughts of a very serious topic, God. I hope you may respect my views, which by the way, is always subject to change, for I will not keep my head in the sand and my mind in a cage trapped by religious dogma that is in “great need of change.”

Ken Driessen, December 15, 2011, 11:32 a.m. EST

Nicholas wrote: “but as a practical man who has respect for the spiritual nature of mankind . . .” So then, I have no respect and I cannot be spiritual unless I believe in God? “. . . may be that a third world war will be required for people to learn to stop killing each other and formulate a system of conduct . . .” So we need another great war where millions die and that is going to bring us peace?

My first manuscript was CAUSE, community awakening universal spiritual evolution. Then I called it SEASON, spiritual evolution alongside scientifically observing nature. Atheist anarchist pagan would probably irk you because you have been programmed to believe

that God and spirituality are one so the nature of the universe cannot exist without a God made in man's image. Anarchy is a horizontal organization that many animals and certain men achieved long before those men invented god. The pagan, instead of nature worship with no sexual bias as I prefer, used to be associated with goddess worship, which you do not seem to consider spiritual? If in fact your studies of Abrahamic religion can lead you to a compassion for all humans and life, you will come to know what this means "toaywtbt tlausbom lye." That is something I can follow even if I don't believe in God, choosing to worship and live within nature. We can also agree to disagree, because while I tolerate and even show love to God believers, I never will believe in such an evil, sadistic, anthropomorphic Deity that would convince you that we have to have another world war to have peace.

Nicholas Ginex, December 16, 2011, 1:55 a.m. EST

Hello Ken,

You appear to distort the intention of this post and my comments. I do not advocate a Third World War but was making the point that so far, after the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions, there has been a legacy of hate, violence, and the killing of innocent people because the leaders of these religions have sought to force their God on other people. My objective is to reveal to all people, whether you're a believer, an agnostic, or an atheist, that the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions were developed with the moral codes and religious beliefs of the ancient Egyptians.

Yes, you are correct in that people from different cultures may or may not have spiritual values that include the concepts of a soul, a hereafter upon living a moral life, and a Creator God of "all there is." My mission is to reveal that the major religions have had their roots from the ancient Egyptians. Why, even Jesus in Revelation 3:14 proclaimed Amen, the greatest Egyptian God for more than two thousand years before the birth of Jesus, is "the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God."

Returning to the topic of this post, I contend that the conception of one universal God was developed by the Priesthood of Amon, who wrote scripture titled *Amon as the Sole God* at least two decades before Moses left Egypt around 1250 BCE. I am not trying to dissuade anybody from their beliefs and have no reason to convert nonbelievers

to any religion. My objective is to reveal a past that few people are aware of and to have them think about how a spiritual people first conceived one universal God.

True, I would like the religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions to unify their beliefs, and knowing that pride and arrogance dominates, I made the assertion that it may require a Third World War for them to learn it is rather stupid to be killing one another. There are two directions for mankind to elevate their desire to emulate integrity, honesty, truth, and love for one another, and that is through some belief in a higher authority we believe is God or educate people from all countries to have the value system of morality.

From a practical point of view, I believe mankind will always believe in God until we have learned how the first atom was formed to multiply into trillion and become the basic unit of all matter, organic and inorganic, for which reason, I appeal to the religious leaders to wake up and honor the words of Jesus by teaching our sisters and brothers from all countries to—*love one another*.

Ken Driessen, December 16, 2011, 9:39 a.m. EST

Hi Nick,

First off, *toaywtbt tlausbom lye* is an acronym for “treat others as you wish to be treated; the least among us shall be our masters; love your enemies.” Even translated, or the letters turned back into words, these sayings are all but forgotten by our so-called religious, political, and economic leaders. For them, the creators of hierarchy and authority in the name of God, to promise an afterlife is and always was a dishonest psychological tool; it does not matter if it began with Jews or Egyptians. When you die, you are dead. You will never be Nicholas again, just as when I die, I will never be Ken. It is a hard thing to watch our relatives die, knowing this too is our fate. That is just one reason why false promises have worked on the human psyche and continue to.

The pyramids were for kings, but I attribute them to the people who built them who have no effigy for us to remember them. Although by researching and stating that it can be proven that there was an origin or human invention of God as a tool of the very human masters, you have come a long way. You still seem to believe it is necessary for us to give ourselves to kings, lords, masters, and fake butt gods in order to be

civilized, loving, and humane. To “love one another” does not require a God, and in fact as you so point out, God (the fake psychological tool) allows the sociopaths to lead believers to kill people from other tribes and nations. This will never stop so long as there are people who use and allow this hierarchy of greed and lust for power and wealth to continue justifying it with a mythical figure of authority. I do not, will not, and have not believed in God since my grandfather died when I was a little boy. Yes, I was forced to shut up and make believe I did believe. I had to keep my thoughts of a collective horizontal organization for the good of all life silent or suffer. I had to make believe I was agnostic when I was absolutely positive that God was a nasty invention of evil hierarchy.

You see, even if you so state that maybe war is necessary for peace and then try to back down from that assertion, I hold to my core belief in the collective cooperative effort toward the health well-being and longevity of each individual and all life on the planet. I believe that I live on after I die through what I accomplish while I am alive and through my species living on, through the force of life that is so beyond the little god, whoever invented it. I believe that allegiance to the hierarchy in the name of God will bring about the final judgment that the Synagogue of Satan predicts in Revelation is the extinction of our species. Why do the leaders need enough nuclear weapons to kill every human on the planet four times over? Why don't religious leaders demand this insanity be dismantled? The answer is their allegiance to the blind headless monster of power lead by a God that isn't.

It has become evident to me that if we live and work together toward the common goal of species' collective well-being, that we can live up to our true potential. Through science, we are learning that an everlasting eternal simultaneous connection to all time, space, and matter exists. We only need to work together in order to become part of what already exists in the physical realm and what most likely exists beyond. I guess I have a sort of faith, because I came to believe these things before I could prove them. I saw a show on PBS the other day about quantum mechanics and the theory of entanglement. Entangled particles seem to react to one another even when they are separated by large distances. This may also relate to the unsolved, unified field theory. Submitting to the authority of sociopaths in the name of God, instead of working together to become one with the physical realm and beyond, will prevent us from achieving our true potential and cause our extinction.

Why I came to correspond with you is because I was impressed that you came to the conclusion that the theory of God was invented or originated in the minds of men that used the theory to justify their authority. Am I wrong? I don't think so. Happy solstice and please celebrate the Christmas heritage and tradition with your family that has been handed down from generation to generation, even though you know the myth of its origin. I will. PL&H, Ken.

Nicholas Ginex, December 21, 2011, 4:18 p.m. EST

Dear Ken,

Sorry I have not replied sooner, but between my wife and I babysitting three granddaughters and my efforts to publish another book, today is my first opportunity to sit and correspond with Gather comments.

I just read your first paragraph, and I must say, Ken, that you think the way I do. I subscribe to the words of my father, "When you're dead, you're dead." To embrace a theology which is an unconfirmed philosophy, one has got to reflect on why such a theory has been proposed and why it continues to exist today. You have cited the answer by stating, ". . . our so called religious, political, and economic leaders. For them, the creators of hierarchy and authority in the name of God, to promise an afterlife, is and always was a dishonest psychological tool; it does not matter if it began with Jews or Egyptians."

There is one distinction regarding the religious beliefs of the ancient Egyptians. Their religion began out of the necessity to control the morality of their people as their communities expanded, where even the pharaoh was strongly indoctrinated by the priesthood to embrace the attribute of "truth." However, you are correct that the spiritual belief for the people to attain a life in a hereafter became corrupted by the R&R (ruling and religious) authorities, namely the pharaohs and the priests. They realized that they could control the minds of their people with the beliefs that started with awe and appreciation of the wonders of their world to believe in one universal God. This took thousands of years, and after the Hebrews adopted their beliefs, they created the Torah, which was designed for their own people as chosen by God. Since the birth of the Judaic religion, the R&R have capitalized on the use of the belief in God to help assure stability within their communities.

Ken, you were a very bright and perceptive young boy to arrive at the conclusion that God was a mythical figure used by the R&R to acquire wealth, power, and control the minds of people. Your questions “Why do the leaders need enough nuclear weapons to kill every human on the planet four times over? Why don’t religious leaders demand this insanity to be dismantled?” has merit. “The answer is their allegiance to the blind, headless monster of power led by a God that isn’t.”

I strongly support your views that “It has become evident to me that if we live and work together toward the common goal of the species’ collective well-being, that we can live up to our true potential. Through science, we are learning that an everlasting eternal simultaneous connection to all time, space, and matter exists. We only need to work together in order to become part of what already exists in the physical realm and most likely beyond.”

Ken, your conclusion is correct in “that the theory of God was invented or originated in the minds of men that used the theory to justify their authority.” The theory or belief in a universal God that created “all there is” will persist in the minds of men, because the theories of quantum mechanics and particle entanglement are too hypothetical and lack evidence just as the “big bang” is a theory because the scientists have not answered where did all the matter come from in the first place to cause an explosion that initiated our universe.

Even if the theories of quantum mechanics become provable, the question remains, how did the first minute particle come into existence in the first place? An answer that God is responsible is likely, but is that God simply a force, an energy that inherently has a field as its basis? For at the lowest denominator of creation, the atom, there are positive and negative forces that combine to form molecules of organic and inorganic matter.

Ken, I believe you also recognize that the spiritual belief in God is inherent in mankind. I believe that because we are made up of the atoms that make us conscious thinking beings, that we are trying to understand the energy or force within us that wants to return to that beginning. But here again, this is a hypothetical thought on my part.

To strip away the belief in God is a disservice to the spiritual nature of man. There is something to be said that humans strive to attain a level of honesty, integrity, love, and compassion that we attribute

to our highest form of belief—the existence in God. However, I also agree that to put all faith and hope in God is not going to solve the problems on this earth. God does not feed a baby, give it love, care, and instruction to face the world. It is the mother and father that forms the promise of the next generation. However, from a practical matter, I feel that the religious institutions can still be a mechanism to teach our youth the attributes of integrity, truth, and love toward one another. Why? Because there are many parents who either lack the skills or are too busy trying to keep their families alive by working most of their daily hours.

That is why I like the idea by preserving the traditions and beliefs that bring hope and joy to people. I played Santa Claus for my little girls and had them receive a religious education, because I felt that a moral and spiritual teaching would be of benefit. To become too intellectual and strip away some of our mythical beliefs and traditions would have us become like mechanical robots devoid of those feelings that bring color and joy into our lives.

In ending, I also wish you a very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year. Your comments have been refreshing and hopefully allowed me to share many of my own personal thoughts for others to think about.

Ken Driessen, January 9, 2012, 1:10 p.m. EST

“Ken, you were a very bright and perceptive young boy to arrive at the conclusion that God was a mythical figure used by the R&R to acquire wealth, power, and control the minds of people.” I am not young. I am chronologically fifty-five years on the planet. I am not your boy. I am an individual multi-cellular biological being, one of 7 billion on an overpopulated planet while the God-people want more people, more houses, more cars, more babies to enslave to their evil monetary system, feeding their infinite greed.

I strongly support your views that “It has become evident to me that if we live and work together toward the common goal of the species’ collective well-being that we can live up to our true potential. Through science, we are learning that an everlasting eternal simultaneous connection to all time, space, and matter exists. We only need to work together in order to become part of what already exists in the physical realm and most likely beyond.” Thank you and I’m glad we at least agree on some of the most important philosophy of my life.

“Ken, I believe you also recognize that the spiritual belief in God is inherent in mankind.” Not so, God is only inherent in the minds of people that use the psychological tool that God is to dominate others. “I believe that because we are made up of the atoms that make us conscious thinking beings that we are trying to understand the energy or force within us that wants to return to that beginning. But here again, this is a hypothetical thought on my part.” The big bang theory is popular only because of the religious notion that some dude had to create the universe in the beginning: <http://metaresearch.org/cosmology/top10BBproblems.asp>

“To strip away the belief in God is a disservice to the spiritual nature of man. There is something to be said that humans strive to attain a level of honesty, integrity, love, and compassion that we attribute to our highest form of belief—the existence in God.” The people who have used a myth backed with physical force to justify their rule are a disservice to humanity. There is no love, honesty, or integrity in any of it. By what you say, are you backing up Leo Strauss and the “noble lie,” supposedly something positive?

“That is why I like the idea by preserving the traditions and beliefs that bring hope and joy to people. I played Santa Claus for my little girls and had them receive a religious education because I felt that a moral and spiritual teaching would be of benefit. To become too intellectual and strip away some of our mythical beliefs and traditions would have us become like mechanical robots devoid of those feelings that bring color and joy into our lives.” If you want to read the Bible to your grandchildren, you better read the whole Bible to them, especially to young women who are property of men in the Old Testament, and even Paul in the New Testament makes women second-class humans and the property of their fathers or husbands. Believing in nature rather than the lie that God is does not make you a robot. In fact, it is exactly the opposite. <http://godisimaginary.com/>

You are so close to calling a myth a myth, Nick. I hope and believe you will realize that the God theory is evil and threatens us with a final judgment of extinction. Yes, heritage and tradition is important. It should help people remember that the greediest, power-tripping spawn have used religious tradition to get otherwise fine humans to kill for them. In ending, I hope you can join what for now is called the occupy movement to bring down the monetary system monopolizers and war profiteers that hide behind their ZioNazi god. The force of

love and life is not a male anthropomorphic god. Please join us in an effort to reach our true potential as a collective of biological beings capable of an eternal connection only if we work together.

2012 A New Beginning.

Scholars who study the Mayan calendar have proven it relates to long count astrological cycles rather than any biblical revelations of end-time myth. Myths, including prophets being born on the winter solstice, have been formed around patterns and movements in the sky since humans began to ponder such things. The only thing 2012 should mean an end to is fear mongering. People are wakening all over the planet to the notion of secular values, democracy, and fair exchange of goods and services; lessening the mythical boogeyman God-religions designed to justify the rule of the few wealthy lords, kings, and masters over the rest of us.

It also is claimed that these stellar long count ages or eons relate to our spiritual development as a species. For instance, Aries the ram and human incarnation, Moses, is a long count span that ended with Pisces the fish and Jesus being the anthropomorphic representation of the setting celestial era. The emerging eon, Aquarius, is the water bearer, which seems more anonymous or collective with no alpha. These shifts in the sky as well as the shifts in human consciousness they are said to coincide with are gradual. While the "Age of Aquarius" took hold with the peace and human rights movement of the 1960s, that all subsided with the 1980s me generation of self-absorption. There was no particular individual alpha hippy. To this day, not everyone is simultaneously attuned to a leaderless effort for peace, social justice, and ecological sustainability necessary for our long-term well-being; the very survival of our species on this planet.

Religion is coming around full circle as people who desire to conserve the old guard seek to bring God into the science room. Unknowingly to them, such pursuit reduces their omnipotent God to a theory; not a very positive or healthy theory for humanity, at that. Their God leads us to submit to the greediest, power-tripping humans on the planet, who only lead to maintain their concentration of wealth. In fact, they have enough nuclear weapons pointed on the earth to kill every man, woman, and child four times over. Now at the University of Wisconsin, they are genetically modifying plague viruses and will stop at nothing, telling us their infinite greed is in our "national interest." A majority

of government officials are guilty of treason against the constitutional principles they swear to uphold. “We the people” and “All men are created equal,” mean nothing to them.”

To me, 2012 does symbolize the next level of love and understanding of our human condition and potential. We will develop a monetary system based on exchange of goods and services rather than a tool of the infinitely greedy. We can end weapons sales to dictators and war profiteering. Many have embraced the anonymous caricature to express desire for valid democracy and a meaningful positive plan for humanity. We can work for the good of humanity on an equal basis to establish a loving eternal connection.

PL&H K

Nicholas Ginex, January 10, 2012, 8:08 p.m. EST

Hello Ken,

First, my apology in referring to you as a very bright and perceptive young boy. I meant it as a compliment, but reading it again, I am sorry and would like to restate it by writing: You are a very bright and perceptive person to arrive at the conclusion that God was a mythical figure used by the Ruling and Religious (R&R) authorities to acquire wealth, power, and control of the minds of people.

Ken, for the most part, we agree on much of what you wrote. Where I disagree is that man will always conceive God as the Maker of All that is. I say this because man has always shown the ability to think about what is beyond his own existence. I believe that there is a spiritual nature in man that will not be easily eliminated by just absorbing all the facts and findings of science. What many atheists and agnostics refuse to understand is that curiosity that man has about how he was created along with the universe he lives in. That curiosity will always be linked to the unknown answer, which ultimately results in God; a force or energy he may never understand because it is mysterious, unknowable, and incomprehensible.

What I agree with is your statement that “God is only inherent in the minds of people that use the psychological tool which God is to dominate others.” That is a false statement by how you phrased it. God does not dominate others; it is the religious leaders and ruling authorities

(R&R) that use God as a psychological tool to dominate people. This is where you are absolutely correct, because it has been the religious institutions themselves that have precipitated bigotry, hatred, violence, and the killing of innocent people throughout the ages.

The original intent of God was for the useful purpose of teaching a set of moral and ethical codes of behavior to maintain peace and harmony between the emerging groups in a society. It was in ancient Egypt that this idea worked because they taught that by leading a moral and righteous life, one can attain a hereafter and live with their God for eternity. Of course, few people now believe in a heaven, just as they, for the most part, no longer believe in hell, a concept that was accepted by uneducated minds, for no righteous God would burn His creations for millions of years.

The beliefs that the Egyptian priesthood taught was initially to maintain stability and harmony between the emerging nomes that had their own unique gods. But the priesthood learned through experience that they needed to focus on one God that created all there is. It was this ability to teach a moral code and sets of laws that unified their people to work together in harmony. The end result was the building of irrigation channels to water their fields, to measure their boundaries between each neighbor, to build homes, temples, monuments, and pyramids, which still inspire awe and wonder at the spiritual nature of these people.

Yes, you are correct in that power corrupts, and we find that the R&R used their god as an inspiring weapon to win wars against their intruders who began to sweep into their land, namely the Semites from Palestine and Syria, the Nubians from the north, and the Libyans from the west.

I do agree that the mission of the religions, specifically the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic leaders, need to focus on using God as a psychological tool to teach morality and ethics, where their end objectives is to teach integrity, honesty, compassion, and love for one another. The promise of a hereafter is a lie, just as the threat of hell was for many people. The stupidity of using Satan to blame for our mistakes and wrongs in life is another false concept that also needs to be eliminated.

But what does such changes in the theology and dogma of these organizations all mean? It means that the religious leaders have got to

wake up and revise their scriptures to deal with a more educated and discerning people that are much more astute and understanding than their ancestors of the past thousand years. Ken, you are one of those people who I admire because you understand that the faults of the religious institutions have caused bigotry, violence, and the killing of innocent people.

Ken, you stated that the belief in God is a disservice to the spiritual nature of man and there is no love, honesty, or integrity in any of it. Here again I agree with you that the mission of the religious leaders needs to be refocused on teaching the attributes that mankind should aspire to. Yes, I like the idea of God because it does add emphasis on a perfect ideal that people can try to emulate and it gives people the psychological power to retain hope and summon added strength over disappointment and failure.

You referred to Leo Strauss and the “noble lie” as something positive. I don’t care about Leo’s views, for I already know about what he calls a “lie.” What I am pointing out is something much more significant, and that is man’s belief in something beyond himself that can have beneficial effects. What Leo calls a lie, I call a concept. It is not a theory but a concept that is unique to every human being. No person has any idea who or what is God, but they construct within their own personal being depending upon their ability to reflect, imagine, and reach out by centering their thoughts on the God they create within their own minds. The mind is a powerful thing, and to deprive a person of the ability to gain hope and strength through that belief is not a bad thing.

Ken, I do not read the Bible to my children. I have instructed them with the knowledge I have gained about life and taught them what can be the dangers in life; be it drugs, the wrong crowd, etc. However, I would like our educational institutions, from early stages well into the professional levels of education, to instruct people in honesty, sincerity, compassion, and respect for integrity, to learn to understand what do we mean by love and what are the components of love. Too few people seem to have time to think about how we can be better human beings.

Ken, because I not only believe, but millions of people believe in God, I say let’s be practical and use both our religious institutions and educational system to breed better human beings whereby the object

is to teach the Word of God announced by Jesus—*love one another*. The trick is to get people to understand that a unified belief in God and a standard set of moral and ethical values must be taught all over the world. But this means the R&R authorities need to work together to achieve such an objective.

Lastly, Ken, you wrote that 2012 symbolizes the next level of love and understanding of our human condition and potential. I agree, but to develop a monetary system based on the exchange of goods and services is to retreat to the old days when our world was much smaller. What is needed is the educational system I wrote about to teach integrity, honesty, and compassion. Such teaching ingrained into people will naturally get them to share what they have that has become more than abundant for their own existence. People will see the common sense in that instead of making 5 million and keeping it all, why not keep a million and spread the 4 million with the workers that helped earn the profits and the investors that helped the business to get started? Yes, I believe in the capitalistic system. Tell me, is there any other place you would rather live where there is the opportunity to get an education and make your own world with the inherent abilities you may have?

Thank you, Ken, for a stimulating conversation. We agree on most things, and the future depends upon how people like you and I can help influence a better future for all of us. Education, education, education. The Internet is a tool where knowledge can be accessed.

The Beginning of the Creation of God

August 14, 2010 06:18 p.m. EDT

Few people, be they believers in God, agnostics, or atheists, know how God was conceived by man. This God is worshipped in temples, churches, and mosques even though worshippers of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions have a very different view. This post is a follow-up of, “Do You Know the Origin of God?” Responses did not answer this question except for those by Jerome K., whose commentary was on the right track.

As a father of four beautiful, personable, and intelligent daughters, I felt the need to write, after my retirement as an electrical engineer, about my thoughts about God and self-published a book titled *Legacy of a Father*. I did not want my children to believe the erroneous concepts and dogmas taught by the three major religions. After a year elapsed, I was further motivated to inform people around the world how and why man first conceived the vision of God.

The second book is now named *Future of God Amen*. It is a shorter version of *Legacy of a Father*, which consisted of 650 pages of text, figures, and tables. Realizing that within that book were several messages that conclusively prove how man first conceived God, I stripped the book of much of the historic content to its present set of 330 pages, which excludes “Why This Book?” its Table of Contents, Prologue, Foreword, and five book reviews.

The thoughts, ideas, assertions, and conclusions in *Future of God Amen* are not all mine. Throughout my lifetime, from the age of six, I thought, *Where did God come from?* As I received a Catholic education, I was curious to also learn about the way others prayed to their God, be they in temples and churches. After serving in the army, I read the findings and thoughts of highly respected historical

writers on religion and exceptionally qualified Egyptologists. I admit, however, I never entered a mosque because I could not accept the idea of submission to Allah. To me, I always felt God would not desire submission by bowing down to Him. Instead, He would be honored if His children followed His final command announced three times by His surrogate, Jesus Christ—*love one another*. It is arrogance to believe God would accept you if you have failed to love your sisters and brothers of every nation.

In Revelation 3:13 and 3:14, Jesus proclaims to all that hath an ear that Amen is

the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.

Astounding, Amen has been misinterpreted to mean “so be it” by religious leaders because they have generated dogma and a hierarchy for their own greed and control of the minds of God-loving people. How is it that Christian leaders believe that Jesus is the Son of God but yet deny and misconstrue his words? The history provided in *Future of God Amen* conclusively reveals that Amen was indeed the first universal God as documented by the Priesthood of Amon with their scripture entitled *Amon as the Sole God*, which was written during the reign of Ramses II.

It was Jesus Christ who has revealed the truth about Amen. Apparently, he has received knowledge in his religious training as a child that Amen existed for over three thousand years in the belief system of the Egyptians. In fact, Amen and Amon (equivalent names) were used in the throne names of at least thirteen Egyptian pharaohs two thousand years before the birth of Jesus Christ. Perhaps we should not fault the religious leaders of ignoring the history of Amen and the words of Jesus Christ because the Egyptian hieroglyphics were only deciphered about 180 years ago, and Egyptologists were able to bring to light for the modern world what was written on their temple walls and tombs about one hundred years ago.

This post hopefully has given you an appreciation of the research, findings, and conclusions that are within the pages of *Future of God Amen*. You have an opportunity to review the praises for the book by visiting: www.futureofgodamen.com

Do you agree with the words of Jesus and the conclusion substantiated in *Future of God Amen* that Amen is—*the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God?*

Comments and Responses

Gary G., August 15, 2010, 12:18 a.m. EDT

Amen is a confirmation word. It holds many meanings in this support. With all Scripture, we need to take into account the whole Gospel. I would say that the “so be it” is far from a dogma statement. God has the last say in all things. I can see how He is referred to as the Amen. This as well fits in line with the use of the word throughout Scripture.

Perhaps a greater concern is that we take into account Jesus’s words when He said to “love our neighbor as ourself.”

Nicholas Ginex, August 15, 2010, 2:53 p.m. EDT

Hello Gary G.,

Thank you for your response. Yes, Amen is a word used as a confirmation in the sense of “so be it.” Amen also means truth, which was the greatest attribute of this Egyptian God. “So be it” is appropriate to say when requesting a favorable outcome to God but does not fit well when “thanking God” for a favorable outcome. However, when using Amen as an entity, “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God,” it makes a lot of sense, because we are thanking God. This is why Amen is sung and announced with adoration, praise, and thankfulness. We are not singing “so be it.” We are praising and honoring his Name.

Gary G., August 15, 2010, 3:55 p.m. EDT

Correct! Jesus said he was the way, truth, and the life (John 14:6).

Hosanna is a great adoration as well.

Nicholas Ginex, August 15, 2010, 5:35 p.m. EDT love

Hello Gary G.,

I agree with you that Jesus was the greatest prophet in spreading God’s Word—*love one another*. This is truly a Son of God in spirit who revealed the truth in Revelation 3:13 and 3:14, namely, Amen “is

the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.” Be careful not to distort, misconstrue, and misinterpret the words of Jesus Christ. Jesus was very clear with his pronouncement. If he was referring to himself, he would have simply said, “I am the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.”

Please avail yourself of knowledge, the history, findings, and facts revealed over the past one hundred years and documented in *Future of God Amen*. Such knowledge will increase your belief in God because it is based upon truth. Believe me, I do not like to be made a fool of by the ramblings of so-called religious men, and likewise, I am not about to make fools of people who only wish to know the truth.

Gary G., August 15, 2010, 12:21 a.m. EDT

Also, God was not created by man. God created man. We find God when God the Father makes Himself known to us.

Nicholas Ginex, August 15, 2010, 3:47 p.m. EDT

Hello Gary G.,

It is clear that you are a very devout believer of God. Please understand that I respect your beliefs and love of God. I have always thought about God as a child and in my lifetime have tried to come to know God. To know God is an impossibility, for he is incomprehensible and mysterious to all of us. Nobody really knows God, and all of us have a different vision of God. There are Christians who believe the Bible, that God made us in His own image. For me, I believe in the unknowing God and therefore do not envision Him in the likeness of man.

God revealed Himself through the minds of men. This was a gradual process whereby men first venerated many gods that were associated with God’s creations, be they the oceans, mountains, rivers, lakes, animals, trees, flowers, the moon, sun, and stars of the heavens. These gods were eventually replaced with a personal God. Then, by the reign of Ramses II, the first universal God was documented by the Priesthood of Amon with their scripture entitled *Amon as the Sole God*.

Yes, you may believe that God created man, but it was man that created the belief in God. You have read the Bible, and to continue on your journey to know how and when God revealed Himself to the

minds of men, I would like for you to also read about the findings of Egyptologists over the past one hundred years. There is factual evidence that it was the Egyptians that exposed the Hebrews to their godly beliefs by embracing the scriptures of the Priesthood of Amon entitled *Amon as the Sole God*. There is no shame in giving credit to the Egyptians, who have given us the belief in God that has profoundly influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions.

Do read *Future of God Amen* to see if you agree with the facts and findings of dedicated men who have brought to light knowledge for all of us to analyze, question, and learn about “the beginning of the creation of God.”

Gary G., August 15, 2010, 4:01 p.m. EDT

Jesus said, “This is eternal life, that they may know You, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom You have sent” (John 17:3).

Knowing God is an intimate relationship. God sent His Son to the earth to die for us in an act of love. Also, if you read Revelation 21 and 22 this will give you a picture of who God is as well. Wish you well on your journey.

Nicholas Ginex, August 15, 2010, 6:10 p.m. EDT

Hello Gary G.,

You will find that in *Future of God Amen*, Jesus Christ is acknowledged as the greatest prophet. He also revealed words that have not been taught by Christian, Judaic, and Islamic leaders. Jesus was very clear in John’s Gospel 1:12 that anyone can become a Son of God. For convenience, it is presented below:

But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the
Sons of God, even to them that believe in His name.

Then in John 14:12, Jesus himself confirms that those who believe in him will do even greater works:

Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the works
that I do shall he do also; And greater works than these shall he do;
because I go to my Father.

So you see, we both agree on the words of Jesus Christ, for he provides hope for this world. The subtitle of *Future of God Amen* is *A Call to Daughters and Sons of God*. Unfortunately, Jesus and John forgot to include our most wonderful partners, the daughters of this world.

We do not have to try and convince each other of the faithfulness and truth given us by Jesus. That is not my intent nor my mission at this point in life. I only desire to inform people worldwide that the beliefs in one universal God, the soul, eternal life, and the Son of God, were originated in ancient Egypt and have been embraced by the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions.

Dorothy H., August 15, 2010, 6:56 a.m. EDT

Very interesting article!

Donald Hawley, August 15, 2010, 3:08 p.m. EDT

An interesting article, but I do not think like you on much of some aspects. For instance, your idea that God does not want man to bow down to him is the height of arrogance, as I see it. I remember the film *The Egyptian* and was terribly impressed when the pharaoh Ikhnaton went into the desert alone and prostrated himself before God. I think that this is the most noble thing a man can do as long as it is not in front of others or before a symbol of God (such as a Pope). It is very un-American, of course, but then that is the problem with American culture, the elevation of the individual before "all else." I think you have missed some extraordinary aspects of religion by not paying more attention to Muhammad and His message (the Holy Koran) and not "moving on" from the limited aspects of Christian theology. Jesus Himself time and time again warned against this stagnation and promised that more would be coming from God as it had from the beginning of history.

Nicholas Ginex, August 15, 2010, 5:05 p.m. EDT

Hello Don,

Thank you for your response.

You had indicated that it "is the height of arrogance" that God does not want man to bow down to Him. God never commanded that man

bow down to Him. For your own edification, read the last Gospel of John and there you will find God's last command was stated three times by Jesus Christ—*love one another*. God would rather see his creations, the sisters and brothers of every nation, love one another. It means nothing to God to prostrate oneself before Him, for He is not an insecure God, seeking adoration. However, He does command us to follow His command. Any believer in God who has failed to love his sisters and brothers of every nation will not be accepted by God.

Don, you have not closely read the Holy Koran because you either have “missed” what it advocates or ignore and excuse its messages of hate, bigotry, violence, and the killing of innocent human beings in the name of Allah. To “move on” from the limited aspects of Christian theology and pay more attention to Muhammad and his message is a statement that does not make any sense. Comparing the two prophets, Jesus Christ and Muhammad, Jesus never spread the Word of God by using force—killing nonbelievers in the name of a God called Allah. You definitely need to reread the Koran. *Future of God Amen* reveals the deficiencies in not only the Holy Koran, but also in the Torah and the New Testament. Please cite in the Holy Koran the words of God given to Jesus Christ—“love one another as I have loved you.” Certainly, God would want His last command, pronounced three times by His surrogate, Jesus, to be stated once again by Muhammad clearly in the Holy Koran.

Let me know where Muhammad has stated the Word of God—*love one another*. If you love God, you should love me, for I am your brother. Let us learn the truth about “the beginning of the creation of God.”

Don L., August 26, 2010, 12:16 p.m. EDT

This is very strange pursuit in retirement, to prove the nonexistence of God.

To see the stars in the heavens, to know that we are wonderfully made, is to receive messages from the God who made them. But God goes even further; He sups with us and watches over our sleeping children as we do.

Our problem is simply belief. We don't trust in this God but prefer our own ways, robbing us of the sight that should be evident.

I do, however, agree with your assessment of man's will to create gods in his own image. No one can dispute that. But I do think there is a higher dimension that you are failing to acknowledge.

At some point, God must reach out and touch you, as he did for me, or you will go on in your disbelief. I pray that this will happen in your lifetime.

It is sometimes hard to understand the ways of God. He does not always explain his reasons or his purposes.

I don't think he will allow you to write a third book without adding some input on his own, or at least, I'd like to think I might be a resource in that direction. Check out my three groups on Gather.

Christians Making Friends

Christians Making Peace

Making Discoveries About the Scriptures.

If I can assist you in any way, be sure to ask me.

If not, God bless!

Nicholas Ginex, August 26, 2010, 3:48 p.m. EDT

Hello Don,

Thank you for a very meaningful and thought-provoking response. I must address the very first line of your comment, "This is a very strange pursuit in retirement, to prove the nonexistence of God."

Nowhere have I tried to prove the nonexistence of God. My mission is stated at the beginning of *Future of God Amen* and is provided below. To reveal a past with truth, which has been confirmed by Jesus Christ, is to inform people of man's development of God. Because mankind has evolved the concept of God does not mean He does not exist. Many concepts have matured into proven realities, such as the theory of electricity; its composition of electrons and the makeup of atoms has led to technical advances of many products, i.e., the plane, computer, artificial light, and television.

With the following link www.futureofgodamen.com, you will see the following reasons why *Future of God Amen* was written:

Why this Book?

- ▶ Inform people that the soul, truth, righteousness, justice, a hereafter, the God Amen, and Son of God were developed by the religion of ancient Egypt.
- ▶ Reveal that Jesus Christ acknowledged Amen in Revelation 3:14 as “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.”
- ▶ Motivate religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions to accept Amen as a common bond to work together for religious unity.
- ▶ Energize religious leaders to eliminate separatism between their religions and prevent the loss of belief in God by a more discerning people.
- ▶ Assist Judaic, Christian, and Islamic unification efforts. As an aid, copies of this book have been mailed to 123 religious leaders.
- ▶ Initiate a Council for Religious Unity that provides a forum for Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders to unify their beliefs with the assistance of daughters and sons of God.
- ▶ Emphasize religious leaders are required to teach our sisters and brothers, from every nation, to love and support one another.
- ▶ Base religious beliefs with truth about their beginnings so that faith and science will advance on a parallel path in the quest to know God.
- ▶ Encourage religious leaders to preserve the spiritual nature of mankind. A silent position will continue bigotry, hatred, violence, and invite terrorism that threatens the very survival of human life and indeed, our planet.

Don L., August 28, 2010, 1:34 a.m. EDT

You're welcome, Nicholas. I don't like to sound disparaging. But as Socrates, I feel compelled to question, to examine, to inquire about the nature of statements made by others that seem slightly out of the mainstream.

Of course, I'm referring to the Amen that you mention. Are you sure you're not putting a little too much emphasis there? Certainly strange doctrines creep into otherwise consistent materials. Revelation, it

must be remembered, is considered by many to be Apocrypha. I'm not implying that that makes it less important. I'm just saying if you're wanting to be truthful and honest, that is not the heart of the Word revealed to us.

After all, Jesus is of the line of Judah, and not the line of King Tut. To infer otherwise is really leading people down the briar patch. Now if you called Jesus the Messiah or the Desire of Ages, it would make more sense to me. That would fit with the chief materials and be more consistent with what came before.

I just think you should be aware of what you look like to the casual reader. You're not really laying all the cards on the table, are you?

Nicholas Ginex, August 28, 2010, 7:19 p.m. EDT

Dear Don L.,

You bring up religious points of view that you wish to discuss and I have not discussed; such as, is Revelation a valid revelation to John from the Holy Spirit—God, and the birth of Jesus from the line of David? It appears you are on a defensive mode to stand up for your beliefs. It is not my purpose to make you stray from your beliefs because I respect believers, atheists, and agnostics who, whether they believe in God or not, follow his final command—*love one another*. As a true believer in Jesus Christ, can you identify where in the New Testament Jesus proclaimed this last command from God?

By reading the book *Future of God Amen*, you will find that as a man who has searched for truth throughout my life, I have with honesty, clear evidence, and support by the greatest works of Egyptologists and writers on religion provided a true historical development of how man first conceived one universal God. I will not deceive my daughters, for whom I was first motivated to write the book and people worldwide with false assertions and conclusions. My purpose is to inform people of knowledge of a past civilization who has given mankind its greatest legacy—the belief in God.

If you are truly seeking God and not afraid to open your mind to new information, you will find that I have laid on the table a wonderful gift—knowledge. Are you courageous and curious enough to read *Future of God Amen*?

Don L., August 28, 2010, 1:43 a.m. EDT

I do like the idea of Jesus as the Amen appealing to different religions and bringing peace and comfort to the world. I think that was the original idea. Unfortunately, mankind screwed it up and accepted him only, as you said, as a mere prophet. If you examine the Scriptures, and be honest in what they have to say, Jesus is so much more than that, the very image of God!

So I can't take literally your opinion that we can't know God. We can know him. We just have to decide whether or not we're going to love him as he commanded.

Nicholas Ginex, August 28, 2010, 7:40 p.m. EDT

Dear Don L.,

You are misinterpreting the words of Jesus Christ because religious leaders have misconstrued the true meaning of Amen. Jesus is not and cannot be the Amen, not if it means "so be it," as taught by religious leaders today. But more importantly, Jesus proclaimed Amen as the "faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God."

After reading *Future of God Amen*, you will find that the historical evidence that Amen was Egypt's greatest God, a God worshipped as far back as 2,000 BCE, was so honored that His name appears in the throne names of more than thirteen pharaohs since 2,000 BCE, and he represents truth, righteousness, and justice.

To say Jesus is the very image of God is highly inaccurate. This is what you are taught to believe however, and continue with your belief as long as it gives you strength. You have also misquoted God. God did not command that his children love Him. No, God commanded that we—*love one another*. You need to follow the Word of God.

Don L., August 28, 2010, 2:00 a.m. EDT

Our Catholic brethren have insisted upon Revelation being a part of Scriptures because it is a veiled reference to the Eucharist, the Lord's Supper. This is very evident. Let it not go unnoticed by believers. Now if you believe it is worthy to do a daily, or even hourly, oblation to God, then Revelation makes a lot of sense. Otherwise, it is a very

weak document indeed. It just doesn't carry any weight theologically, the idea being that God created the world to destroy it so that mankind could be saved through the second coming. It is just total nonsense! Nobody in their right mind would believe it. If given this message to bring to the unbelieving world, you'd have to reject it as unworthy. They simply won't listen to it and would consider you to be an absolute fool.

Nicholas Ginex, August 28, 2010, 10:34 p.m. EDT

Dear Don L.,

You appear to have the opinion that portions of Revelation in the New Testament are unworthy; its message of a second coming is total nonsense; and anybody that listens to (accepts) it would be considered an absolute fool. Yes, your objections to Revelation have a lot of merit. However, the point of my post was not to dispute certain portions of Revelation but to reveal to God-loving people, especially those of the Christian faith, that Jesus Christ proclaimed in Revelation 3:14:

These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness,
the beginning of the creation of God.

If Jesus proclaims Amen is "the beginning of the creation of God," should you believe him or the religious leaders who have misconstrued and misinterpreted the words of Jesus? It is clear that Jesus was knowledgeable about the Egyptian God Amen. But unfortunately, religious leaders are fearful that their Scriptures would be questioned because they would have to acknowledge that God first introduced Himself to man as Amen.

Do you agree with the words of Jesus and the conclusion substantiated in *Future of God Amen*? That is, Amen is—*the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.*

Don L., August 28, 2010, 2:12 a.m. EDT

Listen to the words of Jesus: "I have come that they might have life, and have it more abundantly."

His mission is crystal clear! It doesn't have anything to do with the literal ending of the world.

Nicholas Ginex, August 28, 2010, 11:00 p.m. EDT

Dear Don L.,

Nowhere in my post did I refer to the end of the world. But you need to clearly understand the *new command* given by Jesus Christ. It was stated three times in John's Gospel—*love one another*. Religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic faiths have sorely neglected to preach the Word of God—*love one another*. It is for this reason alone that the religions themselves have caused more bigotry, hate, violence, and killing of innocent human beings. And why? Because these religions, as demonstrated today by misguided Muslims, have an agenda of greed, power, and domination over the hearts and minds of God's children, the brothers and sisters of our world.

I have just posted an article that reveals the threat of Muslim fanatics under the title *Why Future of God Amen?* Your comments will be most welcomed.

Don L., August 29, 2010, 12:08 a.m. EDT

Well, thanks, Nicholas. I appreciate your helping me to understand your position on the Great Amen. I've never heard anyone else speak on this before. I can't think of any other objections than the ones I've mentioned. I have always felt that Egyptian culture had some kind of secret knowledge and assumed it to be mathematical or scientific, but no one has so simply stated what that thing might have been. I'm willing to consider the Amen (It has a striking resemblance to the I AM that God refers to himself as, now that you mention it).

Pardon me if I seemed to be on the defense. I just wanted you to be clear about what you believed. I have learned from listening to others, and your voice is certainly one that is worth hearing.

There are so many crackpots out there. One can never be sure who to trust and who to avoid. I may have misjudged you and wanted to say I'm sorry.

Thanks, Don

Nicholas Ginex, August 29, 2010, 8:40 p.m. EDT

Dear Don,

I am deeply touched by your response and apology. You are truly a man with a kind heart who also seeks the truth. I respect your beliefs in the God you worship, for although we all visualize God in a different way, it is the same God.

Beliefs, however, may from time to time need to be revised with new knowledge we acquire about ourselves and our past. It is not sacrilegious to question your beliefs and see them in a more positive and truthful way. I contend that by accepting the truths of our heritage, our legacy given to us by the ancient Egyptians, we will have a clearer understanding and appreciation for our beliefs.

Very few people have read about the discoveries brought to light by Egyptologists, and I admit, it was not until I read James H. Breasted's *A History of Egypt* that I was able to connect the dots of the many books I have read on religion. I thank you for your ability to receive new information. Your criticisms are appreciated because it offers me other perspectives to consider. I am not a know-it-all but one who is willing to consider new information, evaluate it, and either reject it or modify my thoughts to something more concrete and acceptable. To not do so, I would be making a fool of myself, and I don't like to be made a fool of.

Thank you again for your willingness to understand not me, but the information I have been able to gather and share with others. The book *Future of God Amen* will be available for sale by the third or fourth week of September. However, I will be honored to send you an autographed copy. Just e-mail me your address to: nickginex@gmail.com

Keep in touch with me. We can learn a lot from each other.

Why Future of God Amen?

August 28, 2010, 06:35 p.m. EDT

This question is extremely relevant today as we witness bigotry, hatred, violence, and the killing of innocent human beings in many countries throughout the world. We have only to view the photos of misguided Muslims on the Internet who have demonstrated on the streets of London, England. Below is a commentary by a Londoner who fears worse to come:

“These pictures were shown on British TV—and of course there was the usual National Front and other groups trying to get at the demonstrators—held back of course by the police because everyone has a right to “demonstrate.” However, the ones trying to stop these marches were the ones stopped from doing so by our own police! I am afraid England has been “taken over” and this is the feeling of most rational people. Unfortunately, it has come to the point where one cannot make any remarks which might be construed as derogatory. These people can shout remarks at us, but we cannot retaliate or we will be arrested for not being “pc,” which stands for politically correct.”

The hate and violence demonstrated on the signs of Muslim religious fanatics loudly proclaim the following:

“Behead those who insult Islam!”

“Islam will dominate the world.”

“Europe is the cancer, Islam is the answer.”

“Exterminate those who slander Islam.”

“Freedom go to hell!”

“Be prepared for the real holocaust!”

“Europe, you will pay. Your 9/11 is on its way!”

Religious leaders of the Islamic countries must stop advocating bigotry, hatred, violence, and the killing of innocent human beings in the name of Allah.

This is not the message of God.

The author of *Future of God Amen* has written a very timely book which presents the historical development of man’s belief in God. The reasons for writing the book are provided below:

Why this Book?

- ▶ Inform people that the soul, truth, righteousness, justice, a hereafter, the God Amen, and Son of God were developed by the religion of ancient Egypt.
- ▶ Reveal that Jesus Christ acknowledged Amen in Revelation 3:14 as “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.”
- ▶ Motivate religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions to accept Amen as a common bond to work together for religious unity.
- ▶ Energize religious leaders to eliminate separatism between their religions and prevent the loss of belief in God by a more discerning people.
- ▶ Assist Judaic, Christian, and Islamic unification efforts. As an aid, copies of this book have been mailed to 123 religious leaders.
- ▶ Initiate a Council for Religious Unity that provides a forum for Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders to unify their beliefs with the assistance of daughters and sons of God.
- ▶ Emphasize religious leaders are required to teach our sisters and brothers, from every nation, to love and support one another.
- ▶ Base religious beliefs with truth about their beginnings so that faith and science will advance on a parallel path in the quest to know God.
- ▶ Encourage religious leaders to preserve the spiritual nature of mankind. A silent position will continue bigotry, hatred, violence,

and invite terrorism that threatens the very survival of human life and indeed, our planet.

Future of God Amen challenges religious leaders and their followers to follow the Word of God—*love one another*. Upon an objective critique of the Torah, the New Testament, and the Koran, the author presents recommendations that courageous Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders will implement with the assistance of perceptive daughters and sons of God who are guided with love of humanity.

Place an Internet search on *Future of God Amen*. View press releases and Web sites to view book reviews, a brief overview, and an opportunity to buy this book. It provides recommendations and hope for our future. Such hope is found in Gerald Massey Poems, page 355.

When man to man shall be a friend and brother
 And this old world shall be a happy home,
 And all Earth's family loves one another!
 Hope on, hope ever.

Future of God Amen will be available for sale in the third or fourth week of September 2010.

Comments and Responses

John Doyle, August 28, 2010, 6:41 p.m. EDT

God existed before religion and will exist after or perhaps in spite of it.

Nicholas Ginex, August 28, 2010, 11:29 p.m. EDT

Dear John,

You are correct. It was the spirit of mankind that came to acknowledge God before the formation of organized religions. However, you must give credit where credit is due. It was the Priesthood of Amon, during the reign of Ramses II, that wrote scripture extolling *Amon as the Sole God*. Few people know that it was in ancient Egypt that man conceived the belief in one universal God. *Future of God Amen* provides a historical development of how the Egyptians conceived the concepts

of a soul, truth, righteousness, justice, a hereafter, one universal God, and a Son of God.

Let us be open to investigating our past and acknowledging the contributions made by the Egyptians. To do otherwise is to forfeit an opportunity to gain knowledge.

Col. George W., August 28, 2010, 10:40 p.m. EDT

Islam is not just a religion, it is a system of government.

John Doyle, August 28, 2010, 11:36 p.m. EDT

Col. George, with respect, I don't think you play with a full deck

Nicholas Ginex, August 28, 2010, 11:42 p.m. EDT

Yes, it is clear that it is the religious leaders that control the hearts and minds of Muslims. The Koran is replete with statements made by the "We Group" who speak for God. It is the We Group that incites bigotry, hate, violence, and murder of those who do not follow the worship of Allah. Islamic religious leaders are responsible for misleading and corrupting the minds of their own people with tribal doctrines that are an abomination to free people around the world.

Col. George W., August 28, 2010, 11:52 p.m. EDT

Probably not, John, but that don't stop me from telling you like it is.

Is the Future of God Amen Viable?

January 16, 2010, 10:58 p.m. EST

This post has been written in response to a comment that people should be free to choose their own belief in God based upon their own individual experiences. In answer to this position, I came to reason that we need and can benefit from the spiritual legacy we have inherited from the past, a legacy we should all honor and be proud of. My thoughts may give you food for thought. It is another view of the past that has not been revealed and ignored by religious men of God.

Following a read of the commentary below, I would like your comments to some questions. Should we retain and build upon the original God Amen? Should we continue the separate beliefs taught by Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders? Should everybody conceive their own set of beliefs and idea of God? Should the belief in God be eliminated for reason, which appears to be the argument of elitist minds? Finally, is there hope that daughters and sons of God can assist religious leaders to honor and worship the God Amen in the future?

Here are some thoughts about belief in a God concept. There are those who believe that people will learn on their own by their individual experience; it should be a personal choice that should not be forced upon anybody. This is good for people with a fair amount of intelligence and a pure heart, for they may be able to develop a high level of morality. But this is a possibility that is open-ended because people will have many different perspectives and standards as to what comprises a moral standard to live by.

I contend that, as always, we learn from the past. We have learned from the trials and errors, experiences, and wonderful ideas handed down to us by good and honest-thinking people. Without the books they have generated for us to learn about the past and to pass on the

knowledge they have acquired, we would still be in the Dark Ages. If not the Dark Ages, we would be at odds with each other, because simply by making our own choices, the belief in God will elude us from a common direction of mental and emotional growth.

I have met many people who have no religion they care to follow, but yet they do develop a religion consisting of their own beliefs. But even these beliefs are but pieces of a formalized set of beliefs developed within religions many thousands of years ago. So what happens is we have a mixture of beliefs that are not necessarily in concert with each other. We have only to compare the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic beliefs and we find they cannot agree on the same set of beliefs even though they all pray to the same God. Worse yet, their separatism has resulted in hatred, bigotry, violence, and the murder of human beings in the name of God. Isn't this a sad reality?

I fear that leaving people up to contriving their own belief system will only cause even more confusion because they may not have had any sound grounding or basis of righteousness taught and passed on to them from the past.

Again, I think we agree that we learn from the past. But we must be able to be objective and honest to understand how we are related to and can learn from the past. I have written *Future of God Amen* to inform the public of a legacy we have inherited from the past. It is a wonderful legacy that has been ignored by religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. That legacy is "the beginning of the creation of God Amen." Religious leaders are not proud of the fact that it was the Priesthood of Amon that first introduced Amen as the one universal God. Religious leaders are fearful that to admit this truth, they will compromise the dogma they have been teaching for centuries. But this is a foolish view, because by acknowledging the truth, they will find that they all have a common bond—an opportunity to initiate an effort to work together and unify their scriptures. This is an idealistic hope on my part. However, that is why the book *Future of God Amen* has a subtopic that calls for daughters and sons of God; they are the youth of tomorrow that are not trapped within the religious dogma that religious leaders cling to. In fact, the subtitle of the book is "A Call to Daughters and Sons of God." New ideas from honest, loving, and perceptive daughters and sons, children of God, are needed to help assist religious leaders, whose minds are trapped in a cage of dogma they cannot let go of.

I end this exposition by stating that the past can be very valuable because courageous and perceptive men and women have dedicated their lives and sacrificed their time to pass on worthy information and ideas that we today can benefit by. I do not believe that by throwing the baby and bath water into the fire serves any good purpose. The concept of God that originated from thousands of years of development should not be thrown aside because of the corruption and deception of the religions now in power today. Amen was regarded as the God of truth in addition to the many attributes described in *Future of God Amen*.

When will religious leaders of the three major religions be willing to acknowledge the truth proclaimed by Jesus Christ that Amen was “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.” People will be open to the truth that God first introduced Himself as Amen in Egypt and then profoundly influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. This is a legacy to honor. It is how mankind first conceived God and gave birth to the spiritual beliefs we follow today.

Please return to the second paragraph and let me know your thoughts, pro or con, on the questions provided. We can learn from each other. To inquire about *Future of God Amen*, place an Internet search on the title. Knowledge is a wonderful gift.

Comments and Responses

Richard Regener, January 17, 2010, 1:47 a.m. EST

Well written post, my friend.

I hope for your sake, you're right, Nicholas. You already have my views on the subject.

Gary (The Eclectic) Timothy, January 17, 2010, 1:35 p.m. EST

You are mistaken that Jews and Christians pray to the same God. The Christian God is Trinary while the Jewish God is not. Christians pray to a God that contains Jesus as the Christ, Savior, etc., as one facet of a three-faceted God. Jews do not. Their gods are different, *not* the same.

Nicholas Ginex, January 17, 2010, 11:34 p.m. EST

Hello Gary,

As you know, the Bible contains the Old and New Testament, which is the source document for the belief in the one God. That God is the same God worshipped by Jews and Christians. However, the Christian Church leaders have extended the belief in God to include a Man of God, Jesus Christ. Why this is so has started with the Gospels written by Jewish holy men. A plausible answer as to the growth of the Christian religion from the Jewish religion has been presented in the book *Future of God Amen*. There is every reason to believe that the Christians honor and worship the same God as the Jews.

You mention the Trinity. This concept was promulgated by Pope John Paul II in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* as “the mystery of one God in three persons: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit” (2nd Ed., Page 902). Further, the Church claims the mystery of the Trinity was revealed by Jesus Christ, the divine Son of the eternal Father. Close inspection of the Gospels will show that the Church fathers have overextended themselves, because Jesus never claimed that he was part of the Holy Spirit and God, the Father.

The attempt by Christian religious leaders to raise Jesus to the level of a God has been successful; just as the Roman leaders were successful in making Julius Caesar into a God upon his death. But *Future of God Amen* describes that the Church became more powerful by the time the fourth Gospel was written, and it is the only Gospel where others, not Jesus, explicitly state he is the Son of God six times. In all four Gospels, Jesus stated he was the Son of Man seventy-six times.

So, Gary, what we have is the same God being interpreted differently to bring in a man, who I would say was spiritually but not physically—a Son of God. By the way, it was Jewish holy men who conceived the Holy Spirit. So the Jews believe in at least two of the three entities worshipped by Christians.

What about Islamic worshippers and their worship of God? They pray to Allah, which is reverence to one God. But this is the same Jewish-Christian God Muhammad envisioned, except that Islamic religious leaders claim that their Koran is one better revelation given to them through God’s intermediary, the archangel Gabriel.

There is ample proof that the God worshipped by the three major religions have their roots in the religious beliefs developed by the Egyptian Priesthood of Amon. Their God was conceived thousands of years before Moses walked out of Egypt. The concept of one, universal God Amen was documented in their scripture, *Amon as the Sole God* in 1270 BCE, and it became fixed in the mind of Moses before he left Egypt.

Therefore, there should be no doubt that the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions have a common bond, the God Amen. In fact, we know that worshipers of the three major religions all announce Amen at the end of a prayer, supplication, or the giving of thanks and praise to God. There can be only one God. We all agree on that, if we believe in God at all. This one God Amen has been adopted by people from different countries to bring order and a standard of morality. Yes, these people have given their God other names, or another perception, or simply call God Allah, which means God (no name).

I recommend, Gary, that you consider reading *Future of God Amen* and become knowledgeable as to why Jesus Christ proclaimed that Amen is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.”

Yes, Gary, God is interpreted differently by the three major religious leaders—but their God was derived from the *same* God Amen.

Gary (The Eclectic) Timothy, January 18, 2010, 12:00 a.m. EST

Oh my goodness! This is such a simple concept! I am quite amazed that you cannot seem to comprehend it.

Whatever the origin of the Gods of the Jews and the Christians, those Gods are now defined quite differently. How you can deny that the Gods worshiped by Jews and Christian are different, and vastly so, is beyond me. You seem to think that the concept of a God before the Jewish and Christian split is the one we are talking about with both religions. *No!* We are talking present day, here and now, not some concept that even in the distant past was disagreed upon.

This “same” God that you claim could only be one and the same for both religions if you assume that that God actually exists and is independent of Jewish and Christian views of him/her/it. That assumption is highly debatable in and of itself.

The New Testament has Jesus being resurrected after death by crucifixion. This makes a major difference in the definition of God from Jewish vs. Christian perspectives. And it is key to the difference in the Gods that they separately believe in and worship.

Try telling your contention to Christian and Jewish leaders and maybe Islamic leaders too, just for laughs. Then get back to me.

Nicholas Ginex, January 18, 2010, 2:57 a.m. EST

Hi Gary,

You miss the whole point that the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions have their beginnings with the beliefs that originated in Egypt. The God common to the three major religions is the God Amen. Do you think it is some freak accident that the leaders and worshipers of these religions all announce Amen at the end of a prayer, supplication, thanks, or praise to God? Think a little bit about the reverence they still have for the name Amen. If Jesus Christ proclaimed that Amen was “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God,” you have verification by a man of truth that Amen was man’s initial acceptance in the belief of one universal God.

Oh my goodness! This simple idea, or shall I say finding, by Egyptologists that Amen was introduced to the Hebrews must be very hard for you to accept.

There is no debate as to whether God exists as an It, Her, or a He. I believe nobody knows. God is incomprehensible, unknowable, and mysterious. It is a belief that we envision in our minds. For many people, that belief is real. For others, who know it all, they laugh at the idea that one should even think there is a God. What I am trying to convey to you and other intelligent individuals is that we have inherited a legacy from the past; this legacy was developed after many, many years of trial and error. God evolved from very simple worship of the wonders around us to be the *Creator of all there is*. You may laugh and deny this wonderful idea. The world consists of many ideas. Can you come up with one to replace the concept of God? I am sure you have an idea that is much better than the one that has evolved over thousands of years.

Yes, Jewish, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders will strongly deny the idea that their religion began with the beliefs of a very spiritual

people—the Egyptians. It would challenge their dogmas, lies, deceit, and myths that the God *Amen is the beginning of the creation of God*. Would they laugh? I think not. They will react with the same reaction you permit yourself. They will not open their minds to the *truth* that Amen has had a profound influence on the development of their religions.

That is why in the book *Future of God Amen*, I have made several recommendations for the religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions to accept the perceptions of our youth, daughters and sons of God; children of God who are motivated with love of humanity, integrity, and a deep conviction to seek *truth*. It is natural for religious leaders to fight against the *truth* that has surfaced only one hundred years ago by the findings of Egyptologists. But because of their inability to tolerate other views of the same God (Hey, there can only be one God), they will only continue to incite hatred, bigotry, violence, and the murder of innocent human beings.

The religious leaders of the major religions should honor the fact that their religion stems from one common bond, Amen. If they continue to deny that fact, their religions will not only be a threat to the world by encouraging the next war, they will kill their opportunity to retain the legacy they have inherited from a wonderful civilization—the belief in God.

I end this dissertation by asking you, if you do not believe in God, how will you recommend people live to some high level of morality? Should we all make up our own standards of righteousness? Do you think you are capable of instructing those you love with the attributes of integrity, honesty, and truth? Or are you happily pursuing your own intellectual dreams of being a very wise and honest man?

There are a number of questions for a man of your intellect. Can you answer them all or will you laugh and say, “It’s too simple for me to waste my time on?”

Good luck!

Gary (The Eclectic) Timothy, January 18, 2010, 5:51 p.m. EST

I think you are missing *my* point! And at the same time, you are making my point for me! Please try to wrap your head around this.

You obviously believe in a God that was the basis of the Christian, Jewish, and Islamic faiths. But Christians believe in a Trinary God, not *your* God. Jews believe in a God that is *not* Trinary. How in the world can you continue to say that these things/gods are the same?

You can only do this if you insist on the assumption that *your* God, as you have defined him, is *the* one and only true God. But there are many, many, many folks that would disagree with you. And you can only do this if you insist on the assumption that *your* God actually exists. As I have stated before, this is quite debatable. Your assumptions, sir, do not make a valid logical basis to argue from in the first place. By *your own words*: “God is incomprehensible, unknowable, and mysterious.” So, what makes *you* think you know the unknowable?

The Gods that Jews, Christians, and Muslims have invented are different. Pure and simple. Their concepts of that God construct are different. Their Gods are defined differently. You say that there can be only one God. But this again is highly debatable by many religious leaders. For one example, Mormons believe that each and every one of them can become a god, and that there are many other gods on many other “Earths” throughout the universe. To think that you alone are privy to the truth of the one true God is hubris in its most extreme form. I have to leave it at that.

As to morality, science has shown time and again that moral behavior has arisen over time in concert with survival strategies within the context of evolution. Morality is a biological behavioral adaptation, so to speak, that becomes prevalent in social groupings naturally without the aid of any supernatural influence whatsoever.

I believe that I am every bit as moral as you are! I don’t happen to believe in an invisible supernatural Being. That doesn’t make me any less honest, any less honorable, any less truthful, any less loving, any less devoted to kindness, any less moral at all! If you read the articles I have written here on Gather, I hope you will find that I am indeed moral. There are many societies, both past and present, that do not accept or believe in your God. And yet they are as moral as you and have no difficulty teaching their children to be moral.

If you could only see, by your own study of religious history, that it is man who created God, not the other way around, then you would be closer to the truth, my friend. If you study the big picture of the

history of civilization and mankind himself, you should be able to see clearly that man has always attempted to explain the unknown with supernatural things he didn't understand. The ancient Greeks and Romans finally outgrew their gods, like Zeus, Jupiter, Hera, etc. But why were they invented in the first place? To explain things they didn't understand. But it turns out that gods are not explanatory at all. They never have been and they never will be.

You need to learn some science, my friend. Science is self-correcting and has given mankind the tools to investigate and understand himself and his environment. It has a stellar track record so far. And it has given me and many others solid reasons to trust its process. Religion, on the other hand, simply cops out with explanations like God is mysterious, unknowable, etc.!

Good luck to *you!*

Nicholas Ginex, January 18, 2010, 7:48 p.m. EST

Hello Gary,

I am glad you agree with the fact that God is a concept created by man. You have simply repeated what I have been saying by stating, "If you could only see, by your own study of religious history, that it is man who created God, not the other way around, then you would be closer to the truth, my friend. If you study the big picture of the history of civilization and mankind himself, you should be able to see clearly that man has always attempted to explain the unknown with supernatural things he didn't understand." Bravo, bravo! Gary, you do understand what I have been saying, but I think you like to feel it sounds better when you say it.

Again, let me impress upon your thinking mind that what I have been writing about. It seems you are hung up on the idea that there are multiple gods, each different from the other for the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. Yes, you're correct; they do have different points of view of their God. But what you fail to understand is that their God originally evolved from the God Amen. Think about this sentence before you go off on another tangent.

What I have tried to do is inform you about a past civilization that eventually evolved the concept of one universal God. That God, my

friend, is Amen. *Future of God Amen* was written to inform people of the history of the beginning, development, and future of God. Many people like to be defensive about their religion and will not admit that it was the Egyptian Priesthood of Amon that first originated the concept of one God. Then there are people, like yourself, who do not believe in the concept of God at all. Perhaps you believe that the first atom came into existence by itself or that the idea of energy, unknown to us, may have initiated the beginning of matter.

We are familiar with Einstein's equation that $E=mc^2$. There is a relation between matter and energy; which came first seems to be residing on the side of Energy. We do not know how the universe was created. There are scientists that subscribe to the theory of the big bang. I, for one, think otherwise, that the universe is self-sustaining because if we have quasars and pulsars that release matter and energy back into the universe and stars are born through the process of gravity—you don't need a big bang from a giant ball of matter. But I digress. Back to the idea of God—I don't know the answers as to the creation of the universe and life forms. I am inclined to think it was Energy, or shall we agree on God for want of a better term? This energy or God is presently unknowable, incomprehensible, and mysterious to our very resourceful minds, including me.

To me, there are reasons why a belief in God can be advantageous for the stability of a civilization. Again, I only want you to wrap your head around the idea that the three major religions have evolved from one another and the initial cause for their development was the concept of the universal God Amen developed by the Egyptian Priesthood of Amon. Sure, religious leaders will deny the findings that have been revealed to us over the past one hundred years by Egyptologists. They are fearful that their dogma, their scriptures, will then be questioned to the degree that people will be able to "see" the lies and deceptions even more clearly.

That is why I wrote *Future of God Amen*, to give religious leaders an opportunity to adhere to the truth that their beliefs originated with the worship of Amen. Let me repeat this, for you overlook the words of a very honest and respected Man of God, Jesus, who proclaimed Amen is "the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God."

I believe we both agree on many points regarding the existence of God. I only want to pass on knowledge about the past that few people

are aware of. To know how we came to believe in God is a first step in learning to understanding ourselves. Do you agree that Amen and Egyptian beliefs introduced to the Hebrews were the catalyst that profoundly influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions? Before you answer, remember what Jesus said and the fact that Amen has been instilled in the minds of men as they continue to announce his name in temples, churches, and mosques.

Nicholas Ginex, January 18, 2010, 11:13 p.m. EST

Dear Gary,

Thank you for conceding that we only disagree about the Gods being different for the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. The answer that the Gods are distinctly different and bear no resemblance to each other is what nobody who is a student of history can agree on.

Yes, I agree that the religious leaders of these major religions have adopted other perspectives of God to create a new perspective that will generate an increasing number of followers in a new belief.

We can agree that the Hebrew God is the same Father of the Christian God, because that is why the Bible provides an Old and New Testament. What has happened was that after the Jewish-Roman war, which started in May 66 CE and ended by September 8, 70 CE, the Jewish nation of Israel was totally destroyed, its people decimated and scattered. Flavius Josephus estimated that over 1,100,000 Jews died and 97,000 were captured. It was during this period and after that the Gospels were written by Jewish holy men to preserve the one treasure and precious identity of their people—the belief in one universal God.

So here we have the Jewish God is the Father of the Christian God, which Christian religious leaders, who are Jewish, have held on to. But there was one key change that Jewish holy men made because the Jewish nation no longer existed. It was holy Jewish men of the peaceful Essene sect that had the perception that to keep their religion intact they had to open up their religion to the Gentiles. The Essenes survived over the Pharisees and Sadducees, who comprised the Zealot uprising, which ended in complete disaster for Israel. So now, Jewish holy men used the death of Jesus Christ, a man that had a great following, was loved for his acceptance of other people, and

who was willing to challenge the Torah and reduce it to a very simple commandment—*love one another*.

What happened with the Jewish God was that now the new Christian religion took the Son of Man, Jesus Christ, and raised him to a level of a God. Note that the Trinity did not exist during the composition of the Gospels and Revelation. This was a concept developed by the Church fathers to strengthen the new religion and belief in God. So we have a God that now has a Son of God.

You can see that the God of the Hebrews and the Christians are interrelated except that the Jews, being the chosen ones, still object to the idea that Jesus is the Son of God. This is an understandable objection, for there are people who believe that Jesus was the Son of God spiritually not genetically.

There is no doubt that the Islamic God is the same one God that the Jews worship; there is no Trinity involved. However, the Islamic religious leaders generated their own scripture for the same God. So as you can see, we do not truly have three distinct Gods. What we do have are different groups of people that interpret the same God differently. The underlying, common bond of their God is Amen. Again, Jesus Christ let the world know the truth that Amen is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.”

Again, you should be able to see that the three major religions have their roots in the religious and moral beliefs of the Egyptians and their God Amen.

Son of God or Son of Man?

March 14, 2011, 07:47 p.m. EDT

Christians have been taught that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and even conceive Him as God. But rarely do the Church leaders ever refer to Jesus as the Son of Man. In all four Gospels, Jesus explicitly states he is the Son of Man seventy-six times, and only in the last Gospel of John, others, not Jesus, state six times that he is the Son of God.

Why should we think about these two terms unless there is reason to believe that Jesus was a man of God in spirit but not in substance? Before we examine why Jesus predominately referred to himself as the Son of Man, it is instructive to find out where this phrase was first introduced into the minds of men. In my research efforts to unravel how man first came to conceive God, I found that the Egyptians used Son of Man as far back as the fifth dynasty. Use of the phrase was made by Ptahhotep in his extraordinary work titled *The Maxims of Good Discourse*. He was the vizier of King Djed-Ka-Re Izezi whose reign started around 2683 BCE (Breasted's Chronological Table of Kings in *A History of Egypt*).

In Maxim 35 of Good Discourse, we find "the good deed profits the son-of-man." In this same discourse, Ptahhotep's Epilogue on Listening states, "If the son-of man accepts his father's words, no plan of his will go wrong." Two thousand years later, around 593-560 BCE, the Hebrew prophet Ezekiel used this expression extensively when the Lord spoke to him. This background use of Son of Man clearly shows that the Hebrews were highly influenced by the culture and religion of ancient Egypt. The use of many Egyptian phrases, ideas, and beliefs in other parts of the Bible has been identified in *Future of God Amen*. An overview of the book may be read by placing an Internet search on the title.

Now that we have seen where the phrase Son of Man originated, we will examine why Son of God is also used to refer to Jesus. The Gospels of Matthew and Luke told of Mary's conception by the Holy Spirit of God and that upon birth, he was to be called Jesus. However, throughout the Gospels of Mark, Matthew, and Luke, Jesus always referred to himself as the Son of Man. The most controversial yet most inspiring Gospel of John opens with the following statement:

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that was made. In Him was life; and the life was the light of men . . . And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld His glory, the glory as the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

The inspiring words of John promote the idea that Jesus is not only the Son of God, but also God. This interpretation is due to the Church fathers equating the *Word* with Jesus because they believe he existed in the beginning and was made in flesh. It is this Gospel that has led the Church fathers to create the concept of the Trinity as *the mystery of one God in three persons: Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit*. But this fabrication of Jesus as being co-equal with God and the Holy Spirit is a gross error by the Church fathers and, perhaps, a grievous form of heresy. In the passage below, Jesus states that the *Word* is from his Father so that he cannot be the *Word*.

He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings: and the Word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me. These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you. (John 14:24-26)

Therefore, it should be clear that the Church fathers have misinterpreted and misconstrued John's opening verse, that is, the Word is God and not Jesus. Further, this opening verse agrees with Genesis in the Old Testament that "in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." John's verse goes on to say that God was life and the light of men, which was made flesh (by His Holy Spirit conceiving Jesus within Mary's womb), and he dwelt among us full of grace and truth. But what is the Word? It was announced three times as the last command of God in John's Gospel: *love one another*.

The above passage spoken by Jesus clearly indicates three distinct entities: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. However, Jesus does not say he is the Son of God or is an extension of God. Jesus emphasizes that he is not God by stating in John 14:28, *“I go unto my Father: for my Father is greater than I.”*

To further emphasize that Jesus always referred to himself as the Son of Man, the most precious yet overlooked statement made by Him has been ignored by Christian religious leaders. In John 14:12, Jesus states, *“Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do.”* This statement verifies that Jesus was a *Son of Man* because he says there will be *other Sons of God* that will do greater works than Him. This means that by righteous actions other sons (and daughters) will become children of God by following the Word. Therefore Jesus became a *Son of God* through His works and was not with God at the beginning of Creation.

Another reason why worshippers can appreciate why Jesus is a Son of Man is the laborious genealogy presented in Matthew 1:1-25 and Luke 3:23-38 that emphasizes Jesus is from the line of Abraham and David. This genealogy confirms that Jesus is definitely a descendant from man, and he proudly exclaims this fact in Revelation 22:16, *“I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things said in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.”*

The belief that Jesus is co-equal to God was formulated in 325 CE at the Council of Nice, where Emperor Constantine convened around 220 bishops that agreed upon the Nicene Creed. It states that the Father and Son are co-equal and co-eternal; this disagrees with the words of Jesus, *“My Father is greater than I.”* The new dogma was extended to include the Holy Spirit in 381 CE by the Catholic Church at the Council of Constantinople. Together they defined the Trinity as one God consisting of three persons: the Father, the Son Jesus, and the Holy Spirit. This fabrication of the Trinity has caused the Church to be plagued for centuries for promulgating a concept that has caused many discerning believers to lose faith in God as the Creator of all there is.

Given the above information, would you agree that the Church fathers have committed a gross distortion of the truth by promulgating Jesus

as co-equal with God and existing in the beginning? Or do you believe Jesus was a *Son of Man* who became a *Son of God* spiritually? Also, to consider all aspects of the Bible, do you believe Jesus was conceived by God's Holy Spirit within the womb of Mary and became God's son by disseminating His Word—*love one another*? Perhaps you may have an alternative view you wish to express.

Comments and Responses

Jay Breeding, March 13, 2011, 10:17 p.m. EDT

Hello Nicholas,

I hope all is going well. Actually, I read your previous post that was the longer version of this. I have two questions for you: (1) In your opinion, why was Jesus crucified? (2) What was Jesus's purpose?

Nicholas Ginex, March 13, 2011, 11:08 p.m. EDT

Hello Jay,

Yes, I have given these two questions much thought. First, let us look at the second question, which is in the order of life for Jesus. Again, as you so graciously framed the question, in my opinion, the purpose of Jesus was His entire mission, to teach the Word of God. It was in the Gospel of John that Jesus gave the last command of God three times—*love one another*. This is the Word of God but rarely taught by our Christian leaders. Yes, they refer to love thy neighbor as you would have them love you or do unto others as you would have others do unto you. However, these commands do not simply equate to love your sisters and brothers from every nation.

The second question is a controversial one and the answer may be found in the book *Future of God Amen*. I will briefly indicate to you that Jesus did not contrive His own crucifixion, but it was ordained by the Hebrew priests who were highly concerned that Jesus was a threat to their Holy Book with His more simplified sayings and miracles. Jesus was born through the inception of Mary by God's Spirit, the Holy Ghost. Jesus's mission was to deliver the Word of God to humanity. Regarding sins, people will always be prone to sin for it is part of growing up till finally one matures and makes wise decisions in life.

For Jesus to die for sins to be forgiven is a teaching of the Church fathers. The idea of dying for our sins was not the purpose of Jesus; it was to give us the Word of God.

Thomas R., March 14, 2011, 12:45 a.m. EDT

Nicholas, I see confusion in your reasoning. Jesus is both! God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit exist as *one* God! God sent His only Son to grow in an embryo of Mary to become a human baby. He *is* the Son of God, but for the sake of symbolism and to be accepted by human beings He had to come to the people He's trying to save as a fellow human being. Being born of a human woman made Him a son of (mankind) man. Jesus is God in human flesh!

He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings: and the Word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me. The word was not of Jesus because God is three persons with three voices. God the Father said it. God the son/Son of Man did not. *Jesus emphasizes that He is not God by stating in John 14:28, "I go unto my Father: for my Father is greater than I."*

While Jesus is on earth in human flesh, Jesus is not at the present on equal grounds with God the father. *I will briefly indicate to you that Jesus did not contrive His own crucifixion.* It had all been planned from the day that man learned sin by eating the forbidden fruit in the Garden of Eden. Everything that happened was preset, like writing a play and watching it get acted out. *The idea of dying for our sins was not the purpose of Jesus; it was to give us the Word of God.*

It was *both!* Jesus died to make atonement for the sins of Adam which freed man from the acts of sacrifice for sin atonement as prescribed in the Old Testament. Jesus clearly says that He did not come to abolish the Old Testament or its laws, but to fulfill them. Jesus's death washed away Adam's original sin. You are born with original sin, then add your sin to our sin with age and actions.

Nicholas Ginex, March 14, 2011, 4:13 p.m. EDT

Hello Thomas,

Thank you for entering this very sensitive discussion. It is clear that you believe Jesus is a Son of God, co-equal to God, was Son of

Man, and you believe in the Trinity that defines Jesus, God, and the Holy Spirit as one God. It is good you have a belief you sincerely are convinced of. I only try to inform you how the Trinity belief was created by the Church fathers many generations after the Gospels were written. Nowhere in the Bible is the Trinity expressed by Jesus. It was created incrementally in 325 CE at the Council of Nice where the Emperor Constantine convened around 220 bishops who agreed upon the Nicene Creed and again in 381 CE by the Catholic Church at the Council of Constantinople to include the Holy Spirit. If you believe the Church fathers are immune to committing a gross error by raising Jesus as a Son of God to be co-equal to, and is God, then you believe the dogma not written in the Bible.

You have taken the words of Jesus and have misinterpreted them because your belief in the Trinity is overwhelming. I am certain that Jesus was saying in truth that “the Word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father’s which sent me.” Continue with what you believe. I have only tried to give you a perspective or words from the Bible you may have overlooked.

Jay Breeding, March 14, 2011, 9:16 a.m. EDT

Hello again, Nicholas.

Yes, I suppose I should have answered your question first. I would have to say my answer would be the same as Thomas’s—He was both. I don’t really see why we have to make a choice between the two just because Jesus had a preference for one phrase to describe Him when it is apparent He accepted both as valid.

My views are pretty much in line with Protestant Church doctrine. Some might say that I am a classic example of a follower being blindly led by the Church leaders. I would say to them that such a reply has become standard and popular among agnostics and liberal thinkers to quickly dismiss long-held truths of God so that they can start over with their own slate of beliefs. In fact, perhaps influenced by the young people and anti-establishment movements of the 1960s and 1970s during my formative years, I was more liberal in my beliefs about God when I became a Christian. Originally, I wanted my Christian beliefs to line up with my worldview. But as time went on, through my own study of the scriptures and the influence of the Holy Spirit and listening to

leaders from both sides of the spectrum, I have come to acknowledge the truths long held by Christians throughout the centuries.

I will also say that I also understand what Darren is saying in his last post. Christ is the central figure in all of scriptures, Old and New Testaments.

With all of that said, I want to say that I do respect your years of study of the Egyptian culture, especially when it comes to their religious beliefs, and so I will not say too much about that, only this—I hope you are not making too much of a period of time when Egypt might have recognized that there was one God, whom they called Amen. I have no doubt that man having all descended from Noah, also a believer in one God, would have passed some of that down from generation to generation regardless of how corrupted it might have become.

And now, if you would be so patient (which you have always shown yourself to be), back to one more question. I would agree with you, Nicholas, that the Jewish religious leaders wanted to kill Jesus because He was disrupting their ideas of the Messiah and their religious system, but what premise do you see them using to demand the death of Jesus? I hardly think that they could justify the death of Jesus to the Romans or their own Jewish people, simply because He taught them to love one another.

Jay Breeding, March 14, 2011, 8:13 p.m. EDT

Greetings again, Nicholas,

Out of respect for you, I will purchase a copy of your book; I just don't yet know when. I am in the process of trying to read many books right now but perhaps I can fit it in as a summer reading. I am a history teacher and I'm sure that whether I will agree with your conclusions or not I will learn some new things from your study.

Actually, I am aware of what many have said about the age of man, but I have read and met highly intelligent men and women educated on the subject who challenge those assertions. Still, I will resign myself to the fact that much more apparent evidence lies in favor of evolutionists. My reasons for rejecting that has more to do with personal experiences since I walk with the Lord than with scientific evidence—experiences

that convince me of the truth and certainty of the Bible. For now, that is all I will say about this. I would like to get back to the one question I asked at the end of the last post before I leave. (I am going to see the Jefferson Memorial with my wife and daughter!) In case you don't remember the question it is this: What reason did the religious leaders use to condemn Jesus to death?

Nicholas Ginex, March 14, 2011, 10:57 p.m. EDT

Hello Jay,

Thank you for deciding to buy *Future of God Amen*. I do hope you get the opportunity to read it over the summer. I am flattered to have your interest, and perhaps you may be able to surface some findings for me to ponder about. In reference to your question "What reason did the religious leaders use to condemn Jesus to death?" I have given an answer in my reply above under "Nicholas Ginex, March 14, 2011, 3:02 p.m. EDT." Unfortunately, it was given in my response to Darren who indicated that Jesus was killed, and I tried to clarify to him that it appeared to me that His mission was not to die for our sins but to teach the Word of God. For ease of reference, I will repeat my reply to Darren below:

"Let me address your argument that Jesus died because He was killed by the parts played by Judas, Peter, and Pilate. These are the players that carried out their roles spoken earlier by Jesus concerning Judas and Peter, and Pilate acted based upon the crowd that were in agreement with the Hebrew priests. What you did not mention was that it was prevailing religious leaders who determined that Jesus must die. The following is an excerpt from *Future of God Amen*, page 264, which provides the truth that Jesus did not voluntarily give His life for the forgiveness of sins but was condemned to death by Hebrew priests."

Excerpt: "There appears to be greater emphasis given by the Church that Jesus died so that sins may be forgiven. This is far from the truth, for it is the Word of God that Jesus wanted us to follow. Instead of Jesus voluntarily dying for our sins, it was the Council of Pharisees and their chief priests that condemned Jesus to death. They feared that the miracle of Jesus raising Lazarus from the dead after four days would cause the people to follow Jesus in great numbers (John 11:52). This fear was expressed by the Council of Pharisees in John 11:47, 48:

“What do we? For this man doeth many miracles. If we let him thus alone, all men will believe him: and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation.”

The High Priest of the Council, Caiaphas stated in John 11:49, 50: “Ye know nothing at all, nor consider it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation (Israel) perish not.” Caiaphas then prophesied that Jesus should die for their nation. From that day forward, the council was determined to put Jesus to death (John 11:53). John’s Gospel therefore clearly indicates it was the High Priest and members of the Council that were intent on killing Jesus as opposed to Jesus giving up His life so that the sins of mankind may be forgiven. He died so that he would be remembered for proclaiming God’s Word to love one another. Jesus emphasizes His message was to deliver God’s words to “love one another.”

If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.
(John 14:23)

A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another;
as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. (John 13:34)

John’s Gospel makes it clear that Jesus’s doctrine was that we must love one another as God had loved Him. The doctrine advocated by the Church that Jesus died for our sins was not taught by Jesus. Rather, this teacher of righteousness was betrayed and crucified because he claimed he was the light of the world and the Pharisees saw Jesus as a threat. They foresaw that God’s new command, the Word to *love one another*, could gain precedence over the Torah and its multiple commands. *End Excerpt.*

“Darren, I took the liberty to go into detail about Jesus’s death because Christian priests emphasize Jesus died for sins to be forgiven, which He never advocated. The greatest legacy Jesus gave to humanity was the Word of God.”

Jay, if you have any justification in the New Testament that Jesus clearly states he will give up his life so that sins may be forgiven, please let me know for it is possible that I may have missed it. The Word of God was the last command given by Jesus in John and he was emphatic for he stated it three times.

Jerry Kays, March 17, 2011, 2:14 a.m. EDT

Nicholas,

I cannot see where, on the surface, that we have disagreement, especially on the Trinity as I understand it (esoterically) and write about it as (+=-) and that being the basic equation of truth, the BET.

But my understanding comes from the subjective (esoteric) experience of the Spirit (=) of *God* in Trinity form (+=-) where *God* the Father would be the (+) and His Creation manifested on earth in human form would be the (-), and once they (we) are “graced,” it is through the Holy Spirit (=) making us feel as if Christ was here, both Son of Man as well as Son of *God* (that in transcending the exoteric dualism to esoteric trinitarianism).

Son of Man who knows *not* yet the Holy Spirit is yet “dualistic” still and “ego” separated from all else, considering itself when secular or religious as either (+) or (-) depending upon how he looks at himself compared with other(s); the secular person would say he is (+) in most cases compared to all others. That comes from either/or pride and/or self-confidence. The orthodox religious person, because they are as yet “un-spiritual” (more literalistic), considers themselves (+) (saved) related to secular man and (-) (sinners) compared to Jesus Christ and God. Both have a void or gap as the (/) between them and whatever opposite dualistic consideration the (+) or (-) that they see “other” as . . . (+/-).

That is “normal” for earth beings prior to their true awakening *into* spiritual realization of the value and their relationship with the spiritual as the (=) where their former ego self (-) moves from dualism (+/-) to trinitariansim (+=-) . . . IMnsHO.

Nicholas Ginex, March 16, 2011, 3:30 p.m. EDT

Hi Jerry,

Liked your comment and my response is below. What does IMnsHO mean?

Jerry Kays, March 16, 2011, 8:05 p.m. EDT

In my not so humble opinion.

Jerry Kays, March 16, 2011, 8:25 p.m. EDT

The love is the most important thing about *God*. Any book or books that preach otherwise, not honoring truth and love as the priority, are not worth one's time and effort.

To place all of one's "eggs" in the one "basket" of one book or even one single "religion" is to be so selective as to deny other equally or more valid truths and in the end will get in your way of finding the highest love and truth.

People will invest their energies into what they think best serves them; by their fruit will they be known. In that there is a vast difference in what different people seem to be seeking in their spiritual quest. As we think, we make our own realities. Some people are very much less discerning than others, and you can often tell by their words and actions. Too many set their goals way too low and are thus locked into the controlling dogma first offered by the religious institutions who wanted to have the position of "middle man" between man and their God . . . seek and find better yet *God*.

Nicholas Ginex, March 17, 2011, 4:41 p.m. EDT

Hello Jerry,

Thank you for the point made that the Zionist orthodox view of rebuilding their temple in Jerusalem is an egocentric one. This is the arrogance that prevails with not only Jews, but also Christians and Muslims. They all believe they have a special and unique relationship to God with their precious scriptures. But although their scriptures have been written by very righteous men whose good intention was to strengthen mankind's belief in the one universal God and live by moral teachings, it is also true that there are myths and inconsistencies that have caused many discerning and loving people to shun the scriptures. This is true because the scriptures are not founded in the truth of the past history of man.

There is a need today for the religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions to acknowledge the past development of man's belief in God. Jesus was a man of truth and revealed words that are ignored, misinterpreted, and misconstrued. In Revelation 3:14, Jesus stated for "all those that hath an ear" that Amen is "*the faithful and*

true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.” When religious leaders stop believing that their religion and scripture are the only way to God but are instead only a beginning in man’s quest to know God, then there may be a breakthrough and enlightenment to initiate a Religious Renaissance to revise their scriptures and bring about a unified belief in God.

Unless this effort is accomplished with the assistance of daughters and sons of God, for religious leaders need the perceptiveness and love felt in their hearts and minds, the religions will continue to breed bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent human beings. All people on this earth have an obligation to pressure their religious leaders to *wake up*, get off their ego trip and silent position, and teach the *Word of God*—love one another. For a comprehensive read how man first conceived one universal God and how that God has profoundly influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions, click on *Future of God Amen*.

Jerry Kays, March 18, 2011, 3:45 a.m. EDT

Nicholas,

I agree wholeheartedly with you on all of that.

Darren (L., March 17, 2011, 12:58 a.m. EDT

I agree with your core idea, and I think we are moving in the right direction here. The unifying religion is already here; it’s been here all along. When God said He was putting all things under one name, that is what we are to do also.

When Buddha put his attention on his breath, he came to a revelation: the one breath. This is that breath of life that God breathed into Adam. Islam is correct that Jesus is a prophet; He was a man. It was His anointing with the name that makes His story so valuable. His story is the one that embeds truth.

This story is not new as Odin had the same story; he too hung on a tree sacrificing himself to himself. He was also pierced with a spear; he too brought communion to his people. He hung for nine days while Christ hung the square root of the same.

I don't believe in a God as you describe. I believe that we are evolving out of the darkness of lower life forms. At one time, my direct ancestors worshipped the lightning God; they recognized his vast power, and now we harness this God to power our world. The lightning God did not change, but our understanding of him did.

We are not far from space or the Godhead. Just a small search will reveal that we are already augmenting our evolution. We are not acting in an unnatural manor. This is our nature and an overview of history shows this. The USA is like the Rome of old, as was the British Empire. China is about to give birth to the world's largest middle class. When you look at how our middle class transformed the world, you can imagine the impact of the coming wave.

Nicholas Ginex, March 17, 2011, 5:59 p.m. EDT

Hello Darren,

Thank you for staying with us on questions of God and perhaps solutions for the future. You wrote that the unifying religion is already here. Can you identify which religion is that? Somehow that effort of unification seems to elude me. The religious leaders are silent. Their minds are locked in a cage of dogmas that they cannot revise with views of greater perception. You wrote, "When God said He was putting all things under one name, that is what we are to do also." I was reminded that Jesus did acknowledge the name of God that was responsible for the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. Can you accept the words of Jesus when he said in Revelation 3:14 that Amen is "*the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God?*"

Our direct ancestors conceived the first belief in one universal God in ancient Egypt. The Hebrews borrowed that belief and embellished it within the Torah. Still, God is far from being understood and known for we humans have only the glimmer of God conceived within our own minds through the Holy Spirit. Man is still very far from emerging into space and have not unified the belief in God (Godhead implies more than one God and I find it very distasteful to use because it denies that there is one universal God).

I am pleased with the progress of the middle class, but the impact of the coming wave to transform our world into one of peace and love for

one another is far from being realized. But that is why I wrote *Future of God Amen*: to reveal the truth that has been verified by Jesus that Amen is the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God. When our religious leaders get off their egotistic pride that they have the scriptures that reveal God and His purpose and are honest to acknowledge that *God introduced Himself to mankind as Amen*, then they are ready to unify their scriptures with truth. Only with truth can there be a transformation of our world.

Is Jesus God?

June 18, 2011 05:27 p.m. EDT

This question is raised because several religious leaders and followers have claimed “Jesus is God.” Why Christian religious leaders believe they are justified in claiming Jesus is God appears in the opening lines of John’s Gospel wherein he states:

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,
and the Word was God.

The same was in the beginning with God.

All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing
made that was made.

This paragraph is very poetic and has the majestic beginning of Genesis, but let us consider the common view of God, that is, in the beginning there was only God. God was the singular unknown force that came into being and “created all there is.” After indicating “in the beginning was the Word,” John clarifies his definition of God immediately after by stating “the same was in the beginning with God,” by clearly writing “all things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made.” Therefore, the Word was God.

John’s Gospel originally used Logos as the Word. It is a concept which refers to the principle of order and knowledge that was introduced by the pre-Socratic philosopher Heraclitus (ca. 535-475 BCE). Stoic philosophers adopted the term to mean the divine animating principle pervading the universe. A Hellenistic philosophy, Philo (ca. 20 BCE-40 CE), adopted the term into Jewish philosophy whereby John was influenced to identify God as the incarnation of the divine Logos (theos) through which all things are made. However, in John’s later verses, he associates Jesus as being the “Word.” Common logic indicates that a Son of God cannot exist before God for only God could

create all things. The inconsistency in John's logic in later verses is verified by Jesus as he clearly stated in John 14:24-26, "*And the Word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me.*" Therefore, God is the "Logos," and He created Jesus within the womb of Mary to deliver the *Word* to mankind as written in the Gospels of Matthew (1:18) and Luke (1:35). Jesus in all four Gospels also states he is the Son of Man seventy-six times versus only six times, others, not Jesus, acknowledged Jesus as the Son of God in John's Gospel. As the Son of Man, Jesus does nothing by himself but what His Father has taught him (John 8:28-29).

Finally, even Jesus in Revelation 22:16 states, "*I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.*" Note that Jesus does not state he is the Son of God but attributes His lineage to the Hebrew line of Abraham and David. It is also true that Jesus states in Revelation 22:13 the following:

I am the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end,
the first and the last.

The above quote in John's Revelation contradicts the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, which indicates that it was the Holy Spirit of God that conceived Mary to give birth to a son to be named Jesus. But it also contradicts Jesus who stated he is the Son of Man seventy-six times, is the "*root and the offspring of David,*" and who does nothing by himself but what his Father has taught him. It is clear that the first Gospel writers envisioned Jesus as a Man of God, but by the time John's Gospel was written, around 100 CE, the Church grew sufficiently strong to adopt the Son of God concept, which was used by the Egyptian priesthood for their pharaohs, and they formulated the Trinity dogma to raise Jesus as co-equal with God.

Arius, a preacher from Libya, initiated the debate as to whether Jesus was co-equal with God or created. He taught that the Son of God was not eternal and was subordinate to God the Father. His bishop, Alexander, however, strongly opposed him by insisting that the son was truly God in as absolute a sense as the Father was. To settle the debate, in 325 CE, Emperor Constantine convened the Council of Nice attended by 220 bishops, and the Nicene Creed was formulated; it states that the Father and son are co-equal and co-eternal. This new concept was extended to include the Holy Spirit in 381 CE by approval of the Church fathers

at the Council of Constantinople. Fabricated by the Church fathers, the Trinity dogma disagrees with the words of Jesus in John 14:28, wherein he states, “*My Father is greater than I.*”

In summary, there are inconsistencies in the Bible concerning the accepted belief that there is one universal God versus the Trinity dogma that states the following: “The mystery of one God in three persons, Father, Son and the Holy Spirit” (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, Second Edition, page 902). Readers who desire to read a detailed history of how mankind first conceived the belief in one universal God may place an Internet search on *Future of God Amen*. It provides findings that have surfaced over the past hundred years to further assist in determining if the Church fathers have caused confusion about Jesus whether he is a Son of Man, a Son of God, or “Is Jesus God?”

Comments and Responses

Richard Regener, June 18, 2011, 6:04 p.m. EDT

Why would any god allow themselves to be tortured and crucified?

Mike Voyce, June 18, 2011, 6:09 p.m. EDT

I am struck by the clarity, force, and learning of Nicholas’s post: “Is Jesus God?” It is not a subject I would have tackled and I have learned many things by reading it.

While there are, and have been over the centuries, many people who believe the Bible contains the whole truth of who and what we are, yet there are many others (including me) who will not admit that authority. Such people are aware of the editing and politics which have gone into the creation of modern Bibles and, sadly, no longer accept the divine veracity of every word. For such people the depth of Nicholas’s post is an insight, not to say a revelation.

If there is a problem, it is that those who *do* accept that divine veracity do so from a specific perspective and teaching and may be reluctant to admit any other interpretation.

I hope Nicholas has done something to dispel that rigidity of thinking.

Nicholas Ginex, June 18, 2011, 7:40 p.m. EDT

Dear Mr. Joyce,

It is with deep appreciation and gratefulness that you have received what I wrote as information that helps to clarify your thoughts about this topic. As a little boy, I have always thought about God and I was fortunate to be raised as a Catholic. The training allowed me to be exposed to the beliefs being taught and more importantly to gain an understanding to respect the beliefs of others. Now, as a man of seventy-five years of age, I have been able to reflect on much of what I read by religious scholars and respected Egyptologists. After I retired, I was motivated to write a "*Legacy of a Father*" for my four daughters. But as I wrote, I realized that the knowledge I accumulated in my life had to be shared with others. I know there are many bright scholars who have much more education in the religious sphere, but I also know that few people had my sense of fairness, respect for our religions, and a deep commitment to search for and reveal the truth.

Thank you for your complimentary response.

Mike Joyce, June 20, 2011, 10:46 a.m. EDT

Dear Nicholas,

As I expect you will see from the comments you are attracting, people have a real interest in what you have to offer.

I would like a link to any publications you have, and I would like to see your blogs, whether on Gather or elsewhere.

Nicholas Ginex, June 20, 2011, 6:44 p.m. EDT

Dear Mike,

Thank you again for your interest in what I have been able to learn in my lifetime. You may be able to determine if you desire to purchase my book, *Future of God Amen*, by just clicking on the title herein.

I have written a number of posts that you may access by going to my Gather Home Page. Also, by placing an Internet search on my name, you may view some press releases.

Mike Voyce, June 22, 2011, 10:18 a.m. EDT

On my list.

Nicholas Ginex, June 18, 2011, 7:13 p.m. EDT

That is a good question, Richard. Actually, to be tortured and crucified is not the most painful death as being tortured by having your body stretched to the breaking point and then being burned at the stake. According to the New Testament, Jesus was crucified for our sins and rose in three days to join His Father.

I agree that a god would not allow himself to be tortured and crucified, but His messenger, Jesus, was. Jewish religious leaders were concerned that Jesus was not only raising people from death, but more importantly, he challenged the laws of the Torah when he stated in Mark 12:29-31: ***The first of all commandments is, "Hear O Israel: The Lord our God is one God" (Deut. 6:4). "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength" (Deut. 6:5). This is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Lev. 19:18). There is none other commandment greater than these.***

In the Gospel of Matthew (22:37-40), Jesus challenged the Torah even further by taking "the greatest commandments to an even higher level" by stating the following:

On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.

In accordance with the Gospel of John, God had Jesus represent the *Word of God* for mankind. The Word of God simplifies the "greatest two commandments" given above. That is why Jesus is known as the prophet of love and is the incarnation of the "Word." Yet the Church fathers have misconstrued, misinterpreted, and misled followers of God to understand the "Word." It was announced three times by Jesus as three simple words—*love one another*. It appears to be clear that Jesus is not God; he was created by God to deliver the Word of God for mankind. However, Richard, sadly, few people know the Word of God because we continue to cause bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of our sisters and brothers. But this is the fault of our religious leaders who are more interested in power, wealth, and control rather than teach the *Word of God*.

Inmate 702, June 18, 2011, 8:11 p.m. EDT

What I can't understand is why would anyone formulate a question which allows for a direct answer which may not be liked.

Oh, I forgot, you needed some points, and this is the easiest way to get them!

Nicholas Ginex, June 18, 2011, 11:04 p.m. EDT

Hello Inmate 702,

I do not count Gather points. Whether or not anybody likes the answer to the question "Is Jesus God?" is not of any interest to me. What I hope to do is share facts and findings with religious people to think about the inconsistencies in the Bible. This does not mean the Bible is to be thrown out, but it does mean that we all have an obligation to improve upon what has been handed down to us over three thousand years ago. If the Egyptian Priesthood of Amon was wise and astute enough to revise their conception of God until they finally conceived one universal God, shouldn't our religious leaders be perceptive and courageous enough to revise their scriptures?

Inmate 702, June 19, 2011, 12:20 a.m. EDT

What I can't really understand is why don't people want to accept each other the way they are?

I feel that your behavior is as annoying as those whom you are trying to convince that they are wrong.

What makes you think that insisting and this convincing the nuts that they are nuts make you any different?

A lot of us know that Jesus is not God, but what is the use to force others thinking otherwise if they choose to think that way?

I am bothered in general by any attempt to be convinced of anything that is related to my personal belief.

Do you honestly think that you will get more than endless arguments which will inevitably end up in heavy words?

Nicholas Ginex, June 20, 2011, 3:58 p.m. EDT

Dear Inmate 702,

I understand your point of view that when discussing religious beliefs they will very likely end up being very angry people who do not like their beliefs to be challenged.

As a man who does not like to be made a fool of and always in pursuit of “truth,” I am one to express my convictions, based upon facts, to others. I brought up my four daughters to be taught the Catholic religion because I realize the benefits of instilling moral beliefs and of being exposed to the idea of God. There is an “old saying,” when in Rome do as the Romans do. We are fortunate that my daughters were not brought up in an Islamic country because after reading the scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions, I have found that the Word of God was best articulated by Jesus in the Gospel of John.

Inmate 702, never be afraid to open your heart and mind to new thoughts that may reveal the “truth” and challenge your beliefs. There is a funny thing about the truth. You can feel it ring throughout your being when you have listened carefully.

Inmate 702, June 20, 2011, 4:06 p.m. EDT

The truth is that we are living in a free country, and that is why the “truth” is relative and a matter of interpretation.

The truth is that we are never going to have peace on Earth and that we are going to be blown to bits because everyone has a different truth and tries to convince the other of their truth.

Jerry Kays, June 20, 2011, 5:29 p.m. EDT

Inmate, you are right . . . Truth on this level is relative . . . to the degree we believe something to be true it is to us. But because all is change, even our thinking can and will with time change.

Norman Ketchie, June 18, 2011, 10:09 p.m. EDT

No, Jesus is not God. He was a Jewish Rabbi and a prophet. He was born Jewish and died Jewish.

Nicholas Ginex, June 18, 2011, 11:07 p.m. EDT

Hello Norman,

Thank you for being courageous enough to speak the truth. Too many people are chained to dogma that they have been indoctrinated with that they can't seem to break free of by simply using logic.

Lori F., June 19, 2011, 12:25 a.m. EDT

This has always been rather perplexing to me. Christianity is supposed to be a monotheistic religion, but they have God and the Son of God aka Jesus. How can they be one and the same?

Dave A., June 20, 2011, 1:00 p.m. EDT

And there's the Holy Spirit, too, Lori. Welcome to the mystery of the Trinity.

Nicholas Ginex, June 20, 2011, 3:35 p.m. EDT

Lori, thank you for your response. According to Catholic doctrine, God, Jesus, and the Holy Spirit are one and are referred to as the Trinity. This is against the most acceptable belief that there is only one God that created "all there is." That is why I wrote this post, to help clarify how the concept of the Trinity has evolved, nay, been fabricated to raise Jesus, a man of God, to the level of a God.

The Church fathers defined the Trinity as three persons: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The definition itself is faulty. The only "person" is Jesus, and the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God that pervades the universe.

Barbara Radisavljevic, June 19, 2011, 1:28 a.m. EDT

I'm not a theologian, but I am a student of the Bible and a Christian. It seems to me that you are not taking into account many of the other things Jesus said, such as "I and the Father are one" and "he who has seen me has seen the Father." Those are just two examples, and I don't have time to get into a long discussion, much as I might like to. I just think that in all fairness, before people decide who's right

and who's wrong in this discussion, they read all the way through all four Gospels for themselves. The Trinity is not an easy concept. It's the best way the Church fathers came up with to explain something; it's not easy for the limited human brain to comprehend. If everything God did and was could be fully comprehended by the human brain, He wouldn't be God.

Men like to think their brains and their logic can explain anything worth knowing. Saul of Tarsus thought the Christians were wrong, too, until he met Jesus for himself. No one has to believe the concept of the Trinity before beginning to follow Jesus. It is in following Jesus that those who are trusting him for their salvation from their sins begin to come to grips with the Trinity. If you have not already decided to follow Jesus as your Lord, the one who is in charge of your life, the Trinity, will have no relevance to you anyway. I'm not going to change any minds here, and I'm not trying to. I'm just trying to make the discussion a bit more two-sided if someone who has not already made up their mind happens by here.

Nicholas Ginex, June 20, 2011, 5:23 p.m. EDT

Dear Barbara,

Thank you for your response. I respect your beliefs, and by no means do I dare think that I can or desire to change them. I am only bringing up inconsistencies in the New Testament that makes it very difficult for people who are trying to reach out and believe in God. The inconsistencies are due to the Church fathers fabricating the Trinity as church dogmas for their followers. It is true Jesus was one with God in that he was able to commune with God and he does what "His Father tells him." But the Church fathers in their desire to raise Jesus to the level of a God even poorly defined the Trinity as "the mystery of one God in three persons, Father, Son and the Holy Spirit" (Catechism of the Catholic Church, Second Edition, page 902). To define God consists of three "persons" is a poor vision or infantile belief because the only "Person" was Jesus.

Since God is unknowable, mysterious, and incomprehensible, Jesus is the only "person," and the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God that pervades the universe. Does the Trinity appear to be falsely defined?

Jay Breeding, June 20, 2011, 11:53 p.m. EDT

“No one has to believe the concept of the Trinity before beginning to follow Jesus. It is in following Jesus that those who are trusting Him for their salvation from their sins begin to come to grips with the Trinity. If you have not already decided to follow Jesus as your Lord, the one who is in charge of your life, the Trinity, will have no relevance to you anyway.”

Wow, Barbara, you said this so well and so succinctly. You are right. No one has to understand or accept the doctrine of the Trinity before becoming a believer, and I believe we are both glad for that. At least I can be grateful for this in my own life since I had no understanding of the Trinity when I first became a follower of Christ. As with you, it was only by the guidance of the Holy Spirit and walking with Jesus over the years that I began to understand why Jesus Christ is and has to be God Himself and how scripture, both Old and New Testaments, opens up and reveals it. However, it all starts and ends with our “sincere and pure devotion to Christ.” And I think that is what is important for anyone reading this post right now—if you are one seeking God, there is not much you have to understand to become a follower of Christ, just much to let go of. He will be your liberator so that you can be completely free to love God and obey Him faithfully and serve Him fully.

Nicholas Ginex, June 21, 2011, 3:24 p.m. EDT

Dear Jay,

Thank you for your response. You are a devoted follower of Jesus, and yet I wonder if you truly understand why he is the Word of God. Do you really believe Jesus died for sins to be forgiven or to follow the Word of God? All people in the process of maturing will make poor decisions, some of which are categorized as sins. But it is surprising how few people really know the words Jesus spoke in John’s Gospel. It is the last command given by God and announced by Jesus three times—*love one another*. Do you think anybody will be accepted by God if His last command was not followed? Sins are easily forgiven and many people learn from their unfortunate decisions, but if a person does not show compassion, assistance, and kindness toward others, the ways of love, that person will not be accepted by God for what you call salvation. What does salvation mean to you?

Ben Surbana, June 19, 2011, 7:24 p.m. EDT

There is no need to argue about whether Jesus is God.

All a person needs to do is get down on his knees and ask God who Jesus is. Then, when you get an answer, wisely keep it to yourself unless someone respects and asks for your experiential knowledge and can keep a secret if you ask them to . . .

Personal experience outranks intellectual speculation any day of the week.

Brett C., June 19, 2011, 7:29 p.m. EDT

Well said, but what if you don't get an answer?

Or were you being facetious? Doesn't sound like you were . . .

Ben Surbana, June 19, 2011, 7:42 p.m. EDT

Brett, no facetiousness here.

If an answer is not forthcoming, it is not important for you to know—at least not yet . . .

Just put your entire confidence in God's will for you.

Brett C., June 19, 2011, 9:38 p.m. EDT

No disrespect, but I asked a prominent priest once something that was a quandary for me (and, hopefully, if one has enough humility, it is a quandary for many others):

How can you know who, or what, is speaking back to you
if you make an attempt to speak directly to God?

The priest agreed that the discernment can sometimes be a challenge—even for the most pious.

Ben Surbana, June 19, 2011, 10:45 p.m. EDT

Ask God for discernment. That which comes from God produces good fruit.

Jerry Kays, June 20, 2011, 4:01 a.m. EDT

Brett, when I was depressed and disillusioned with the world and my life in it, I sought better, but I only wanted the “truth” and some kind of “justice” in the world . . . I had no belief in or concept of *God*, God, or gods, but being an agnostic I was open to such possibilities . . .

When I was really ready, without any preconceptions, just wanting answers concerning truth and my relationship with it . . . I “met” (via a spiritual awakening beyond words) what resonated as the highest most intelligent truth that anyone could ever ask for . . . and experienced that also as unconditional love and a “cosmic acceptance” . . . There was then no doubt in my mind that I had experienced something “godly.”

Most likely had I had a previous “religious” background that I believed in, *if* I discovered God via that mindset, I would have most likely attributed it all to the creed and dogma associated with the said religion, such as if I had been leaning toward Christianity I would have figured that I had met Jesus . . .

But I didn’t; my mindset was toward truth, and so that is what I received . . . Ask and ye shall receive . . . if you want it bad enough and are considered by the spirit realm to be ready . . . IMnsHO.

Thus my advice and caution to everyone is to seek above all else truth . . . The truth will set you free . . . and everything else will fall into place . . .

The way I look at it now is that *God* is found *within* us through our own *intuition*, which is our connection to our spiritual soul, the highest connection to *God* anyone can get during this life . . . It is my belief that if you put a “name” associated with religious dogma and creed to such a “connection” that it will be tainted by such thinking and be less than the highest truth . . . but to each their own, of course.

When looking and seeking truth *within*, fervently and honestly, the worst that you can do is miss it by 50 percent . . . and the chances of success are really a lot higher as compared to the alternatives of relying solely on human “authorized” leaders . . . There is much knowledge in this world, but the most rewarding finding is wisdom . . . and that is personally subjective, *intuitive*.

Brett C., June 20, 2011, 6:48 a.m. EDT

Ben Surbana and Jerry,

Neither of you will likely agree with what I say . . . but my opinion is (in my opinion) not simply based on personal experience . . .

There are, literally, many hundreds of thousands of people all over this planet—individuals who are humble and kind and compassionate and tender and loving—who feel abandoned by God.

Some even feel betrayed by God.

You may be able to convince yourselves that these people are approaching their lives—or their spiritual lives, if you will—in the wrong way.

But I would strongly, strongly disagree.

One's own personal experience—whether self-realized or misguided—does not necessarily tell you how close one is with God.

If anything, it should tell one how far away one is.

My beliefs inform me that we cannot understand the way God works—even if we feel strongly that we have touched or embraced God's Spirit.

To think otherwise, for my values, is to practice basic self-deception.

Ben Surbana, June 20, 2011, 9:55 a.m. EDT

Brett, if you knew how much you are loved by the Most High, you would weep with joy!

It is humankind who betrays God, the greatest love.

The world remains unreceptive and rebellious toward God's wisdom and compassion for us. It flirts with spiritual death.

May your path lead you to the joy and contentment, which only God can offer you!

Jerry Kays, June 20, 2011, 2:38 p.m. EDT

Brett, you asked a question, and I answered as best as I could from my own profound personal experience . . . nothing more and only gave a suggestion . . . It was not intended to be judgmental about anyone's path or place on it . . . Only with *God* I know that answer, but if they are unhappy, it probably means they are not doing as well as they could. Maybe it's time to re-evaluate and change their thinking a bit.

But to each their own. Best wishes.

Brett C., June 20, 2011, 3:47 p.m. EDT

Jerry, ben Surbana,

We do not invalidate each other's experience.

Your experience is as valid as mine.

I was being blunt—but it doesn't mean I'm right.

I can only share my own experience. That's all you can do.

I happen to believe the following:

Many men and women, in and out of Church, know full well that they can embrace the love of God until their last day on earth . . . but it does *not* necessarily mean that God hears them or doesn't hear them, loves them or doesn't love them, prevents suffering or inflicts suffering.

For me, to think that one understands how God really works is to practice an unfortunate form of hubris.

That's my own opinion, obviously. But I simply don't believe that any of us can understand how God works by means of our rational intellect.

And if it comes to us, we need to be quite careful in discerning where the voice or the guidance is truly coming from.

Ben Surbana, June 20, 2011, 4:07 p.m. EDT

Brett, if you are truly receptive of heart and mind to the perfect love of God, you have nothing to be concerned about.

There is only a danger of hubris if a person does not choose God's will over his own. This means that you may be required to give up your present way of navigating through life.

I agree with you about the intellect not being enough. A purely intellectual understanding of how God may work and *experiencing God's works upon one's soul* are two different things.

You shall receive your own experience of the soul, or truth, by God's grace, according to His will for you. Accept it, when the time comes, with open arms. You shall never be able to thank God enough for what He does for you!

The source of any guidance is known by its fruits.

Brett C., June 20, 2011, 5:32 p.m. EDT

Ben Surbana,

When you personalize your message for me, you completely miss the point.

You have determined that my viewpoint above—about those who seek communion with God—is solely based on—what you consider to be—my own personal failed experience.

From your point of view—when you see it this way—it makes you feel as if you have more of a license to preach . . . as if to suggest that you have found God and I or others—who speak like I speak—have not.

And that, what's more, because you speak the way that you speak means that you feel that not only you have found God but you also have the capacity to tell others what you've found—because many others have not.

I don't buy it. I do not buy it at all.

I see your attitude as a self-righteous approach based on self-deception, lacking basic and necessary humility.

Regardless of how fundamentalist it might be for a Christian to spread the word of Christ, I see the need to do that as falling short of the necessary humility to truly let . . . God . . . in.

But I recognize that I could be wrong—and correspondingly, I recognize, too, that you could be wrong.

Brett C., June 20, 2011, 5:37 p.m. EDT

I should also say that your compassionate tone comes through as well . . . but, alas, I simply see your approach as literally misguided.

Jerry Kays, June 20, 2011, 8:56 p.m. EDT

Brett, one will *not* find *God* (in the truest sense) until they are ready to “let the ego self go” and transcend it to the higher (spiritual) self. When they have thus met their souls, they have nothing but compassion for the lost egos of this world and want nothing better than to help others also find *God* . . . so it is *never* from a position of “lording it over” anybody as the ego folks so often (naturally) tend to “take it” and want to reject it . . . IMnsHO.

Nicholas Ginex, June 20, 2011, 6:21 p.m. EDT

Hello Jerry, ben, and Brett,

You all have made personal and interesting comments to this post. As the moderator who brought up the question, “Is Jesus God?” I humbly give my perspective to your responses.

God is a very subjective feeling. Some people feel they know God through the inward feelings they possess; others are introduced to God by their religious instruction. For me, God is a feeling I get for the happiness I have found in my life. When I walk outside and look at the wonders of the trees, flowers, and the clouds, feel the sun on my back, and smell the fragrance of the wind, be it sweet or salty air from the ocean, I am filled with thankfulness for God giving me the body and mind to appreciate it all. For me, this earth is heaven.

However, God is also a luxury. How many people in this world are beset with physical and mental pain, poor nourishment, labor like slaves to make a living, never have the opportunity to read a book and gain wisdom from great minds of the past? God was conceived by spiritual people who lived along the Nile River. They experienced the good life by having their land fertilized year after year and learning to live together developed one of the greatest civilizations on this earth. Few religious leaders will give credit to these people because they have adopted many of their beliefs, such as the concept of a soul, the belief in a hereafter upon living a righteous and moral life, a Son of God (their pharaoh), and finally, after many times their scriptures were rewritten, they believed in one universal God, “*Amon as the Sole God.*”

So yes, God is a very natural phenomenon for those who are fortunate enough to look up at the skies and thank God for the life they have or for having survived a near catastrophe. It is my hope that more people will be interested in how man first conceived God. *Future of God Amen* was written to reveal how the three major religions developed from the first formal religion in the world. To learn more about the history of the process by which mankind conceived God, place an Internet search on the title, *Future of God Amen*.

God is unknowable, incomprehensible, and mysterious. Each one of us has a different conception or subjective feeling about God. Until science can determine how the first atom was formed and how billions of atoms came together to form the many galaxies in the universe, I can only submit to the unknown, incomprehensible God that created “all there is.” Perhaps there is the element of love in the creation process. We know there are negative and positive elements that make atoms exist, and in the same way, nature has evolved to have animals be endowed with the ability to create sperm and an egg to produce life. The power or force throughout the universe shows its ability to produce the flower, butterfly, and all the wonderful things we enjoy. That force may be characterized as “love.”

I would say that Jerry has defined God as “love,” and if we listen to God, we would heed His words given to Jesus to announce to mankind. Given as the last command and proclaimed three times in the Gospel of John, the Word of God is—*love one another*.

Ben Surbana, June 20, 2011, 6:41 p.m. EDT

Each person brings his own experience to the written word, whether it be sacred literature or this post. Experience includes prejudices and emotional baggage.

It is my hope that all readers will bring love to this post before making any conclusions about the participants.

I personally thank you for this opportunity to share my heartfelt experience with your readers.

Nicholas Ginex, June 20, 2011, 7:04 p.m. EDT

Thank you, Ben, for visiting with us. All points of views are welcomed for that is how we learn from one another.

Nicholas Ginex, June 20, 2011, 7:35 p.m. EDT

I thank the many Gather readers who have responded to this post “Is Jesus God?” and would like to write the following to think about.

Please know that what I have shared in this post is awareness that the scriptures are not complete. There are many inconsistencies because the written words were not written at one point in time but by different groups of people who have tried to define God for their own people. There is always room for improvement to our scriptures. However, to do that, religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions have got to learn how to work together to preserve the belief in God. Right now, the scriptures of these three religions have caused hate, bigotry, violence, and the killing of innocent people. If the Egyptian priests were smart enough to rewrite their scriptures, why not the religious leaders of today? Are they so entrenched in religious dogma that they have missed the whole conception of God and the Word of God—to *love one another*?

One unfortunate answer to those questions is that in humans, be they priests, scholars, or followers, the basic trait that appears to dominate is arrogance due to the proud notion that they believe in the “true” God. This arrogance has caused many discerning people to shun religious dogma and develop their own beliefs in God. I strongly believe there is more to learn if we use science and faith as instruments in parallel

in our quest to know God. Though science is based on facts, it is faith that ennobles the human spirit and allows the mind to improve our relationship with one another. If we succeed, we may yet learn about God from other life forms we may meet in the universe. But can our religious leaders meet the challenge?

Am Jordan, June 20, 2011, 8:31 p.m. EDT

The Bible has predicted all of today's problems. How is it that our earth can have self-sustainability? Our own bodies have to have the intricate parts to make it work. That took sensitive design. Jesus was an actual person, and archeologists have discovered items that prove his existence. As far as Jesus being God, well, the Bible states that Jesus asked God for help. So He would have been asking himself for help. Don't we lock people up for talking to themselves.

Optimus Parigdigm, June 20, 2011, 9:31 p.m. EDT

Many prophecies outside of the Bible have also predicted the problems of today. Many seers, sages, and psychics predicted events that come to fruition. We all have that divine ability within.

There were many Israelite men named Jesus in and around Galilee and Jerusalem in and about 4BCE—56 CE.

When one prays, whom is one really speaking to? Couldn't one be locked up for speaking to the self as well?

When one prays . . . does the one speak back? Or is it rather the subconscious or even superconscious mind actually replying in return?

The study from the human standpoint, of subconscious, subliminal, psychic, soul forces, is and should be the great study for the human family, for through self man will understand its Maker when it understands its relation to its Maker.

A proper understanding of ourselves must be built on a solid foundation. We must start with primary premises which are for us givens, assumptions with which we are comfortable and to which we are committed. For any system of thought, the assumptions upon which it is based can never be proved; however, subsequent observations should provide confirmation.

The one force is the Spirit of God, and all that we know or experience is a manifestation of that force. A second premise is that we, all mankind, are children of God and thus are spiritual beings. A third given is that the primary condition of being is consciousness and, as a corollary to this, that we are presently projecting into a three-dimensional consciousness.

There are many other dimensions in reality; however, since we are in a three-dimensional experience, it is fruitful for us to try to understand reality in terms of three-dimensional, or triune, concepts. For example, we may work meaningfully with the premise that God is one; however, we may more deeply understand His nature by working with the triune concepts of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. As children of God, made in His image, we are likewise aided in a better understanding of ourselves by seeing the same pattern of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit within ourselves as physical, mental, and spiritual beings.

In the beginning as spiritual beings, we were in the mind of God as focal points of individual awareness yet with an open access to the infinite. The fall in the spiritual plane may be seen as a movement away from the dynamic awareness of both finite and infinite to the orientation of an awareness only of the self with the accompanying separation in consciousness which would follow.

Now, through thoughts, experiences, and investments in consciousness, we have cut ourselves off from that immediate access to an awareness of the divine. We may conceptualize our present levels of awareness as the conscious, subconscious, and the super-conscious potential. These are, as it were, processes for which there are corresponding structures: the physical body (conscious), the mental body (subconscious), and the spiritual body (super-conscious). The spiritual body is the soul, having the attributes of spirit, mind, and will.

Anyway . . . this is a start.

2 0 1 2, June 20, 2011, 9:42 p.m. EDT

Optimus Parigdigm,

Michel de Nostredame (December 14 or 21, 1503—July 2, 1566) predicted the following month, date, year, in his life, his quatrains for our time our future: December 21, 2012.

Also I would like to point out that in 2012 will be the astronomical alignment of many planets first in hundreds of thousands of years,

Optimus Parigdigm, June 20, 2011, 9:55 p.m. EDT

And this is exactly why many are coming into alignment enlightenment that is drawing the enlightened ones in full circle.

I do not doubt all the 2012 symbolism. I do not necessarily believe all of it. But I do believe in the most of it. And it isn't because of what I read or see. It is what I feel.

There are those I feel drawn to, my friends, and there are those that I am not drawn to; however, they are not my enemies but shadows of who I once was in the past.

Yes . . . not since the Annunaki—Elohim in relationship with the Sumerians has this happened, 3650 years ago and the Great Deluge . . .

Ben Surbana, June 20, 2011, 9:54 p.m. EDT

Religious leaders may better meet any challenge if we pray for them rather than denigrate them when they error.

May we all ask ourselves before we evaluate others whether we as individuals can “meet the challenge?”

We each carry responsibility for our own thoughts, words, and deeds.

2 0 1 2 . . . , June 20, 2011, 9:52 p.m. EDT

In our philosophy class in CSU Stanislaus, Turlock, California, by Dr. William Holly, we studied the likes of Aristotle, Socrates, Plato et al.; we discussed ad nauseum circular arguments and various forms of arguments, such as whether *God* is omniscient, omnipotent, omnibenevolent. That being said, *God* is *all* knowing, *all* powerful, *all* good, then how is it possible *war* is even remotely in line of this philosophy? Is *God* on cocaine?

Ben Surbana, June 20, 2011, 10:07 p.m. EDT

Good question! Perhaps, the word “good” goes beyond the normal usage of human beings in the egoist sense of the word when we refer to God.

I believe that God allows all things, including war, because free will is sovereign—a gift of God. Nevertheless, it is divine wisdom which must be consulted before any decision is taken to engage in it.

Wisdom always trumps an unhealthy and inflated ego.

Jerry Kays, June 21, 2011, 3:55 a.m. EDT

I agree with ben on that and take it a bit further as I mentioned elsewhere concerning how we define *God* (God or gods) . . . Everyone has heard of the concept of “theism” (and we have many rejecters we call atheists); some have heard of Pantheism (multiple gods), and there is another related descriptor called Panentheism, which is nearer to the way I see it all . . .

Most of those ways present a God as “a being,” making decisions and having laws and desires for us . . . Panentheists see *God* more as the “cumulative total” of the entire *universe* of Creation and subject to change as Creation uses its free will to decide what they want their *God* to be . . . Yet *God* is, above all, *unconditional* love and absolute truth . . . and with those traits already “built into” (genetics) us, in the end they will prevail . . . Meanwhile, we will learn that by trial and error, cause and effect, through however many life incarnations it takes . . . while what is called “karma” (divine justice) does the “accounting” for our personal actions which follow our decisions as we progress (evolve) ever closer to the oneness of *God*.

IMnsHO

Optimus Parigdigm, June 20, 2011, 8:15 p.m. EDT

First and foremost, one must prove that there is a God. No proof can be given. Belief in a Higher Being is by faith, so they say. It is by faith not by sight that one believes in God, a god, or gods.

If we are going according to the book of many books that were not books but continuous writings that were divided into books, chapters, verses,

etc. then I will answer the best way I can with what information I have to offer. However, let us reason; it is all speculative and subjective.

Nothing is as it seems to be, and all things are subjective reality to the observer. Everything is relative to each person from the viewpoint of the only ultimate reality.

The biblical scripts are written in an almost lost language of myth, allegory, and symbolism according to the scholars.

Much of the stories and messages have been lost through translation. Much of it has been borrowed from other cultures and societies stemming back to the Sumerian Culture or Babylon if you will. Considered today as the first intelligent civilization on Earth. the Sumerians from ancient Sumer—Mesopotamia (current day Iraq) are the first fully developed civilization on the Western hemisphere or “cradle of civilization.”

To be clearer, the context of what the Sumerians claim scares the——out of the current organized religions. They of course dismiss it as “mythology.” Funny how four thousand years of detailed recorded history that predates “any” organized religion can be disregarded because it doesn’t fit into the Church’s sacrament.

And it is here I shall begin.

Adonis, Attis, Baal, Bacchus, Balder, Beddru, Devatat, Dionysos, Hermes, Horus, Krishna, Mithras, Orpheus, Osiris, Tammuz, Thor, Zoroaster, and Jesus all were acclaimed as such:

- Born of virgin on December 25;
- Stars appeared at their births;
- Visited by Magi from the east;
- Turned water into wine;
- Healed the sick;
- Cast out demons;
- Performed miracles;
- Transfigured before followers;
- Rode donkeys into the city;
- Betrayed for thirty pieces of silver;
- Celebrated communal meal with bread and wine;
- Which represented the savior’s flesh and blood;

- Killed on a cross or tree;
- Descended into hell;
- Resurrected on third day;
- Ascended into heaven;
- To forever sit beside Father God and become Divine Judge.

Many religious texts and beliefs post-date Christianity and Aramaic Hebrew writings by the Sumerians and Egyptians.

It is from the Sumerian Culture and Society that all religious beliefs stemmed all other societies spawned from Sumeria.

The Sumerian writings attest to “*one*” Supreme Being with “*twelve*” gods under him, similar to “*Jesus*” and the “*twelve*” disciples.

An in-depth study of the religions of the world will quickly bring one to the understanding that Jesus was and was not God in the same time continuum—a divine dichotomy of sorts.

Jesus is a story, a myth (not saying myth as being untrue) to tell us one thing and one thing only . . .

We are all God however not the whole God in the same time continuum. Thus, we are God playing out billions of billions of parts and plays throughout the universe on different levels and planes.

Jesus was an example of who we are, who we could be, and to reveal our true self.

I am. I am before Abraham. I and the Father are one. Do as I do. Follow after me. A house divided against itself cannot stand, etc., is telling us that we are one and the same. “Love your neighbor as you love yourself. Love the Father with all your heart, soul, and mind or strength.”

Jesus was a reflection of who the Father (Divine Life—(Energy)) is as a whole and who we are.

Jesus in flesh is the man woman kind; Jesus in spirit is the divine energy, life, God.

Separation is an illusion. We are not truly separate. We are all of one divine energy radiating at different speeds, producing different

outcomes, levels of being, identities, planets, stars, the universe as a whole, and all things seen and unseen.

We are in fact God in many fashions, forms, and things from the micro—to the macrocosmic.

And unfortunate as it is . . . many have missed the true intent of Jesus, Buddha, and many, many spiritual masters who have crossed through every facet and time of intelligent man's history to reveal.

I, you, everyone is God and not God in the same time continuum. We are not the whole God as an individual; however we are a part and piece of the whole God being.

God *is being* through everything else.

Was Jesus God?

Yes and no.

Nicholas Ginex, June 20, 2011, 11:38 p.m. EDT

Hello Optimus,

Your response was very perceptive and shows an appreciation of history. I was in full agreement with you until you made the following statement:

“The biblical scripts are written in an almost lost language of myth, allegory, and symbolism according to the scholars. Much of the stories and messages have been lost through translation. Much of it has been borrowed from other cultures and societies stemming back to the Sumerian culture or Babylon if you will. Considered today as the first intelligent civilization on earth, the Sumerians from ancient Sumer—Mesopotamia (current day Iraq) are the first fully developed civilization on the western hemisphere or ‘cradle of civilization.’”

Nicholas's response:

Optimus, are you saying that the influence of the Egyptian civilization was not superior to that of the Sumerians? In regards to religion, are you aware that the Egyptians had the most formal religion that

surpassed that of Sumer and Mesopotamia? I recommend you read *A History of Egypt* by James H. Breasted. To bring you up to date on how the religion of Egypt influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions, read *Future of God Amen*; an overview is available by clicking on the title herein.

You also wrote, “It is from the Sumerian culture and society that all religious beliefs stemmed all other societies spawned from Sumeria. The Sumerians writings attest to ‘one’ Supreme Being with ‘twelve’ gods under him, Similar to ‘Jesus’ and the ‘twelve’ disciples.”

What you fail to give credit to is the fact that Egypt was isolated from Sumerian culture as their religion grew into a formalized one that developed the concepts of a soul, a hereafter, a Son of God (the pharaoh), and finally, before Moses walked out of Egypt, one universal God, “*Amon as the Sole God.*”

However, I can sense relevancy in what you wrote and repeat it below:

“Jesus was a reflection of who the Father (Divine Life—(Energy)) is as a whole and who we are. Jesus in flesh is of the man woman kind; Jesus in spirit is the divine energy, life, God.

Separation is an illusion. We are not truly separate. We are all of one divine energy radiating at different speeds producing different outcomes, levels of being, identities, planets, stars, the universe as a whole, and all things seen and unseen.

We are in fact God in many fashions, forms, and things from the micro—to the macrocosmic.

And unfortunate as it is . . . many have missed the true intent of Jesus, Buddha, and many spiritual masters who have crossed through every facet and time of intelligent man’s history to reveal.

I, you, everyone is God and not God in the same time continuum. We are not the whole God as an individual; however, we are a part and piece of the whole God being.

God *is being* through everything else.

Was Jesus God? Yes and No.”

Nicholas's response:

Your statements are somewhat philosophical, but also only your impression of God and how we relate to God. The ideas you present are noble but not valid because they are contradictory. However, you did hit upon identifying Jesus as the greatest prophet of God because he was the man that delivered the Word of God to mankind. I appreciate your mentioning Jesus's statement to love your neighbor as you love yourself, but Jesus simplified that command even further. In the Gospel of John, Jesus proclaimed the last command given by God and announced it three times. Yet many people have missed that command. It is the Word of God—*love one another*. This is also why many people believe Jesus is the incarnation of the "Word." The "Word" was given by God through the creation of Jesus. However, there is only one God; He is unknowable, incomprehensible, and mysterious.

I agree that we are all made of the "same stuff" in the universe. It may be the reason why mankind through many people of different cultures has expressed worship to God(s). It is their way of appreciation for the beauty and wonders we share on this earth.

Ben Surbana, June 20, 2011, 9:41 p.m. EDT

And an insightful one it is, Optimus. I thank you for your courage and your truth.

Jerry Kays, June 21, 2011, 4:02 a.m. EDT

And . . . *if* we argue too many specifics too much we will end up throwing the baby out with the bathwater . . . The essential, fundamental message is love . . . in its highest form, *unconditional* love . . . and *that is the truth*.

IMnsHO

Nicholas Ginex, June 21, 2011, 2:22 p.m. EDT

Thank you, Jerry, for your response. Is that love in its highest form for God or is it for one another? I ask people to think about this question because if God does truly exist, would He want His creations to love one another rather than worship Him? Is this form of unconditional love for our sisters and brothers? After all, Jesus

announced three times in the Gospel of John the Word of God—*love one another*.

Jerry Kays, June 21, 2011, 5:04 p.m. EDT

Unconditional love is the “type” of love which *God* practices . . . “We” should keep that in mind and at least try to emulate it when we can . . . We should thus be a bit less judgmental . . . Discernment is recommended though considering relative choices.

To worship *God* is to worship all of creation because “we” are aspects of *God* . . . IMnsHO

Optimus Parigdigm, June 21, 2011, 3:18 p.m. EDT

Jerry,

And may I ask why that would be? Universals can never be precisely articulated so their truth or validity can never be decided on the basis of concrete evidence or dismissing them as a prioritization. We are constituted as both particulars and universals—the one cannot be reduced to the other; the one does not stand higher than the other. There are different stages and different levels, but at each stage and level, what is must be described in both its universal and particular aspects.

According to Jung (1959), “The primitive mentality does not invent myths, it experiences them. Myths are original revelations of the pre-conscious psyche, involuntary statements about unconscious psychic happenings . . . Not merely do they represent, they are the psychic life of the primitive tribe” (p. 154). In his *Origin and History of Consciousness*, the Jungian theorist Erich Neumann identifies the deep psychological structures which generated the originally concrete mythic stories that lay upon the cultural surface of an evolving and developing consciousness. When subject to the insightful analysis of a Neumann (or a Joseph Campbell, an Ernst Cassirer, or a W.I. Thompson), ancient myths reveal their meanings as reflective of deep formative and developmental processes of the psyche, meanings and processes lying beyond the fully conscious knowledge of their creators. “Just as unconscious contents like dreams and fantasies tell us something about the psychic situation of the dreamer, so myths throw light on the human stage from which they originate and typify

man's unconscious situation at that stage" (p. 263). But what exactly are myths? In the words of Joseph Campbell (1972):

Mythology is like the Greek god Proteus . . . [it] has been interpreted by the modern intellect as a primitive, fumbling effort to explain the world of nature (Frazer); as a production of poetical fantasies from prehistoric times, misunderstood by succeeding ages (Muller); as a repository of allegorical instruction, to shape the individual to his group (Durkheim); as a group dream, symptomatic of archetypal urges within the depths of the human psyche (Jung); as the traditional vehicle of man's profoundest metaphysical insights (Coomaraswamy); and as God's revelation to his children (the Church). Mythology is all of these. The various judgments are determined by the viewpoints of the judges. For when scrutinized in terms not of what it is but of how it functions, of how it has served mankind in the past, of how it may serve today, mythology shows itself to be as amenable as life itself to the obsessions and requirements of the individual, the race, the age. (pp. 381, 382)

We get the picture of the structure and development of consciousness from its primal beginnings through the amplified tensions of the rational/egoistic phase on to higher levels of integrative transpersonal awakening on individual and collective levels. And further, as a particular knowledge discipline in dialogue with the transpersonal community, slaying the ego can come to play an ever more significant cultural part in the continued developments of consciousness and a higher awareness that "we are one."

Nicholas Ginex, June 22, 2011, 5:33 p.m. EDT

Hello Jerry,

I thank you for a clarification of your view of "unconditional love." I am reluctant to accept your view because I do not know if God "practices" any love. But also, if indeed God is "love" and through love created "all there is," don't you think God would rather have His creatures learn to love one another rather than worship Him?

There is another question for you to consider. Is it easier to love God, a mental construct of your own, than to learn to love the people around you? For me, it is easier to love God because there is nobody to interfere with my vision and beliefs of God. It is much more difficult to learn to love others,

real entities with their many different qualities, both good and bad. But is that the challenge God gave us through Jesus, namely, love your sisters and brothers of every nation? That love need not be the same for each person for we all have our preferences, which is part of our physical and genealogical makeup. However, there is compassion, kindness, tolerance, and assistance for those in need that are indicators of love.

Jerry Kays, June 23, 2011, 4:10 p.m. EDT

Nicholas: “Don’t you think God would rather have His creatures learn to love one another rather than worship Him?”

Of course, that is basically what I meant . . . because all of creation is a part of *God* . . . “Worship” is a word that is often misused IMnsHO, and I love and respect more than I “worship.”

“There is another question for you to consider. Is it easier to love God, a mental construct of your own, than to learn to love the people around you?”

Of course, there is absolutely no reason to not love the *God* that I have a relationship with . . . People on the other hand give all kinds of reasons to not be so loved . . . but at least I can offer them the term “namaste” . . . though relatively few understand it.

Jerry Kays, June 23, 2011, 4:16 p.m. EDT

P.S. As the word is meant, “the spirit in me respects the spirit in you,” “the divinity in me bows to the divinity in you,” and others are relatively modern interpretations, based on literal translations of the Sanskrit root of namaste (citation needed). They are usually associated with Western yoga and new age movements.

Nicholas Ginex, June 23, 2011, 4:47 p.m. EDT

Thank you, Jerry, for your response. There is no doubt that you’re a kind and loving man. However, I do not believe that anybody should bow to the divinity in others because the spirit in each of us is only revealed with actions that openly express love, kindness, compassion, and giving of one’s own worth to those in need. This is not easy but becomes easy as more people are in tune with the old adage “it’s nice to be nice.”

Jerry Kays, June 24, 2011, 12:53 a.m. EDT

The “bowing” is spirit to spirit, not person to person or person to spirit; it is but a metaphor for the recognition of our relatively common spirituality . . . It honors the potential of the best in us and the potential for the best to be expressed by us toward all other(s).

IMnsHO

Nicholas Ginex, June 21, 2011, 3:15

Hello Opitmus,

There is some rationality to what your research reveals from noted psychologists and psychiatrists. Also, from a scientific view, whereby we try to envision the first atom, and the billions of atoms that came to create the galaxies in the universe, it becomes apparent that all organic and inorganic matter are made from the same “stuff.”

Could it be that out of organic matter, namely humans, consciousness finds its place in higher ordered animals, and that consciousness inherently reaches out to its source?

We know that the mind is capable of constructing hypothetical scenarios whereby some of the greatest theories and practical applications have been born. So it is with the conception of God that human consciousness has evolved the conception of one universal God that created “all there is.” Associated with that high expression of power or energy referred to as God, wise men have adopted attributes to develop within themselves, such as truth, justice, and moral values to have people live together in a harmonious community. At first, to enforce such attributes there was the promise of eternal life or the pains of hell. However, today there is a need to revise the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic scriptures to eliminate the myths, inconsistencies, and worn-out dictates that are no longer believable or applicable.

Optimus Parigdigm, June 21, 2011, 7:13 p.m. EDT

I agree . . .

Mike Voyce, June 22, 2011, 10:36 a.m. EDT

What a wonderful mass of words!

Is it now time to interject that it is our egos which identify with definitions, arguments, and dogmas? These are not us, and our egos neither know nor care for the truth.

For myself I prefer simplicity; yet there is so much more concord than discord here, this debate *is* a joy.

Nicholas Ginex, June 22, 2011, 5:56 p.m. EDT

Hello Mike,

Thank you for taking part and enjoying the debate of this post, "Is Jesus God?"

I also like your ability to simplify, for it is in simplicity that understanding is truly found. You make a good point that the definitions, arguments, and dogmas are not really what define the true us. They are inputs that if we allow them into our minds they then shape who we are. Unfortunately, many people have had their minds shaped with poor data and teachings that hurt rather than improve our character and ability to truly learn who we are. As an example, we are witnessing the turmoil in Islamic countries where there is an intolerance of people who practice another religion. These poor people have succumbed to ideas that infect their minds with poison to hate, cause violence, and even kill innocent people in the name of their God, Allah.

Mike Voyce, June 22, 2011, 8:07 p.m. EDT

Nicholas, thank you for saying that. So many people so identify with ideas (especially religious ones) they defend them as if their lives depended on it.

I think both you and those who have left comments here are to be seriously congratulated for the quality of discussion.

Was Genesis Inspired or an Emulated Work?

January 28, 2011 01:26 a.m. EST

Did Hebrew priests write Genesis, the first book of the Torah, using scripture written by the Egyptian priesthood? There is overwhelming evidence that the beginning of Genesis, Creation, contains original concepts that came from Egyptian scripture.

It was during Solomon's reign that the first Hebrew scripture was created in 950 BCE. Genesis may have been written with the cooperative efforts of Egyptian and Israelite priests. We know that King Solomon, king of Israel, was on friendly terms with Egypt. From the start of his rule, 992 BCE, he had a close relationship with Pharaoh Amenemopet, which lasted for a period of twenty-six years (992-976 BCE). Early in Solomon's rule, he married a daughter of a pharaoh (possibly Amenemopet's daughter) and built a palace for her. There can be no doubt that the political intermarriage between Egypt and Israel and the close religious connections between their high priests formed an objective to preserve the concept of one god.

Ginex Amendment, March 30, 2012: An accurate timeline shows King Solomon's rule to be from 970 to 931 BCE. Fortunately, Egyptologists were able to decipher the records of Pharaoh Sheshonk I who invaded Palestine in 926 BCE, the fifth year of Rehoboam's reign. Rehoboam was one of two sons of King Solomon that inherited half of the Hebrew kingdom upon his death in 931 BCE. We may therefore confidently accept that the end of King Solomon's reign was 931 BCE. A close relationship may therefore have existed between King Solomon and the Pharaoh Siamon who ruled for 16 years from 976 to 958 BCE. The overlap of these rulers would present twelve years in which Siamon may have shared much of the prized Egyptian texts and hymns with

King Solomon's priests. It is to be noted that King David (1010-970 BCE) had an overlap of rule with the Pharaoh Amenemopet of 34 years (1010-976) and he may have met Siamon as their rule had an overlap of six years (976-970).

The Israelite priests were aware that through the belief in an all-powerful god could they unite their people. These priests had to have been influenced by the introduction of the Amon god and Egyptian temples in Syria and Palestine built by several conquering pharaohs. As early as the reign of Thutmose III (1501-1447), Amon temples were in many of the garrison towns in Asia where Egypt maintained strongholds. An Egyptian temple was built as early as 1501 BCE in Byblos, located north of Tyre. The priesthoods of both Israel and Egypt had to have formed a common bond over the years, their beliefs merging into a higher conception of god, especially after *Amon as the Sole God* was written by the Priesthood of Amon by 1270 BCE.

Scholars of religions have found that many phrases in the Old Testament have been derived from original ideas and beliefs developed by the Egyptians over previous centuries. To conclusively demonstrate that the creation in Genesis was written based upon Egyptian religious beliefs, we will review the occurring theme that the beginning of life started out of the waters of chaos as described in the seventeenth chapter of *The Book of the Dead* (by Sir Wallis Budge), which was written as far back as the Middle Kingdom (2000 BCE). We find in Genesis, 1.1, 1.2, that God moved upon the face of the waters. This idea of water being the medium for creation was a central idea in the Egyptian belief of God and creation. Let us look at these ideas in both documents:

In the beginning God created the Heaven and the earth.
And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was
upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved
upon the face of the *waters*.

(Gen. 1.1, 1.2)

I am Atum when I was alone in Nun (the *waters* of chaos, out of which life arose). I am Re in his first appearances, when he began to rule that which he had made. I am the great God who came into being by himself. (Book of the Dead, 17th chapter)

We see that *water* is associated with the beginning of Creation, and creative writers retained it in Genesis. But also the phrase “*the beginning*” which has an aura of majesty is found in Ikhnaton’s *Hymn to the Aton*:

O living Aton, the beginning of Life!

The above comparisons reveal that the first lines of Genesis are not original but rather a restatement of what the Egyptians already believed. What is of further interest is that chapter 1 of Genesis identifies heaven, earth, water, and the same life forms attributed to the god in the *Re-Isis Myth*. Though the order is not the same, in Genesis the *same nouns* are used: heaven, earth, water, birds, fishes, cattle, creeping things, and man.

Re-Isis Myth: The spell of the divine god, who came into being by himself, who made heaven, earth, water, the breath of life, fire, gods, men, small and large cattle, creeping things, birds, and fishes, the king of men, and gods at one time, (for whom) the limits (go) beyond years, abounding in names, unknown to that (god) and unknown to this (god).

Genesis provides a conceptual advance from the *Re-Isis Myth*; they both identify one *divine god*. However, the *Re-Isis Myth* is more definitive by also stating that God “*came into being by himself.*” Much credit must be given to the author(s) of Genesis for the wonderful ideas that have been borrowed from Egyptian scripture and restated in an eloquent manner. Note that the *Re-Isis Myth* used to be regarded as scripture because it embodies the religious beliefs of the Egyptians. The *Re-Isis Myth* is now classified as a myth because the sun-god Re and Isis, the beloved sister and wife of Osiris, god of the afterlife, have lost religious reverence to the one universal god Amon extolled by the Priesthood of Amon. *Amon* is commonly known as *Amen*, which has been used in the throne names of more than twelve pharaohs beginning with Amenemhet I in 2000 BCE.

The *Re-Isis Myth* offers an aspect of time not understood by the authors of the Hebrew Testament in their development of the Creation in Genesis. The focus of Genesis in the Bible was the creation of Adam and Eve and a laborious and detailed lineage that leads to the twelve tribes of the Hebrew people. The record of births in the

Hebrew Testament has in fact led chronologists and religious scholars to estimate the creation of heaven and earth to have taken place around 4004 BCE. But factual and empirical evidence exists that prove this date to be ludicrous. The Egyptians had a truer understanding that time is not a boundary or parameter in defining when God first existed. Note that the words given in the *Re-Isis Myth* emphasize limits that go beyond years:

The divine god, who came into being by himself, who made heaven, earth, water, the breath of life . . . (for whom) the limits (go) beyond years.

The depth of the Egyptian mind in searching for truth is astounding. They were wise enough to comprehend that time is unbounded and limitless in their conception of God. It is unfortunate that the Hebrews so much wanted to be the chosen people of the one God that they inserted with great efforts a lineage that indicates heaven and earth was created just over 4,000 years BCE. The references for the above findings are clearly presented on the pages they appear within footnotes, on the same page, in *Future of God Amen*. To attain an overview of this book, simply place an Internet search on the title.

Religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions should be proud of a spiritual legacy that informs their worshippers of the very beginnings of their beliefs. By being aware that their religious beliefs developed over thousands of years, there will be greater acceptance that God slowly brings people to a higher conception of Him as they evolve into more sophisticated human beings. God is not a static concept but an integral part of the human spirit. Just as the Egyptian and Israelite priesthoods improved their scriptures, changes are needed to keep pace with the evolution of humans in a changing world.

Do you agree that scripture is not cast in concrete but must be revised to keep pace with advanced generations of people that acquire knowledge about themselves and the universe?

Comments and Responses

Darin Waugh, January 27, 2011, 3:26 a.m. EST

Very interesting!

Nicholas Ginex, January 27, 2011, 6:15 p.m. EST

Thank you, Darin. It is my way of informing people of the past and how mankind has come to conceive God. Very few teachers are out there that teach the truth about the past because they were influenced by other teachers who also lacked knowledge of the past.

Gary G., January 28, 2011, 12:10 a.m. EST

To answer the question, it is inspired (2 Tim. 3:16). Further, reading the verse in context, it states, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" (Gen. 1:1). He created the earth which includes the water. It states the Spirit of God (which is His presence) was there, hovering; it does not state that the water was used as a medium for creation.

Thus, read in context it does not establish a connection to a god you are speaking of.

Nicholas Ginex, January 28, 2011, 2:19 a.m. EST

Hello Gary,

Thank you for your response. Yes, you are correct that the Torah was written by men who were inspired to write how God created the heavens and the earth. Timothy 2:3, 16 states, "*All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.*" This means that scripture written by the Priesthood of Amon in 1270 BCE formed the basic beliefs in God as the Creator of all there is. The beliefs of the Egyptian religion, as presented in this post, inspired the priests during Solomon's reign to write Genesis, which captured many of the ideas originally conceived by the Egyptian priesthood.

With each new generation, righteous men built upon what they have learned by wise and learned men before them. We know that the Priesthood of Amon merged their original belief in Atum, the first Egyptian God of creation, with Amon-Re, and finally, they revised their scripture to extol *Amon as the Sole God*. Amon is a variation of Amen, which was used in the throne names of more than twelve pharaohs since 2000 BCE. Hence, Amen is a revered name of God that continues to be announced in temples and churches. Knowing the

history of the Egyptians, Jesus Christ was knowledgeable to proclaim in Revelation 3:14 that *Amen is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.”*

What we have learned is that righteous men have been inspired to write scripture and had to revise it several times to arrive at the first draft of the Torah in 950 BCE. Since then, the Gospels were written to open the belief in one God to people of every country. Jesus Christ has said in John 14:12, *“Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go to my Father.”* Jesus is saying that there will be other men that will do even greater works than he, which means that scripture can still be improved upon to direct human beings to live in truth and righteousness.

If you believe in Jesus, you should be able to understand his words about the authenticity of Amen as being the beginning of the creation of God, especially after learning the impact Amen has had on influencing the beliefs in one universal God in not only Egypt, but in Palestine, Syria, and Nubia. Amen has been announced since 2,000 BCE or over 6,000 years, and his name is sung today in the beautiful song, Amen.

Gary G., January 28, 2011, 8:27 a.m. EST

In the context of the Old Testament, how did you come to the conclusion that Amon is the sole god?

Also, in the context of the message of John 14:12, how did you come to the conclusion that Jesus is referring to the scriptures being improved? Hebrews 13:8 says that Jesus (John 1:14) is the same today, yesterday, and forever.

Nicholas Ginex, January 28, 2011, 4:16 p.m. EST

Hello Gary,

You pose some good questions. The Old Testament does not refer to Amon (Amen) as the Sole God and for good reason. The writers during Solomon’s reign were intent in writing scripture that shows God as being the source of their existence, the Creator of all there is, and named their god after a mountain god previously known as Jehovah.

Jesus Christ, in John 14:12, implies that there will be others who believe in him that will do even greater works than he did. This is John's Revelation that there is hope for future generations whereby followers of Jesus will assist in providing a clearer and truthful understanding of the "beginning of God." There is reason to believe that there will be other righteous daughters and sons of God that will revise and improve the scriptures for a more educated and discerning people of future generations. Just as God evolved in the minds of men over many centuries by constant revision by the Priesthood of Amon the scriptures of today sorely needs improvements.

Yes, Jesus is always Jesus now and forever. But what we are talking about is the need to follow Jesus's words to improve our beliefs in God and His desire to direct His creations to lead lives of integrity, truth, and righteousness. Do you think the scriptures are cast in concrete? If the Egyptian priesthood was wise to rewrite their beliefs from what they learned in the past and realized the need for a higher belief in one universal God, then it is logical and reasonable to conclude that it is time for scriptures of today to be improved upon.

This post shows conclusively that Solomon's priests were influenced by the ideas already generated in Egyptian scripture; an honest evaluation of the post findings reveals we learn from former ideas. The baby will not be thrown out with the bath water when gifted daughters and sons of God assist courageous religious leaders in revising their scriptures. The objective is to have Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders, and their worshippers all pray to the same God. By achieving this objective, there will be the elimination of fanatical religious factions who are killing people in the name of God. But do people want to hold on to their inculcated beliefs that divide people around the world or come to understand we are all sisters and brothers who should embrace the words of Jesus—love one another. By visiting www.futureofgodamen.com you have an opportunity to obtain a better understanding why Jesus Christ said Amen is "the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God."

Gary G., January 28, 2011, 6:25 p.m. EST

Can you show me further scripture support for how you came to that conclusion in regards to John 14:12?

Jesus Himself said, “Do not add or take away from this book.” Do you have further scripture support for your conclusion that the Bible needs to be improved?

Nicholas Ginex, January 28, 2011, 7:12 p.m. EST

Hello Gary,

Please indicate the referenced document when you assert Jesus said anything. The quote by Jesus in John’s Gospel, 14:12, speaks for itself. Very rarely will you hear a sermon by a Christian religious leader that informs his worshippers that Jesus has clearly stated there will be others who believe in him that will do even greater works than he. Religious leaders do not want people to start thinking that there can be loving and righteous people who can do greater works than Jesus.

It is already clear that Jesus understands that there are daughters and sons of God that will be able to foresee the weaknesses in established beliefs. Jesus himself admonished the money changers that were polluting the Holy Temple but tolerated by religious leaders.

To say Jesus said “Do not add or take away from this book” is very disingenuous of you. The Gospels and Revelation were written after Jesus died so what you have intimated about what Jesus said is false.

So, Gary, do you strongly believe that scripture is written for all time, never to be changed even though it was written in an age when people were less educated than we are now? I have more faith than you on the ability of people to improve upon what they have learned in the past. By facing the truth of the past, faith and science can proceed in parallel in man’s quest to know God and our purpose in life. You will be able to understand why Jesus Christ said Amen is “the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God” after you have read the book, *Future of God Amen*. Simply put an Internet search on: www.futureofgodamen.com

Gary G., January 28, 2011, 11:46 p.m. EST

The reference document is the Bible. We have established that the Word is Jesus as in John 1. And that all scripture is God breathed.

Further, it is stated in Revelation 22:18-19 that the scriptures are not to be changed:

For I testify to everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this book: If anyone adds to these things, God will add to him the plagues that are written in this book; and if anyone takes away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part from the Book of Life, from the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book. (Rev. 22:18-19)

Nicholas Ginex, January 29, 2011, 2:29 p.m. EST

Gary, what I meant was you should indicate the document by name and verse/page when quoting your source. You wrote, "Jesus Himself said do not add or take away from this book." please indicate the document and verse.

Gary, I have read John 1, and it is a marvelous allegory that has a hidden spiritual meaning that transcends the literal sense of what is written. You fail to realize that though Jesus announced the Word of God three times in John, which is "love one another," Jesus was not God in the beginning. Only God existed in the beginning. The truth is that Jesus first came into existence only after the intercession of the Holy Spirit of God within the Virgin Mary. To equate Jesus with the beginning of all Creation, when God created all of the galaxies and stars, is simply an ignorant interpretation of the allegorical phrase in John.

Gary, once again you are misleading or misinforming people about the truth regarding John 22:18-19. John is talking about his revelation and not the Bible consisting of the Old and New Testaments. But then, many religious documents of past civilizations end with curses on anybody who dares to change or revise what was written. This is a sign of arrogance to protect the order of things set up by either political or religious leaders. I thought you were smart enough to realize that.

Gary, too many God-loving people are so convinced of the beliefs they have been taught that they close their minds to wonderful possibilities to spread the Word of God to all people. The Word of God is not the entire Bible for it has many myths and inconsistencies. The Word of God is very simple, *love one another*. This Word translates into

loving our sisters and brothers, from all nations, races, and beliefs. If all people can satisfy that one command expressed by Jesus Christ three times in John, God would be most pleased with His creations for there is no other way to make God proud of us.

It is clear that you have not taken the opportunity to read *Future of God Amen*. Take advantage of learning factual findings about how man first came to conceive one universal God by placing an Internet search on the title or go to www.futureofgodamen.com

Glome . . . ONE of WE the People, February 1, 2011, 11:52 p.m. EST

I've loved reading through your posts, Gary. Your relationship with Him shows through your personality. It's nice to meet you. I enjoy hearing you and Nicholas talk.

Nicholas Ginex, February 6, 2011, 4:34 p.m. EST

Thank you for your responses and for keeping a civil tone on this topic. As you know, religious beliefs are a way of conducting their life for most people, and I do want to sway their beliefs in the God they worship. The important thing is that we respect the beliefs of people from all religions for God has introduced Himself into the minds of righteous men and women for thousands of years.

The purpose of this post was to inform and educate people that God first introduced Himself to the Egyptian people. They were the first people, who, after progressing through the growth stages of believing multiple gods, came to believe and worship one universal God, Amen. This growth process started with the Egyptian god Atum, the creator of all there is. Atum was conceived many years before 4,000 BCE, perhaps centuries. The concepts of a soul and a hereafter materialized as the Egyptian priesthood taught their people that they may gain eternal life with the Son of Atum, Osiris, upon living a life of righteousness and truth.

This post conclusively shows that Genesis was not an original idea, but was a rewrite in a more advanced way of the ideas about the beginning of creation already generated in *The Book of the Dead*, *Hymn to the Aton*, and the *Re-Isis Myth*. These writings about the beginning and the God of creation were already introduced to mankind before Genesis was written ca. 950 BCE during the reign of Solomon.

My objective is to inform people of the greatest legacy given to mankind by the Egyptians, the belief in one universal God. Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders will not reveal that the roots of their beliefs stem from the one universal God conceived by the spiritual beliefs of the ancient Egyptians. We must not be ashamed to acknowledge our past and, with human decency, give credit where credit is due. The most honest and truthful Man of God, Jesus Christ, proclaimed the Egyptian God Amen as *“the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.”* Jesus knew that God first introduced Himself to the Egyptians and verifies the belief in one universal God started with Amen.

Jesus was also perceptive to inform all believers in God that there will be others who will do even greater works than he did (John 14:12). I believe Jesus is saying that there is still more for human beings to learn about God because very few of us have learned what the Word of God is. Jesus stated it three times in the Gospel of John. It was the last command God gave Jesus to direct our lives in the future. If it is true, that the Word of God is “love one another,” then there is a very real need in today’s world that the scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions should be revised. Presently, these religions have gone astray and divided the people of this world whereby we have religious leaders who advocate hate, bigotry, violence, and the killing of innocent people by claiming they worship the one true God. We see extreme religious fanatics who are willing to kill themselves and many innocent people because their religious leaders are following words in the Koran. This does not excuse Jewish and Christians of having done the same abominable acts of murder as written in the Bible.

I close this response by saying we all have to improve our belief in God and our purpose in life. No one religion is the true religion. To think otherwise will lead to more holy deaths. The time has come for believers in God to follow His last command so that sisters and brothers, of every nation, love one another. This means that daughters and sons of God must encourage and assist religious leaders to revise their scriptures so that there is a unified belief in God. We are still children who need to acquire more knowledge about our past, ourselves, and our world to know God and our purpose in life.

May your belief in God and your love for your sisters and brothers around the world bring you happiness, health, and peace. If you

have not done so, it is recommended that you visit <http://www.futureofgodamen.com> for more information about the history of God.

Gary G., February 1, 2011, 3:13 a.m. EST

Jesus made everything. He always existed and is:

All things came into being through him, and apart from him nothing came into being that has come into being. (John 1:3).

There are no myths; Jesus said He is the way,
truth, and the life (John 14:6).

Nicholas Ginex, February 1, 2011, 3:16 p.m. EST

Hello Gary,

It is fine if you believe that the Son of God and God existed at the same time. This is a very hard concept to believe because one would think that God came first, then His Son. However, if you believe the Bible as being infallible, continue your belief. I admire you for believing that both God and His Son came into being in the beginning because it really is difficult to understand and accept.

God's Last Command

September 11, 2011 03:15 p.m. EDT

Many Christians know who is the “*Word of God.*” It is stated in the John’s Gospel, verses 1:1-5 below:

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not.

John associates the Word as being Jesus; but “what” is the *Word of God*? It is what God instructed Jesus to tell the world.

John indicates that Jesus is the light that shineth in darkness and that the darkness comprehended it not. That light is “what” gives meaning to leading a life of morality, truth, and love. Jesus and God mean nothing without understanding “what” the *Word of God* is—for it is the light for all mankind to follow.

God gave Jesus to mankind to announce the *Word of God*. It was the *last command* given in the New Testament and Jesus proclaimed the *Word of God* three times, *love one another*:

A new commandment I give unto you, That ye *love one another*;
as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. (John 13:34)

This is *my commandment*. That ye *love one another*,
as I have loved you. (John 15:12)

These things *I command you*, that ye *love one another*. (John 15:17)

With today's turmoil and clash of religious ideologies that may lead to a Third World War, the new command by God announced by Jesus is perhaps of greater relevance today than the "two great commandments" in Matthew 22:37-40, in which Jesus said, "Hang all the law and the prophets." God simplified the two thou shalt with *His last command* that serves as the light to guide mankind toward peace and harmony on earth.

Do you believe the *Word of God* is to *love one another* or something else?

Comments and Responses

Mike Voyce, September 11, 2011, 4:20 p.m. EDT

This is a very good and powerful post. It must provoke thought.

Edwah Joshua, September 21, 2011, 10:41 a.m. EDT

The Spirit of the *Lord* who spoke to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; indwelt the body the Word became John 1:14 "Jesus" that same Word Revelation 19:13, John 1:2 was in the beginning with God. The volume of the book, all that the OT prophets spoke are what promises Jesus came to fulfill. 2 Corinthians 3:17 reveals that the *Lord* is that Spirit that spoke to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and to Moses who came down upon Jesus the Word made flesh there at the Jordan (Luke 3:22).

Nicholas Ginex, September 21, 2011, 5:45 p.m. EDT

Thank you, Edward. It is clear that Jesus was the Word made flesh (John 1:14). Jesus was "the light that shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not" (1:5). As the Word was with God (1:1), he announced the *last command* given by God three times—*love one another*. When will religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic faiths acknowledge that the Word of God is *love one another*? Will they continue to keep separate by not uniting their beliefs in God because of their own arrogance, pride, and ignorance to think they have the only "true" belief?

What must become obvious to all believers of these three religions is that they all pray to the same God. To please and be accepted by God, they must obey His *last command*—*love one another*.

Nicholas Ginex, September 22, 2011, 3:48 p.m. EDT

To the atheists.gather.com group, thank you for sharing my post on your forum home page.

It is clear that atheists have an appreciation for morality, love, and truth. Many people have their own view about God; agnostics are not informed enough to make any decision of God's existence, and atheists have greater faith in humanity in teaching morality, love, and truth.

The key operative is—*love one another*. If humans are capable of treating one another like human beings where there is always compassion, love, and truth whether God exists or not becomes a mute question.

A New Religious Perspective Is Needed

January 20, 2011 06:54 p.m. EST

Many people today have a dismal outlook about the future. Already there are those of us who perceive the destruction of our planet by the year 2200. Unfortunately, I believe there is strong possibility that the destruction of our planet could occur even earlier. To offer solutions to prevent such an outcome, the book *Future of God Amen* was written. Recommendations are provided to stimulate Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders to recognize that their religions all evolved from the same roots—the religion of ancient Egypt. This is no easy challenge for religious leaders to accept and will require perceptive and knowledgeable people with loving hearts to assist them. They are so entrenched in their inculcated beliefs and dogmas that they will need to be pressured by the worshippers of the three faiths. It will become necessary for “Daughters and Sons of God” (the subtitle of the book) to assist religious leaders in efforts to unify their beliefs and teach one simple command, a command that should be a natural and easy thing for all of us—*love your sisters and brothers from every nation*.

I believe that it is the people like you, me, and others who recognize the problem to do something about it. It does no good to throw stones, laugh, ridicule, and deride the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. These religious leaders are in dire need of being pressured by people around the world to acknowledge that human beings do have a spiritual and inquiring nature, but it is time to acknowledge that man has evolved the concept of God and scriptures that define that God has got to be revised. The Egyptian priesthood revised their conception of God from many animal forms until a personal God took form, and finally, the concept of one universal God evolved by the name of *Amen*.

Yes, the foreseeable future outcome of destruction is highly possible. It will happen if we, the people, fail to rise up and assist our religious leaders to work together and revise their scriptures or beliefs so that no one religion lauds over the other. They all pray to the same God, and it follows that the beliefs in that God must be consistent. It may appear impossible, but people worldwide need to initiate a movement from which daughters and sons of God will emerge and lead a new religious renaissance. Do you feel it is necessary for people worldwide to rise up and direct religious leaders to truly be representatives of God by revising their dogmas and teach us to love our sisters and brothers from every nation?

Comments and Responses

Lynn P., January 21, 2011, 12:45 a.m. EST

Sorry, I'm not buying; a new perspective is needed, not that your perspective is the correct one. I'm conservative by nature, not progressive. If something worked in the past, I believe that is the obvious course to take. If we then try something new and it doesn't work, the past teaches us what did work. The wheel worked/works. I see no purpose in reinventing it for each generation anymore than I see reason behind what "we the people" want to happen. This is probably the prevailing reason why your idea won't work.

Nicholas Ginex

Dear Lynn,

Thank you for your response. I respect your beliefs and the God you worship. However, one does question if the wheel really works regarding the effectiveness of the major religions of today. There is a lot of concern about the murder of innocent people in the name of God by Muslim extremists, and few people realize that it is the Koran itself that advocates bigotry, hate, intolerance in the belief of another religion, and the killing of innocent people who do not believe or refuse to worship Allah. You may belong to a more tolerant religion that teaches we should love one another, and for that you are fortunate. Please read my response to Jim below and understand why I believe there is a need for religious leaders to unify their beliefs and teach our sisters and brothers to love one another.

James Stemmler, January 21, 2011, 11:06 a.m. EST

Nicholas,

Did you write the new book? Your statement was in passive voice. It's unclear.

Whether or not, I agree with you. I have been calling for new scripture and a new concept of God for a long time, maybe some sort of world conference of religious officials to come together and begin the process. Determined to keep truth wherever it can be found, recognizing that all religions contain truth. It's just that all religions also contain flaws and unhelpful doctrine and practice. You are a voice crying in the wilderness, with nobody, or damn few, listening.

I don't give warning. I probably don't believe disaster is imminent. Few heed warnings anyway. Of course, it's traditional for prophets to speak that way. Their stories, or rather the stories of some of the prophets, are in our legacy scripture.

For me, it's more a rational unweaving of the fabric of religion and not so much in conflict with science. Hey, science is a part of our world view. We have to invent a concept of God from that world view, as the ancients invented a concept of God from their world view. But we have to ask, "Do our beliefs make sense?" I believe enough people will ask such questions that the superstructure of doctrine will tumble, sooner or later, probably later. These things take time.

A good starting point is awareness of the size of the universe. That is if we want to include in our concept of God the creator thing. If God is creator, let's look at creation. It's big, billions of galaxies. Only some of them can we see. And billions of other planets capable of supporting evolution as ours are evolution being God's mode of creation, Creation being ongoing. None of that is done-in-six-days stuff.

So does it make sense that God would pick a particular tribe or a particular person in that tribe on an insignificant planet to work out His plan for creation? Maybe not or maybe so. It's a myth, but not in the sense of never having happened, rather in the sense that it keeps on happening. It wasn't a once for all time event. Rather it's one in a series of saving events. And we ordinary people can be saving events too, only on a smaller scale. Grass roots in a religious sort of way. We

have to start thinking of ourselves as somehow fitting into God's plan, into God's works. We need to be creative and redemptive as God is.

I do go on. Better stop. Leave the rest for another time.

You got it right, Nicholas. Keep shouting from the rooftops.

Cheers,

Jim

Nicholas Ginex, January 21, 2011, 7:39 p.m. EST

Hello Jim,

I was very impressed to see you think very much as I do. The same analogies you refer to, such as the immensity of our universe and the possibility of life on millions of other planets, leave one to pause why God would create humans in His own image when other intelligent life forms also must exist. It is true that humans have the intelligence which gives rise to a spiritual nature to question why are we here, who started the creation of our earth and its life forms, and is there a God responsible for all creation?

Yes, Jim, I wrote *Future of God Amen* out of an initial motivation to write for my four daughters what I have learned in my lifetime. As a little boy, I always wondered about God, and as I grew into manhood I absorbed bits and pieces of information that never came into fruition until I read books by religious scholars and Egyptologists. *Future of God Amen* is on its third edition and will be available as an e-book in about three weeks. You can put an Internet search of the title and gain access to my website and some press releases. The book presents a factual history that reveals how man first came to conceive God and how that God has had a profound influence on the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. After presenting how spiritual people conceived a personal and universal God and established moral values and the concept of a hereafter, I showed how those beliefs were adopted by the Hebrews.

The book gives an objective critique of the Torah, Gospels, and the Koran. More importantly, it provides recommendations for these leaders to unify their beliefs in the same God and teach our sisters

and brothers from every nation to love one another. The flaws in these scriptures cry out to discerning and loving people that there is a need to revise them by people who are perceptive and courageous to assist leaders as their minds are trapped in dogma that resists change. For over thousands of years, man has revised his concepts of God and substantiates that scripture is not cast in concrete.

By the way, my book also deals with the size of our universe and the possibility of life elsewhere. You will find I have presented some of the thoughts of Giordano Bruno, an Italian philosopher and Dominican friar, who was burned at the stake for writing a book that concludes there are other life forms of spirit and intelligence that exist in other worlds throughout the universe.

I must say your response was highly refreshing and encouraging to see there are other people out there who realize that our religions of today are falling out of step with the growing numbers of educated people who no longer believe in myths. *Future of God Amen* recommends that since the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions all pray to the same God, they must acknowledge that they all were born out of the same roots of beliefs. It is no accident that today in temples and churches Amen is announced at the end of a prayer, supplication, thanks, and praise and is sung with fervor and love. Regarding the Koran, Amen is not announced and prohibited in Muslim countries.

The Church Fathers Committed a Gross Error!

March 11, 2011 02:32 a.m. EST

The Church fathers have been exceptionally strict in assuring the doctrines of the Bible are not violated. They were strict to the extent that they had heretics burned at the stake or imprisoned for expressing another view of their beliefs, be they religious or logic based upon scientific discovery. Two examples out of thousands that illustrate the validity of Christian fathers not tolerating other religious or scientific views are the burning at the stake of Giordano Bruno and the imprisonment of Galileo Galilei.

Giordano was an Italian philosopher and a Dominican friar who wrote *On the Infinite Universe and Worlds*, which motivated the Church fathers to terminate his life in the year 1600. Bruno introduced the idea that the universe was infinite, contained an infinite number of worlds, and they were inhabited by intelligent beings and life forms that existed in matter and spirit, body and soul, and thereby existed as two phases of the same substance.

Our illustrious scientist, Galileo Galilei, published in 1632 *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems—Ptolemaic and Copernican*, which supported the Copernicus argument that the planets revolve about the sun. For this notable work, Galileo was ordered to appear before the Holy Office in Rome and convicted of heresy. He begged for mercy and requested they consider his advanced age, but they sentenced him to prison for a period determinable at their own pleasure. Galileo was later transferred to a friend's house in Siena, and later under house arrest, he lived in his own villa where he went blind by 1638 and died on January 8, 1642.

These two striking examples are men silenced by the Church fathers for knowledge that would challenge dogma that the Church promulgated to their worshippers. Yet the Church leaders were immune to the greatest error committed against the Bible by advocating dogma that promoted Jesus Christ, a Man of God, to not only be accepted as the Son of God as proclaimed in the New Testament, but to also raise Jesus to be co-equal with God and is God.

Simple logic that God “created all there is,” consisting of the universe, living organisms, and finally mankind, is acceptable to most thinking beings even though proof is unattainable. But the Church fathers in their zeal to raise Jesus, a Son of God, to be co-equal with God devised a concept called the Trinity. Pope John Paul II promulgates the Trinity conceived by the Church fathers in *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, Second Edition, page 902, as follows:

The mystery of one God in three Persons:
Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit.

The Church teaches that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are three persons called the Trinity. This interpretation has caused much confusion among people around the world. First, this definition shows an inability of the Church to properly describe God. God may be acknowledged as the creator of all there is, but to characterize God as a *person* presents a limited view. God is mysterious, unknowable, and incomprehensible to mankind—He is revealed only through the Spirit of Truth, the Holy Spirit. Secondly, only Jesus existed as a *person*. Lastly, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God and therefore should not be defined as a *person*. With limited knowledge of God, it may be unfair to criticize the Church fathers for conceiving God as three persons in one. The Trinity concept is extremely complex and diminishes the concept of God as the creator of all things within and beyond the universe.

This audacious mental distortion of the Trinity is compounded by the idea that Jesus existed in the beginning of all creation and is God. This belief is introduced by the majestic and poetic opening of John’s Gospel wherein he states:

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was

made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men . . . And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld His glory, the glory as the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

The inspiring words of John promote the idea that Jesus existed in the beginning for he is equated as being the Word. As such, there are many Christians who believe Jesus created all there is and is God. This is infantile reasoning because a Son of God cannot exist before God the Father. In accordance with the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, God created His son via His Holy Spirit with the conception of Mary, the mother of Jesus.

The reasons why Jesus cannot be God are clear: (1) Only God existed in the beginning, (2) God's son Jesus was not needed until the creation of man, (3) Jesus was conceived in the womb of Mary by God's Holy Spirit, (4) Jesus comes from the line of Abraham and David and thereby, born through Mary, has the genes of mankind, and (5) the Word was not delivered to mankind until Jesus announced the Word of God to the world—*love one another*.

Concept of the Trinity Deserves Clarification: John introduced another beautiful concept, that of the Holy Spirit. Much confusion exists in the interpretation of the Trinity because many religious leaders have fused Jesus and the Holy Spirit with the One God. This has been what initially may have been a noble attempt by the Church to raise Jesus, the Son of Man, to the level of a God. In the passages below, Jesus does not claim to be God's son but does emphasize that the Holy Spirit can enlighten and teach those who follow His Father's Word.

He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings: and the Word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me. These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you. (John 14:24-26)

I go unto my Father: for my Father is greater than I. (John 14:28)

The above words spoken by Jesus clearly indicate three distinct entities: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. He does not say he is the Son of God or is an extension of God. Jesus makes it known that His Father is greater than he, and it is only through the Father that he

is given the Word. Jesus also stated, “Verily, verily, I say unto you, *he that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do*” (John 14:12). This statement infers that Jesus was a *Son of Man* and that there will be *other Sons of God* that will do greater works than him. This means that by righteous actions, other sons (and daughters) will become children of God. Therefore, Jesus became a *Son of God* through his works and was not with God at the beginning of creation. This is further emphasized by Jesus when he says, “*My Father is greater than I.*”

The third entity, the Holy Spirit, is the comforter Jesus speaks of. The Holy Spirit entered Mary for the conception of Jesus. A man of truth, Jesus always proclaimed he was the *Son of Man*. The Christian Church fathers teach that three persons form one God called the Trinity. This interpretation has caused much confusion and apprehension among people around the world. John initiated this mystery and confusion when he began his Gospel with the intensity of Genesis by saying, “In the beginning was the Word.” This is poetically beautiful, but is not the truth. The Word, as professed by Jesus, came much later and, according to the Church, supersedes the Torah. John’s approach is politically incorrect, for the Word was given to Jesus by God as stated in John 14:24-26 and could never have existed in the beginning because man was not yet created, and there was no need for its application—*love one another*.

The Holy Spirit is an extension of God. The Spirit of God pervades the universe. Those that understand the basic command to *love one another*, namely, all the sisters and brothers of all nations throughout the world, are candidates to be sons and daughters of God. This was the Word given by God through Jesus. He emphatically stated the Word three times in the Gospel of John (13:34, 15:12, and 15:17).

The concept of the Trinity is nebulous and mysterious because it combines entities that are both physical and transcendental. The Church fathers have embodied in the Trinity the unknowable, incomprehensible, omnipotent God; a physical man that became a Son of God; and the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God that evokes the search for truth within the soul of mankind. The Trinity presents a confusing concept developed by the Church to establish the godliness of Jesus. Though John’s Gospel recognizes Jesus as the Son of God, he does not fuse these three entities into the embodiment of one God. In fact, nowhere in the Bible is the concept of the Trinity presented.

The Word that was taught by Jesus was to *love one another*. This command is to be honored whether Jesus was a man or a God. During Jesus's lifetime, the idea of men being worshipped as gods was very popular. The entire line of Caesars during the Roman Empire was regarded as gods. The Egyptian pharaohs and leaders of nations have found that people are motivated to obey and act through the authority of a god. Use of the belief in God by religious and political leaders allows them to facilitate the development of integrity, ethics, and a moral set of values for a stable nation. John was perceptive in the use of the power of God to raise a humble and wise man to the level of a god so that greater authority is given to the Word. It should be clear, however, that Jesus was the *Son of Man* embraced by God as His son to deliver His Word to mankind.

In ending this discourse, it is worthy to mention inconsistencies in the Bible that do not agree with the astonishing idea that Jesus existed in the beginning with God. First, in Genesis, it is clear that only God created the heavens, earth, living things, and finally man. The NT Gospels clearly state in Matthew 1:20, 21 and Luke 1:35 that Jesus will be conceived within Mary by the Holy Spirit. In all four Gospels, Jesus explicitly stated he was the *Son of Man* seventy-six times. Only in the last Gospel of John, others, not Jesus, stated six times he was the *Son of God*. In Matthew 1:1-25 and Luke 3:23-38, genealogy is presented to emphasize Jesus is from the line of Abraham and David. This genealogy confirms that Jesus is definitely a descendant from man blessed with the grace of God through the Holy Spirit. Finally, not to belabor other inconsistencies, in John 14:28, Jesus states, "*I go unto my Father: for my Father is greater than I.*"

With the above information, would you agree that the Church fathers have committed a gross distortion of the truth by promulgating Jesus as co-equal with God and existing in the beginning? Or do you believe Jesus was conceived by God's Holy Spirit within the womb of Mary and became a *Son of God* spiritually? Perhaps you may have an alternative view you wish to express.

If you desire to increase your knowledge of how man first conceived God and a deep understanding of how that God profoundly influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions, time invested in reading *Future of God Amen* will be well spent. To evaluate if you would like to read this book, place an Internet search on the title and you will learn why the author wrote the book, several book

reviews, an excerpt to examine the author's writing style, and a brief biography of its author, Nicholas P. Ginex.

Note:

The word Trinity does not appear in the Bible. Early church writers such as Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Novatian, Arnobius, and Lactantius were very explicit in affirming that the Heavenly Father alone is the supreme God and that Jesus is completely subordinate to His authority and will. It was Arius, a preacher from Libya, who initiated the debate as to whether Jesus was co-equal with God or created. He taught that the Son of God was not eternal and was subordinate to God the Father. His bishop, Alexander, strongly opposed him by insisting that the son was truly God in as absolute a sense as the Father was.

To settle the debate, it was in 325 CE that Emperor Constantine convened the Council of Nice, attended by 220 bishops, and the Nicene Creed was formulated; it states that the Father and son are co-equal and co-eternal. As noted above, this disagrees with the words of Jesus, "*My Father is greater than I.*" Also in John, Jesus confirms he is the *Son of Man* and does what his Father has taught him because he always does those things that please his Father.

When ye have lifted up the Son of Man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father has taught me, I speak these things. And He that sent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please Him.
(John 8:28-29)

The fabricated Nicene dogma was extended to include the Holy Spirit in 381 CE by the Catholic Church at the Council of Constantinople. They defined the Trinity as one God consisting of three persons: the Father, the Son Jesus, and the Holy Spirit. This definition of the Trinity was a foolish and obvious mistake by the Church fathers because they did not understand that the Holy Spirit is the spirit of God that pervades the entire universe. The fusing of three entities into one God has caused the church to be plagued for centuries for fabricating a concept that has caused many discerning believers to lose faith in God as the creator of all there is.

Unfortunately, to try to validate the Trinity, the Church has misconstrued Jesus as co-equal with God when Jesus stated in John 10:30, “*I and my Father are one.*” Yes, the scriptures teaches a oneness between the Father and the son, but this oneness is extended to all those that follow the Word. The oneness with God for all followers of God is expressed in John 17:8-11, 20-23, where Jesus prayed that his followers would experience the same oneness: “*That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they may also be one in us.*” Jesus is clearly saying he and followers are not one in substance with the Father and son but one in mind in the belief of God’s Word.

What has been proven when the Church fathers adopted the Trinity dogma is that man will repeat his arrogance of the past or, put another way, history will repeat itself. In *Future of God Amen*, page 103, the author presents an astonishing account of how some pharaohs, worshipped as the son of God, upon their death, would not only join their God in the hereafter but also consume him to gain strength and eternity forever. The following utterance was extracted from the Pyramid Texts of Kings Unis, Yeti II, Pepe I, and Mernere of the First Intermediate Period. The passages that follow are from *Future of God Amen*, pages 105-106.

Pharaoh’s dignities will not be taken away from him.

For he has swallowed the knowledge of every god. Pharaoh’s lifetime is eternity. His limit is everlastingness. In this his dignity of: “If-he-likes-he-does. If-he-dislikes-he-does-not.” He who is at the limits of the horizon, forever and ever. Lo, their Ba is in Pharaoh’s belly. Their Khu’s are in Pharaoh’s possession, as the surplus of his meal out of the gods, which is cooked for Pharaoh from their bones.

(Extract 10)

The above extract combines two powerful beliefs: (1) that the resurrected king exceeds the power of even the creator God, Atum-Re, and (2) the king lives off the bodies of the gods, absorbing their wisdom by eating their hearts (thought to be the mind by the Egyptians) and assimilating their khu’s (souls) by eating their flesh. Emphasis on eating the gods was the priesthood’s solution to sustain the king once in heaven. The solar theology of Atum-Re was exclusive to the pharaohs and the gods. Consequently, food that was formally provided by the people who attained the hereafter on earth in the Osirian theology was not available for the heavens.

The findings that the kings of Egypt became so powerful that they believed they could attain immortality among the stars and even replace the creator God should be considered. Is the king to be blamed for becoming so arrogant in believing that he was greater than his creator? Or is religion, as taught by the priesthood, to be blamed for leading the king into a world of fantasy? It is obvious that the indoctrination of a theology by the priesthood was responsible for shaping the views and conceptions that formed in the mind of the king. In fairness, both the king and priesthood may have shared the authority to carve the utterances on the tomb walls. Although the priests were subservient to the king, they had him believing from early childhood that he was the *Son of God*, which inflated his vanity and gradually led to the development of a distorted illusion of himself and his gods.

In summary, theology, like a scientific hypothesis, needs to be constantly revised and updated in order to serve a useful purpose in society. Throughout Egypt's history, the priesthood found it necessary to change their theology. This observation serves to reveal that as man's intelligence evolves to better understand the world and his relationship to it, his conception of God will also change.

Theology, taught by any religion is subject to change. Change is good, not because of mistaken ideas, but because it is necessary in order to make improvements. Man has learned that to survive we must adapt as technology continues to push the limits of our abilities. So too, religion must change and evolve to keep pace with the knowledge man obtains in his world. (Excerpt end from *Future of God Amen*)

The above extract reveals that just as the Egyptian priesthood was able to form the belief that the king was a Son of God so has the Church fathers adopted this belief to direct the religious beliefs of their people. The pharaoh's vanity, in collusion with the priesthood, led to arrogance that he could replace his God. But, in another vein, isn't that what John in the opening lines of his Gospel also attempted to do? To say in the beginning was the *word* namely Jesus, John has fired the imaginations of thousands of people to believe Jesus is the creator of all there is, placing God in a subordinate role.

What the world needs today is a religious revolution whereby people all over the world pressure their religious leaders to wake up and perform the responsibility of their profession by improving their scriptures and make them apply to the real world of today. Too many inconsistencies

and myths exist in the scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. In the case of the Koran, it is an abomination to the Word of God, for its many verses provoke bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent people who do not believe in the Islamic God Allah. *Future of God Amen* provides a critique of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic scriptures and recommendations for people around the world to insist upon efforts to unify the belief in God and establish a moral and ethical set of values for all people to live by. To do nothing, religious fanaticism can and will cause more unholy deaths and threaten the viability of our planet.

Comments and Responses

Richard Regener, March 11, 2011, 12:41 a.m. EST

There is little to argue here as the facts are clear, Nicholas. Unless we dismiss theological dogma in its entirety as an exceptionally bad idea from beginning to end, everything hinges on two presumptions that God exists and is a sentient entity, for without this, the whole concept of religions in any viable context falls apart into fantasy regardless of anyone's beliefs. That the concept of one god was an Egyptian creation to my understanding is not in dispute; the validity of this belief as accurate is quite another matter that has no chance of ever being validated.

All that this article actually shows is religious upgrade and design of their dogma for maximum public appeal to manipulate the public into believing they remain a viable institution to be supported and are violently reactive to theological contradiction.

Nicholas Ginex, March 11, 2011, 2:20 a.m. EST

Thank you, Richard, for taking the time to read a lengthy article. I realize that a post of more than four and five paragraphs requires an interest in the topic. I hope I have provided enough history to reveal Church dogma that has confused many people and I, for one, could never believe. It is difficult enough to believe in God, but to then have a Son of God co-equal to God becomes an insult in logic.

You've got to appreciate my purpose, and that is, the idea of God should not be a static one, frozen by scripture written thousands of

years ago. If the Egyptian priesthood was astute and intelligent enough to revise their beliefs many times, it reveals that our religious men of today have their minds frozen, locked in a cage, unable to address the many inconsistencies, myths, and lies that exist in their holy scriptures. There is no shame in revising scripture to reflect what man has learned about himself and the world he lives in. Yes, a religious renaissance is needed to unify the belief in God and eliminate verses that advocate bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent people.

Is There Need for a Religious Revolution?

November 27, 2010 01:25 a.m. EST

Jews, Christians, and Muslims know already that their God is the same. Astute intellectuals, theologians, and fools realize that there can only be one God that created all there is. The problems that exist are follows: Judaic religious leaders are convinced they are the chosen ones; Christian religious leaders believe in a God who has a son and are still waiting for that son named Jesus; and Muslim religious leaders believe Jesus is a prophet, not the Son of God, but also that they have the “true” religion. These beliefs suit them for various reasons. It is apparent that these religious leaders are no dopes and know the differences in the gods they worship. The dogmas between the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are at odds with each other, but intelligent, courageous religious leaders do exist who understand that, by not uniting their beliefs in their vision of one God, their religions will eventually crumble and die as people become more educated or there will be a downward slide into extreme devastation of our earth.

If the above religious leaders are representatives of God, the smart ones will understand that the only way to preserve the belief in God, and their religions, is to unite their beliefs and teach the Word of God—*love one another*. People with multiple levels of intelligence can agree that we all pray to the same God. If religious leaders are incapable of agreeing on a set of beliefs in one God, then it is the people, all around the world, of all races and religions that need to force the backward, mentally trapped religious leaders to sit together and work it out. Yes, it means revising the Old and New Testaments and Koran so that there is one unified scripture that all people can believe and follow. Today’s scriptures are truly outdated and need a new perspective about God and His intentions for His creations. The scriptures are full of

old, antiquated stories, myths and lies, which belittle His creations and cause bigotry, hate, and death to His creations. A book has been written, *Future of God Amen*, which perceives a religious renaissance is needed to right the worn, outdated scriptures of today.

People who are truly concerned about the bigotry, hate, violence, and killing due to religious differences will benefit in obtaining a greater understanding of God by placing an Internet search on *Future of God Amen* and invest time to read it.

Comments and Responses

Roy Wallen, November 26, 2010, 8:56 p.m. EST

Your initial premise is incorrect, you write of sedition, and you place “revolution” at the forefront. There is truly “nothing new under the sun.” Satan did the same and was cast out of heaven for it. The bigotry, hatred, violence, and death that you mention have come from rebellion against God are at least as old as man. One day, we will all know the true way that God has provided for each to know Him. No human-based method can do that.

Nicholas Ginex, November 26, 2010, 10:56 p.m. EST

Dear Roy,

By reading the post closely, you will see that I wrote, “If religious leaders are incapable of agreeing on a set of beliefs in one God, then it is the people, all around the world, of all races and religions that need to force the backward, mentally trapped religious leaders to sit together and work it out.”

The above post does not promote a revolution that entails “war” or sedition. It is simply an awakening by people all over the world to unite in bringing religious leaders together and break bread with each other so that they will be able to understand the problems they have created and make a concerted effort to solve those problems.

You, my friend, must try to think in more positive ways that promote love and understanding, not a seditious frame of reference.

Larry M., November 26, 2010, 9:14 p.m. EST

I have a different solution to the bigotry, hate, violence, and killing that I think will drastically reduce them. It does not require that anyone change their beliefs about God or their holy works.

Nicholas Ginex, November 26, 2010, 11:02 p.m. EST

Thank you, Larry, for your belief in a possible solution. Our readers and I would like to know how it is possible to have a solution without anybody changing their beliefs about God and the scriptures they now follow.

Richard Regener, November 27, 2010, 3:27 a.m. EST

Your choice of the term revolution rather negates what you apparently wish to inspire, Nicholas—that being a spiritual awakening of contemporary revision into a united accord.

Nicholas Ginex, November 27, 2010, 2:11 p.m. EST

Hello, Richard,

I contemplated your astute response as I wrote the title to this post. After couching my words with the idea that religious leaders need to sit down and work together to unify their beliefs and later, in the last paragraph, stating what is needed is a “religious renaissance,” I decided to use “revolution.” But there was a second reason; we all know that religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are, for the most part, trapped in a cage mentally due to their strict allegiance and inculcated training of their own religious dogma. Hence, it will be the people, worldwide, that direct the possibility for change. Use of the word “revolution” was to get people stimulated to understand that unless they get involved, the status quo will prevail, and yes, the outcome of more killings and devastation to our earth will occur.

Richard Regener, November 28, 2010, 1:41 a.m. EST

(Heh, heh) I do understand, Nicholas, although I’m sorry to say you would probably have a better chance of success with the mythical snowball’s chance in hell. The simple fact is most mature people

hate change, even when change may benefit them. Youth on the hand thrives on change because very few of them will understand cause and effects until it's too late.

Nicholas Ginex, November 28, 2010, 10:42 p.m. EST

Hello Richard,

Always good to know you're keeping watch over me. You know and I know that what I am proposing is a very, very long shot. For people to realize that the scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are out of date and sorely need revision is a very hard truth to comprehend. All cultures, civilizations, can only thrive and advance if their people are willing to accept change. The scriptures of the Torah, New Testament, and Koran have stymied the intellectual growth of more advanced societies. The Egyptian priesthood continually changed the beliefs they had for their gods until finally they developed the concept taught by our major religions—the belief in one, universal God.

Consider the possibility that if the Muslims conquered all civilized countries there will be a stop to human mental development. Already, Muslim fanatics prohibit learning of great literature that expands the mind to new ideas. Muslim children are taught fundamentalism and women are restricted from higher learning (except in more advanced countries like Iran, but intellectuals no longer want to live in Iran).

Richard B., November 27, 2010, 5:10 a.m. EST

There will be disasters because there are too many people here on earth eating the same thing and killing off and replacing all the “wild” environments that house all the other animals that will be gone.

Nicholas Ginex, November 27, 2010, 2:23 p.m. EST

Hello Richard B.,

You are right about the use of our resources to feed more people and retaining “wild” environments are important to the well-being of people and animals. However, I am bringing to the attention of people

who believe in one God, a creator of all there is, the need to have the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders work together to accomplish two things: unify their beliefs in the one God and teach the Word of God—*love one another*.

This is a great challenge for the present, and unless people are educated to realize that it is the religions that are causing divisions between Jews, Christians, and Muslims, there is no hope for a common belief in God that brings all these people together.

Darren (L., November 27, 2010, 6:18 a.m. EST

Astute intellectuals, theologians, and fools realize that
there can only be one God that created all there is.

To answer your question, religious revaluation is a constant phenomenon in human culture. There is nothing new in the world. People have often prayed to the same God on the battlefield as they have readied themselves to kill their brethren. Knowing the same dogma and believing in the same God has no effect on violent war.

War is not caused by religion; it is caused by the inability of two or more parties to compromise on shared resources—like land in Israel or water in Darfur or oil in the Middle East.

Religion is a tool to manipulate people to engage in holy battles; whether it is a battle over politics or a battle on the field of war it is the same. In the end, religion is simply tribalism. True spirituality is not concerned with doctrine or dogma. It's an interring into communion with the divine; it's not a god. It has no basis in dominance or subjugation. There is no definition to it; it is pure relationship. Its practice changes and transforms all other relationships in one's life, making the experience life-changing, and the soul is born again in perception having received new eyes.

In the spiritual world, war is interpersonal. The battle ground is confined within the heart of the seeker. If the battle spills out of the heart, it inters into the dark matter of the material world and is no longer a spiritual battle.

Dorothy H., November 27, 2010, 10:45 a.m. EST

You said it much better than I, Darren, but you stated basically what I thought after having read this article. The article is based on a false premise and delivers a non-answer answer.

Nicholas Ginex, November 27, 2010, 3:09 p.m. EST

Thank you, Darren, for your insightful response. You make some valid points, and one is religious beliefs are constantly changing as people become more educated and knowledgeable about themselves and their environment. The other point made was as follows: "Religion is a tool to manipulate people to engage in holy battles; whether it is a battle over politics or a battle on the field of war it is the same." This statement is unfortunate but true as we witness holy wars and suicide bombings in the name of God. However, I do not agree that "in the end, religion is simply tribalism." Religion has its value in teaching an entire set of people a uniform set of moral codes for them to live by. It is an institution utilized by all civilized countries to establish a common set of values on how we treat each another. The accusation that religion is "tribalism" is valid at the lower levels of community life, such as the many Hebrew tribes that existed before Abraham and Moses united them into the belief in one God and also the many Arab tribes that existed in Saudi Arabia before Muhammad unified them with a higher belief in one God.

You wrote about "true spirituality" has no definition but is a "pure relationship" that transforms one's life so that one's soul is "born again." For spirituality to exist, there must be something that the soul aspires to, and that, Darren, are the values created by wise human beings for us to live by—be it integrity, honesty, truth, righteousness, justice, and a belief that you can please your creator by loving your sisters and brothers, of all races, throughout our world.

Nicholas Ginex, November 27, 2010, 3:21 p.m. EST

Dear Dorothy,

Thank you for your response. You stated that "the article is based on a false premise and delivers a non-answer answer." Please indicate the false premise. Regarding the answer, the post clearly states that the

religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions need to work together to unify their beliefs otherwise our future will be a catastrophic one with the many suicide bombings and killing done in the name of God. Hence, an answer is a religious renaissance is needed to revise the worn, outdated scriptures of today.

John Doyle, November 27, 2010, 8:48 a.m. EST

Interesting post, but my answer is no. Those who are most vocal about religion know the least about it. Fundamentalists are case in point “read my Bible that’s all I need.” The remark above about truth is just dualistic as those who insist on true religion. I believe that the majority don’t care enough about their religion to participate in a revolution, and the ones that do care are convinced that theirs is the only true religion.

Nicholas Ginex, November 27, 2010, 3:46 p.m. EST

Dear John,

You are a very realistic man about stating that most people don’t care enough about their religion to participate in a revolution and the ones that do care are convinced that theirs is the only true religion. This is a very sad but true assessment of the “religions” of today. Your assessment is even more realistic when we consider the religious leaders themselves; they will be most resistant to change. However, change is the only saving grace. The Egyptian priesthood was adaptable to change as they went through several transformations from multiple gods to the belief in one, universal God named Amen.

But there is a difference; the Egyptians made changes in their beliefs within their own culture. It would be more difficult for Judaic, Christian, and Islamic leaders to agree because they have an innate pride and deep indoctrination in their vision of God as written in their scriptures.

However, John, I cannot with a true consciousness not stand up and fight for a unity of spirit and vision in the belief in one, universal God. If we all sit on our asses and do nothing, we are guaranteed to witness more suicide bombings and the killing of people all over the world. The only solution, at least as I see it, is for the people, worldwide, to

confront the religious leaders and pressure them to unite their beliefs. Yes, it will mean a revision of their scriptures into a unified whole. But if they do not have the perceptiveness and are courageous enough to make the needed changes their religions will eventually crumble and die.

Can Religious Leaders Provide World Peace?

November 03, 2010 07:03 p.m. EDT

Can religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions work together to unify their beliefs in the interest of world peace? In an article by Hanna Siniora, on October 31, titled “Can religious leaders play a constructive role?” it became clearly apparent that progress was not possible. Recently, two weeks of meetings conducted by bishops of the Vatican declared that Israel should not use the biblical concept of a promised land or a chosen people to justify new settlements in Jerusalem or territorial claims in the West Bank.

We have seen in the past that religious leaders are so entrenched in their doctrines that they are not capable or courageous enough to make adjustments, compromises, and revisions to their religious beliefs. This state of affairs can only be remedied by the followers of these religions. In *Future of God Amen*, solutions are provided to direct a ground swell of public support to force their religious leaders into action. Now, as in the past, a lot of nice words are exchanged but there is no progress in revising their dogma because they are locked in a mental cage that insulates them from being open to new ideas. Religious leaders are so indoctrinated in their own scriptures that they believe it to be sacrilegious to improve their doctrines. They will not admit their scriptures are not only outdated with a more educated and discerning populace, but they still insist on retaining their myths and distortions of the truth.

Ms. Hanna Siniora provided a summary of her article by concluding as follows:

“To date, religion has been more of a source of discord than a source of peace. The territorial and political conflict

between Israelis and Palestinians has led to the abuse of religious interpretations, rather than the cultivation of moderate attitudes toward the homeland and, in particular, the holy sites in Jerusalem. In our particular case, religious leaders must intensify their efforts to persuade their followers that God and His Word call for acceptance, understanding, balance and peace. Extremist voices are misinterpreting this message.”

Readers of this post may review the reasons why religious leaders must work together by clicking on www.futureofgodamen.com Are there suggestions or solutions you can offer to energize religious leaders to acknowledge and compromise their differences? Is it a sin to revise scripture that has been written more than 1,500 to 3,000 years ago? Do most people realize that scripture was not inspired over a few weeks but was written and revised many times over many centuries? To be informed, readers are encouraged to visit the website.

Comments and Responses

Larry M., November 3, 2010, 7:44 p.m. EDT

Historically, religious leaders have been able to spark war or get wars started, but they have not prevented war, not stopped a war. I have no idea how to get religious leaders to resolve their differences.

Nicholas Ginex, November 3, 2010, 11:05 p.m. EDT

Larry, you're so right that rather than promote love between people, religions have promoted divisions that have caused wars. However, as dismal as it appears, I do hope that there are ways for religious leaders to resolve their differences.

Larry M., November 4, 2010, 6:59 a.m. EDT

I also hope there are such ways. I just have not thought of any. It's tough to resolve differences between absolutes, ultimates, and infinities.

Nicholas Ginex, November 4, 2010, 4:27 p.m. EDT

You're right, Larry.

Religious leaders and many of their followers are entrenched in a set of beliefs that has been ingrained so strongly that there is little room for an open mind. However, I am a strong believer in change as mankind grows intellectually and gains experience with his world. I have invested my own money to inform people and religious leaders that there are ways to work together to come up with a unified belief between all three religions.

But it cannot happen without the participation of the followers of the major religions demanding their leaders acknowledge that they all pray to the same God. If this is not possible, then there is no hope for change because the leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions do believe in, as you say, their absolutes. Change is possible. The Priesthood of Amon revised their scriptures many times until they finally came up with the concept of one God. It is much more difficult now because we have three religions instead of one, where each religion thinks they have the *true* religion. How foolish or as my father would say “What fools these men are (similar to what fools these mortals be)!”

Debra C., November 3, 2010, 8:23 p.m. EDT

To your question “*Can Religious Leaders Provide World Peace?*” the answer is no. Religious leaders can preach world peace and better yet model it, but they cannot provide it. What they can provide is an encouragement for the discussion of world peace by those charged with treaties, alliances, and negotiation for it.

Nicholas Ginex, November 3, 2010, 11:21 p.m. EDT

Hello Debra,

I agree with you. However, I believe the religious leaders themselves need to find ways to agree on solutions that eliminate bigotry, hate, and discontent that cause wars. Do you feel active participation by Judaic, Christian, and Islamic leaders in a council for religious unity would be a positive start?

Debra C., November 3, 2010, 11:34 p.m. EDT

I know religious leaders from these religious groups who are involved in this cause. There are a number of organizations very active to this end.

Nicholas Ginex, November 4, 2010, 4:10 p.m. EDT

Thank you, Debra.

I would like to e-mail to the religious leaders you know of to try to gain their assistance to identify religious leaders that will be willing to participate in a *council for religious unity*. The Vatican Synod consists of about 250 cardinals and bishops, which recently met in October. This group has been in existence for many years, but the size of the group, in my mind, prohibits any real progress. Another reason for their failure to have a strong impact on cooperation between the major religions is that they have not given equal representation for the Judaic and Islamic religious leaders.

I plan to mail a complimentary copy of *Future of God Amen* to twelve religious leaders in each Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religion. The book reveals weaknesses in the Torah, OT, NT, and Koran. More importantly, it provides recommendations for religious leaders and worshippers to work together to unify their beliefs and teach the Word of God—*love one another*. You may access an overview of the book by clicking on www.futureofgodamen.com

Your help to have me contact some of the religious leaders is appreciated. My e-mail address is nickginex@gmail.com

Gary G., November 4, 2010, 12:22 a.m. EDT

No. Christianity and Islam are not the same. Nor will they unite. But there will be people in Islam who will convert to Christianity. However, world leaders will eventually come together with what is thought of to be peace. But it will be a false peace.

Nicholas Ginex, November 4, 2010, 3:46 p.m. EDT

Thank you, Gary, for sharing your view. You do miss one important fact; although the Christianity and Islamic (and Judaic) religions have their own way of teaching the concept of God, they all pray to the same God. Few people are aware that these religions all share a common bond with the God named Amen. He, the God, is announced at the end of a prayer, supplication, in giving thanks and praise to God by followers of the three religions.

The religious leaders, if they were perceptive and courageous enough, could acknowledge that their beliefs sprang from the same roots. To be informed how and why they all have the same God, read *Future of God Amen*. Then, and only then, will you realize why Jesus Christ proclaimed *Amen* as “*the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of god.*”

Gary G., November 4, 2010, 7:21 p.m. EDT

Sorry, I disagree. Jesus is God, the Father is God, and the Holy Spirit is God. The Bible is the true inspired Word of God. This is not in line with Islamic belief.

Sorry, don't wish to read your book.

Richard Regener, November 4, 2010, 12:23 a.m. EDT

In answer to the title of this post, Nicholas, “*no, they cannot!*” The only ones who can declare peace are all the people by refusing to do battle for any reason, and that will never happen.

Nicholas Ginex, November 4, 2010, 3:35 p.m. EDT

Yes, Richard, I am inclined to agree that it is the people that will ultimately make any changes and not the religious leaders. To say it will never happen is to lose faith in the intelligence of mankind. I believe that only the people are capable of making changes to the religious dogma of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions.

There is a need to teach a moral code that is consistent for all people. This need, if not provided by the religions, will cause religions to crumble and die.

Richard Regener, November 4, 2010, 5:40 p.m. EDT

“To say it will never happen is to lose faith in the intelligence of mankind.”

On the contrary, Nicholas (chuckling), I have the utmost faith in human nature to cut off its nose to spite its face regardless of any intelligent pursuits. History is riddled with this truth as the future will ultimately prove. In the end, it comes down to which path every person chooses

to follow, wisdom or ignorance—the illusion of power or the illusion of life as most understand these concepts?

Nicholas Ginex, November 4, 2010, 10:28 p.m. EDT

Hello Richard,

You do have a realistic view of life regarding people are ultimately responsible for the path they choose: the illusion of power (ignorance) or the illusion of life (wisdom?). In either case, the path is determined by the foundation of moral codes based on experience and certain bits of knowledge handed down by those gifted enough to teach others.

To expect people to learn about the best way to make decisions without passing down wisdom of the ages will end up in complete havoc, producing devastation around the world. People will find many paths that end up in disillusionment. We need solutions, and one would be equal education throughout the world that makes all people communicate without bias, bigotry, and hate. Here I throw in the Word of God—*love one another*, for without this teaching we continue to be animals.

Richard Regener, November 5, 2010, 2:03 a.m. EDT

In teaching, there is an ethical standard which few follow, and moral concepts are just not applicable here. “Do no harm with knowledge,” meaning the path of wisdom is defined by examining and understanding cause, effects, and consequences to discover balance.

For instance, is there balance in the concept of love? Of course, there is, and yet there are also the extremes of love, which can easily become perverted and malignant, so without teaching the full applications of love there is always the essence of harm attached to this concept. If only the positive aspects of love are taught, then the dangers of its corrosive influences exponentially increase due to a lack of understanding. The evidence of this is all around us today in all cultures!

Nicholas Ginex, November 5, 2010, 10:59 p.m. EDT

Richard,

You are absolutely correct. Forgive my use of a command that is stated in its most simplistic form. What you say is extremely necessary in teaching a particular aspect of morality. Love is an attribute, but how

it is applied and used, and not abused, is where teachers like yourself come in and provide a very important role. It is experience of those who have gone down a lot of wrong paths and learned a bit of knowledge that could humbly share it with others.

Thank you for the clarification that by examining and understanding causes, effects, and consequences, we discover balance and a more successful path in life.

Dennis Gilman, November 4, 2010, 11:00 a.m. EDT

“Religious leaders are so indoctrinated in their own scriptures that they believe it to be sacrilegious to improve their doctrines.” I wholeheartedly agree.

“They . . . insist on retaining their myths and distortions of the truth.” This is the reason why they can never provide world peace.

“This state of affairs can only be remedied by the followers of these religions.” I have no faith in seeing that ever occurring. I keep getting the impression that the followers are either intellectually lazy or suffer from mental inertia. They seem to prefer to let someone else think and decide for them. This attitude has been encouraged and enforced by religious clergy from as far back in history as I have checked.

One result has been the rise of what has been called “new atheism.” New atheists are calling for an abandonment of beliefs in all gods to free mankind’s minds from the shackles placed on them by religion. The example of the horrors committed under atheistic regimes in the twentieth century makes me not have any confidence in that proposed solution either, such as the piles of human bones in Cambodia and German cremation camps.

An atheistic world is just as terrifying a prospect to me as a “religious” one.

Nicholas Ginex, November 4, 2010, 3:01 p.m. EDT

Hello Dennis,

Your comments are very revealing and perceptive. The fact that religious leaders are blinded by their dogma prohibits the ability to have an open mind.

That's why I propose that it is the followers that must teach the religious leaders that they are behind the times because their scriptures do not, that is the Torah, OT, NT, and Koran, do not provide a unified message for all people to live by—*love one another*.

I agree that the public is somewhat lazy. However, like the Tea Party Movement, they can be energized to correct a situation that the religious leaders are, so far, failing to do.

If religious leaders continue to posture themselves as a silent, inactive force to teach the Word of God, then it is up to the public, people around the world, to demand religious leaders to get off their righteous asses and cooperate with one another to make this a harmonious and peaceful world.

Jacob S., November 5, 2010, 10:04 a.m. EDT

I would like to recommend a book about religious tolerance. It is *The Dignity of Difference* by Rabbi Jonathan Sachs, the Chief Rabbi of England. Actually it is Lord Rabbi Jonathan Sachs—in particular chapter 2.

Nicholas Ginex, November 5, 2010, 10:45 p.m. EDT

Dear Jacob,

I was able to put a search on Rabbi Sachs's book, *The Dignity of Difference*, and I was comforted by the following statements he made in summarizing some of what he wrote:

1. The power of ideas.
And perhaps you are thinking to yourselves: "Put an idea against a laser guided missile or a suicide bomber; that's a pretty uneven fight." My answer is that there are two different ways of confronting conflict. One is through the instrumentalities of power-economic power, political power, military power. The other is through something that is utterly not power, called influence, which, because it shapes human decisions, shapes how we use the technology and the wealth of this world.
2. *The Dignity of Difference* is just a book of ideas.
I think we need ideas in our arsenal as well as high-precision weaponry. I believe that it is possible to be true to your faith without ever, ever denigrating the faith of others.

3. Tolerance and respect for other cultures.

Friends, you don't have to denigrate any culture. You can admire the fact that there are wonderful other cultures, other civilizations, other faiths, but this is ours. Each one of us can say that. And if that is enough for us, we will bring peace to the world.

Jacob, as the author of *Future of God Amen*, I have taken the belief in God a great step back into a past that Rabbi Sachs has overlooked. He forms his ideas around God being for all people though they may worship Him differently; but begins with the Genesis of the Old Testament that begins with the chosen family of the Hebrews started by the patriarch, Abraham.

Both Rabbi Sachs and I deal with the world of ideas, but I start at the very beginning, whereby man conceived the beginning of the creation of God. That God is the common bond of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions; his name is Amen.

Nicholas Ginex, November 7, 2010, 5:59 p.m. EST

Hello Jacob,

I was able to review some commentary on Rabbi Sachs's book, *The Dignity of Difference*, and the statement below closely appears to agree with the book *Future of God Amen*:

“There is no harm coming to extra-cultural and extra-religious agreements, as he seeks to do with the leaders of other religions, intending to produce, presumably, minimalist, religious sourced universal ethics of agreement that all can live by! Conversation allows us to learn about different cultures and religions, but also helps to set standards and make combined strategies.”

Peggy V., November 7, 2010, 3:36 p.m. EST

It is only people outside the three major monotheistic religions that believe those three religions worship the same god. Adherents to those religions believe it is *not* the same god they worship. Therefore, the god worshipped is not a basis for unity. An excellent explanation of the world's major religions—from a scholarly and readable point of view—is “*God Is Not One*” by Stephen Prothero.

Nicholas Ginex, November 7, 2010, 6:33 p.m. EST

Peggy, thank you for your practical and realistic response.

Your response helps many people realize that although Judaic, Christian, and Islamic worshippers believe in one God they do not believe it is the same God that created all there is. This is arrogance taught by religious leaders, and they are the prime source of such stupidity, which is based upon pride and nationalism/culturalism and their specialized scriptures.

That is why I believe it is the people themselves that must, through education, tolerance, and respect for each other, demand their religious leaders wake up and reflect the knowledge of our times. More and more people are leaving their houses of worship because the religious leaders are trying to hold on to their own specialized interpretation of God that is formed by scriptures that are out of date. A very bold movement by people of the world is needed to initiate change by showing their desire to have peace, which also means that they all pray to the same God. Until this fundamental idea is taught by religious leaders, there will be continued divisions that breeds hate, bigotry, and violence.

I will try to read up on the book you referenced, *God Is Not One*, by Stephen Prothero. In spite of the overwhelming task of informing people that we all pray to the same God and that the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions have a common bond, the God Amen, I will continue because it is better than putting my head in the sand and hoping for the best. Nothing happens without trying to do something about the present course of events.

Nicholas Ginex, November 7, 2010, 11:05 p.m. EST

Dear Peggy,

Thank you for introducing me to Stephen Prothero's book *God Is Not One*. Stephen makes it clear that all religions share the same moral values, and all paths up the mountain lead to the same God. But he makes a good point that as believers approach the top of the mountain there is a divergence due to the different rituals, dogmas, and traditions in the concept of the same God.

This is understandable since the founders of these religions were righteous men who adopted the concept of one God for their own people. The customs and traditions of each group of people blended in with their written scripture used to define their belief in God. What we, in our modern world, have not been told by religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions is that their conception of one universal God has the same roots and was conceived in ancient Egypt. This oversight may not be intentional but simply arrogance of the past history of Egypt. Still, in light of the findings discovered by historians and Egyptologists over the past hundred years, there must be religious leaders who are well aware that the first universal God was beginning to be born into the consciousness of men two thousand years before the birth of Jesus Christ.

There is a common bond, and element of truth, that links the three major religions, and that is the God Amen who is reverently announced at the end of a prayer, supplication, in giving thanks and praise to God and singing Amen.

There is a fundamental bond that although the differences are many in religious rituals and customs, there is the idea of God that created all there is. This idea is distorted in the mental image of their believers because of the unique myths and ritual practices that are different, but the God is the same.

Have Religious Leaders Corrupted Religion?

January 19, 2010 03:22 p.m. EST

This post has been motivated by the words I responded to on a Gather comment. Because the words below have a resounding sense of truth, I would like to repeat them for many Gather readers.

“My personal views on any religions is that they have been corrupted beyond any measurable use and should be abolished as a belief, however many of the ancient teachings are quite relevant today and could easily be taught only as a true to life philosophy providing a moral foundation for living.”

There is a need for religious leaders to get back to the basics of righteousness and respect for truth. The ancient Egyptian priesthoods developed many moral laws by which their people took it seriously to be able to enter into another life of eternity. However, the priesthood had a strong hold on the development of their pharaohs and ingrained in their minds that they were Sons of God. This concept has survived up to the present whereby Christians are taught by the priesthood that Jesus is a Son of God.

In ancient Egypt, the priesthood became corrupt as they became increasingly more powerful and eventually took control, replacing the pharaoh's authority on the throne. This became evident toward the end of the reign by the long line of Ramses with Ramses XII. By 1026 BCE, the authority of the pharaohs clearly shifted to the priesthood with Amenemopet who ruled for a period of forty-nine years. It is to be noted that the reign of Amenemopet coincided with the periods of time that King David and King Solomon were the patriarchs and

rulers of Israel. We should pause and reflect on the fact that early in Solomon's rule he married the daughter of an Egyptian princess and built a temple for her to reside in. We could make an intelligent guess and surmise that it was the daughter of Amenemopet or his successor, Siamon who actually ruled while King Solomon was on the throne.

I bring these facts up for readers to understand the very strong possibility that there was cooperation between the Egyptian and Israeli priesthoods. It is no wonder that it was during Solomon's reign that the first Hebrew scripture was created in 950 BCE. Scholars of religions have found that many phrases in the Hebrew scripture have been derived from the original ideas and beliefs of the Egyptians. A prime example may be found in comparing the Re-Isis Myth with Genesis in the Torah. The following comparison, written by yours truly, has been extracted from *Future of God Amen*, page 225.

Re-Isis Myth: The spell of the divine god, who came into being by himself, who made heaven, earth, water, the breath of life, fire, gods, men, small and large cattle, creeping things, birds, and fishes, the king of men and gods at one time, (for whom) the limits (go) beyond years, abounding in names, unknown to that (god) and unknown to this (god).

The first line of Genesis states: *In the beginning, God created the heaven and earth.* This is not an original idea but rather a restatement of what the Egyptians already believed in the above Re-Isis Myth. What is of further interest is that chapter 1 of Genesis identifies heaven, earth, water, and the same life forms attributed to the god in the Re-Isis Myth. Though the order may not be the same, notice the use of the same nouns: heaven and earth; water, birds, and fishes; cattle and creeping things, and of course—man.

Genesis provides a conceptual advance from the Re-Isis Myth. They both identify one divine god. However, the Re-Isis Myth is more definitive by also stating that God "*came into being by himself.*" Much credit must be given to the author(s) of Genesis for the wonderful ideas that have been borrowed from Egyptian scripture and restated in an eloquent manner. Note that the Re-Isis Myth may be regarded as scripture because it embodies the religious beliefs of the Egyptians. In a strict sense, if we classify the Re-Isis Myth as simply a myth. Should we in fairness classify Genesis also as a myth?

Back to the profound words quoted at the top of this response; it is very true that the ancients have developed some very instructive and moral codes or laws to help guide people in a life of fairness, righteousness, and truth. There is no need for religious leaders to fabricate lies and myths to strengthen the moral beliefs for people to live by. A truth not acknowledged is that Jesus Christ was a Son of Man spiritually and not a Son of God genetically.

The four Gospels reveal that Jesus stated explicitly he was the Son of Man seventy-six times. It was only in the last Gospel of John, written around 95-120 BCE, when the church gained greater power and authority, that others, not Jesus, stated only six times, he is the Son of God.

I leave a thought for Gather readers to ponder. Would Christians believe any less in the words of Jesus Christ if he was only a Man and not a Son of God? He loved His Father and gave to the world the greatest commandment in the Bible—*love one another*.

Comments and Responses

Richard Regener, January 19, 2010, 5:07 p.m. EST

Excellent post, Nicholas.

Nicholas Ginex, January 19, 2010, 6:00 p.m. EST

Thank you, Richard. I wanted to cite your name to that very impressive paragraph you wrote, but I felt your approval would be needed.

You are, to me, somewhat of a mentor because you have motivated me to write commentary and posts I would not have thought of. So thank you again. It is rare to have a friendship with somebody with your perceptiveness and maturity.

Are Religious Leaders Too Arrogant to Unify Their Beliefs?

August 10, 2011 04:50 p.m. EDT

A conclusion not obvious to many people of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions is that they pray to the same god even though their religious dogma is not consistent. It is no accident that worshippers announce Amen at the end of a prayer, supplication, or giving thanks and praise to God. It was the Egyptian god Amen that existed for over two thousand years before the birth of Jesus. This god is the first universal god of all creation and the maker of all that is.

The divisions in the belief of god by the three major religions have caused bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent people in many countries for the past two thousand years. It is crucial that the religious leaders of these religions work together to unify their beliefs in the same god. Some recommendations are that they open their doors to all people and work together to revise much of their dogma to unify their beliefs in god. A few of the ways to make this happen are by proactive people; worshippers are the only ones to make it happen because the leaders themselves are so locked into their dogmatic beliefs they are resistant to change.

The effort will require courageous and perceptive religious leaders to update their scriptures. Nothing is so sacred that it cannot be improved upon. The Egyptian priesthood revised their scriptures many times until they finally gave the world the belief in one universal God. Are our religious leaders too proud and arrogant to acknowledge that they pray to the same god? Are they capable of working with daughters and sons of God and understand that their mandate is to teach all people, from all countries, to love and assist one another?

Comments and Responses

Sue B., August 10, 2011, 3:27 p.m. EDT

It's not a matter of arrogance; it's a matter of belief.

Nicholas Ginex, August 10, 2011, 5:01 p.m. EDT

Sue, to me that is an excuse to say belief is more important than acknowledging the truth of the past and teaching all people to love one another regardless of their beliefs. Even Jesus acknowledged Amen as "the beginning of the creation of God" in Revelation 3:14, but Christian, Judaic and Islamic religious leaders ignore, misconstrue, and misinterpret his words. It is clear that the religions seek only to hold on to their traditions, control wealth and the minds of their worshippers. They still believe they each pray to the only true god, which is sad.

Sue B., August 10, 2011, 5:21 p.m. EDT

No one is saying that belief is more important than acknowledging truth. The beliefs that people have are their truths unless you think people have faith in what they don't believe to be true.

You know the two greatest commandments of the Christian religion, the foundation of that faith, as I call it. They not only teach, but command that we love all people regardless of anything, including their beliefs. That is not part of either Judaism or Islam. We can respect those religions, but we cannot unify our belief system with theirs.

We know that there have always been, are now, and always will be religious leaders out for their own gain, but as Christians, we do not follow or at least shouldn't follow religious leaders. Christ is the leader of our faith.

You want to interpret that verse as meaning the beginning of God, but that's not what it says. It's the beginning of God's creation. That's what the truth is and that's what it says even though you want to interpret it so you can make your point.

Nicholas Ginex, August 10, 2011, 6:03 p.m. EDT

Sue, thank you for your comments. You fail to recognize the greatest commandment given by Jesus in the Gospel of John. Jesus stated it as a command and announced it three times. It is very simple—*love one another*.

I agree with you that the Islamic religion has taken another path to grow an Islamic Empire, and they are doing a good job at succeeding. Christ is the leader of “our” faith, and here again, it is an example of a single-mindedness that does not care to acknowledge that we all pray to the same God. If you believe in Jesus as the leader of our faith, why not acknowledge His words—*love one another*? That, Sue, means Jews, Christians, Muslims, and people of all faiths. Jesus did not say worship only my god; in fact he made no mention of God. Keep in mind, the last *command* given by God and announced by Jesus was *love one another*. We must make an effort to break down the walls of religious bigotry. This can only be done by people, like yourself, and not religious leaders alone because they are too deep in the belief of their own dogma.

Sue B., August 10, 2011, 9:49 p.m. EDT

“Jesus stated it as a command and announced it three times. It is very simple—*love one another*.”

Who told you this is the greatest commandment? Why do you believe it is?

Nicholas Ginex, August 14, 2011, 10:58 p.m. EDT

Hello Sue,

I would like to make it clear that if you refer to the last Gospel of John, you will be able to read the last command given by God through His surrogate, Jesus Christ. In fact, Jesus announced the last *command* three times in a Gospel where many Christians believe in the Word introduced by John in his opening line of his Gospel. But what was the Word? The Word is believed to be Jesus, and the new command received from God stated three times is as follows:

A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. (John 13:34)

*This is my commandment. That ye love one another,
as I have loved you. (John 15:12)*

These things I command you, that ye love one another. (John 15:17)

Would any devout Christian deny this is the *Word of God*? Yes. There are many worshippers who cling on to the two great commandments given by Jesus wherein he says in Mark's Gospel to love your God with all your heart, mind, strength, and soul, and the second command was to love your neighbor as yourself. Then, in the Gospel of Matthew, Jesus was more specific to further state that on those two commandments "*hang all the law and the prophets.*"

By the time the last Gospel of John was written, Jesus simplified the Word of God, given through His father, by simply stating "*love one another.*" God was saying through Jesus that He was not that important to give your love to Him in mind, heart, strength, and soul but to love one another. For truly, unless you have learned to love your sisters and brothers, from any country, you cannot be accepted by God. God is self-sufficient and rather "see" His creations love one another, and that would be God's proudest achievement.

Sue, do you believe that Jesus, a Son of God, proclaimed the *Word of God—love one another*? I believe that when the last command is given three times by God through Jesus in John's Gospel where Jesus is identified as the Word that "*love one another is the Word of God.*"

Sue B., August 15, 2011, 9:06 a.m. EDT

Yes, it is *a* new commandment, one of the *two* greatest, not *the* new commandment. I've already proven your deception herein. No Christian who is a Christian will be interested in your idea of unification. I've told you why. Good-bye.

Nicholas Ginex, August 15, 2011, 3:57 p.m. EDT

Dear Sue,

You have proven what deception by me? You agree that the information provided for you is correct regarding the last set of commands given by Jesus. But you come back with a snide remark that I am being deceptive. You are trying to discredit what I have written. You are the one who is

headstrong in not agreeing that the words of Jesus is the Word of God but continually retreat to the old two great commands. Is it that hard for you to love other people? I do not think you are incapable of loving others, especially those with whom you disagree with.

Scott I support Zionism, August 10, 2011, 5:47 p.m. EDT

Scott, it appears that my facts add up and you have nothing but your own opinion—not a fact.

You're a new-ager, my friend. You are like on a different planet.

You are of this world, and I understand how and why you're all mixed up.

Rest assured you know little or nothing of God.

It's foolish to stay on the path you are on, my friend.

Accept Jesus the Christ as your Lord and Savior and live, my friend.

Sue B., August 11, 2011, 1:00 a.m. EDT

You can term it whatever you'd like, but Scott has it down. The concept itself is no different from any New Age philosophy. It just arrives differently.

I'm sure that Scott knows that the beliefs of other people are just as real to them. As I said before, "The beliefs that people have are their truths unless you think people have faith in what they don't believe to be true." That would really be foolish, wouldn't it? Your beliefs are just as real to you too. We understand that, but maybe you need to understand that it's *never* going to come to pass that our beliefs will be yours and probably not yours ours. That's the acceptance that you must come to realize. Loving people who don't think the same way you do and who don't have the same beliefs as you do is not as easy as loving people who do. We accept that you believe what you do despite what we "know" to be true, for if we did not "know" it to be true, we would not believe it, and though we are privileged to have met you, we have not been awaiting the coming of Nicholas Ginex and the *Future of God Amen* for our salvation. Thank you for your generous offer though.

Nicholas Ginex, August 11, 2011, 4:01 p.m. EDT

Hello Sue,

You are proving to me that people, once indoctrinated into a particular faith, are trapped by the beliefs they have been taught, never to be open to other ideas even when change becomes obvious. You know, as a little boy, I believed in Santa Claus and looked forward to Christmas. But I grew up to realize it was a belief taught to me to bring joy and hope for the future with gifts my parents could not easily afford during the year. Since then, I became a father and continued to play the role of Santa Claus because I enjoyed the awe in their eyes when I sat them on my lap and we sang Jingle Bells and Silent Night. Beliefs can change when there are educational resources to reveal the truth!

Let it be known, I am not a holy roller, a prophet, or a savior. I wrote *Future of God Amen* to share the knowledge I have gained in my lifetime reading many books on sociology, theology, and Egyptology. Few people have been exposed to books that open their eyes with truth from the past because their lives may be caught up with just trying to survive the challenges of everyday living. I was always curious about God, and since a little boy, my ears were open to information and my eyes read some of the finest books by religious scholars and Egyptologists. After I retired and sat at my computer to write about my views and thoughts for my four daughters to remember me by, I found that a book started to unfold itself as I connected the dots of the religious past of the Egyptians, Hebrews, Christians, and Muslims.

I have not written the book for your salvation or others to change their beliefs. It was written to provide you, and others, with a history backed up with actual facts and findings of how spiritual people finally conceived the belief in one universal God. The myths that God handed human beings a belief to worship Him by need to be acknowledged for what it is, a myth. The belief in God was conceived after thousands of years by people that were in touch with nature and the beauty all around them. They admired those things they could not explain and developed gods that they could believe were the answers. The greatest concept they developed was the idea of a Creator God, the Maker of All that is. So the book goes on to reveal that the Egyptians were first to envision the concepts of a soul, a hereafter, a Son of God, and finally one universal God by 1270 BCE.

Sue, what I have tried to convey in *Future of God Amen* was how the Egyptian God Amen has had a profound influence on the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. There is history we could learn from instead of myths and lies that are interwoven with knowledge and experience wise men have documented into the fabric of scripture. Was it God that gave us the Ten (actually more than ten) Commandments or was it the experience of wise men who realized there are common sense laws of morality that needed to be applied in any community? To cut my response short, my message to all God-loving people is that there is a God. That God introduced Himself to the Egyptian people, and Jesus Christ acknowledged *Amen* as, “***the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.***” No truer words have been spoken by a man of God.

Wyoming Catt, August 13, 2011, 9:44 p.m. EDT

He’s right, Sue. If the religions were *truly* all about worshipping the Creator and loving one another, they’d have no problem coming together as one. It seems to me the only time they bother is when they’re *against* something. Also even within the different factions, there are offshoots of different interpretations and beliefs. It’s all just a mess, and each of you gravitate to the “side” that seems to speak your “language.”

Me, I stay out of churches and just try to be good to my fellow man (unless I witness said “fellow man” being a righteous bastard to others).

When I see religion *truly* come together in love and harmony and not just a bunch of bucolic “believers” rallying against, say, interracial marriage or gay love, *then* I’ll know that God might be making an appearance. Until then, I believe He’s in hiding from all the lies, pain, and suffering being spread in His name. (Yea verily, *Scott*, I’m thinking of you in particular.)

Nicholas Ginex, August 14, 2011, 6:28 p.m. EDT

Hello Wyoming Catt,

I have found that many people are so protective of their beliefs that they are not receptive to other points of view. I want to thank you for understanding what I am proposing for all worshippers of the

Judaic, Christian, and Islamic faiths. I agree the differences in the dogma of these religions are great and difficult to overcome, but wise, courageous, and perceptive religious leaders will come forward to realize it is in the interest of humanity to endorse and teach a unified belief in God, a belief that eliminates the bigotry, hate, violence, and killing of innocent people.

What we have is a problem, and that problem is created by the religious leaders themselves. They relish the power, wealth, and control of large numbers of people but lose sight of the mandate of their profession, and that is to create a harmonious society. These religious leaders are supposed to be representatives of God and they all miss the one important command of God, which is to *love one another*.

Jerry Kays, August 15, 2011, 5:56 p.m. EDT

It sounds to me that *the fly in the ointment* then is the Christian view of God . . . To them love and truth are someplace way behind or beneath what they call Jesus. They worship the Being rather than what he tried to teach them.

John Knight, August 16, 2011, 1:16 a.m. EDT

No, Jer, it can't all be about interpretation or what people are looking for according to Nicholas . . . (it doesn't seem). He's selling the idea that you, and everyone else that believes in a single God, didn't have any inspiration from anyone but those ancient Egyptians (and those who built on their ideas). That means you didn't receive anything at all from any God directly, according to his doctrines.

If you could have, then obviously those who wrote the scriptures of the three religions might have too . . . and vice versa; if they *couldn't* have, then naturally you're just imagining you did.

Jerry Kays August 16, 2011, 12:03 p.m. EDT

Nicholas admits that he has not personally knowingly "talked to God" (though we all have unwittingly), and he has studied the subject in books back as far as the Egyptians where he has found that there is one common God associated with the three major "subsequent" religions and that that common admonishment (or command) was to *love one another* . . . That is his main, and honorable, message offered for the

greater good . . . We should also honor his “intent” and not attempt to pick it apart for “other” personal reasons.

IMnsHO

Nicholas Ginex, August 16, 2011, 8:44 p.m. EDT

Hello Sue, John, and Jerry,

I read your comments with great interest and respect your beliefs. It is Jerry that I commend in that he understands my message, the Word of God stated by Jesus—*love one another*. This was a *command given by God* and not a “Thou shalt or shalt not.”

So what does this all mean that God gave Jesus His last command in John’s Gospel? Is God saying that His ultimate command is for our sisters and brothers, from any nation, to love and assist one another? Or is this a command meant only for one group of people who have the same beliefs in God? We all are bright and sensible enough to know that there can only be one universal God, the Maker of all there is. Isn’t it foolish that the religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions do not appear to accept that they all pray to the same God?

We must understand that each group of people has envisioned God and made Him their personal God, and in fact, the Hebrews are proud to proclaim that they are the chosen ones. But will the Judaic religious leaders be honest and truthful to admit that their roots can easily be traced back to the beliefs of the Egyptian religion? When I read comments by Sue and John, I must say that I understand your concerns that it may mean compromises in dogma.

The only great compromise for Christians is to revere Jesus as a Son of God spiritually. Jesus himself has repeatedly stated in the four Gospels that he is the Son of Man seventy-six times. Only in the last Gospel do others estate, not Jesus, that he is the Son of God six times. Yes, Jesus is a Son of God but is not co-equal to and co-eternal with God. Jesus is the Word of God for it was Jesus that announced the Word of God three times—*love one another*. However, to think God had Jesus with Him in the very beginning to create all there is a heretical view that the Church fathers fabricated to gain followers who need authority at the level of God.

There are many great men who have established a religion and obtained a great following, such as Buddha. There is no reason to believe that Christians will not follow the God-given words of Jesus simply because he is regarded as a Son of Man and not a god co-eternal and co-equal to God, the Maker of all there is. If there are people with so little belief in the words of Jesus, they will not believe in him even if he was the one universal God.

I will end this response by mentioning that I visited my daughter Lori in the hospital who just delivered a beautiful baby girl. Lori is my pal and she has read my book *Future of God Amen*. I mentioned that on the Gather forum there are pro and con responses over some of the controversial topics on religion. She was surprised to learn that many Christians were upset about my views of Jesus and God because she thought I gave the Christian religion the best write-up in the book. I said it is unfortunate that most people are lacking in history of the past and I cannot and should not expect them to appreciate what I wrote. It is a book for the future when there are more discerning and educated people who will be willing to acknowledge the “truth” provided by dedicated men who have discovered actual facts and findings, a truth that reveals that it was the Egyptians who introduced God to all of us through thousands of years in their belief that a God exists.

Mike Voyce, August 10, 2011, 6:12 p.m. EDT

A human being is a human being whether they devote themselves to religion or not. It may be that people turn to religion out of need for spiritual support rather than from spiritual strength. Someone full of doubt and in need of certainty is not going to take kindly to evidence that their way is not the only way, not *the* right way.

Historically this was far, far worse than it is today. It did not help that the emperor Constantine and, in England, the Tudors as well as others brought politics into religion, often mixing secular tyranny with religious faith.

We must not allow the spiritually frightened, and therefore aggressively dangerous, to blind us to the fact that the great religions get on better than they have done for many centuries.

Go on, be an optimist.

Nicholas Ginex, August 10, 2011, 9:01 p.m. EDT

Hello Mike,

I was impressed with your wisdom, understanding of human nature, and knowledge of religious history. I agree that fear and aggressive behavior that leads to violence and the killing of people in the name of God is prevalent today. Though you may feel it was worse centuries ago, I have to say that the violence and killing going on by Islamic extremists is still going strong.

You are right in that I am an optimist, but that is because I love all human races. Having been brought up in the melting pot of Manhattan, New York City, I have had the good fortune to meet people from many cultures. I played and laughed with them, an exposure that has enriched my life. Though an optimist, I am practical. Being a Virgo at heart, I can understand the awesome task of trying to get people to widen their perspectives, accept the beliefs of others, and be open to change. This will not happen by the religious leaders themselves because they are mentally locked in a cage of religious dogma that prevents them to be open and receptive to change.

In the book *Future of God Amen*, I have provided several recommendations how people worldwide can initiate changes in the three major religions. Change will come when enough people are educated and are knowledgeable about a past that reveals how mankind came to conceive one universal God. When their knowledge reveals that the roots of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions stem from the Egyptian religion, they may become humble to acknowledge that there is a common legacy in the belief of God. I am not a holy roller or a new-ager, but a man who desires that people wake up and confront religious leaders to unify our beliefs in the same God. Only people worldwide can do that. It is my belief that such an initiative will not happen with religious leaders.

Nippy Katz (not his real name) Patriotic Troll of Gather Freedom, August 10, 2011, 7:16 p.m. EDT

I've never seen anything that led me to believe that people in the various Abrahamic religions prayed to the same god. Admittedly, the big three all claim to worship the one true god, but you have to make some assumptions to get to the god of the three religions being the

same one. Ancient Judaism never made a case for there being one and only one god. It made a case that a god had selected Abraham and his descendants as its personal favorites.

The word “amen” that often concludes prayers comes from Hebrew. The name of the Egyptian god is a coincidence. It’s usually transliterated “Amun.”

Nicholas Ginex, August 10, 2011, 9:16 p.m. EDT

Hello Nippy,

Thank you for your comments. I had the same ideas like you regarding the three religions and their different beliefs could not possibly have anything to do with the concept of one universal God. I learned a lot during my research in the two-year writing effort that produced my first book, *Legacy of a Father*. It was a 650 page monstrosity that included too much history about many of the Egyptian pharaohs. I went through a few editions to arrive at the book now titled *Future of God Amen*.

I learned that contrary to the belief that the Egyptian religion was a myth, it was a religion that existed for over three thousand years, or longer, before the birth of Jesus Christ. It became clear that it was the Egyptian priesthood that developed the concepts of a soul, a hereafter, a Son of God, and a universal God by 1270 BCE.

It was the religious beliefs of the Egyptians and their god Amen that has profoundly influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. It is no accident that Amen is announced in temples and churches for this god existed for over two thousand years before the birth of Jesus. Very few people acknowledge this fact, but Jesus did by proclaiming that Amen is “*the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.*”

Richard W., August 10, 2011, 7:18 p.m. EDT

When you say “the three major religions” are you speaking of Judaism, Islam, and Christianity? From the tags which you attached to this post that appears to be the way you are thinking, which is the problem. Other religions have important teachings too. On a moral, ethical, and humanitarian level, Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, and Taoism are superior to your “three major religions” because they are oriented toward the individual rather than a mysterious sky god.

Christianity, Islam, and Judaism are more concerned with what you believe than in what you do. In Christianity it's simple: If you murder somebody, you are forgiven. If you deny the Trinity, you are excommunicated and sentenced to an eternity in hell. Dogma is not something to be rewritten; it is something to be taught, and if you refuse to accept it, you are better off dead. You are not going to change these religions because to do so would be to change their essence.

Nicholas Ginex, August 10, 2011, 11:37 p.m. EDT

Thank you, Richard. You are correct that many other religions have moral values as do the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. I would not say that they are superior because they concentrate on the individual rather than a mysterious sky god. Actually the Buddhist and Hindu religions also have a concept that relies on the transformation of the soul and some afterlife idea that is used to promote morality. It is not my goal to deal with these other religions for they have been behaving the way good human beings should behave. My concern is the divisions of belief of the three monotheistic religions that have caused bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent people.

All religions have some kind of dogma to induce their worshippers to follow a system of morality. Of course, dogma can be rewritten. This has been done several times during the life of the Egyptian priesthood. They went from the worship of a creator god Atum to the merged Atum-Re god to Amon-Re and finally accepted the belief in one universal god with scripture titled *Amon as the Sole God* by 1270 BCE. The problem today is that religious leaders of the three monotheistic faiths are too proud and too arrogant to realize that their mandate, if they truly believe in God, is to teach our sisters and brothers, from all countries, to love and assist one another. Unfortunately, this world view of God is not taught as each religion desires to hold on to their power, wealth, and control of the hearts and minds of people.

Richard Regener, August 11, 2011, 2:42 a.m. EDT

Hi Nicholas,

You never cease to amaze me in your attempts to change the big three that which does not lend itself to change. No matter what inducements you can suggest, the desire for the power to exert control over others cannot be deflected, and that is your nemesis. Directing attention to individuals is where real success is achieved.

Nicholas Ginex August 11, 2011, 6:31 p.m. EDT

Hi Richard,

I just laughed after reading your comment. I am not trying to develop another power to exert control over others. What I am trying to do is inform people how they came to believe in God by revealing the past history of man. Change will only occur from the masses of people around the world. When they come to realize that they have been fighting one another because of their beliefs and learn to love one another before they destroy humanity, changes to unify their beliefs in the same God may materialize.

Richard W., August 11, 2011, 4:14 a.m. EDT

To insist that Judaism, Islam, and Christianity all worship the same God ignores the fact that each individual has his or her own concept of God. Sometimes the individual differences are greater than the differences between the religions. Are we talking about a god of peace or a god who would destroy two-thirds of mankind? Are we talking about a god who is one with its creation or separate from its creation? Are we talking about a god who involves itself in the affairs of mankind or a god who does not interfere with history? Are we talking about a god who exhibits male attributes, an androgynous god, or an asexual god? Or are we talking about a female god? Are we talking about a god who created the world by the authority of its word or about a god who created the world through angels and powers? Are we talking about a god who walks upon the face of the earth or a god with no physical attributes? Are we talking about a god who is one or a god who is three in one? Are we talking about a god whose son is of a similar substance or the same substance as the father? Are we talking about a god who punishes the son for the sins of his father or are we talking about a god who punishes each for their own sins? Are we talking about a god who existed from eternity or about a god who sometime in the past created itself? Are we talking about a god who can do the logically impossible? Are we talking about a god who enjoys the pleasing aroma of animal sacrifices or are we talking about a god who does not demand sacrifice? Are we talking about a god who sits upon a heavenly throne surrounded by cherubim who sing his praise? Does god have a back? The answers to these questions are not as simple as you think.

Nicholas Ginex August 11, 2011, 7:27 p.m. EDT

Hello Richard,

You raise a lot of serious questions, and I agree that individual beliefs are very different from one person to another. Nobody knows God or has any real conception of God except for the attributes that have been given via the different constructs of God they have been taught. The Egyptian Priesthood of Amon got it right in that God is mysterious, unknowable, and incomprehensible. The answer, Richard, is that simple; nobody knows God.

I agree with you that there are many interpretations of God and the scriptures are becoming obsolete because they have caused the many questions that you have raised. The most profound question is how was the first atom created? Science has found that all matter, both inorganic and organic, is made up of atoms. Science has been able to identify the many elements formed by atoms. But they do not know where the atom first originated. What is more baffling is that the universe is made up of trillions and trillions of atoms that the human mind is unable to count.

Science cannot answer how a big ball of atoms, or lower set of particles, formed the big bang. Humans have only one answer, the unknowable, incomprehensible, and mysterious God. We do not know how God or the big ball came to exist. But, Richard, does it really matter? God was conceived after thousands of years by spiritual people in an isolated land from its neighbors called Egypt. It was wise men who thought up a system of morality so that their people could live in harmony and become productive without stealing from and killing one another. The benefits of believing in a creator god allowed for stability within their communities. This belief was strengthened with the idea of an afterlife where dearly departed souls could join their god. So now the concept of a soul evolved as well. Then of course, in order for the leader to have authority, he was blessed by the priesthood as being the Son of God. After many centuries, the priesthood finally arrived at the concept of one universal god by 1270 BCE.

It is the above summary that finally gave birth to the Judaic religion after the Hebrews were exposed to the many beliefs of the Egyptians that materialized after thousands of years. So now what? We have the

other two monotheistic religions Christianity and Islam that are an outgrowth of the Judaic religion. All three religions have their roots in the Egyptian religion. The question then becomes, is it possible for these three religions to acknowledge their roots and religious leaders work together to unify their beliefs? That, Richard, is why I was motivated to write the book. This idea of unity did not occur until the book unfolded and I wrote the last chapter. After all, why write a book if you do not have a message? The message is to inform people why and how they have come to believe in God, more importantly, knowing the three religions have the same roots, to motivate religious leaders to unify their beliefs in God.

Finally, I would like to end this discussion by quoting words by Jesus Christ, who validates the theme of my book, *Future of God Amen*, that the Egyptians introduced the belief in God. Jesus stated in Revelation 3:14 that Amen is “*the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.*”

Ben Surbana, August 12, 2011, 5:18 p.m. EDT

If you choose not to go on, so be it. Many will choose to be annihilated, especially those who are not living in heaven now and do not desire to serve God.

A soul can “die” many times before the body of dust does.

One can never be too old to enjoy heaven, Nicholas. The greatest beauty is to see your soul with your own eyes.

Nicholas Ginex, August 12, 2011, 10:03 p.m. EDT

Hello Ben,

Be certain that I do not have to choose if God will accept me. God will do that based upon the kind of life I lead. If a soul exists, a concept developed by man, I will hope that if God accepts my soul that He gives me something constructive to do while in heaven rather than floating around doing nothing for millions of years. By the way, who told you or where did you learn that the soul can die many times before the body of dust does?

John Knight, August 16, 2011, 12:40 a.m. EDT

“God cannot help those who rely of Him.”

Please note that Nicholas says *can't* there . . . As I said, this guy is utterly godless. He's not here to unite the religions in anything but his own disbelief in a God that is real, I say. He's just telling people his opinion that God won't do anything, indeed can't do anything, which of course would mean there is no real God.

His reasoning here is based on nothing more than the childish notion that if he can convince folks that someone in Egypt believed in a single God, then they will for some mysterious reason stop believing in the God of Abraham . . . which is utterly silly, since the book clearly speaks of people “walking with God” long before Moses or Abraham was even born.

If it could somehow be proved that no one on Earth believed in that God before the Book was written, then *that* might cause a few to doubt, but proving some did has just the opposite effect on one that knows Scripture, since that is told of in Scripture. It better be true that some knew of Him since very ancient times or the Scriptures would be proven wrong.

(So, thanks Nicholas, for spreading the idea that the God Abraham worshipped was apparently at least heard of before He gave people the Book itself to learn more about Him from . . . I appreciate it.)

Nicholas Ginex, August 17, 2011, 3:23 p.m. EDT

John, your comments reveal that you are a liar and a cheat who does not even know much about your own faith.

First, you deliberately misquoted me by writing, “God cannot help those who rely of Him.” What I wrote was “God helps those who help themselves.” Your mind is twisted, and that's why you misinterpreted what I wrote.

Second, to further commit a lie, you wrote, “Please note that Nicholas says *can't* there . . .” Then you quickly write, “As I said, this guy is utterly godless.” Our readers are beginning to find out, John, that you are a liar and a cheat.

Third, you wrote another false statement. You wrote, “He’s not here to unite the religions in anything but his own disbelief in a God that is real, I say.” That is another lie because if you read my book one of its main themes is to unite the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions with the same belief in God.

Fourth, you wrote an absolutely untrue statement about me by stating, “He’s just telling people his opinion that God won’t do anything, indeed can’t do anything, which of course would mean there is no real God.” Here you are definitely a liar and a cheat. All my comments and the book *Future of God Amen* reveal that I believe in God and have the highest regard for the greatest prophet, a man of God, Jesus. What I am telling people, and you are too blind and obstinate to acknowledge, is how mankind came to believe in one universal God and how that God has had a profound influence on the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions.

Fifth, you created another lie about me by writing, “His reasoning here is based on nothing more than the childish notion that if he can convince folks that someone in Egypt believed in a single God, then they will for some mysterious reason stop believing in the God of Abraham . . .” No convincing is necessary that the Egyptians were first to believe in a soul, a hereafter, a Son of God, and one universal God, the Creator of all there is. You are simply a closed-minded individual who is poorly read about the latest findings that have surfaced over the past hundred years. You, my faithful friend, are ignorant about the history of Egypt. Read some books and learn something in your life.

Sixth, my intent is not to have, for some mysterious reason, people stop believing in the God of Abraham. These are your words, never mine, you liar. You are fabricating lies about me out of your hatred for the “truth.” I made it clear that the Hebrews were greatly influenced by the religious beliefs of the Egyptians. In fact, I brought to the attention of our readers that eight of the Ten Commandments were already practiced by the Egyptians to qualify to join their God upon death. You just refuse to believe that the Hebrews emulated many of the beliefs and copied many of the ideas that were developed by the Egyptian priesthood that existed over two thousand years before Abraham. Again, do yourself a favor and read books besides the Bible.

Seventh, you respect the scriptures of only your Christian faith but do not acknowledge the scriptures of the Priesthood of Amon who wrote

Amon as the Sole God before the Moses Exodus. You, John, are a blind man who has a very limited view of God and even more lacking in the history of spiritual people who first conceived one universal God. I will pray that someday you will do the required reading and learn something more about “*the beginning of the creation of God.*” Jesus Christ gave you truthful words in Revelation 3:14, but you are so ignorant you cannot understand his words.

I will commend you for appreciating that I have written the truth about Abraham in *Future of God Amen*. But always remember, it was Moses who wrote the *Book of the Covenant* and is the father of the Judaic religion. Abraham wrote nothing about God but is truly the father of the Hebrew people.

John, be careful about what you write and stick to facts, not your biased opinions. As I have shown above, you have consistently distorted my words and created lies. I have taken the time to show you that you have got to be a better Christian and only deal with the truth. I could ignore you, but I love all people and am willing to help you recognize your own faults.

Jerry Kays, August 15, 2011, 3:33 a.m. EDT

Nicholas, your views on that are noble and your cause is just . . . Old worn-out religious traditions that have strayed from the original intended truths are bound to cause problems and eventually fail . . . It is my view that the folks who make up the “sheeple” of the “churches” are there because they think they need a “leader” . . ., and in being “that sort” of people, they are not likely to be the ones who will pressure their leaders for change. The existing leaders then will have no reason to change until possibly when the numbers of attendees fall off enough, which it surely will because the pressures of society will be ever increasing to the degree that people will seek truth where they can best find it . . . and that will turn out to be where it has always been, right *inside* of themselves through their self.

IMnsHO

Nicholas Ginex, August 15, 2011, 6:38 p.m. EDT

Thank you, Jerry, for your common sense response. It will only be through education of the past and the ability to accept a history rich

with the most wonderful way human beings came to conceive one universal God. I am a man who prides himself in revealing the truth; not as I conceive it, but as I have come to verify actual facts that can be put into proper order. As a Virgo, I have the disposition to connect the dots and apply logic to the facts and findings produced by dedicated men; the religious scholars and Egyptologists who have tried to reveal the truth about our belief in God.

Too many people are so enmeshed in the dogma of their religion that they refuse to even read a book outside of their scriptures for fear they will become tainted with the devil that will lead them away from their God. This is the height of stupidity for only through knowledge will we be able to understand and know God. Both science and religion must run on the same parallel path in man's quest to know God.

Nicholas Ginex, August 15, 2011, 9:10 p.m. EDT

Dear Sue,

I do try to answer your questions as honestly and politely as possible. I am not one to avoid any challenge and I am quick to admit when I do not know the answer. I told you once before that I am not out to make a fool out of you or anybody else because I do not like liars and cheats. Now to your question(s) that you thought I did not answer. You asked me to tell you how Christianity is not reduced to nothing with my preservation of belief. To be fair, you stated your reservation in this manner: "As I said above, Christianity is reduced to nothing with your idea of what preservation of belief is. If it isn't, then please tell me how it isn't."

The preservation I write of is the belief in God, a legacy given to us by the ancient Egyptians and carried on in the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. Will Christianity be reduced to nothing if there are certain compromises required? Now that depends on the intelligence and devotion of both religious leaders and their followers. Rather than sidestep your concern, I gave you an answer in my response dated August 14, 2011, 6:09 p.m. EDT above. I wrote:

"Hello Sue, again you are upset and it appears that you have a concern that Christianity will be reduced to nothing if there was an effort to unify the beliefs of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. I cannot

solve the problems of the differing beliefs of these three religions by myself, but I did provide recommendations in *Future of God Amen* to start them on a path to success. Do you believe the dogmas of these three religions so far apart that religious leaders are unable to come to a unified belief in God? Yes, it would take some compromise on each of their beliefs but is that so strange when it is an effort to show all their followers that we are all children of God and that God wants us, indeed *commanded* us, to *love one another*. You need to answer the question, why can't the religious leaders work together to unify their beliefs in one God?"

To approach a very real concern that you may have, I addressed the question about Jesus being a Son of Man or a Son of God. So I gave my guess if Jesus can still be worshipped as a Son of Man instead of a Son of God with the following:

"My guess is that Jesus will be regarded as a Man of God instead of a godly entity, the Son of God. Do you truly think Christians will think any less of Jesus if he is regarded as a Son of Man? You are aware that Jesus explicitly stated in all four Gospels that he was the Son of Man seventy-six times, and only in the last Gospel, when the Church grew more powerful, did John have others state, not Jesus, that he was the Son of God six times. Apparently, you are willing to negate the first three Gospels because it is in John's Gospel that Jesus is raised to the level of a God, co-equal to and co-eternal with God. This idea was cemented in concrete with the fabrication of the Trinity by the Church fathers in 325 CE, when the Emperor Constantine convened the Council of Nice."

To make my view clear to you, I indicated that Christians will still follow Jesus as the greatest prophet and Man of God by writing the following:

"Sue, it seems you have very little faith that Jesus would be reduced to nothing and I greatly disagree. Jesus was a Man of God, a man of truth. But even regarded as a Son of God, Christians pay little heed to his three commands given in the last Gospel by John, namely, the Word of God—*love one another*. A greater failure, Christians have been misled by their religious leaders who have misconstrued, misinterpreted, and ignored the words of Jesus when he stated in Revelation 3:14 that Amen is *the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.*"

I then concluded my beliefs about Jesus and of God by writing the following:

“No, Sue, I have faith in people having common sense and intelligence to ‘see’ the benefit in dealing with the ‘truth’ about their faith. They will come to realize that Church leaders have adopted, or shall I say resurrected, the Son of God concept from the Egyptians. More importantly, all three religions, if their leaders are courageous and perceptive enough, will acknowledge the words of Jesus that *Amen is the beginning of the creation of God.*”

“Do you really think these truths are impossible to accept by those who have had an appreciation of Egyptian history? Or do you have so little faith in the intelligence of people that the effort to unify the beliefs in one universal God is nonsensical? I repeat history has shown that people are adaptable to the ‘truth’ because the Egyptian priesthood demonstrated that they were able to transform the beliefs in their people from gods to one universal God. The religious beliefs by the priesthood changed several times and prove that a better idea, a more consistent view of God, is possible.”

So, Sue, are you now convinced that I tried to give you a straight-up honest answer? I do not believe I have skirted giving you an answer like a politician. Instead, I gave you an answer that goes directly to the heart of the matter. Few people are courageous enough to challenge and question any religion, but I am dedicated in informing people of knowledge. Knowledge can break away from teachings that hide the “truth” that we should learn from the past and not continue to deceive God-loving people.

Sue, you then clarified what you said by restating, “I said that Christianity is reduced to nothing with *your idea* of what preservation of belief is.” As you can see, I have stated that preservation of belief is possible with the Christian religion. All I have simply stated is that let the “truth” be known, and sensible people will gravitate to a unified belief in God. I have been quite clear and open about my views to show you that Christianity will not be reduced to “nada.” Be specific about what you disagree with, and I will address your concerns. I have spent ample time with you, as you have with me, but you appear to cross swords and not receptive even when I substantiate my views.

We both agree that the dogmas of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are far apart and have caused much pain and misery for people around the world. You consistently say I have not answered your question that Christianity is reduced to nothing with my idea of preservation of belief. This preservation of belief is no idea of mine because I have not expressed any preservation of belief except that the religious leaders of the major religious work together to unify their beliefs. It is not up to me to tell these religious leaders what they ought to do and what compromises they can make to unify their beliefs. Yes, I am capable of doing that, but that would be taking too much of the pie or a big chunk of the apple whereupon I would be considered an arrogant and stupid man. I have already stated in *Future of God Amen* the approach for the religious leaders to take to unify their beliefs; the ball is in their court.

Sue, you believe that Jesus Christ's divinity would be eradicated with my unifying idea. You have very little faith in human beings; I don't. There are courageous and perceptive men and women who understand the past and are willing to give credit to the development of God by spiritual people. The problem is the arrogance of religious leaders who will not recognize and acknowledge that the roots of their beliefs began in Egypt. The persistence of this arrogance will mean stupidity will continue to run rampant.

It is clear, Sue, that you are a Trinity believer and have bought the idea of a Son of God introduced by the Egyptians. There is good reason to believe that anybody who thinks Jesus was with God at the very beginning is well indoctrinated with an idea that is heresy against the one simple truth, which is there is only one universal God of all creation. The idea of a polytheistic god was long ago trashed for the belief in one God. This does not mean that Jesus will not be regarded as the Son of God, but will be adored as a Man of God who all Christians can worship. How little faith you and other Christians have to feel that you could no longer believe in God and follow Jesus because he is not a god but a man of "truth?" If the Jews believe Jesus was a Man of God as do the Muslims, why not the Christians? They have proven you can still believe in God. This does not mean the life and teachings of Jesus are worth "nada" for we should even have greater reverence for a man who gave his life to teach us to *love one another*.

Christians will not have their beliefs reduced to nothing. It will take intelligent god-loving daughters and sons of God to assist the

religious leaders to work together. Yes, this will mean that the Judaic followers will have to acknowledge Jesus with greater reverence. More importantly, the Muslims will have to accept the words of Jesus who has given more words from God than any other prophet. All three religions would have to work together to embrace the words of Jesus. This effort takes the intelligence of people who are perceptive to know how to make the words play together for a unified belief in the same God we all worship. For any person to say my God is not the same God of all people is to know that person is a phony and has no real conception of God.

I have already answered your question “Nicholas, how do you preserve the beliefs of Christians with your unifying concept?” Sue, I gave you enough of an answer to my ability without telling the religious leaders what they themselves should agree upon. This effort will take time and effort to reach the common sense compromises that allow all people to have a unified belief in God and a greater respect for each other. The words of Jesus Christ will still ring in all three religions for it is the Word of God—*love one another*.

I had hoped that with your intelligence and devotion to God that I can count on you being a daughter of God. Here again, Jesus has said those who believe in me and my Father will do even greater works.

Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go to my Father. (John 14:12)

It will serve the reader well to revisit John’s Gospel 1:12, wherein he states below that anyone can become a Son of God.

But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the Sons (and Daughters) of God, even to them that believe on His name.

In *Future of God Amen*, I included “Daughters of God” in the above verse. Indeed, the subtitle of the book is *A Call to Daughters and Sons of God*.

“The One and Only BERF,” August 18, 2011, 12:43 a.m. EDT

“I recommend reading each chapter slowly, and questioning the validity of Ginex’s assertions and conclusions.”

Andrea Borja hit that nail on its proverbial head . . .

Nicholas Ginex, August 18, 2011, 5:09 p.m. EDT

Hello, to the “One and Only BERF.” Thank you for posting a recommendation by a book reviewer of *Future of God Amen*. Andrea Borja is a journalist and author of *Fixing Alicia*. She has given a detailed review of *Future of God Amen* and made the statement you quoted because much of the information is new to the average reader. She was cautioning readers to read each chapter slowly because facts and findings presented will challenge the belief systems of Judaic, Christian, and Islamic worshippers. It requires reflection and evaluation of Ginex’s assertions and conclusions in order to decide if in fact they are valid based upon the facts and findings he presents.

To appreciate the critique given by Andrea, it is provided in full below for Gather readers to assess:

“Better written and more cohesive than many books on religion, *Future of God Amen* is scholarly and fleshed out to the point of textbook meticulousness; but it blindsides you with new discoveries and conclusions. Ginex’s provocative analysis of theology that we thought was absolute, is unsettling. How much do we really know about God? How much do our religious leaders really know about the beginning of the creation of God? Ginex has conclusively shown that “Amen” is more definitive than “So be it.” Muslims use the word “Amin,” with the same meaning as in Christianity, and the Islamic use of the word is the same as the Jewish Amen. They all imply an underlining attribute: truth. How stark are the differences? How solid are the similarities? In the drive to reduce everything down to “God is good, Amen,” important nuances are lost. Ginex underlines the need for these nuances to be acknowledged by religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic faiths. I recommend reading each chapter slowly, and questioning the validity of Ginex’s assertions and conclusions. This book is for believers, agnostics, and nonbelievers of God; for those who want a broader perspective of how mankind first conceived God. A recommended read for religious leaders of the major religions; this will unify their scriptures and teach the Word of God—to love one another.”

BERF, your quote from Andrea Borja’s review of *Future of God Amen* could not have come at a better time. You can see that there are

negative responses by several people committed to their beliefs, and some have clearly stated they would not even read the book even if it were free.

There are many people in this world who would stand at the door of knowledge and not knock to be open to ideas that may challenge their belief system. But these are people who are afraid of exposure because they are of little faith or the opposite, whereby they will not tolerate or analyze new information.

BERF, you have given me the idea of posting all five reviews for *Gather readers* to read, which includes one negative review to show that there will always be those who will stay within their cage of indoctrinated dogma never to question why they believe.

The Koran Advocates Violence and Murder

January 30, 2011 07:27 p.m. EST

Of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic scriptures, the Koran advocates violence and the killing of people who do not worship God. Few Muslims, as low as 20 percent, are knowledgeable of the Koran, and worshippers of other religions are ignorant of what the Koran advocates. It is imperative that Muslims and people around the world are informed that the Koran incites bigotry, hatred, violence, and the killing of innocent people who do not worship Allah. Such exposure will enlighten Muslim religious leaders to understand that the Koran sorely needs to be revised. To do nothing will continue the spread of violence and murder we are witnessing around the world. The Koran must endorse one simple objective—*love our sisters and brothers of every nation*.

Muslims are wonderful, proud people, who have the same aspirations as all people who seek a life of peace, prosperity, and love of their fellow human beings. However, the Koran justifies Islamic religious leaders to teach hate, bigotry, violence, and killing of nonbelievers. The following suras from the Koran reveal why today countries are threatened by fanatical Islamists from the Taliban, Hizballah (a party of God), Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad Movement, and other extremists groups that engage in suicide bombings. It is true that Judaic and Christian worshippers have had their share of killing innocent people in the past, but their actions are no longer advocated against nonbelievers of the Bible whereas the Koran dictates such action for the present and the future.

Let us read the following unaltered suras in the Koran and see why there is an urgent need for Muslims and people around the world to

clearly understand that this scripture desperately needs revision. But let us not be uninformed about the weaknesses of the Old and New Testaments. These scriptures are not cast in concrete and consist of weaknesses that continue to have discerning men and women question its authority as the Word of God. These weaknesses are identified in the book *Future of God Amen*, which reveals how man first came to conceive one universal God. It includes recommendations to revise the scriptures so that there is unity in the belief of God. Readers are encouraged to obtain an overview of the book on the Internet at www.futureofgodamen.com.

The following suras are presented unaltered to reveal that they do not belong in a holy book:

The Koran sanctions the killing of nonbelievers.

Sura 2:217-219: Fighting is ordained for you, while it is repugnant to you. It may be that you dislike a thing which is good for you, and it may also be that you prefer a thing and it may be the worse for you. Allah knows all and you know not. They enquire from thee about fighting in the sacred month, Say to them: Fighting in it is a great evil; but to hinder people from the way of Allah and to deny Him and to profane the sanctity of the Sacred Mosque, and to turn out its people there from is a much greater evil in the sight of Allah; and disorder is a worse evil than killing.

Sura 7:5-7: Little is it that you heed. How many a town have **We** destroyed! Our punishment came upon their dwellers by night or while they slept at noon. When **Our** punishment came upon them all they could utter was: We are indeed wrongdoers.

Sura 7:97-100: **We** afflicted them suddenly with chastisement, while they perceived not the cause thereof. If the people of those towns had believed and been righteous, **We** would surely have bestowed blessings upon them from heaven and earth, but they rejected the Prophets, so **We** seized them because of that which they did. Do the people of these towns now feel secure against the coming of **Our** punishment upon them by night while they are asleep? Or, do they feel secure against the coming of **Our** punishment upon them in the forenoon while they are at play? Do they feel secure against the design of Allah? None feels secure against the design of Allah, except those that are losers.

Sura 5:34-35: The appropriate penalty for those who wage war against Allah and His Messenger and run about in the land creating disorder is that they be slain or crucified or their hands and feet be cut off on alternate sides, or they be expelled from the land. That would be a disgrace for them in this world, and in the Hereafter they shall have a great punishment; except in the case of those who repent before you obtain power over them. Take note that Allah is Most Forgiving, Ever Merciful.

The Koran advocates and rewards suicide killings.

Sura 4:67-69: If **We** had commanded them: Kill yourselves in striving for the cause of Allah or go forth from your homes for the same purpose: they would not have done it except a few of them; yet if they had done what they are exhorted to do, it surely have been the better for them and conducive to greater firmness and strength. **We** would then bestow upon them a great reward from **Ourselves**, and **We** would surely guide them along the straight path.

The Koran promotes suspicion and animosity.

Sura 3:119: O ye who believe, do not take outsiders as your intimate friends, they will not fail to cause you injury. They love to see you in trouble. Their hatred has been expressed in words, and that which they design is even more virulent. We have made **Our** commandments clear to you, if you will understand.

The Koran advocates terror against nonbelievers.

Sura 3:150-152: O ye who believe, if you obey those who have disbelieved, they will cause you to revert to disbelief and you will become losers. Indeed, Allah is your Protector and He is the Best of helpers. **We** shall strike terror into the hearts of those who have disbelieved because they associate partners with Allah, for which He has sent down no authority. Their abode is Fire, and evil is the habitation of the wrongdoers.

The Koran incites hatred against Jews and Christians.

Sura 4:47-48: O ye who have been given the Book, believe in that which **We** have now sent down, fulfilling that which is with you, before **We** destroy your leaders and turn them on their backs or cast

them aside as **We** cast aside the people of the Sabbath. The decree of Allah is bound to be carried out.

Sura 5:52-54: O ye who believe, take not the Jews and the Christians as your helpers, for they are helpers of one another. Whoso from among you takes them as helpers will indeed be one of them. Verily, Allah guides not the unjust people. Thou wilt see those whose minds are diseased hastening toward them, saying to themselves in justification: We fear lest a misfortune befall us. Maybe, Allah will soon bring about your victory or some other event from Himself favorable to you. Then will they become remorseful of that which they keep hidden in their minds. Those who believe will say concerning them: Are these they who swore the most solemn oaths by Allah that they are entirely with you? Their works are vain and they have become the losers. Sura 9:29: Fight those from among the People of the Book who believe not in Allah, nor in the Last day, nor hold as unlawful that which Allah and His Messenger have declared to be unlawful nor follow the true religion, and who have not yet made peace with you, until they pay the tax (tribute) willingly and make their submission.

The Koran advocates a party of religious leaders.

Sura 3:105: Let there be from among you a party whose business it should be to invite goodness, to enjoin equity and to forbid evil. It is they who shall prosper.

This Sura provides a clear statement that a *party of religious leaders*, the *We Group*, is empowered to enforce their will in the name of Allah. They authorize the killing of human beings who will not convert to Islam, or who are disbelievers. To emphasize the authority of the *We Group*, wherever the *We Group* appears as **we**, **ours**, and **Us** they are highlighted in bold in the above suras as well as below.

The first sura recited by Muhammad reflects fear and advocates a party of **we**, **ours**, and **us** that drags sinners by their forelocks into hell.

Sura 96: In the name of Allah, Most Gracious, Ever Merciful. Recite in the name of thy Lord who created everything. He created man from a clot of blood. Recite, for thy Lord is Most Beneficent, Who has taught by the pen, taught man that which he knew not.

Man does indeed transgress, because he considers himself self-sufficient. Surely, unto thy Lord is the return. Knowest thou him who obstructs a servant of ***Ours*** when he stands in Prayer?

Tell me, if he who prays follows the guidance and enjoins righteousness, and he who obstructs rejects the truth and turns his back on it, what will be the end of this last one? ***We*** will surely drag him by the forelock, the forelock of a lying, sinful one. Then let him call his associates, ***We*** too will call ***Our*** guardians of hell. Then follow not him, but prostrate thyself and draw nearer to ***Us***.

The devout reader is quickly introduced to the idea that man considers himself self-sufficient and will transgress from belief in God. But instead of acknowledging the retribution coming from God, the Koran introduces the entity ***We***, a *Group* that speaks for Allah; instead of *one God*, a plural form is introduced. This multiple entity becomes evident with the admonition “***We*** will surely drag him by the forelock, the forelock of a lying, sinful one.” This cannot be the most gracious and ever merciful God because He does not need ***We*** partners or associates. God does not need any assistance by the *We Group* and would never reduce Himself to that of an animal by dragging one of His creations by the forelock of his hair.

The above sura brings to light that there is a *Group of Muslim Religious Leaders* that is making decisions and acting for God with the authority provided in the Koran.

This article informs people around the world what the Koran advocates and why there is so much turmoil in the world initiated by Muslim extremists. The book *Future of God Amen* offers solutions for Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders. Today, more than ever, they need to work together to unify their beliefs and teach the Word of God—*love our sisters and brothers from every nation*.

Comments and Responses

Raymond McIntyre, January 30, 2011, 8:20 p.m. EST

When you take the verses of a scripture out of their contexts, you can prove anything. I could post similar biblical verses, all of them ripped from their contexts as these have been.

Nicholas Ginex, January 31, 2011, 1:53 a.m. EST

Hello Raymond,

Do not accuse me of trying to prove anything. The suras provided in the post were not taken out of context because I carefully want the Koran to speak for itself. Look up every one of the suras I referenced and then get back to me. See for yourself if you are the blind man and I am only the messenger who is informing you of the truth. I do not tolerate liars and try to enlighten people who are being made fools of because they have not read the suras I bring to your attention. I am sure people like you do not like to be made a fool of. Learn the truth of what's in the Koran and be thankful I have the courage to share it with you.

Raymond McIntyre, January 31, 2011, 2:00 a.m. EST

I have studied Islam for many years, Nicholas.

Nicholas Ginex, January 31, 2011, 2:14 a.m. EST

That may be, Raymond, but you have missed reading the suras I bring to your attention. Be honest with yourself and others about what is in the Koran.

Libramoon, January 31, 2011, 4:47 p.m. EST

Do you even bother to look at the history of why these predictions and rationales were written in the Koran? It was a time when the people of Allah were being murdered and brutalized by outsiders bent on conquest. In the Old Testament, the exhortations to kill Jehovah's enemies were more about being the conquerors to take land and kill the inhabitants.

Darren (L., February 8, 2011, 11:08 p.m. EST

Sad how foolish people like Nicholas are! Who are the "we?" Are they not the jinni? Has Nicholas learned the language, the customs, and traditions? Getting stupid, we might read the literal text of the

Christian God who advocated the murder of not only the people of Canaan but the animals too.

Nicholas Ginex, February 9, 2011, 2:48 p.m. EST

Hello Darren,

You are uninformed and have a misconception or promote a lie that “the Christian God who advocated the murder of not only the people of Canaan but the animals too.” Your interpretation is from the Old Testament, which was not written by Christians but people of the Judaic faith, namely Jews. If you read the holy books, like the Torah, the Gospels, and the Koran, you will find that in the New Testament, where the Gospels reside, you will find it is the only scripture, unlike the OT and Koran, that does not advocate hate, bigotry, violence, and the killing of innocent people in the name of God. However, the Koran, as I have informed you, is an abomination as a holy book of God, which is conclusively demonstrated in this post.

Darren (L., February 11, 2011, 8:29 a.m. EST

Not at all, Nick. I am way out ahead of you on the reading of the books. Religious Jews, Christians, or Muslims all are equal in their insistence of supremacy. It is this intolerance on the supremacy of dogma and doctrine. All of which is a lie of self-will and ego. These supremacist tendencies always divide and give sanction to ideas of holy separation. Christianity is chief among the offenders in this death march.

When man makes what is a myth into an absolute doctrine he steals the transformational power from it. What was a living form is made dead.

Beyond the arguing there is a *table of companionship set*. What is praised is one and the praise is one too; all the water in the basin is turned into one wine and it is the best wine. It is served last as its spirit takes the longest to ferment.

Love is salt . . . a spice to the palate, yet oh so bitter to the wound. Bread is the body; yeast is that which expands it. Wine is the spirit . . . a libation has been proud out for the fallen. Honor the dead by living.

Nicholas Ginex, February 17, 2011, 6:15 p.m. EST

Hello Daren,

You are correct in asserting that the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are all promoting a lie that they have the true religion. I agree that it is the supremacist views of their religions that have divided people from one another causing hate, bigotry, violence, and the killing of innocent people who do not follow their religion.

Yes, the Christians were responsible for many holy deaths in the past. Now we have got to watch as many innocent people are killed today and tomorrow by extremist Muslims who are brainwashed with the holy words of the Koran. Maybe we need to have some more bombs go out here in America for people to wake up as to who are now killing people in the name of God. Apparently three thousand killed at the 9/11 site was not a sufficient wake-up call. We can honor the dead by living and ensure our own lives by being more aware of what is going on in many parts of the world. Or wine is the spirit we need to drink and sleep away the real world.

Ron Hall, January 30, 2011, 9:30 p.m. EST

If you came to the writing group to write, I would accept this, but your primary objective is something else. Perhaps the blog site made available by Fox News would be a more suitable venue for this.

Nicholas Ginex January 31, 2011, 2:36 a.m. EST

Hello Ron,

Very few people have the knowledge and courage to write what I reveal about the Koran. Are you saying that what I wrote in the post is untrue? My primary objective is to educate you about parts of the Koran. Please read the Koran and learn something in your life.

You know, ever since I was a little boy I questioned my religion and I learned a lot. I have come to find that there are myths and inconsistencies in scripture. However, I have learned to tolerate most of it because I value the good aspects of religion in teaching moral and ethical behavior. The Koran, like other scripture, teaches moral values, but you cannot deny that there are many suras in the Koran that

advocates bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent human beings.

Are you fearful that extremist Muslims will be upset with what this post reveals? There should be no fear because the suras mentioned are provided in their full context and are what Muslims are taught. Fox News commentators are very careful not to be as forthright as I have been because they would cause uproar by many people who are ignorant of what is in the Koran. Rather than bring up the issue, they sidestep it to avoid too much noise from people who are not informed. Be grateful that I have provided some knowledge to you about what the Koran advocates.

Libramoon, January 31, 2011, 4:42 p.m. EST

It's not about the Koran or Islam. It's about people's reaction to the devastations of colonialism and its turbulent aftermath—realpolitik, not religion.

Richard Regener, January 30, 2011, 11:09 p.m. EST

More appropriately, Nicholas, is the question “what holy book does not advocate violence retribution or killing in one form or another?” I have yet to find one!

Nicholas Ginex January 31, 2011, 3:42 a.m. EST

Hello Jerry,

Thank you for providing another perspective as to why there are misunderstandings of scripture written a thousand or more years ago. You bring up a side of human nature that longs to understand the meaning of life and why we are here. Such thinking is referred to as our spiritual nature because of the love we feel for others and wish to preserve that love by some means. I am not as spiritual as you, but I have loved deeply in my life, which has given me great scope in the human nature of my being and others.

I went to the post that Libramoon recommended and found your paragraph below to be most interesting as it relates to this post:

“In this day and age of excessive ‘anti-terrorism’ distorted into ‘anti-Islamism,’ you can bet your bottom dollar that the Arabs of all

kinds are looking into these matters and have a far different belief system about it all than the west has been indoctrinated with . . . there is so much more to the story available readily to the rest of the world . . . and how hiding our heads in the sand pretending that other information does not exist and believing 'our media' that the 'others' have it all wrong and 'we' have it right, will not get us the truth needed to settle the issue and prevent world strife, maybe even the next WW3."

What you wrote is a little convoluted and not clearly forthright about what the Arabs really think. You accuse the West of hiding their heads in the sand and pretending we have got it right. However, you did not clearly express what we think is right. The world situation is a difficult one to understand and to put into simple terms. One perspective is that the Arab countries do not educate their people to reach a high potential of intellect because they are controlled by a repressive theocratic rule. Power resides with Arab leaders, and they maintain their power by conquering other countries for their resources. The Koran is used by the *We Group* as the Word of God, but it does not advocate love your sisters and brothers of every nation.

Jerry, you are a self-thinking man. The truth hurts is a truism regarding what the Koran advocates. I live for the truth, and anybody that thinks otherwise about what I wrote in the above post has the opportunity to show why I am in error. Just use reason based upon verifiable facts.

Jerry Kays, January 31, 2011, 7:47 a.m. EST

Nicholas, you have taken a portion of my writings out of context and pretended to know what I was getting at about how the West thinks . . . I suggest you read all of the material and the links that I provided there before jumping to conclusions.

Nicholas Ginex, January 31, 2011, 5:40 p.m. EST

Hello Jerry,

I must apologize for being very brief and not giving your writing the justice it deserves. What caught my eye was the statement "in this day and age of excessive 'Anti-Terrorism' distorted into 'Anti-Islamism.'" I assure you my post is not anti-Islamic, but it is an attempt to inform people of what is written in the Koran. I was somewhat confused that

your statement indicated that the Arabs are looking into the matter of anti-terrorism being distorted into anti-Islamism. Yes, the Arabs do have a far different system than the West, a system that controls the minds of their followers both on a spiritual and political level because of theocratic rule. You are correct that the U.S. media has been negligent by putting their heads in the sand and not educating Americans about the Arab belief system, which is dictated by Islamic religious leaders that use the Koran as the basis for their control.

Darren (L., February 8, 2011, 11:16 p.m. EST

“Anti-Islamism.” I assure you my post is not anti-Islamic, but it is an attempt to inform people of what is written in the Koran.

People who need this info need to first see what is written in their own *holy books*, otherwise what you have posted here is nothing more than propaganda.

Nicholas Ginex, February 9, 2011, 3:12 p.m. EST

Hello Darren,

I have read the Torah, Gospels, Revelation, and the Koran, line by line. It is not possible that this post represents propaganda because what has been revealed to you was taken out of the Koran without any change in one word. What you should be grateful for is that I am courageous enough to inform you of what most people do not know about the Koran. The translation of the Koran is by a truly honorable and highly educated Muslim, Muhammad Zafrulla Khan. It was published in 1893 by Olive Branch Press, Brooklyn, New York, under ISBN 1-56656-255-4. Mr. Khan offers a deep understanding of Arabic scholarship, Islamic learning, and a capable command of the English language. His text renders a strictly faithful translation of the Koran, includes the Arabic text, and offers clarity and precision for the reader. Mr. Khan is distinguished by his accomplishments for he was the foreign minister of Pakistan in 1947, became president of the seventeenth Session of the UN General Assembly, and later served as Judge of the International Court of Justice at The Hague, of which court he became President. Are you accusing Mr. Khan of being a propagandist for it's his interpretation of the Koran, not mine?

Dorine H., January 31, 2011, 4:31 p.m. EST

Islam is one of the most evil religions on earth. It has a history of committing the violence and murder advocated in the passages you cite. Look at how Muslim death armies pressed across Africa and Asia and entered Europe in the seventh and early eighth centuries (until they were finally stopped at Roncesvalles by Charlemagne and Basque guerrillas). Look at the wholesale rape and murder of Christians in Spain after their conquest in 711. Look at the atrocities they committed in Eastern Europe and how even after establishing the Ottoman Empire they abused local Orthodox Christian populations. Less than a century ago, look at the Muslim Turkish genocide attempt on the Armenians. Today's Muslim terrorists stand on the shoulders of a very long line of equally evil ancestors.

Nicholas Ginex January 31, 2011, 6:17 p.m. EST

Thank you, Dorine, for your comments; they provide a succinct history of the atrocities of the Muslim nation. Your response shows a realistic understanding of the threat that exists for civilized countries for today and tomorrow. Many intellectuals refer to the past and cry out that many religions are just as violent and caused the deaths of innocent people. What these intellectuals fail to realize is that it is the threat of Muslim fanatics in the "here and future" that are intent in establishing an Islamic world power based upon theocratic rule.

Lori F., January 31, 2011, 6:19 p.m. EST

For every one who curses his father or his mother shall be put to death; he has cursed his father or his mother, his blood is upon him. (Lev. 20:9)

If a man have a stubborn and rebellious son, which will not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and that, when they have chastened him, will not hearken unto them: Then shall his father and his mother lay hold on him, and bring him out unto the elders of his city, and unto the gate of his place; And they shall say unto the elders of his city, This our son is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton, and a drunkard. And all the men of his city shall stone him with stones, that he die: so shalt thou put evil away from among you; and all Israel shall hear, and fear. (Deut. 21:18-21)

He that smiteth his father, or his mother, shall be surely put to death.
(Exod. 21:15)

He that curseth his father, or his mother, shall surely be put to death.
(Exod. 21:17)

Children who mock their parents will have their eyes plucked out by ravens and eaten by eagles. The eye that mocketh at his father, and despiseth to obey his mother, the ravens of the valley shall pick it out, and the young eagles shall eat it. (Prov. 30:17)

Like Abraham, parents should be willing to kill their children for God.

And he said, Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and . . . offer him there for a burnt offering . . . And Abraham stretched forth his hand, and took the knife to slay his son. (Gen. 22:2, 10)

God killed all the firstborn children in an entire country.

The *Lord* smote all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, from the firstborn of Pharaoh that sat on his throne unto the firstborn of the captive that was in the dungeon . . . And there was a great cry in Egypt; for there was not a house where there was not one dead. (Exod. 12:29-30)

Sometimes God kills children for misbehaving.

And he went up from thence unto Bethel: and as he was going up by the way, there came forth little children out of the city, and mocked him, and said unto him, Go up, thou bald head; go up, thou bald head. And he turned back, and looked on them, and cursed them in the name of the *Lord*. And there came forth two she bears out of the wood, and tare forty and two children of them. (2 Kings 2:23-24)

Someday God will force parents eat their own children.

And ye shall eat the flesh of your sons, and the flesh of your daughters shall ye eat. (Lev. 26:29)

And thou shalt eat the fruit of thine own body, the flesh of thy sons and of thy daughters. (Deuteronomy 28:53)

And I will cause them to eat the flesh of their sons and the flesh of their daughters, and they shall eat every one the flesh of his friend. (Jer. 19:9)

And then there's this statement, which could only be found in the Bible:

Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones. (Ps. 137:9)

Hmmm!

If there be found among you, within any of thy gates which the *Lord* thy God giveth thee, man or woman, that hath wrought wickedness in the sight of the *Lord* thy God, in transgressing his covenant, And hath gone and served other gods, and worshipped them, either the sun, or moon, or any of the host of heaven, which I have not commanded; . . . Then shalt thou bring forth that man or that woman, which have committed that wicked thing, unto thy gates, even that man or that woman, and shalt stone them with stones, till they die. (Deut. 17:2-3, 5)

Lori F., January 31, 2011, 6:20 p.m. EST

For the record, I think all you religious zealot nutcases whether Christian or Muslim are about the same. You use your religion to justify your hate.

Nicholas Ginex, January 31, 2011, 7:42 p.m. EST

Hello Lori,

I love that name; it is the name of daughter number three, and I am quite proud to say she is a lawyer. Lori and I had many discussions as she grew up into her formidable years. I remember posing her with the question, "What would you do if you went to heaven and lived there for millions of years?" She was not able to give me an answer, so I probed on and said, "Do you believe there are animals up in heaven?" Ha, ha, she said yes. Then I knew I could get her to think, and I pressed on, "How about ants and roaches? Do you believe that they will also be there with you?" Once again, Lori stopped to think. Though she believes in God till this day, she does not think about heaven; at least, I don't think so.

Just a little story to lighten up our discussion (smiling). Lori, I appreciate your research to show that the Judaic scriptures contain lots of appalling verses that make good people twitch. I note that you must be Jewish or had a Jewish upbringing because you did not refer to one verse from the Christian Gospels and Revelation. But your point is well made. Religious scriptures are written poorly and need to be revised for educated and discerning people of today. What I have tried to do, Lori, is simply inform people of a religion that is a threat today and tomorrow. All of the quotes you provided are way back in the past, and Judaic and Christian religious leaders do not refer to them anymore. In fact, they would be embarrassed that you should even bring such quotes up to them. No scripture, if it represents the Word of God, should advocate hate, violence, and the killing of people just because they do not follow a religion.

The suras I have provided in this post are extracts from the book *Future of God Amen*. It is a historical presentation of how man first came to conceive one universal God and how that God profoundly influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. More importantly, after providing a critique of the Torah, Gospels, and the Koran, it provides recommendations for religious leaders and followers of these religions to work together to unite their beliefs.

I hope I have informed you of some suras that should be removed from the Koran. One of my recommendations in the book indicates that scripture is not cast in concrete but needs to be revised as people become more knowledgeable about themselves and the world they live in. I hope this post gets people to know a little bit more about the Muslim religion because knowledge is a wonderful gift, and I wish to share it with you.

I do not do this for anybody, but I would be honored to mail you a complimentary copy of *Future of God Amen*. Just send me your mailing address via my e-mail: nickginex@gmail.com

M O., February 2, 2011, 8:26 a.m. EST

There are writings of violence in almost every religion. You know that—the Jewish and Christian Bibles are full of them.

Religion can help people be good and can support their evil actions as well. Personally, I would love that all religions were wiped off the

face of the earth and people were brought back to reality and personal responsibility without having to resort to mythology to justify their behavior. Kill religion, not people. Kill mythology, and we'll all be safer and happier on this earth.

Nicholas Ginex, February 2, 2011, 11:08 p.m. EST

Hello MO,

Thank you for your perceptive and realistic response. I have read the Torah, Gospels, and the Koran, and yes, the Jewish, Christian, and Muslim religions have been responsible for the killing of millions of people. The killings were either forced belief on people of other countries or fighting for dominance as to who's religion is the true religion. The religions have not acted to promote peace and love between people of all nations. Rather, they seek only to dominate for control of resources and the minds of people, and all have a distorted view of God.

An objective critique of the three major religions has been provided in *Future of God Amen*. This book provides a historical description of how man first came to conceive God and how that God has had a profound influence on the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. More importantly, recommendations are provided in the last chapter to ignite our brightest minds to assist courageous and perceptive religious leaders to work together and unify their beliefs.

I believe the concept of God is man's greatest vision of the creation of all there is and serves as the highest form of achieving the attributes of truth, integrity, righteousness, and love of our fellow human beings. The religions, in my mind, serve a purpose. They are the surrogates for mothers and fathers who are either incapable or too busy to bring their children up with such attributes. What is needed is a religious renaissance to unify the scriptures of these three religions and a clear set of moral and ethical principles without the myths and inconsistencies the scriptures now contain.

Yes, I am an idealist and even naive to believe religious leaders are capable to teach the Word of God, *love your sisters and brothers of every nation*. The problem is that to leave the teaching of morality to individual parents will cause many, many differences in what should

be a common set of principles to live by. As the past has taught us, societies will be much worse and we will fall back into the Dark Ages where respect for human dignity is gone.

M O., February 3, 2011, 6:07 p.m. EST

You have every right to your beliefs, Nicholas, but I disagree that “*the concept of God is man’s greatest vision of the creation of all there is and serves as the highest form of achieving the attributes of truth, integrity, righteousness, and love of our fellow human beings.*” The concept of any “god” is a lie—it is man’s ultimate ego creating divine being(s) that are interested solely in his actions. If you step back from the entire picture, it really is quite silly and immature. It basically creates a set of rules to live by, assuming that human beings cannot be good without these strict rules, backed up by punishments and banishments. It’s the ultimate game of control. And the so-called “leaders” who are “the most knowledgeable” about these rules and even claim to know what their “god” think (imagine!) can secure control and power over others, extracting their adoration and money.

It is only through rising above this self-adoration, this ego, and breaking through this concept of god(s) and rules and reward/punishment by a mythical being and his/her leaders that human beings can truly free themselves to self-actualize, to realize that they do not need someone else’s rules, they do not need leaders to preach to them, and they do not need gods to do what is right and what is good.

Love your sisters and brothers of every nation. Yes. And love your sisters and brothers of every species. And love the non-living gifts of the earth. Human beings are no better, no more special than any other creature on this earth. They have no more right to use its resources either. Were we to break free from this egotistical “God chose us above all others” concept we could create a paradise on earth.

M O., February 7, 2011, 11:23 a.m. EST

I greatly admire your goal, Nicholas, but disagree as to the manner in which you propose we reach it. There will always be arguments about religious difference, even within one sect never mind the greater differences between the main religions. The arguments will always be there—“my religion is better, more holy, etc. than yours.”

And I disagree about your assessment of the uprising in Egypt. I beg you to inform yourself with the facts about this wonderful country. The uprising is not based on any religious grounds—it is based on the Egyptian people being denied their basic human rights and the freedom to work and self-actualize and express themselves in their country. I have travelled throughout Egypt and the Sinai on two separate occasions, on my own. I assure you that Egypt, with all its flaws, is a place where Muslims, Coptic Christians, and Jews live peacefully side by side and respect each other's right to practice their religion freely. They are a kind, hospitable, and generous people. They want what everyone else wants in the world—the chance to raise a family in security and find meaningful work. Please don't lump all Muslims in Africa and the Middle East into a clump—they are as varied as any other religious sect, including Christians. And I must remind you that I have heard and still hear a lot of Christians in the United States preaching crusade in the Middle East when it comes to our wars and continued presence there. Missionaries have done a lot of damage to people, all in the name of their Christian god.

Nicholas Ginex, February 7, 2011, 3:36 p.m. EST

Dear MO,

Thank you again for an excellent appraisal of the Egyptian crisis and giving me and our readers a clearer appreciation of the harmonious interrelationships of the Muslims, Jews, Christians, and Coptic people within Egypt. Unfortunately, I have not been able to visit many foreign countries with only Italy (Tuscany and Sicily) to give me a more worldly perspective. I agree with your assessment of the mix of people in Egypt, whereby they are not all Muslims and the majority of them want a democratic process of self-government.

You are also correct that there will be fanatical, well-meaning religious people who will rather die (and resort to violence) than give up their belief in the religion they have been taught. However, it is with people like you, me, and others that I have met on some of my posts who can spread the word that we all have a spiritual sense that some force, call it God, began the creation of all things. We do not know God, and only through the reasoning powers of the human mind will man increase his knowledge about himself and his vision of God. Mankind has made a breakthrough in being able to conceive one universal God. That one God is taught differently by the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic

religions because their scriptures were evolved by different groups of people with their own traditions and culture. But any wise person will admit there can only be one universal God.

I do not subscribe my belief in God to any one religion. I believe that all religious leaders try to educate their people with a set of moral and ethical values. I do believe there have been very wise men who foresaw the need for a common set of rules for people within their society to live by. One of the greatest teachers, who was groomed by the Torah, was Jesus Christ, a Man of God. Most importantly, it was His apostles who documented His teachings for the world to live by.

The greatest command was announced by Jesus three times in the Gospel of John—*love one another*. To me, there is no greater command than for our sisters and brothers, from every nation, to love and assist one another. With the Internet, there is hope that the Word of God, provided by His surrogate Jesus, will permeate and be embraced by people all over the world. It is only by sharing this command that religious leaders of all religions will need to open their doors to all people to teach there is only one universal God and we, His creations, can only make Him a proud God when we learn to love one another.

What I propose is that people from every part of the globe storm their houses of worship and insist their leaders teach the Word of God. In *Future of God Amen*, I have provided several recommendations for God-loving people to help all of us learn to love one another. We cannot rely on the religious leaders to do it by themselves because they are too entrenched in their own dogma and will continue to resist change. There is no doubt in my mind that there is a need for a religious renaissance. The scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are sorely in need of revision whereby they need to unify the belief and our vision of God. Scripture is not cast in concrete. Why? It was the Egyptian priests that revised their conception of God many times until, by the reign of Ramses II, they wrote scripture extolling “*Amon as the Sole God*.” This God is announced in many houses of worship as *Amen* after a prayer, supplication, giving thanks and praise, and even singing His name.

MO, I truly understand your assessment of the stupidity that does exist in our world where there are people who believe in God and will kill other people in the name of God. But you see, only through education of the past people learn that it was, in fact, the Priesthood

of Amon that finally accepted the belief in one universal God, which was introduced by the Pharaoh Amenhotep IV, ca. 1370 BCE. When the major religions of the world acknowledge the words of Jesus that *Amen is the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God* then will humanity be headed on a pathway to love and peace for all mankind.

In ending this discourse, which I did not mean to sound like a preacher but a man of truth, I ask you, MO, is it not a practical solution to teach our sisters and brothers, from every nation, to love and assist one another? The solution entails that the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions unify their beliefs with a revised, modern, humanistic view. The scriptures of these religions must be updated and many passages eliminated so that religious leaders demonstrate that their minds are as flexible as those of the Egyptian priests. People will always believe in God, and by living with the same common set of moral and ethical values, there will be a better world for us to live in. If you have an alternate solution, let's discuss it. It is a most important conversion for all people to participate in.

MO. February 7, 2011, 5:47 p.m. EST

“The scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are sorely in need of revision whereby they need to unify the belief and our vision of God. Scripture is not cast in concrete.”

Therein lies the biggest rub, Nicholas. So many religions view their holy books as the actual “Word of God” and do not accept the fact that these writings were in fact done by human beings, sometimes many, many years “after the fact,” if they are factual at all. How many Christians do you find just on Gather quoting horrendous nonsense from their Bibles against homosexuals or women? They are led down horrible paths of hate and prejudice by these very writings.

I would love to “teach” love. I find the best way to do so is by practice. People condemn me daily on this forum for being an atheist and say it is impossible for me to be moral or ethical. But, frankly, I find that my views on politics or family life or international affairs are more toward the “love thy neighbor” dictum than most of theirs, the ones who profess to be special because they believe in their god(s) and go to church and call for their religion to be put upon all citizens of this country.

I respect your views, even if you see the goal of all accepting a unified god. At least you see that ancient religious texts should be cleansed and that people should unite as one and love each other. That is comforting to me to see one of faith express such views.

Norman Ketchie, February 7, 2011, 6:17 p.m. EST

Maybe believers should consider these documents as historical documents and use them for the lessons in them, but not take them literally.

Nicholas Ginex, February 7, 2011, 6:53 p.m. EST

Again, MO, you are exactly right about religious leaders being so entrenched with their beliefs in their “Holy Book” that they will not easily accept the view that they all pray to the same God. That is why I wrote *Future of God Amen*. It provides a historical account of how man developed the belief in one universal God. For religious leaders to discount the actual findings by Egyptologists that a religion existed for thousands of years before the writings of the Bible and Koran is a sign of arrogance. Further, the Egyptians were the first people to develop the belief in one universal God. It is this arrogance that has led to many religious wars and holy deaths. I am strongly of the opinion that religious leaders cannot change unless their followers, people with common sense, love of humanity, and a desire for peace will provide pressure on their leaders to acknowledge the past, a past that introduced the concept of God and the sacrifice of many wise and righteous men who have only tried to teach us to—*love one another*.

I wonder if you have any ideas how people all over the world will realize that we should love and assist one another in order to make our world a better one to live in. True, I use the belief in God as a reason why. It is only because people will always believe in God even if they do not know what He looks like. God, for many people, is a subjective feeling that gives many people hope, another avenue to find strength and peace within themselves. There are other people who try to find peace within themselves by sitting on the ground and isolating themselves from everything around them to find God or a oneness with Him. But this is a construct of the mind. The mind does many things, and just as people believe there is a devil, they also easily believe in ghosts and other illusions because, frankly, they are unhappy and disillusioned people.

M O., February 8, 2011, 12:53 p.m. EST

“True, there are still a lot of backward countries where people are fooled into thinking they will go to a paradise if they kill innocent people in the name of God. But they are the uneducated or distorted minds due to a good job of brainwashing by their religious leaders.”

I think you need to look at the fact that this is the case in the United States as well. The Iraq war was sold to Christians as a holy war by Bush. Religious groups were allowed to go into the country and proselytize. Soldiers were told they were bringing salvation to the infidels. It’s not only “backward countries,” Nicholas.

M O., February 9, 2011, 3:26 p.m. EST

I believe there are probably many more uneducated Muslims, Nicholas, but I don’t believe there are more Muslims than Christians who are brainwashed into believing that their religions are superior and that they are commanded by their god to proselytize. I think you would be surprised how “evangelized” our military forces are right now. There are many writings about it, and I encourage you to research them. Non-Christians are discriminated against in our military—it has been extremely evangelized under the Bush command. Every leader in this country feels compelled to end their speeches with “God Bless America”—something you did not hear in the past. It is not a good sign for a secular country to be so swayed by a religious force, whether it be Christian, Jew, Muslim, or other.

Jerry Kays, February 9, 2011, 3:51 p.m. EST

Amen.

M O., February 10, 2011, 3:57 p.m. EST

“To not accept Allah as God and Islam as the only true religion means you may no longer have a head on your shoulders.”

Sorry, Nicholas. That is simply not true. There are millions and millions of Muslims around the world, in almost every country, I would wager. The vast majority of them do not live under those circumstances, nor do they believe that should be the case. That is not only untrue, it is

a bigoted, prejudiced comment that deserves to be challenged. That's the problem—these lies that are propagated about large groups of people. You should know better than that.

Do you have another way of ending such speeches? After all, this country was founded on Christian principles and the Christian God.

Another propagated lie! There were many colonies in the new world. Some were founded by people seeking to practice their religion freely; some were founded as purely economic enterprises, looking to profit their home colonizing country. The group of people who envisioned forming their own independent country years and years after these initial colonizations deliberately made this a country where there was no religious testing, no required state religion, no requirement to believe anything or nothing. It is irrelevant what the people of ancient Egypt did. It is irrelevant what the people of Saudi Arabia do today. We live in the United States, founded as a secular nation where no religion is above any other, regardless of how these religions are distorted or proselytized here or elsewhere in the world. It is one of the greatest conceptions of our founders and one of the reasons we are admired by other nations.

And I have told you an alternative approach to teach people a common set of moral and ethical values—it is “love each and every living and non-living thing on earth as your brother or sister,” respect others and the world in which we live that supports us with its gifts. Have compassion. Have empathy. Strive to be the best person you can be, using all the abilities you have. Strive for peace and the self-actualization of each human being. Strive for equality and human rights—the right to a peaceful, productive, and free life.

I raised my children with these values without religious guidance. They are kind, productive human beings who would never use violence against another and strive to make themselves better people and the earth a better place in which to live.

It is in denying that this can easily be accomplished without the divisive, demoralizing taint of myth; that is the greatest travesty of human existence and keeps us from attaining a much better and peaceful world.

Nicholas Ginex, February 17, 2011, 5:37 p.m. EST

Hello MO,

I am in total agreement with you regarding an alternative approach, “*to teach people a common set of moral and ethical values—it is ‘love each and every living and non-living thing on earth as your brother or sister,’ respect others and the world in which we live that supports us with its gifts. Have compassion. Have empathy. Strive to be the best person you can be, using all the abilities you have. Strive for peace and the self-actualization of each human being. Strive for equality and human rights—the right to a peaceful, productive, and free life.*”

Well, written! It looks like it came out of my book *Future of God Amen*. I do not advocate the teaching of a myth to achieve the “love one another” ideal. My only recommendation is to learn from the past how man first came to conceive God. You are correct that moral and ethical values are taught by parents. But, unfortunately, not all people have your ability to groom young minds to become productive with the principles of integrity, honesty, and the ability to love others sincerely. It is for this reason I find that organizations, such as religions, may serve to teach young minds. The problem is that all the religions are only interested in their own survival and do not teach—*love one another*.

I believe, from a practical matter, mankind will always believe in a God that created all there is. At least, until scientists figure out how the first atom was formed and multiplied into billions of galaxies with their billions of stars and planets. Your solution is also mine, except that I still endorse the belief in one universal God and a *common set* of moral and ethical values to be universally taught by organizations that are committed to teach the same thing. This means an overhaul of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic scriptures, which will reflect the truth of the past—to understand how and why we believe in God and a common set of values.

Nicholas Ginex, February 8, 2011, 2:17 a.m. EST

Hello MO,

In answer to your response, “Can we just skip the god thing and get straight to the ‘love one another?’” “I have to say that my position is

clear with the proposal for unity by the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders to adhere to a common set of moral and ethical values. This common set falls under one basic humanistic statement—love and assist your sisters and brothers, from every nation. I have already stated there is a need for their scriptures to be revised for a common view of God and moral beliefs. If you feel God should be replaced, how is this hypothetical concept replaced?”

Now if the god thing does not suit you, please use your ability to recommend how could a consistent set of moral and ethical values be implemented for all people? Perhaps you can propose an alternate solution that also emphasizes love one another. What is important is that if you desire to replace the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions as a mechanism to teach a common set of moral and ethical values, how would you do it?

M O., February 8, 2011, 12:57 p.m. EST

How? I think you’ve defined it yourself—love one another. If a law or rule contradicts that basic premise, then it should be abolished. Loving someone in my opinion means allowing them to be all they can be, to be free to reach their potential, to be assisted in every way to reach their full potential. I see too many religious “rules” and “standards” that are directly opposed to human beings doing just that.

Are Muslims Misled by the Koran?

November 20, 2010 05:24 p.m. EST

The Koran is a holy book written by Allah, who gave its words to an angel Gabriel, who gave them to Muhammad, who recited them to his companions. Stephen Prothero, the author of *God Is Not One*, reveals that about only 20 percent of the world's Muslims are able to read its Arabic so that they are enthralled more by its sound than by its meaning.

The purpose of this article is to inform Muslims and people around the world what the Koran says about Jews, Christians, and people who do not believe Allah is the true God. It is necessary to educate Muslims about their holy book because they are misled by their religious leaders who rigorously follow the commands in the Koran. Muslims are a wonderful, proud people, who have the same aspirations as all people who seek a life of peace, prosperity, and love of their fellow human beings. However, because so many Muslims, and people worldwide, know little or nothing of what is written in the Koran, it is incumbent for them to be informed today. Why? The fanatical religious leaders of the Islam religion are advocating bigotry, hatred, violence, and the killing of innocent human beings who do not believe in Allah.

But are Islamic religious leaders justified to teach hate, bigotry, violence, and killing of nonbelievers? Yes. Although the Koran advocates beneficence, charity, and moral codes of righteousness, it strongly advocates negative commands that have caused the murders of millions of people around the world. The following suras from the Koran will reveal why today's countries are threatened by fanatical Islamists from the Taliban, Hizballah (a party of God), Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad Movement, and other extremists groups that engage in suicide bombings.

Let us read the following unaltered suras in the Koran and see why there is an urgent need for Muslims and people around the world to clearly understand that this scripture desperately needs revision. To avoid duplication, refer to the suras in the post “The Koran Advocates Violence and Murder.” But let us not be uninformed about the weaknesses of the Old and New Testaments. These scriptures also are not cast in concrete and also consist of weaknesses that continue to have discerning men and women question its authority as the Word of God. The weaknesses of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic scriptures are identified in the comprehensive book *Future of God Amen*, which includes recommendations to revise them so that there is unity in the belief of God. This book not only reveals how man first came to conceive one universal God, it also provides a history how this God has profoundly influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. Readers of this article are encouraged to visit the website www.futureofgodamen.com for a brief introduction of the book.

The suras presented in the post “The Koran Advocates Violence and Murder” are a small sample of the commands given by Allah carried out by a party of religious leaders. Of all three scriptures, the Koran is the most bigoted by advocating violence and killing of nonbelievers. The suras presented in the referenced post are unaltered to reveal that they do not belong in a holy book.

It is my hope that you, the reader, has been informed of what the Koran advocates and why there is so much turmoil in the world. The book *Future of God Amen* offers recommendation and solutions to bring together the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders to unify their beliefs and teach the Word of God—*love one another*.

Comments and Responses

John Doyle, November 20, 2010, 5:28 p.m. EST

Are Christians misled by the Bible? Are Jews misled by the Torah?

Gary G., November 20, 2010, 6:12 p.m. EST

No, Christians are not misled. “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for

instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, thoroughly equipped for every good work” (2 Tim. 3:16-17).

As well as, “the Word of God is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the division of soul and spirit, and of joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. And there is no creature hidden from His sight, but all things are naked and open to the eyes of Him to whom we must give account” (Heb. 4:12-13).

I would not say the Jews are misled by the Torah as they simply do not accept Jesus as the messiah.

John Doyle, November 20, 2010, 6:40 p.m. EST

Rule No. 1: You can't prove scripture by quoting scripture.

Rule No. 2: Muslims believe that the Koran is divinely inspired scripture.

Rule No. 3: The Old Testament is about nothing but duty.

Rule No. 4: Tell the Muslims who were slaughtered (women and children) in the crusades, especially the first that teach Christians about love.

Nicholas Ginex, November 23, 2010, 10:25 p.m. EST

Hello John,

Sorry, I have not responded to your comment sooner. Rule No. 1 does make a lot of sense. Scripture written by righteous men with their revelations, for the most part, have been faulty or as you say wrong. For example, God's Flood did not kill all the inhabitants on earth. The Egyptians had a thriving civilization before and after Noah's Flood.

To say the Old Testament is nothing but duty is wrong. Is it a duty to kill another people as the Hebrews in conquering Canaan? The Torah also has stories, like the Adam and Eve creation that led to eating fruit from a forbidden tree, and it is used for many interpretations. This very popular story caused the Catholics to interpret it as being the beginning of sin for all God's children born on earth. This story is a myth that has caused the degradation of human beings. The rabbis do not offer such an interpretation of this tree myth; rather, they emphasize the attainment of knowledge to learn to know God, a much better interpretation.

Larry M., November 21, 2010, 8:15 a.m. EST

Nicholas,

Doesn't the Bible show Sampson, Joshua, Moses, and David killing those who are not of the faith? Wasn't Moses a religious leader to whom God spoke (and on several occasions)? Weren't the chosen people authorized to take "the Promised Land" by force of arms from the people who lived there?

Nicholas Ginex, November 21, 2010, 7:02 p.m. EST

Larry, you are right to all three questions. It is true that holy men have used God to conquer people in other lands. In fact, in the Bible, Genesis 15:18 says, "In the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt into the great river, the river Euphrates."

But also God went on to say in Genesis 15:18-21, it is also the land of many other people and no mention was given that they should be destroyed.

The Torah, New Testament, and the Koran all use God to have a religion survive or multiply at the expense of killing other people not of their God. However, we are now in the present, and we must identify who are the killers today. The Bible speaks of conquests, and the Christians did kill many millions of people in the past. Are the Christians killing people today or are the Muslims, by direction of fanatical madmen, killing innocent people? Let us not cry over spilled milk. I do not condone the killings by Jews and Christians, but we must understand who is on the initiative to kill people today in many, many countries.

Of the three holy scriptures, the Koran is the most virulent by stating there be a party or "*We*" group to kill all nonbelievers of all races and people. The inflammatory suras are presented in the post "The Koran Advocates Violence and Murder."

Larry M., November 21, 2010, 7:18 p.m. EST

The Christians are killing far more—tobacco, bombs, politics. The fanatics are extremists. But our killing has no such excuse. We do it for profit.

We disagree as to the understanding of the suras.

Libramoon., November 21, 2010, 11:57 p.m. EST

There are crazy folk in any group. However, when we give truth to what the crazies warn of by our extreme acts of Islamophobia, what are even the moderate rational folks to think?

Nicholas Ginex, November 23, 2010, 6:27 p.m. EST

Dear Larry and Libramoon,

Let's stay on topic, which is religion, and not bring in tobacco, bombs, and politics. *We all agree* that the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions have used God to conquer and kill people in other lands—the motive is greed and power over human beings.

If you both feel that Islam is a wonderful religion and deny the suras presented in this post, then you guys are living in a dream world. I am not an Islamophobic guy but a realist who is simply giving you facts right out of the Koran. The words of the suras, provided in the referenced post, are unaltered and easy reading. You guys need to read those suras again and again until you understand what it says. You will then know their “exact” meaning exactly!

Larry M., November 23, 2010, 6:33 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

You are quite right about history.

I don't feel that any religion is wonderful. I am agnostic. I simply don't know and admit it. I also know that what a religious book says and how that is interpreted by its followers are two different things.

Nicholas Ginex, November 23, 2010, 7:52 p.m. EST

Hello Larry,

There are many things in all three scriptures that are written one way but interpreted in another way to suit the times. It is amazing that most people do not even read the scriptures. For example, Steven

Prothero in his book *God is Not One* writes that possibly only 20 percent of the Muslims have read the Koran. Let's face it; there are a lot of undesirable sentences in the Torah, New Testament, and the Koran. What is needed is a complete revision of these old, outworn, and antiquated documents so that people of these religions have a unified conception of God and they follow a consistent set of moral and ethical rules of conduct.

Larry M., November 23, 2010, 9:25 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

That's what got the Koran started. It was a new perspective on old religions.

Nicholas Ginex, November 25, 2010, 2:51 a.m. EST

Hi Larry,

The Koran is really not a new perspective on old religions because it retains the belief in one God. The difference is that the Muslims call Him Allah instead of Yahweh in the Torah. *Future of God Amen* relates how Muhammad used the influence of the Judaic and Christian religions to mobilize believers who became armies that accomplished two things: (1) unite the many Arabic tribes into a Muslim nation and (2) use the Koran to further their nation's growth by claiming they have the *true* religion and therefore beat up people in surrounding countries with the godly commands, declaring that they deserved punishment and death if they do not repent and worship Allah.

Larry M., November 25, 2010, 7:36 a.m. EST

Nicholas,

What were the nations for thousands of miles in every direction doing at the time when Muhammad (peace be upon him) was a child? Weren't they beating up each other? Weren't they trying to dominate the Arab tribes? Weren't those same tribes trying to beat up each other? Didn't Muhammad (peace be upon him) get those tribes to live in peace with each other? Now I admit that peace was short-lived and that it was soon after his death that Islam broke into two major factions. But when one compares the life under Islam with life at the time under Christianity one

would have to prefer Islam. (I also would note that Christianity claims to have the *true* religion and beat up on almost the whole world.)

Nicholas Ginex, November 25, 2010, 5:05 p.m. EST

Hello Larry,

Yes, you are correct that the Arabic tribes were dysfunctional all over the Arab peninsula that lies between the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea, namely Saudi Arabia. The Arabic tribes in this hostile land caused them to protect themselves, forming strong bonds against other predatory tribes. Their law was simple: In retaliation for the murder of any one of their tribe members, they would kill a member of the opposing tribe. Muhammad having been brought up in the Hashimite tribe, his family had the responsibility for the hospitality and welfare of the pilgrims who came to Mecca. His exposure to their multiple gods and then the Judaic and Christian beliefs filled his imagination to the point whereby he believed the angel Gabriel spoke the words of God to him, and hence after ten years, a group of his associates put together Muhammad's suras into the Koran.

The unification of the Arabic tribes was a noble thing. However, the "*We Group*," a party that represents Allah in the Koran, felt the taste for power and proceeded to conquer countries in the Byzantine and Persian empires and as far west as Spain and all of North Africa, including its east coast down to the island of Madagascar and further east to the northern half of India. This achievement was accomplished in just twenty-nine years after the death of Muhammad (661-632 CE). The Muslims established an empire by 1300 CE not by spreading the new God Allah as a merciful, most gracious, and most forgiving God, but by force with use of the sword, whereby nonbelievers were beheaded or killed while at sleep or at play.

Larry, you are also correct that the Christians were responsible for killing millions of people in spreading their religion and defending it against the rising power of the Islamic religion. However, you must be a realist and look toward what's happening today. Muslims are killing innocent people in many, many countries as they spread the news about their ever merciful, most gracious, and most forgiving God Allah.

You have got to wake up and not get lost in the past, but think if you might someday be blown up by some fanatical Muslim terrorists. The

Muslims are driven by the Koran that advocates it is the *true* religion (which is not stated in the Torah or New Testament), and by reading the small sample of suras provided in the referenced post, you must know that Muslims are taught from the Koran to hate, incite violence against Jews and Christians, and kill innocent people who do not believe in Allah as the one true God. The future of free countries in our world is in danger of the expansion of a religion that has within its scripture the Word of God to hate, cause violence, and kill innocent people. Larry, worry about today and the future, not the past.

Larry M. November 26, 2010, 8:23 a.m. EST

Nicholas,

I oppose terrorists “on both sides” (as if there were only two) of the issues. Both sides kill innocent bystanders. Both sides can use holy books to justify killing.

The future of free countries (relatively free) in our world is threatened not by religion, but by the nature of their money. It is only our money that makes such conflicts possible. Otherwise, the few acts of terror (and even today they are relatively few) would be seen for what they should be—random acts of insane people.

The Koran was never intended to harm people, especially the innocent.

I do not believe that the Koran teaches people to hate or to incite violence against Jews and Christians. Jews and Christians also believe in Allah as the one true God. They just use a different name. It is people like me, an agnostic, to whom the Koran would be most likely to oppose; yet I have Muslim neighbors with whom I am friends. They do not hate me. I fear no violence from them.

Nicholas Ginex November 26, 2010, 3:28 p.m. EST

Hello Larry,

Your innocence and naive outlook of today’s events around the world is surprising. To say the Koran was written to never intend harm to innocent people is absolutely ridiculous. Obviously, you have not read the suras that show unmistakably the command to kill Jews, Christians,

innocent people of other beliefs, and even receive rewards for killing those people as they kill themselves as suicide bombers.

Of course, there are Muslim people who are loving and make great friends. There is nothing wrong with the Muslim people; it is their scripture, the Koran, that has words that promote bigotry, hatred, violence, and the killing of innocent people. Live in the present, not the past, otherwise you will have no future.

Larry M., November 26, 2010, 3:41 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

It's nice to hear that I am innocent. (I certainly feel innocent.)

I say the Koran was conceived and treated as a holy book sent from God to help people act as they should. That was its intent on the part of the human beings involved in its creation. That is not to say that others have not attempted to make use of it (as people have abused other holy books) to attain unworthy objectives. Were the people of Islam human beings tempted and yielding to temptation as are all other people? Of course they were. But I can no more blame the Koran or the faith of Muslims for the abuses of the Koran and that faith than I can blame the Bible and faith in Christianity for the sins of Christians. So far as I can tell they are very similar.

Nicholas Ginex, November 26, 2010, 6:58 p.m. EST

Hello Larry,

I agree with you that the sins of Jews, Christians, and Muslims are not only similar but strikingly appalling. However, for you to say that "the Koran was conceived and treated as a holy book sent from God to help people act as they should" is ludicrous. You refuse to acknowledge that the Koran advocates bigotry, hate, violence, and murder of people around the world who do not worship Allah. Please read the suras provided in the referenced post. They are lifted out of the Koran without any changes in content.

I think we can agree that the scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions do provide a moral code of conduct for people to live by, but also they have content that cause division, hate, and murder

of people. What really is needed is a revision of these scriptures so that there is a consistent set of morality and a unified belief in the one universal God of all creation.

I have added a new post that begins with the question “Is there a need for a religious revolution?” I look forward to your participation.

Jeff H., November 20, 2010, 6:43 p.m. EST

At least the Muslims are trying to become modern. I heard that they were now teaching the proper way to beat their wives without leaving permanent scars. Plus they are trying to be more humane when they go about doing honor killing of their daughters. Give credit where credit is due.

Lea and . . . c., November 20, 2010, 8:14 p.m. EST

Very funny.

Nicholas Ginex, November 20, 2010, 8:35 p.m. EST

Hi Jeff,

You have a sense of humor because I was able to laugh at your comment. Yes, it is ironic that so few people know what’s in the Koran, and the suras I provided in the referenced post are a small sample of this very holy book. What I am trying to do is wake people up to be knowledgeable about all three scriptures: the *Torah*, *New Testament*, and *the Koran*. They all need to be revised by perceptive and courageous religious leaders with the help of people who have a great love for humanity and seek peace throughout the world.

The last chapter of *Future of God Amen* provides recommendations for daughters and sons of God to assist religious leaders of these faiths because they are locked into dogma they cannot let go of. The Egyptian scriptures never advocated the killing of their neighbors.

Lea and . . . c., November 20, 2010, 8:48 p.m. EST

Not the only reason for terror to exist. First, we are in other people’s country; second, we meddle in their business. Most importantly, we support Israel at the expense of Palestine. If not for that, we would not have terrorists.

I am not sure the Koran was inspired by Gabriel. According to the Muslim God, he was not pleased because Christians were not living by his word. So he sent the angel to Muhammed to give him a new Bible version and make sure this time people would listen. He uses punishment like it was used in the Old Testament to make us do what he says is good.

God at this point has lost all credibility. Why would God need to send angels to an ignorant man who could not read or write a new Bible version? Aah . . . that is proof that it came from God because he could not read or write they say . . . A man like him could not have spoken in such beautiful language. Actually he had to speak it and someone else was writing it, but it was not his ideas. Well, if you come across some old copies of the New Testament and also heard stories about God, who is to say that you may have decided to invent everything and become the new Jesus so you can bring some order with a sword and a book from the Almighty?

Give it another ten years and many of these Muslims will be changing religion.

This is what God told me. Be still and know that I am God . . . To me, it means we should stop worrying about all these people and their religions and listen directly. Also it means there is nothing we can do to change others. We can only change ourselves and be good models.

Nicholas Ginex, November 21, 2010, 1:36 a.m. EST

Lea, you are correct that the United States promotes terrorism since “first, we are in other people’s country; second, we meddle in their business. Most importantly, we support Israel at the expense of Palestine.”

This observation is a sound one, and perhaps the United States should stop supporting Israel, get out of Palestine, and let the Muslims continue to kill their neighbors and people in countries around the world.

To right a wrong with a wrong by a most gracious, ever merciful, most beneficent, and most forgiving God is rather hypocritical. Does God use punishment to do what He says is good or does the We Group,

a party to “invite goodness, to enjoin equity, and to forbid evil,” act in the name of God? If this is so, you are right that God has lost all credibility.

I like what God told you, which is to be still and believe in Him. But here are very important questions: Who describes Him? How is He to be worshipped? What are His commands for all people to live a truthful and righteous life? These answers are normally found in Scripture so that a people can follow a consistent set of rules. If these questions were left up to each individual, there would be so many differences and deviations in each model that there will be chaos. There is a need for some mechanism to teach people the consistent set of morals and ethics. Aah . . . how do we accomplish a uniform set of beliefs and moral code? I say get the religious leaders off their asses and do what they are supposed to do as representatives of God—teach our brothers and sisters, from all nations, to love and assist one another.

Lea and . . . c., November 21, 2010, 11:40 p.m. EST

I think the religious people have actually slowed the get-to-know God considerably with their behavior. What I am saying is each person has the ability to reach out and to teach others. You are underestimating people’s ability to find God on their own. In the olden days, church was in people’s homes where they gathered and talked about love not devils. They lived it, not just talked. This thing about devils has damaged more kids and adults than I can count. Both mentally and psychologically, it has made people fearful rather than open to faith and good works.

In this time of higher consciousness and knowledge, God wants you to grow and learn how to reach out directly. Have faith and you will know . . . faith as small as a mustard seed that is all you need.

Jesus also said that saving one soul is more important than building a church building.

Whoever he was, the teaching was clear and never talked about huge buildings with preachers earning 150,000 per year.

It has become another business and another way to get rich.

Nicholas Ginex, November 22, 2010, 10:00 p.m. EST

Lea, you are a loving, intelligent, and perceptive woman. I know after visiting your profile and reading your comments. Having read a very moving piece in one of your responses in this post, I regard you as a daughter of God. Yes, I agree with you that people are inherently loving and desire the best for their families. I do not underestimate people, but their development depends upon how they were brought up. Were they taught values, morality, integrity, and truth by their parents? Were they fortunate enough to have teachers who were able to inspire them to believe in themselves and love others? That is why I mentioned the need for a mechanism, institutions like the temples, churches, and mosques where there are representatives of God who desire to teach morality and ethics—using God as the standard of perfection.

However, you are correct that the dogmas of devils and hell are outmoded ways to develop wonderful human beings. In *Future of God Amen*, I concentrated on the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions knowing that there are many other religions that do a good job in moral development. But I chose to limit the book to the three monotheistic religions because they all sprang from the same roots of belief in God.

Lea, you mentioned that God wants us to grow and learn and to reach out directly, but where did you get that idea? I was not taught that in my Catholic training. The one religion that taught learning as a way to reach God were the rabbis I listened to. I cannot speak for the Islamic religion seeing how they do not allow literature from all parts of the world into their educational institutions and limit women's equal status with men. I cannot be encouraged with this religion.

Lea, I have read the Torah, New Testament, and Koran and found that the greatest man of God was Jesus Christ. Why? Jesus is the only prophet that pronounced the Word of God three times in the last Gospel of John, *love one another*. This command sums up all the commands given by God. The Christians have *got it all wrong*. Jesus did not die for our sins; he never said or preached that. This idea was generated by the Church to perpetuate their livelihood. However, Jesus was adamant by proclaiming God's Word three times.

Nasr A., November 20, 2010, 10:48 p.m. EST

For starters, it's common knowledge amongst scholars that the “**We**” refers to God only, not a group of Muslim leaders. It's the “royal” form of the singular, similar to how kings or queens would refer to themselves in the same fashion.

Nicholas Ginex, November 21, 2010, 2:35 a.m. EST

Dear Nasr,

This is religious leader mumble jumble. I will show you more evidence in the Koran that “**We**” refers to a unique set of religious people, a party sanctioned to “*invite goodness, to enjoin equity, and to forbid evil.*” Let us examine a few verses in Sura 22; it will not be necessary to belabor this observation, for the Koran is replete with statements made by the *We Group*.

Sura 22:35-38: **We** have appointed the sacrificial camels also as the Signs of Allah, for you. In them there is much good for you. So pronounce the name of Allah over them when they are tied up in lines; and when they fall down on their sides slaughtered, eat thereof yourselves and feed the needy, those who are content and those who are distressed. Thus have **We** subjected them to you that you may be grateful.

Note that it is the *We Group* that appoints what animals are to be sacrificed—not Allah. Nowhere in the Koran does God command that camels be sacrificed to Him as a way to glorify Him. After five hundred years since the revelations espoused by Jesus and the Gospels, whereby the sacrifice of animals is not a requirement to honor and pray to God, the Muslims have taken a step backward by reestablishing this practice. It is apparent that the tribal religions still observed strong ritual practices of the past and that Muhammad continued some of them. Note that the *We Group* is actively engaged in continuing animal sacrifice but really to serve a practical need, which is to provide meat for the needy so that they may be grateful. This was an expedient way of accommodating the thousands of pilgrims that came to Mecca to worship God.

It appears that the *We Group* has a very strong influence on directing the Muslims in many aggressive activities. As shown in the referenced

post, the powerful *We Group* are religious leaders who aggressively convert people to Islam by force. At first, the Koran served the noble purpose of unifying the Arab tribes in Saudi Arabia, but soon greed and power led the *We Group* to force Islam throughout the civilized world by the sword—believe in Islam or die as a nonbeliever. God would not commit the punishment of killing innocent people while asleep, but the *We Group* had the honor of killing innocent people.

Nasr, how could you accuse God of killing His own creations when He is willing to wait until the nonbelievers die and then He will punish them in the fires of hell? Your “royal” form of the singular does not make sense because to think God would do what the *We Group* have done in His name is a shame and discredits the goodness and love of God for His creations. The *We Group* are fanatical madmen, not God. Religious leaders will distort and misinterpret their scriptures to defend their beliefs. Be careful, Nasr, and not be fooled by fanatical religious men.

Richard Regener, November 21, 2010, 12:55 a.m. EST

I’m sticking to the Harry Potter fantasy, Nicholas. It’s a lot safer and more fun (chuckling).

Nicholas Ginex, November 21, 2010, 2:49 a.m. EST

You are right, Richard. I really wonder if it is worthwhile to inform people about the truth of how man came to believe in one of the greatest concepts—the belief in God. It seems people will ignore facts, real tangible findings that reveal it was the Egyptians that gave the world the most wonderful legacy of one universal God. Yes, people are so bound to the beliefs of their religion that they are terrified to think their religion was not the first but an adoption from the greatest religion in a forgotten past. However, I do have faith that there are smart people out there who are willing to read and learn what they have not been told by scholars and religious leaders who prefer to keep the status quo.

Lea and . . . c., November 21, 2010, 11:06 a.m. EST

People have always believed in something if you look back. Since when we needed a book to be good people? The Native Americans had a sacred belief in creation and our creator without a book and

survived thousands of years. In came the Christian missionaries, and the Western wickedness with booze and genocides occurs . . .

There is another possibility that prophets were here for a purpose to enlighten people.

“When is God’s Kingdom coming?” they asked. He answered, “It is already here, but you cannot see it.” . . . Our hearts are closed.

Next when you give yourself up, you will find yourself referring to people letting go of all distorted worldly religious ideas and use reason and love.

The New Testament if understood correctly leads you to a higher consciousness and connection with an authentic self that connects directly with a creator if there is one . . . I am living the doubt open.

Jesus also said, “Do not listen to the dogmatic preacher’s words.” He professed love for others, which is the highest form of religion to understand God’s mind and be part of it.

The occupation of every human being should be the cultivation of a love-filled conscience that embraces all of the world.

If tomorrow a billion people wake up to this notion and become lovers versus haters . . . the world will change overnight. The flood of loving energy is more powerful than any religion or any government or any evil in the world.

A billion points of light will make the earth shine and cause such a revolution in thinking it will spread like wildfire all over the world.

It would be as if mankind had discovered fire for the second time in history of mankind . . . Theillard De Chardin said that.

We have millions joining in this thinking; we need billions . . .

Go out and spread the good news. All we need is love.

Richard Regener November 21, 2010, 4:03 p.m. EST

The only one you control is yourself, Nicholas. The rest is out of your hands. You are doing fine (smiling).

Nicholas Ginex, November 21, 2010, 7:46 p.m. EST

Dear Lea,

You are so right to accuse the Christians of killing millions of people. However, please do not exclude Jews and Muslims from their share of killings. Concerning God's Kingdom, does He bring devastation or His love? You know, at the time we had World War II many people thought God's Kingdom was also near. There have been other times when God-fearing people have been wrong about the coming of God's Kingdom.

Lea, "when you give yourself up" has to do with believing in God and actively act like a creation of God. It does not mean giving yourself up to God. Do you think God wants His creatures to love Him or His creations? It is when we love our fellow man we are children of God.

God does not want you to prostrate yourself on the ground in submission to Him, He wants all of us to follow His moral code and love one another. God does not need your love as He is very strong, very capable, and very independent. He has created us to love one another, but which of the three holy scriptures gives this command from God?

Lea, God bless you. You have written several lines of love that has touched my heart that tears have come to my eyes. I will reprint your words of love:

““When is God's Kingdom coming?” they asked. He answered, ‘It is already here but you cannot see it.’ . . . Our hearts are closed.

Next, when you give yourself up you will find yourself refer to people letting go of all distorted worldly religious ideas and use reason and love.

The New Testament if understood correctly leads you to a higher consciousness and connection with an authentic self that connects directly with a creator if there is one . . . I am living the doubt open.

Jesus also said, ‘Do not listen to the dogmatic preacher's words.’ He professed love for others, which is the highest form of religion to understand God's mind and be part of it.

The occupation of every human being should be the cultivation of a love-filled conscience that embraces all of the world.

If tomorrow a billion people wake up to this notion and become lovers versus haters . . . the world will change overnight. The flood of loving energy is more powerful than any religion or any government or any evil in the world.

A billion points of light will make the earth shine and cause such a revolution in thinking it will spread like wildfire all over the world.

It would be as if mankind had discovered fire for the second time in history of mankind . . . Theillard De Chardin said that.

We have millions joining in this thinking; we need billions . . .

Go out and spread the good news. All we need is love.”

Amen.

Dorine H., November 21, 2010, 2:23 p.m. EST

Note that the Koran is available in many languages. My copy has facing pages in English and Arabic. I have read it through in English.

The suras you cite are clear examples of what is so terribly wrong about Islam. There's plenty more, too. Islam and Christianity have nothing in common except the belief in one true God. In Arabic-speaking countries, both Christians and Jews call him Allah. Allah is not the name of a particular god of Islam; it is the word for God in Arabic, so we who worship one God call him Allah if speaking Arabic, just as we call him Dios if speaking Spanish or Dieu if speaking French or Gott if speaking German.

Islam is so very clearly not a religion of love and tolerance; it is a religion of hate, violence, and murder. The suras make that clear, as do the centuries of history of violent Islamic raping, pillaging, and forcing religion by violence. I can tell you stories from a late elderly friend of mine who survived the Armenian holocaust and endured, with her teen friends, appalling rapes and beatings in a Turkish country because they refused to convert from Christianity to Islam. My friend and her

friends held strong by talking about how Jesus endured the Cross for them, so they endured abuse and remained faithful to Him.

In addition to the hate-mongering suras, there are imams who focus on the violence spoken of in the Koran as they teach the people who listen to them. I'm not convinced that the imams who preach violence, terrorism, and even suicide bombing are even "extreme." They are simply taking these awful suras literally.

Islam is evil at its very roots, and the Koran is an evil book.

Nicholas Ginex November 21, 2010, 10:09 p.m. EST

Dear Dorine,

Thank you for your response. My copy of the Koran was published in 1970 by Curson Press in Great Britain in 1970. The author was Muhammad Zafrulla Khan who was the foreign minister of Pakistan in 1947, became the president of the Seventeenth Session of the UN General Assembly, and later served as the judge of the International Court of Justice at the Hague, the court of which he became the president. A truly honorable Muslim, Mr. Khan offers a deep understanding of Arabic scholarship, Islamic learning, and a capable command of the English language. His English translation appeared in 1970 and was reprinted in 1981, 1991, and 1997. His text renders a strictly faithful translation of the Koran with clarity and precision and also includes the Arabic text.

Dorine, your assertions about the content of the Koran and the imams that teach their worshippers the literal meanings of the suras are responsible for misleading the Muslim people into the behaviors of bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of millions of innocent human beings. In *Future of God Amen*, to be fair, I tried to show that the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic scriptures all have weaknesses so that intelligent and discerning people find it difficult to belong to these religions. However, I am a man of action and instead of criticizing and describing past events look to the future and how best we can change the dogma of outworn scriptures.

Future of God Amen provides recommendations for God-loving people, the daughters and sons of God, to assist perceptive and courageous religious leaders to unify their beliefs and teach the Word

of God—*love one another*. It is necessary that more people like Lea, who provided a moving and perceptive comment in this post, join with thousands of other people from all religions, agnostics and atheists as well to loudly voice their displeasure of the worn-out scriptures and pressure religious leaders to work together for peace and love of our people.

Those of you who share the objectives given in “*Why this Book*” presented on the home page of www.futureofgodamen.com are requested to read its recommendations given in the last chapter of the book. One recommendation is to form a coalition of daughters and sons of God that will direct religious leaders to listen and work for unity than simply concentrating on power and greed for their own unique religion. You are encouraged to place an Internet search on the title or click on www.futureofgodamen.com

Thank you.

Maynard R., December 5, 2010, 2:10 p.m. EST

All humans, being fallible, are capable of misunderstanding anything and anyone. I doubt that the divine is capable of willfully misleading by revelation or scripture; humans however certainly are capable of willful deception.

Accordingly, to the posted question, the answer is “no, nobody is misled by their sacred scripture.” Yet everybody surely misunderstands at least some part of their sacred scripture, and individuals, intentionally or not, surely misrepresent anything.

Nicholas Ginex, December 6, 2010, 2:55 p.m. EST

Hello Maynard,

You contend that “no, nobody is misled by their sacred scripture.” If you are correct, then you are saying that Allah, the most merciful, compassionate, and gracious God, advocates bigotry, hate, violence, and murder of those people who do not believe in Him. Reread the suras in the referenced post, and you will see they are unchanged from the Koran so that there should be no misrepresentation or misunderstanding of what the suras say.

It is clear that there are many parts of scripture that are not fit for a holy book representing the Word of God. There are lies and myths that exist in scripture because they were written by men, men who truly tried to direct the social behavior of their people to promote stability, justice, and respect for each other.

But man's belief in God is still in its infancy, and scriptures must be revised as man becomes more knowledgeable about himself and his universe. The Egyptian priesthood revised their scriptures many, many times until they formulated the belief in one universal God. Let us all be realistic. Scripture was not meant to be cast in concrete; it must be revised to reflect the aspirations and hopes of mankind and place it in God's hands.

Maynard R., December 6, 2010, 5:25 p.m. EST

Hello Nicholas!

I also think that divine scripture was not intended to be taken too literally, or out of context, that it should not be treated so much as a field book of natural history or of social order as it should be explored for its divine and spiritual rather than mundane and natural messages. Every part of all scripture, and most particularly the contradictions, should be viewed as a catalyst for reflecting more deeply and more reverently upon what might be God's vision for us.

Clearly the vast numbers of practicing Muslims are not going around killing people on the sole basis of believing that they are mandated by Allah to do so. It seems to me unfitting that you should be suggesting that they are in error.

Please make a visit to your nearest imam and see if you come away dead or enlightened.

I believe it unfortunate and inaccurate that you conflate "what the Koran advocates" with "why there is so much turmoil in the world." We'll do a much better job of collectively managing the turmoil and solving the problems in this life if we accurately identify their causes and far-reaching effects.

Until then, we can resist the negative and reinforce the positive for everybody.

Nicholas Ginex, December 7, 2010, 1:40 a.m. EST

Hello Maynard,

Thank you for your response. I am a fair, objective, and honest man who will not discredit any man's beliefs in his God. All good men worship God to show how he is worthy of God and of himself toward his fellow sisters and brothers. If you believe in the Word of God, to love one another, there is no need to be offended by what I have said about the Koran. My comments were intended for the Judaic and Christian religions as well as the Islamic religion.

There is definitely a need for mankind's religious leaders to wake up and do what God has intended them to do and that is teach the Word of God. The scriptures of these religions are not pure and do not serve the purpose of teaching human beings of all nations to love one another.

There is no reason to twist and redefine the suras referred in this post; they are word for word taken from the Koran. To try to reinterpret them to be words that promote love, understanding, and compassion for your fellow human beings is an exercise in being untruthful.

Yes, the scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions need to be revised, passages deleted, and passages/suras added to promote love and understanding between people of all nations. If you are not honest to admit that, then peace on earth is lost because like religious leaders your mind is incapable of perceiving a better world, which requires change.

Maynard R., December 7, 2010, 10:25 a.m. EST

Actually, my mind is incapable of *not* perceiving a better world. I do believe in divine revelation, and that it is not our job to create or edit it or for that matter to condemn it or for that matter to preach it, especially if we don't understand or agree with it. There are many more positively productive ways to advance social and cultural harmony.

Thank you for the thoughtful discourse.

Nicholas Ginex, December 7, 2010, 4:25 p.m. EST

Dear Maynard,

Thank you for your response. I was disappointed that you feel your mind is incapable of “*not* perceiving a better world.” These negatives appear to mean you do perceive a better world and believe in divine revelation.

However, you are a great believer who is *not* open to envision your God with new revelations because you are committed to keeping your Holy Scripture unchanged, which is not to edit it, condemn it, or preach it because many people are incapable of understanding God’s Word.

This is a sad reality that God has provided revelation that is not *clear enough* for His creations to understand what He has provided in Scripture. But how can that be? God is the greatest communicator that ever existed. To not understand God’s written words mean that we are awfully stupid because God wrote for all mankind to *clearly understand him*.

What we have is a situation whereby religious leaders deny, misinterpret, and misconstrue what God has provided in Scripture because they are embarrassed, shamed, and still desire to protect their holy book. Please read again the *suras* in the post “The Koran Advocates Violence and Murder” and tell our readers if God is merciful, gracious, and compassionate for His creations, people of all races and all nations.

Our world needs courageous men and women who are perceptive and loving to revise Scripture so that God’s children will *love one another*; that, my friend, is the Word of God.

Religious leaders are proud, arrogant, and chained to their dogma so that mentally they lack the vision to make this a better world—a world that God can be proud of His creations.

Demand Muslims Provide Religious Reciprocity

September 01, 2010 02:17 a.m. EDT

Americans should learn Muslim history to realize that their scripture, the Koran, advocates bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent human beings who do not worship Allah. What is stunning to free people is that the Muslims have built mosques in every country they have conquered or controlled. But Muslims will not tolerate Judaic, Christian, Zoroastrian, Hindu, or any other religious house of worship on their territories. Where is the reciprocity of the Muslim people to live amicably with their neighbors with tolerance, love, and peace? I would like to refer you to an article “Mosque of Conquest?” by William J. Federer featured on the Internet: <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=194997>. There you can read the many Muslim conquests whereby they built their mosques upon the temples and churches they destroyed. Of the thirty-five examples of Muslim disregard of the houses of worship of other religions, just six of Mr. Federer’s examples are cited below:

- In 630, Muhammad led ten thousand Muslim soldiers into Mecca and turned the pagans’ most prominent spot, the Kaaba, into the Masjid al-Haram Mosque.
- In 638, Caliph Umar conquered Jerusalem. In 691, Caliph Al-Malik ordered the Dome of the Rock built on the most prominent spot in Judaism, the Temple Mount, followed by Caliph Al-Walid building the Al-Aqsa Mosque there in 705.
- In 706, after Muslims took Damascus from the Byzantine Empire, Caliph Al-Walid turned the prominent Orthodox Church of St. John the Baptist into the Umayyad Mosque.
- After the conquest of Egypt, Caliphs al-Mamun (813-33) and al-Hakim (996-1021) turned prominent Coptic Christian churches and Jewish synagogues in Cairo into mosques.

- In 831, Muslims conquered Palermo, Sicily, and Asad ibn al-Furat turned the prominent Church of Saint Mary of the Assumption into the Great Mosque of Bal'arm.
- In 1193, Muslims conquered Delhi, India, and Qutbuddin Aibak turned the Red Citadel in Dhillika, the most prominent spot of the last Hindu rulers, into the Qutb Minar mosque.

Now Muslim groups are proposing a thirteen-story \$100 million mosque in the most prominent spot in America—the heart of downtown New York City near the World Trade Center site.

If this mosque is built, it is not only a sign of another Muslim conquest, it also reveals that Americans are naive and border on being fools. Why? It is like a Muslim can kill your child but you cannot kill theirs. The analogy is striking but true. Muslims can do what they want but will not reciprocate in friendship, love, and peace. It is clear that Americans are overly politically correct and thought of being naive fools by people around the world.

Would not a sign of love, peace, understanding, and compassion by all Muslims be to build a religious site that *embraces the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic faiths*? Should *Americans demand* that Muslims allow the building of Judaic and Christian *houses of worship in their countries* before we allow a mosque be built where three thousand Americans died in our country? Forget about the argument that they can do what they want with the property they purchased. It is the same as allowing Hitler to build a concentration camp at a site where he killed thousands of people. Are Americans really stupid to buy the argument of President Obama that those who own the land can do what they wish without taking into account human decency and respect for American lives killed by Muslims? Unless Muslims provide a positive answer to the first two questions, are we Americans fools if we allow Muslims to build a mosque at the 9/11 site?

Comments and Responses

Richard Regener September 1, 2010, 2:49 a.m. EDT

Reciprocity does not exist where Muslim doctrine is concerned, Nicholas.

Nicholas Ginex, September 1, 2010, 2:05 p.m. EDT

Yes, Richard, you are correct. That is why Americans should demand reciprocity of religious beliefs. Otherwise, they are going to certainly lose to Muslims, whose goal is to dominate all countries with their Islamic religion.

Richard Regener, September 1, 2010, 5:16 p.m. EDT

We gave the right to ask anything of religions long ago, Nicholas, by addressing it in the constitution. The rest is just historical idiocy that never seems to end.

Nicholas Ginex, September 1, 2010, 5:30 p.m. EDT

The constitution provides for freedom of religion, but it remains for the people to use their common sense in its application. When one religion does not respect the rights of other religions to exist on their land, that same religion should not be given the right to build in America. This is referred to as a lose-lose situation where one religion grows worldwide at the expense of destroying other religions. For this reason, Americans should advocate reciprocity by the Muslims for religious tolerance. To do otherwise, we Americans are fools.

Richard B., September 1, 2010, 4:56 a.m. EDT

The three Abrahamic religions all use the same text.

The fundamental sides of all three religions are actually in the same boat and want the same thing whether Jewish, Christian, or Muslim and that is to kill others that don't follow their religion.

Nicholas Ginex, September 1, 2010, 2:31 p.m. EDT

Dear Richard B.,

You are correct concerning the holy wars of the past. However, it is the Muslims today who actively advocate and implement what is written in the Koran. One has only to read one of the earliest translations of the Koran by a highly respected Muslim. He is Muhammad Zafrulla Khan who was the foreign minister of Pakistan in 1947, became the

president of the Seventeenth Session of the UN General Assembly, and later served as the judge of the International Court of Justice at the Hague, of which he became the president.

I refer to you this very early translation published in 1893 because translations of today are corrupt in an attempt to be politically correct. For those interested in reading the suras (verses) of the Koran that advocates bigotry, hate, violence, and murder of innocent human beings, read Mr. Khan's book line by line (a brief list is presented in the post "The Koran Advocates Violence and Murder"). It is the Islamic religion that is under the control of religious fanatics who threaten the free people of many countries.

John Doyle, September 1, 2010, 2:48 p.m. EDT

I don't read about atrocities. I am still trying to digest the holocaust which deliberately murdered six million people. This horror was committed by a Christian nation and assisted by Christian allies. By the way, I am a Roman Catholic, which by the tone of your writing is worse than being a Muslim.

And I do love Sufi poetry; they are Muslims too. And I am pretty good at algebra which was invented by Muslims. And I am grateful for the zero also invented by Muslims.

Nicholas Ginex September 1, 2010, 3:46 p.m. EDT

Dear John,

You need to acknowledge the present. It is here in the present that our way of life is being challenged by Muslim religious fanatics. At a march recently held in London, England, the Muslims loudly proclaimed their intolerance for other religions and civilized countries. A sample of the signs they held for the world to see are repeated below:

- **"Behead those who insult Islam."**
- **"Islam will dominate the world."**
- **"Europe is the cancer. Islam is the answer."**
- **"Exterminate those who slander Islam."**
- **"Freedom, go to hell!"—**

- “Be prepared for the real *holocaust!*”
- “Europe, you will pay. Your 9/11 is on its way!”

John, you and many other Americans have fallen for the one-sided approach whereby Muslims are forgiven for their intolerance. But that may be because they do not live in a Muslim country, are brainwashed by the liberal media, and believe the Muslims love Americans. But these Americans are fools.

John Doyle, September 1, 2010, 4:22 p.m. EDT

If they break the laws of this country, then put them in jail. What would you do? Lock them all up? Your posting the kind of things you post is no different from their signs. They are inflammatory. The entire premise of your post is ridiculous. Who do we demand reciprocity from? If they don't want Christian churches in their countries, then that is their right. These are sovereign nations. Exporting Christianity (especially the evangelical kind) is as stupid as exporting democracy. If Christian missionaries go into Muslim countries and get butchered, that is the chance they take. We should not rush to try to save them from their own chosen fate. I will not respond to any more of your posts as I see clearly where you are coming from. Faith is a gift from God; and perhaps Islam is the faith he has given the people of the Middle East.

Nicholas Ginex, September 1, 2010, 5:55 p.m. EDT

Hello John,

I am a man who believes in fairness and truth for both sides. Did God really give the people of the Middle East a faith that promotes love for all people or is Islam a power grab by religious fanatics to control the hearts and minds of people throughout the earth by force? Show Gather readers where in the Koran it provides a command to love one another.

There is only one man who reduced *all scripture* to one *new* command from God: “Love one another as I have loved you.” Do you know who that man is?

We should agree that there is only one God. That God, if you believe in one God, is the same God worshipped in temples, churches, and mosques. However, Muhammad was remiss to reveal the new command provided by God—*love one another*. It is this command that religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions should teach—that sisters and brothers, from every nation, love and support one another.

Richard B., September 1, 2010, 9:12 a.m. EDT

By the way, we have a constitution in the USA that is paramount and above the laws and the methods of all religions.

And in that constitution is the first amendment which is:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Therefore if one or a group wants to build or expand a religious building, they should be allowed to do so.

Nicholas Ginex, September 1, 2010, 11:06 p.m. EDT

Hello Robert,

I checked out your link and found that MMM Bloomberg has some underhanded financial dealings with the Arabs who are extremely wealthy and have successfully built a consortium for financial control in the Mideast. Our government is corrupt at every level, and it all starts at the top with President Obama.

Jerry Kays, September 2, 2010, 5:21 p.m. EDT

What most fail to realize is that there is in effect a secretive “government” above and behind that of the one we are supposed to relate to . . . the very one that vetted Obama, and all presidents, long before they are even “allowed” to become actual candidates . . . Our presidents are but a “tool” for them . . . one of their “puppets” meant

to keep us entranced upon the sleight of hand “show” that he performs as his strings are pulled remotely . . . It must be one helluva effective show to fool so many of us . . .

Nicholas Ginex, September 2, 2010, 11:08 p.m. EDT

Hello Jerry,

You appear to either be extremely perceptive or have gotten insider information that has a ring of truth to it. Are there evidence, books, or articles that back up your contention that an elite group calls the shots and pulls the strings to run government with a “hidden” agenda? It appears your contention that there is a “control group” has merit because, as an example, after thirty years of talking about our country being oil independent it has not happened; we are still buying oil from the Arabs. A key answer is that there are very powerful oil businessmen who dominate decisions made in government.

Another answer not provided is how is it possible that a man is vetted by high security standards but yet there is no record that clearly shows Mr. Obama’s birth certificate that qualifies him as a citizen for the position of president of the United States?

For high security officials to miss checking for a birth certificate does point to underhanded puppet stringing because when I was cleared for top secret, security officials did not miss a trick as they went back many years and interviewed people without my knowledge until they told me.

Debra C., November 19, 2010, 2:47 p.m. EST

“What I have done is inform people that it is the Koran that is full of bigotry, hate, violence, and advocates killing of innocent human beings in the name of Allah.”

Let’s be fair and say there are passages in most “scriptures” that can be interpreted this way. This includes the Christian scriptures.

While we should “educate” ourselves, we should also be careful about insightful suggestion.

Nicholas Ginex, November 19, 2010, 5:59 p.m. EST

Hello Debra,

I am very fair and honest. No other scripture specifically refers to Jews, Christians, and nonbelievers that do not worship the Islamic God Allah as infidels and advocates bigotry, hate, violence, and the murder of these infidels. Let me remind you that the Muslim people are good people. It is the Koran that is used by fanatic Islamic religious leaders to incite violence and killing. If you are not convinced, read the Koran yourself. Make sure you read the earlier translations because politically correct translations over the few years have changed many suras, which is not supposed to happen with this holy scripture.

Debra C., November 19, 2010, 8:09 p.m. EST

The Old Testament has a number of passages that talk about God “ordering” the killing of all the “nonbelievers” or “people of the town,” etc. Start with Exodus 22:20. “Whoever sacrifices to any god other than the *Lord* must be destroyed.” It is important to read it in context, including cultural context, to realize that this is not an ongoing command.

I have read the Koran. It is also important to read it in context.

Most intolerance and violence happens because fringes “use” scriptures to validate their own ends rather than to discover what is being taught.

It is vital, however, that we take care when characterizing scriptures, religions, and cultural groups and their motivations. There are many passages in the Koran that talk about peace with others, benevolence, kindness, and other areas on which we can agree.

Nicholas Ginex, November 19, 2010, 11:38 p.m. EST

Thank you, Debra. Is it a comfort to know the Judaic scriptures are just as much at fault as the Koran in using God to isolate one people from another? I have no reason to validate my own ends but to inform people of the weaknesses in the scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Muslim religions. All three scriptures talk about peace, benevolence,

kindness, and other moral and ethical rules to lead our lives. But of all three scriptures, the Koran is the most descriptive and bigoted, advocating violence and killing of nonbelievers. To show you that I do not take words out of context, I will leave you with just several suras that do not belong in a holy book.

First, some suras that sanction the killing of nonbelievers:

Sura 2:217-219: Fighting is ordained for you, while it is repugnant to you. It may be that you dislike a thing which is good for you, and it may also be that you prefer a thing and it may be the worse for you. Allah knows all and you know not. They enquire from thee about fighting in the sacred month, Say to them: Fighting in it is a great evil; but to hinder people from the way of Allah and to deny Him and to profane the sanctity of the Sacred Mosque, and to turn out its people therefrom is a much greater evil in the sight of Allah; and disorder is a worse evil than killing.

Sura 7:5-7: Little is it that you heed. How many a town have **We** destroyed! Our punishment came upon their dwellers by night or while they slept at noon. When **Our** punishment came upon them all they could utter was: We are indeed wrongdoers.

Sura 7:97-100: We afflicted them suddenly with chastisement, while they perceived not the cause thereof. If the people of those towns had believed and been righteous, **We** would surely have bestowed blessings upon them from heaven and earth, but they rejected the Prophets, so **We** seized them because of that which they did. Do the people of these towns now feel secure against the coming of **Our** punishment upon them by night while they are asleep? Or, do they feel secure against the coming of **Our** punishment upon them in the forenoon while they are at play? Do they feel secure against the design of Allah? None feels secure against the design of Allah, except those that are losers. Sura 5:34-35: The appropriate penalty for those who wage war against Allah and His Messenger and run about in the land creating disorder is that they be slain or crucified or their hands and feet be cut off on alternate sides, or they be expelled from the land. That would be a disgrace for them in this world, and in the Hereafter they shall have a great punishment; except in the case of those who repent before you obtain power over them. Take note that Allah is Most Forgiving, Ever Merciful.

The following sura promotes suspicion and animosity:

Sura 3:119: O ye who believe, do not take outsiders as your intimate friends, they will not fail to cause you injury. They love to see you in trouble. Their hatred has been expressed in words, and that which they design is even more virulent. **We** have made **Our** commandments clear to you, if you will understand.

The following sura advocates terror against nonbelievers.

Sura 3:150-152: O ye who believe, if you obey those who have disbelieved, they will cause you to revert to disbelief and you will become losers. Indeed, Allah is your Protector and He is the Best of helpers. **We** shall strike terror into the hearts of those who have disbelieved because they associate partners with Allah, for which He has sent down no authority. Their abode is Fire, and evil is the habitation of the wrongdoers.

The following suras specifically identify hatred against Jews and Christians.

Sura 3:150-152: O ye who have been given the Book, believe in that which **We** have now sent down, fulfilling that which is with you, before **We** destroy your leaders and turn them on their backs or cast them aside as **We** cast aside the people of the Sabbath. The decree of Allah is bound to be carried out.

Sura 5:52-54: O ye who believe, take not the Jews and the Christians as your helpers, for they are helpers of one another. Whoso from among you takes them as helpers will indeed be one of them. Verily, Allah guides not the unjust people. Thou wilt see those whose minds are diseased hastening toward them, saying to themselves in justification: We fear lest a misfortune befall us. Maybe, Allah will soon bring about your victory or some other event from Himself favorable to you. Then will they become remorseful of that which they keep hidden in their minds. Those who believe will say concerning them: Are these they who swore the most solemn oaths by Allah that they are entirely with you? Their works are vain and they have become the losers.

Sura 9:29: Fight those from among the People of the Book who believe not in Allah, nor in the Last day, nor hold as unlawful that which Allah and His Messenger have declared to be unlawful nor follow the true

religion, and who have not yet made peace with you, until they pay the tax (tribute) willingly and make their submission.

The following sura advocates and rewards the need for suicide killings:

Sura 4:67-69: If We had commanded them: Kill yourselves in striving for the cause of Allah or go forth from your homes for the same purpose: they would not have done it except a few of them; yet if they had done what they are exhorted to do, it surely have been the better for them and conducive to greater firmness and strength. **We** would then bestow upon them a great reward from **Ourselves**, and **We** would surely guide them along the straight path.

Having read the small selection of many insightful suras, would you honestly say that the Islamic God Allah is most gracious, ever merciful, most beneficent, and most forgiving? My, my, how knowledge hurts when it is presented truthfully.

Debra C., November 20, 2010, 12:44 a.m. EST

You are entitled to your opinion. Please allow the rest of us ours.

Nicholas Ginex, November 20, 2010, 1:06 a.m. EST

Dear Debra,

What was presented to you was not opinion, but fact. By the way who are “the rest of us?” There is only you and I discussing the weaknesses of the Koran. You should be grateful that I am able to share with you the *truth* of those suras that incite bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of Jews, Christians, and nonbelievers of the God Allah.

But I am a very fair and objective man. The Torah and the New Testament also have their weaknesses. The object is to wake people up to realize that Scripture is not cast in concrete. Scripture needs to be revised as mankind becomes more knowledgeable and discerning about his world. The Egyptian priesthood revised their scriptures many times until they developed the concept of one universal God Amen. Do you honestly feel that the scriptures are not in need of revision by perceptive and loving human beings who want a world of peace and love? My dear woman, I love the fact that you are concerned about our

religions of today, but they all need to work together to help make our world a better one.

May God bless you! I wish you the best in life and hope you believe that there can be change, for without change there can only be failure of our religious institutions.

Jerry Kays, September 3, 2010, 3:27 a.m. EDT

My words were intended to link Jesus to the liberalism that he actually practiced and promoted . . . that being a far cry from the misunderstandings and misapplication of his teachings exemplified by the conservative evangelical side of the religion . . . those who seek so often to solve world problems with violence . . . such as those who so supported the neo-cons so enthusiastically just a few years ago.

I am not equipped to get too specific about the Koran at this time . . . other than to say that you seem to unfairly emphasize the most negative aspects of it that you can, most likely reading information that was intended to put it in the worst light . . . if not a falsified version.

Jerry Kays, September 3, 2010, 7:28 p.m. EDT

I would hazard a guess that the Muslim side of the debate has at least as many examples of Christian atrocities around the world as well . . . those either ignored or denied by the apologists.

Nicholas Ginex, September 3, 2010, 10:15 p.m. EDT

Yes, Jerry, Jesus was a liberal to break away from the traditional practices that religious leaders followed. After being in power a long time, they tend to stop using their brains and sit on their asses. This is true with many of our government officials who love to draw a pay check but for the most part do very little for the people who voted them into office. A failure of most humans is to sit back and relax, enjoy the fruits of their success, and stop thinking how to make our world better.

As the author of *Future of God Amen*, I was obligated to read the Torah, New Testament, and the Koran. The thesis or message of the book was to clearly reveal that the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions have their roots, their beliefs, from the ancient Egyptians. Not to belabor

an extremely important finding, it was Jesus that acknowledged that *Amen*, Egypt's greatest God, was "the faithful and true witness, *the beginning of the creation of God.*" Is it any wonder that *Amen* is announced in temples, churches, and mosques?

Upon reading the Koran, line by line, I was able to give a fair, honest critique that allowed the Koran to speak for itself. To ensure I represented the truth for those who defend the Koran, entire Suras were presented so that I would not be accused of giving a "falsified version." Jerry, I am a man who searches for the truth. If I find that I was wrong by somebody who has clearly revealed a proper view, I gladly embrace the wisdom of that person with grace and respect.

Jerry Kays, September 4, 2010, 2:26 a.m. EDT

Nicholas, I respect any and all who seek the highest truths . . . They are not all that easy to come by in this day and age . . .

Nicholas Ginex, September 3, 2010, 11:45 p.m. EDT

Hello Jerry,

I went to the link you prescribed: <http://www.islam101.com/terror/mythViolence.htm>. It was hosted by an Islamic website that presented an article by Vincenzo Oliveti, "The Myth of 'The Myth of Moderate Islam.'" The website states: "Islam 101 is an educational website on Islam, Muslims, its theology, human relations with Muslims and non-Muslims, its history, civilization and everything else in life." The article writes in opposition to Patrick Sookhdeo's article (July 30, 2005) in London's *The Spectator*, "The Myth of a Moderate Islam," and he contends that it reflects a dangerous trend in the war on terror.

Vincenzo writes that "under the guise of informing Westerners about Islam, he (Sookhdeo) is in fact spreading the very same disinformation that anti-Islamic polemics have been based upon for over 1,000 years. This plays directly into the hands of Osama bin Laden, Abu Musab al-Zarqawi and others, for it encourages the "clash of civilizations" they so appallingly desire. It is indeed of the utmost importance that we learn more about Islam and fight the scourge of extremism with all the tools possible. But Sookhdeo and those like him corrupt this process, seeking to advance their own agenda by turning the war on terror into an ideological war against Islam."

Jerry, it is clear that Vincenzo is defending against extremism by non-Muslims because he strongly feels they are “turning the war on terror into an ideological war against Islam.” It is unfortunate that civilized people around the world are becoming aware of the fact that there is indeed an ideological war against Islam. Educated people need only read the Koran to learn that it promotes and advocates bigotry, hatred, violence, and the killing of innocent human beings who do not worship or deny Allah. Vincenzo makes the following argument to prove that Muslims terrorists are not a problem:

“It is thus “the height of illiberalism” to define as terrorists over 1.3 billion Muslims who have nothing to do with “religious violence” because of the misdeeds of a fringe minority of 0.005 *percent*. At most, one in every 200,000 Muslims can be accused of terrorism. That is to say there are a maximum of about 65,000 terrorists worldwide—roughly the same figure as the number of murderers on the loose in the U.S. alone, with over 20,000 homicides a year and a population of only 300 million.”

Vincenze appears to make a justified argument that with only 0.005 percent or 65,000 terrorists worldwide the civilized world really has no reason to condemn Muslims as being terrorists. This is a marvelous deduction but in reality untrue. What Vincenzo forgot to take into account are the number of Islamic countries that prohibit the education of their citizens by insulating them from books that open the mind to ideas whereby they can think for themselves. The Islamic countries are indeed theocratic states that impose a strict moral and religious code of conduct. But the most damaging influence is their holy scripture; the Koran instructs people with poorly guided messages already stated in the above suras.

It is most important that religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions show the world that they truly teach love and peace for our sisters and brothers of every nation. *Future of God Amen* is a timely read for today. It gives an objective critique of the scriptures of the major three religions and offers recommendations and solutions to have people of these religions embrace their beliefs in God. They all share a common bond. It is *Amen* they announce at the end of a prayer, supplication, or giving thanks and praise to God.

People around the world have got to wake up their religious leaders for they are brain dead with scripture that was written more than

two thousand years ago. *Future of God Amen* has provided “a call to daughters and sons of God” who are endowed with perception of love of humanity to guide courageous religious leaders to unify their scriptures in a modern world.

Jerry Kays, September 4, 2010, 2:44 a.m. EDT

Nicholas, I myself thought the linked article mentioned was a very good one . . . and the percentage figures sure put things into context . . . Those who truly seek to unite the religions around their best aspects of love, truth, and harmony amongst all peoples are commendable for sure . . .

One must remember that there are folks in all orthodox (exoteric) versions of religion that seek only to boost their own rather selfish image at the expense of the others, and they are more than willing to lie to do so . . .

That being why the true Muslims are encouraged to read the Koran in its original Arabic . . . Too many people writing their “exposes” into English do so from the perspective of intentionally misrepresenting it . . . there is a real good chance that the version which you studied was one of those . . .

When I read books, I do so from the perspective of seeking the deepest esoteric truths that were intended, those things expressing the love of the religion . . . I can read the very same words that the average Christian reads from their own book(s) and come away with a very different interpretation . . . the difference between the shallow exoteric of literal objectivity and the deepest esoteric mystical meanings which are personally spiritual, subjective as that may be, just like *God* and spirit . . . The final clearing house for each of us should be our own *internal intuition* . . . provided we seek the love and truth from it . . . IMnsHO.

Nicholas Ginex, September 5, 2010, 12:06 a.m. EDT

Hello Jerry,

I was careful to select a translation that was made by one of the most respected and honorable Muslims. He is Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, who was the foreign minister of Pakistan in 1947, became the president of the Seventeenth Session of the UN General Assembly, and later

served as the judge of the International Court of Justice at the Hague, of which he became the president.

I refer to you this very early translation published in 1893 because translations of today are corrupt in an attempt to be politically correct. Mr. Khan provides the English and the Arabic text side by side. For those interested in reading the suras (verses) of the Koran, they will find that it advocates bigotry, hate, violence, and murder of innocent human beings. It is the Islamic religion that is under the control of religious fanatics, a select “group” who uses the Koran to advance their domination of free people of many countries.

Jerry Kays, September 5, 2010, 4:58 p.m. EDT

Nicholas, I will gladly take your word for the authenticity of the Koranic translation that you studied . . . We must not forget that there is comparable violence in the Christian Bible also in considering the OT which so many still adhere to . . . at least to the parts that best suit their personalities . . . something applicable in all religions, I suspect.

My argument has always been about the need to transcend the exoteric orthodoxy of such religions, to look to the offerings of the esoteric mystical sects . . . such as the Sufi relatives to the Muslims.

Jerry Kays, September 5, 2010, 5:05 p.m. EDT

P.S. To the degree that we stay in ignorance about such transcendent thinking, there will be a matching fear and hatred between people . . . to believe what George W. Bush said about the terrorists. That they hate our freedoms . . . is simply a lie . . . Many may dislike our licentiousness, the evil and sinful ways of so many, seeing it as a threat to the divine nature of humanity . . . probably for good reason from a religious perspective, even that of Christianity . . .

But the main overlooked, ignored, and even roundly denied reason for terrorism is the way that the “West” has treated Third World countries in propping up despotic leaders who allow us to steal their natural resources at the expense of the average person of the country who lives in poverty . . .

All of the present hate and discontent that those such as Robert are stirring up will just add to the hatred and fears on all sides and ensure more rather than less problems down the road . . .

Nicholas Ginex, September 6, 2010, 4:32 p.m. EDT

Hello Jerry,

Your contention that .005 percent of Muslims or 65,000 out of 1.3 billion Muslims worldwide are terrorists is in gross error. The actual number of terrorists is much higher, and the total number of Muslims is closer to or exceeds 1.79 billion. You have got to forget the past atrocities of the Judaic, Christian, Islamic religions and live in the present. It is here and now and the future of all people that we must be concerned with.

What are religious Muslim leaders doing to accelerate peace and harmony in all the troubled counties experiencing terrorism today? Nothing. They are silent, waiting for domination of Islamic religious beliefs throughout the world.

There is a great opportunity for Islamic religious leaders to demonstrate a peaceful initiative throughout the world.

Why don't they propose a tri-religious holy house of God that embraces the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions instead of another mosque that exemplifies another Muslim conquest on the 9/11 site of three thousand dead Americans?

Norman Ketchie, November 19, 2010, 12:07 a.m. EST

Nicholas, for a man who in other posts has espoused peace, you are spouting hate in this post. That makes you a hypocrite and maybe a liar. I think I shall un-friend you!

Nicholas Ginex, November 19, 2010, 1:07 p.m. EST

Hello Norman,

Read my profile, my website, www.futureofgodamen.com, and press releases with an Internet search on *Future of God Amen*. You will find that I am on a mission to assist religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic faiths to work together to unify their beliefs and teach the Word of God—*love one another*.

The problem with Ron, who has lied about my intentions, is that he does not like to debate with valid facts that I have found but instead

tries to throw stones with lies, distortions, and bigotry of his own. I have wished him the best in health and happiness, and let us leave this discussion that way.

Ron W., November 18, 2010, 1:03 a.m. EST

No, no reason he should have had to, to placate Islamaphobes like you. You say you want to unite Jews, Muslims and Christians, but you want to unite them under your bias, Christianity. That is a recipe for failure, and you will. I knew I remembered you from somewhere. Considering your statements, I should have known.

Nicholas Ginex, November 18, 2010, 1:34 a.m. EST

Ron, who told you that I am a follower of the Christian religion? Are you a fool for making such an assumption? I have a *greater view*, which is the possible harmony between Jews, Christians, and Muslims. My book, *Future of God Amen*, clearly shows that all three major religions have the *same common roots* of belief that stem from the Egyptian religion.

The problem is followers of the three religions believe they have the *true God* and fail to recognize it is the *same God*—the difference is that they worship Him differently. But then, this is the stupidity of both the religious leaders of these faiths and of course their followers who blindly play at “follow the leader.”

Do you really feel that people believe the Muslims are tolerant, loving people? Read *Future of God Amen* and you will find the Koran has multiple statements that evoke bigotry, hatred, violence, and the killing of innocent people who do not subscribe to the Islamic faith. It is you who has his head in the sand, and I tell it like it truly is.

We the American people are fools, not Islamaphobic. We are so politically correct we refuse to face up to a threat caused by Muslim fanatics. Instead of taking a great opportunity to show Americans the desire to promote peace by housing a tri-house of worship, the Muslims rather add insult to injury by building a mosque that is a stone’s throw from the deaths of more than three thousand Americans.

Apparently you believe the Muslims have a great love for Jews, Christians, and those who refuse to worship Allah. I suggest you wake

up and start smelling the roses or someday you will be lying under a bed of roses.

Ron W., November 18, 2010, 12:46 p.m. EST

Better than under a pile of your BS any day. You don't have a *greater* view; you have *your wackadoodle view*, which is misguided and more than a bit bigoted. Nothing good ever comes from bigotry, in my experience, no matter your claimed intent. Jews did not bring persecution on themselves, and the vast majority of Muslims are peaceful and no threat to anyone, especially the Sufis, despite the few that grab the headlines. You have committed slander of Imam Rauf, Muslims everywhere, and the entire Jewish people, and from what I have read Christians as well. I only called you Christian because I thought you self-identified that way from your comment on LYR about Jesus, but you are right; you are no Christian. Now my lunch break is over and so is my conversation with you hopefully.

Lori F., February 4, 2011, 10:53 p.m. EST

“Americans should learn Muslim history to realize that their scripture, the Koran, advocates bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent human beings who do not worship Allah.”

Change that to the Bible advocates bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocents and add the rape of the Virgin Mary.

Zealot Muslims and zealot Christians are two peas in a pod.

Nicholas Ginex, February 5, 2011, 2:10 a.m. EST

Lori, let's be fair and say that zealot Jews, Christians, and Muslims are three peas in a pod. But most people, like you, are ignorant of what the Koran advocates. Read the Gather post “The Koran Advocates Violence and Murder.” To inform yourself why the Koran misleads Muslims to violence and murder of innocent people (infidels), read an excellent translation of the Koran, written in 1893 by Muhammad Zafrulla Khan. It was published by Olive Branch Press, Brooklyn, New York, ISBN 1-56656-255-4. A truly honorable Muslim, Mr. Khan offers a deep understanding of Arabic scholarship, Islamic learning, and a capable command of the English language. His English translation appeared in 1970 and was reprinted in 1981, 1991, and 1997. His text renders a

strictly faithful translation of the Koran, includes the Arabic text, and offers clarity and precision for the reader.

The distinguished accomplishments of Mr. Khan should be mentioned. He was the foreign minister of Pakistan in 1947, became the president of the Seventeenth Session of the UN General Assembly, and later served as the judge of the International Court of Justice at the Hague, of which he became the president.

The big difference between the Bible and the Koran is that the Koran advocates violence today and tomorrow. We are witnessing killings in many parts of the globe, and behold, if Americans think that the Muslims are going to embrace our democratic way of life by giving up Sharia law, they are going to be devastatingly surprised.

G. M. Jackson, November 20, 2011, 6:30 p.m. EST

I am not sure that all Muslims are intolerant of other religions. Here is an *article* (*How many synagogues and Christian churches in Islamic countries?* On the Internet, [http://askville.amazon.com/synagogues-Christian-churches-Islamic countries/AnswerViewer.do?requestId=73179092](http://askville.amazon.com/synagogues-Christian-churches-Islamic-countries/AnswerViewer.do?requestId=73179092)) that shows that there are in fact Christians and Jews living in predominantly Muslim countries.

Nicholas Ginex, November 21, 2011, 5:43 p.m. EST

Hello Mr. Jackson,

Of course, *not* all Muslims are intolerant of those that are devoted to a religion other than Islam. However, it is the heart and core of their scripture, the Koran, that promotes bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of people who do not worship Allah.

With all people raised in different countries, you will find those that are loving, understanding, and receptive to people outside their culture and faith. However, this article was written to awaken all people to understand that within the Koran there are verses that do not belong in a holy book.

Yes, the Torah and Christian Gospels have abominable verses, but they do not specifically identify those that do not follow their god to be killed. You do realize that Muslims are controlled both politically

and spiritually by having the Koran serve as the basis for a theocratic government. Sharia law goes back to the tribal traditions of honor where, as one example, the killing of a daughter is justified if she commits sex outside of marriage.

It is clear that the scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are not unified in their beliefs in one universal God. This is a reality whereby religious leaders sought to devise a religion for their own people. In the book *Future of God Amen*, there is a critique of the Torah, Gospels, and Koran to inform people of the weaknesses of these holy documents. But more importantly, recommendations are provided in the last chapter to stimulate cooperation between the leaders and worshippers of these religions.

I read the article you provided a link to, and it did not give a positive view of the Islamic countries tolerating those people who worship within another religion, such as Judaism and Christianity. To cite a few areas and small pockets of Muslim tolerance of other religions is very disingenuous.

G.M. Jackson Nov 22, 2011, 7:29pm EST

Yes, the Torah and Christian Gospels have abominable verses but they do not specifically identify those that do not follow their god to be killed.

Pot, meet Kettle. You obviously are not a Bible scholar. You should realize that both Islam and Christianity come from the same roots.

“You must kill those who worship another god.”—Exodus 22:20

“Kill any friends or family that worship a god that is different than your own.” Deuteronomy 13:6-10

Kill all the inhabitants of any city where you find people that worship differently than you. Deuteronomy 13:12-16

Kill everyone who has religious views that are different than your own. Deuteronomy 17:2-7

Kill anyone who refuses to listen to a priest. Deuteronomy 17:12-13

Kill any false prophets. Deuteronomy 18:20

Any city that doesn't receive the followers of Jesus will be destroyed in a manner even more savage than that of Sodom and Gomorrah. Mark 6:11

Jude reminds us that God destroys those who don't believe in him. Jude 5

Don't associate with non-Christians. Don't receive them into your house or even exchange greeting with them. 2 John 1:10

Shun those who disagree with your religious views. Romans 16:17

Whoever denies "that Jesus is the Christ" is a liar and an anti-Christ. 1 John 2:22

Christians are "of God;" everyone else is wicked. 1 John 5:19

The non-Christian is "a deceiver and an anti-Christ" 2 John 1:7

Anyone who doesn't share Paul's beliefs has "an evil heart." Hebrews 3:12

False Jews are members of "the synagogue of Satan." Revelations 2:9, 3:9

G.M. Jackson Nov 22, 2011, 7:50pm EST

I pulled the Bible quotes above from the web. I found a couple that are inaccurate, but most support the idea that non-believers and non-Christians/Jews should be killed. And excellent reading assignment for any Christian should include the books of Exodus, Deuteronomy, Leviticus and Joshua. Read those and you will understand where the Quran gets its inspiration.

G.M. Jackson Nov 22, 2011, 8:01pm EST

"But Muslims will not tolerate Judaic, Christian, Zoroastrian, Hindu, or any other religious house of worship on their territories."

But they do or there wouldn't be any other religions occupying their territories.

“read the article you provided a link to and it did not give a positive view of the Islamic countries tolerating those people who worship within another religion, such as Judaism and Christianity. To cite a few areas and small pockets of Muslim tolerance of other religions is very disingenuous.”

What’s disingenuous is your claim that NO tolerance exists when in fact there are pockets of Muslim tolerance.

“Hello Mr. Jackson, of course NOT all Muslims are intolerant of those that are devoted to a religion other than Islam.”

Nicholas Ginex April 1, 2012, 4:20pm EDT

Hello Mr. Jackson,

Forgive me for not responding to you sooner it seems that I missed your comment when it was posted on my e-mail. I thank you for giving me an education in the Bible, the Old and New Testaments where there are clear statements of the Jews avoiding and killing those that did not believe in the Hebrew or Christian god.

You bring to light for all of us the bigotry, hate, violence, and the sanctioning of killing others that do not worship the same god. I commend you for enlightening me about the abomination of verses within the Bible. As I have stated before, I am not an avid student of the Bible but that does not excuse me from not being more diligent in reading the Torah as I have read the Gospels, Revelation, and the Koran. Regarding the supplementary second-hand accounts, such as Acts, Romans, many Epistles, and other writings supporting the Torah and Gospels, I am even less read.

Your research of the bigoted and intolerant verses that advocate killing in the Bible are very likely just a small sample that may provoke shame and embarrassment for followers of the Judaic and Christian religions. Again, I thank you for citing actual verses in the Bible because it strengthens my argument that the scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are in dire need of being improved upon. These documents were written to incite a religious following for a particular group of people and the mechanisms of fear and admonishment were used to spread their beliefs.

As I have said before we, on Gather, learn from each other and I am grateful for the information you have provided. As you may know by now, my mission in writing the book, *Future of God Amen*, is to reveal to believers of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions that their beliefs originated from the first formal religion known to man, the Egyptian religion. They provided a legacy that the religious leaders of these three religions will not admit to even though it was the Egyptian priesthoods that developed the concept of a soul, belief in a hereafter upon living a righteous and moral life, the idea of a Son of God (their pharaoh) and finally, after many years, they advanced the beliefs in many gods to the worship of one-universal god. This one-god belief was documented by the Priesthood of Amon with their scripture, *Amon As the Sole God*, which was written circa 1270 BCE, two decades before the Moses Exodus in 1250 BCE.

Once again Mr. Jackson, I am grateful for your educating me about the abominable verses contained in the Bible. But also, you must agree that the Koran is not better a work of scripture. It is the theocratic, political and religious aspects of the Koran that is the basis for Sharia law. The fundamentalists of the Islamic religion are now gaining increasing numbers in their takeover of surrounding countries. They will cause Israel to fight back in self-defense and precipitate a Third World War. Unless, people all around the world stand up and say “STOP THIS STUPIDITY!!” There must be a call from all loving and peaceful human beings to coalesce and force religious leaders of these three religions to unify their belief in one-universal God and to teach the Word of God.

The Word of God was announced three times as a Command from the greatest Man of God, Jesus—*love one another*. It is not taught by the religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions because they have been dismal failures and are responsible for the state of fear and apprehension that may initiate the next world war. If we continue to sit on our asses and do nothing, we can also blame ourselves for the devastation that war causes to human life and our planet.

Ken Driessen Apr 1, 2012, 11:03am EDT

Being that the Quran contains Adam and Eve, Noah, Abraham, Moses and even Jesus; with all the hateful lying cheating, murderous, genocidal Hebrew stories; the Quran certainly does contain writings expressing crimes against humanity. Other than a few stories about what war was

going on during the time the “enlightened” Mohammed was writing his rant, the Quran is nothing more than a Bible commentary. Since, in the BIBLE, when the Hebrews entered a land they often killed every man woman and child that were living there so the non-Hebrew culture and blood would not be mixed with “god’s chosen people”. It is therefore impossible for the Quran to not contain the hate and bigotry within the Bible. Therefore this article “Demand Muslims Provide Religious Reciprocity”, is just a cheap form of Freudian Projection, in other words; to be hateful and attempt to justify murder, torture, terrorism, genocide and thievery of a people’s natural resources, you accuse the opposing party of the crimes against humanity you and your morally sick society itself are taking part in. I find this article shameful.

Nicholas Ginex Apr 1, 2012, 6:21pm EDT

Ken, you’re on the right track in pointing out that the Bible is the precursor to the bigotry, hatred, violence, and killing of those that do not worship the same god. Muhammad learned well how to spread his belief in Allah by using force. From his death in 632 CE, his successors were able to establish an Islamic Empire in just 29 years. The first Caliph had been concerned only with spreading Islam among the Arabs in Saudi Arabia. Motivated by power and wealth, by 1300 CE, the Muslim leaders forced conversion to Islam not only in the Byzantine and Persian empires, but as far west as Spain and all of North Africa, including its east coast down to the island Madagascar, and further east to the northern half of India.

You indicated that this Post was just a cheap form of Freudian Projection, which appears to discredit Freud’s ability to analyze and develop some of the greatest psychological ideas and attain the recognition of being the father of psychotherapy. You go on to write, “in other words; to be hateful and attempt to justify murder, torture, terrorism, genocide and thievery of a people’s natural resources, you accuse the opposing party of the crimes against humanity you and your morally sick society itself are taking part in. I find this article shameful.”

What I find disingenuous with your statement is that you blame me and my morally sick society for taking part in murder, torture, terrorism, genocide, and thievery of a people’s natural resources. Do you really think I advocate such sick and abominable actions against my fellow human beings? Which sick society are you blaming for

causing the taking of lives and resources of other people? Please be specific because I do not like being associated with anybody that causes bigotry, hate, violence and the killing of innocent people anywhere on this earth.

This Post is quite clear that you neglect to respond to the questions presented, namely: “Would not a sign of love, peace, understanding, and compassion by all Muslims be to build a religious site that embraces the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic faiths? Should Americans demand that Muslims allow the building of Judaic and Christian houses of worship in their countries before we allow a mosque be built where 3,000 Americans died in our country? Forget about the argument that they can do what they want with property they purchased. It is the same as allowing Hitler to build a concentration camp at a site where he killed thousands of people. Are Americans really stupid to buy the argument of President Obama that those who own the land can do what they wish without taking into account human decency and respect for American lives killed by Muslims? Unless Muslims provide a positive answer to the first two questions, are we Americans fools if we allow Muslims to build a mosque at the 9/11 site?”

My Post was written to bring our American citizens a little common sense and get them to think are they being politically correct or fools for letting Muslims build a 13-story mosque adjacent to the 9-11 site. I do not advocate hate but justice and decency. To celebrate the deaths of 3,000 innocent Americans with a mosque by an Islamic people who do not allow a church or temple to be built adjacent to their house of worship is a sign of stupidity. We have only look to how Iran supports the terrorism and takeover of countries like Egypt and Syria. Shall we say to ourselves “Oh, since we took this country away from the Indians, the Muslims have every right to take over any country they wish.”

Mr. Driessen, I do not know what you are trying to accuse me of, but if you have read any of my Posts or visited the website, www.futureofgodamen.com, you will find that I strongly advocate that the leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions work together to unify their belief in one-universal god and teach the Word of god—*love one another*. Let us stop quibbling about who is right or wrong with who is causing all of the terror and death in our world and look for ways to stop the insanity caused by the religious fanatics of the three major religions.

I agree with you that no one society is responsible for the stupidity of terror and death around the world. The Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions have all shared in the death of human lives and destruction of beautiful properties. Are we, you, I, and people around the world going to allow the religious leaders and political dopes to continue to advocate bigotry, hate, violence and killing of our sisters and brothers of any country? If not, would you like to help bring sanity to people all around the world to follow the Word of God—*love one another*.

People today need to be asking themselves how can we make this a better world and stop blaming each other for the destruction going on to lives and property. Only the people, around the world, can make it happen. They can bring down religious and political leaders to their knees to work together for a world of love and peace. There are workable political systems of government but if they side with any one religion then they cause division and hate. It is the religious leaders of the three major religions that have got to wake up and teach the Word of God. But they will need daughters and sons of God, our young people who understand that change is possible and that revision to the dogmas of out-worn religions must be revised.

Ken Driessen Apr 2, 2012, 12:03am EDT

Nick:

You are just going to get in trouble here debating with me about this stuff. “letting Muslims build a 13-story mosque adjacent to the 9-11 site.”, duh! Here is directions to the Mosque in question and others that were “near the WTC” prior to the 9/11 attacks just in case you get lost on your way, if you ever want to go there:

Mosques near WTC site:

“Much has been made of a proposed mosque at ground zero, but the Islamic center would be established at 45-51 Park Place, just over two blocks from the northern edge of the sprawling, 16-acre World Trade Center site. Its location is roughly half a dozen normal Lower Manhattan blocks from the site of the North Tower, the nearest of the two destroyed in the attacks.

The center’s location, in a former Burlington Coat Factory store, is already used by the cleric for worship, drawing a spillover from the

imam's former main place for prayers, the al-Farah mosque. That mosque, at 245 West Broadway, is about a dozen blocks north of the World Trade Center grounds.

Another, the Manhattan Mosque, stands five blocks from the northeast corner of the World Trade Center site.

To be sure, the center's association with 9/11 is intentional and its location is no geographic coincidence. The building was damaged in the Sept. 11 attacks and the center's planners say they want the center to stand as a statement against terrorism." http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/38760800/ns/politics-more_politics/t/mosques-already-near-world-trade-center-site/

The hijackers on 9/11 were supposedly mostly all Saudi Arabians yet we did not attack their country did we? Bush never went after Bin Laden did he? Check out Architects and Engineers for 9/11 truth and then tell me if it was the Muslims that planted the explosives that brought down Building number 7 or not? I couldn't have been the dancing Jews with the cameras set up before the planes hit on 9/11? You tell me because you obviously know all about 9/11 terrorism and religion . . .

Check out the recent history of Iran and you will find that the US & Brit sponsored coup took out Prime Minister Mohammad Mosaddegh in 1953 and let the Shah & world oil corporatocracy rule their nation until 1979. Iran was good enough for Reagan to sell weapons to after the revolution, once before he was elected, to get them to hold the hostages until after he was, and again during the Iran Contra weapons for School of the Americas ongoing genocide.

Iran is not a threat to the US or the ZioNazi banksters of Israel, they want a war for military profiteering and Iran's oil. UN Inspectors say they do not have even one atomic bomb while the US has 5000 and Israel has hundreds. Iran Cuba and North Korea are the only nations on the planet that don't do ZioNazi Rothschild style world banking so they want to take them out. They can't go wrong with propagandists like you on their side can they?

What we have here is a failure to communicate. You will just get madder the more I explain to you about a whole different way of studying human history. Check out both sides, check out what the losers of the war said for once. You have to come to the realization

that everything you were told and taught to believe is a lie. Okay I'm agreeing to disagree and I won't bother you again . . .

Nicholas Ginex April 2, 2012, 3:20pm EDT

Hello Ken:

Thank you for indicating where several mosques are located within several blocks of the WTC. You appear to be correct about American corporations being in bed with Saudi and Iranian businessmen in extracting oil for their own profits. It appears to be so because after 40 years about our government talking about America being oil-independent it has not happened. America is subsidizing the Arab countries by allowing American dollars to buy their oil so they are very pleased to work with oil corporations.

You are very much up with much of what is going on in the Arab countries and unfortunately my interest is in another direction. My efforts are trying to get the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic leaders to work together to unify their belief in god. This is a noble idea but also an unrealistic dream as we look at what is happening with the turmoil occurring around the world. It is for this reason, I am trying to inform people world-wide that it is them, not the religious leaders, that can change the direction of world destruction.

It is clear in the book, *Future of God Amen*, that the religious dogma of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic scriptures have caused more hate, bigotry, violence, and the killing of innocent human beings. You read that presently, we have Muslim fanatics who are blowing themselves and taking the lives of people with them. The Koran is a book that sanctions and inculcates Muslim minds to kill in the name of their god Allah.

Read the Gather Post, **The Koran Advocates Violence and Murder**. To inform yourself why the Koran misleads Muslims to violence and murder of innocent people (infidels) read an excellent translation of **The Qu'ran**, written in 1893 by Muhammad Zafrulla Khan. It was published by Olive Branch Press, Brooklyn, NY, ISBN 1-56656-255-4. A truly honorable Muslim, Mr. Khan offers a deep understanding of Arabic scholarship, Islamic learning, and a capable command of the English language. His English translation appeared in 1970 and was reprinted in 1981, 1991, and 1997. His text renders a strictly faithful

translation of the Qur'an, includes the Arabic text, and offers clarity and precision for the reader.

By now, if you have read any of my Posts, you must realize that my only objective is to inform people around the world that the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions have sprung from the beliefs of the Egyptian religion. Visit the website www.futureofgodamen.com and you will find that I do not desire to propagandize hate, bigotry, and violence but just the opposite—to pressure the leaders of the three major religions to improve their scriptures with the belief in one-universal god and teach the Word of God, ***love one another***.

Yes, you are correct, everything people around the world have been taught lies and myths, a distorted view of god. *Future of God Amen* was written to inform people around the world how the belief in one-universal god was conceived by mankind. Yes human history has been distorted to serve the interests of the religious and ruling leaders of developing and civilized countries.

Us

How Can Integrity, Love, and Understanding Be Instilled in Humans?

September 20, 2010 05:50 p.m. EDT

This question has been addressed by rulers of civilizations throughout time. Many rulers have devised ways to develop a morality and sets of civil laws to control their people. Unfortunately, those in power gradually corrupted what were meant to be constructive ideas by using them to attain more power, wealth, and control of not only their own people but also other nations.

I would like for members of this forum to share their thoughts on how integrity, love, and understanding can become the foundation of our next generation of people from all countries. Political and religious leaders have addressed this question, but far too often, the solutions were for unique people or used to serve their own ambitions for greater power.

Neglecting who was right or wrong as a nation or a leader, I believe we should look to the future for proposals and answers that are constructive. Casting stones on the past acts of certain world leaders and religions does no good in trying to develop a positive way to strive for excellence in adhering to the principles of integrity, love, and understanding of all people.

I do believe that there is much that we have learned from the past, and much of it is still applicable for us tomorrow. What are some ways to achieve the educational development of human beings, which promotes

integrity, love, and understanding? We should not only identify what promotes integrity, love, and understanding, but also how do we go about instilling them in our youth?

Comments and Responses

Jim G., September 20, 2010, 6:06 p.m. EDT

Well written, Nicholas. Number one, it takes courage to make yourself vulnerable. We are mostly brought up to be defensive. Good question. I don't have the answer. Hope someone else here does . . .

Nicholas Ginex, September 20, 2010, 6:14 p.m. EDT

Thanks, Jim . . . The question appears challenging. But very simple answers can accumulate to arrive at some feasible solutions. I encourage you to assist when a thought or idea does come to mind.

Larry M., September 20, 2010, 9:36 p.m. EDT

Nicholas, I think my novel shows how that can be done. The table of contents is at my profile with links to all the chapters. I really think it will produce exactly what you have in mind (and solve lots of other problems as well).

Nicholas Ginex, September 20, 2010, 10:09 p.m. EDT

Thank you, Larry. This question deserves to be answered by your participation to show how integrity, love, and understanding are taught and implemented. Only with your assistance to crystallize the answers provided in your novel can Gather members benefit and comment to show their support, some compromised position, or a very different approach.

Larry M., September 20, 2010, 10:28 p.m. EDT

I love participating in such things. What do you want of me?

Nicholas Ginex, September 20, 2010, 10:48 p.m. EDT

Thank you, Larry, for wanting to participate. I have read many of your comments, and I know you are a man who is capable of reflection

on the above question. Rather than direct the Gather readers to your novel, it would be very helpful if you could share thoughts and ideas that directly provide an answer to the question. Yes, the question appears challenging, but the answers can be very simple. I believe all great and complex ideas can be broken down into very easy to follow parts. Give it a shot.

I did not want to drive the discussion in any one direction. But for sure you know I am one who will share what may be helpful.

Larry M., September 21, 2010, 8:17 a.m. EDT

Nicholas,

We have three mental states we wish to induce in human beings. We want people to have integrity, we want them to love others, and we want people to understand the point of view of other people.

Integrity:

Integrity is a state of being moral in one's dealings with others. That is, one is honest, dependable, reliable, and respected. In a zero-sum game situation in which one can win only if others lose, one can gain by being dishonest. Our current form of money simulates a zero-sum game situation when our real situation is mutual interdependence. Therefore, our current money makes us distrust others. You can't believe those ads on TV. You can't be sure that a coworker isn't trying to take credit for your work. You can't trust your employees to not steal from you.

With our current money, one can acquire a reputation, but that reputation doesn't go with us. Former employers do not always report honestly in recommendations and such. When you enter a store, you don't usually know whether that owner (or clerk) has cheated customers in the past. We simply lack knowledge of the past behavior of many of those we deal with. We don't know whether they are dependable, reliable, and have a good reputation. It is very difficult to find out.

With my solution, the mutual interdependence of people is emphasized by the nature of the money. One is paid on the basis of the net benefits one produces for others. It is only by helping others that one gains

money. Therefore, we will expect others to be attempting to do things that are good for us.

Also, in my system as shown in the novel, one's reputation and past dealings with others (in a work situation) are readily available to others. Therefore, people are sensitive to and aware of their reputations. Being honest, reliable, and dependable bring one many benefits and the cooperation of others. Being dishonest not only does not gain anything, it actually makes it harder to gain money.

Therefore, in my system people get direct rewards for having integrity and lose potential rewards for lacking integrity. One can prosper and grow wealthy only if one has a good reputation, and one who is wealthy will have a good reputation.

Love:

We are not talking about romantic love here. That is strongly influenced by things over which we have little control and varies quite a lot by unique characteristics of the two persons involved.

We are considering only what we might call "love of one's fellow man" (women included, of course).

Having affection for others is largely determined by what one expects of those others. If we expect them to be nice to us, to help us, to look out for our best interests, to "forgive us our debts as we forgive others," then we will have affection for them in the main. Thus, our experience with others and how they treat us will make us fearful or grateful.

With my system, people are rewarded with money for acting in a loving, caring, helpful, courteous way toward others. Cooperation gains money. In other words, since it costs money to harm others and gains money to help others, the most common behavior will be to help. In fact, most people will go out of their way to help others. People will look for things to do for others. So after a time, people will come to expect the best of others rather than the worst because that will be their experience of their behavior.

Though this will be most commonly seen in adults, it will even extend to children. Teachers and others who care for children (including their parents) will be paid based on how those children do in life. A child

taught early to be cooperative and helpful, to work hard, and work smart will gain more pay for its parents and all who helped to rear the child than children who lack those virtues.

Note that these are not bribes. No deal is struck along the lines of “if you get an A in math, I’ll give you \$50.” Getting paid is a result of the consequences of your actions. No one tells you what to do. It isn’t what you did; it’s the consequences of what you did that matter. Just like a child learning to walk learns about gravity and falling, so a child in my system learns to notice the consequences of her actions since those affect rewards.

Understanding:

This leads neatly into the understanding aspect of community life segment. In order to be able to accurately predict how others are going to respond, one must be able to take their point of view. Since pay is for consequences, those who understand best have the easiest time deciding on the most profitable (beneficial) things to do. In other words, if you know how others are going to respond you can produce more benefits. If you understand their point of view, you will have a better idea how they will respond. Therefore, if you help others to understand both your point of view and the points of view of still others you increase everyone’s pay.

For example, if you explain to a child how being rude makes other people feel and how those people are likely to react, you help the child understand their point of view. You also help them to be courteous because they now can understand how and why it works to get the cooperation of others. “This pan is hot and will hurt you if you touch it” is a better approach than “keep your hands away from the stove.”

Also, the payers who reward good behavior will gain more social rewards for themselves the better they understand various points of view. No matter what they do, some will like it and some will not. Their need is to find ways to encourage more approval and less disapproval. By understanding diverse points of view, they can minimize the antagonism and enhance the approval.

In summary, by rewarding people for the consequences of their actions, the net benefits to others of their actions, we foster and encourage all the virtues listed above while reducing their opposites.

Jerome k., September 21, 2010, 1:06 p.m. EDT

Larry, I'm glad of your direct input to this post, rather than have me trawl through all forty-three chapters of your novel. I'm not sure a "system" is either going to be accepted or workable. We each come to this situation with differing motivations, and some might be elderly, negative-thinking, inhospitable people with ill health; others might be teenagers just happy to stay in their rooms on a computer for eighteen hours a day and anything you bribe 'em with just fails. Or they might be happy-clappy, "let's get the world put to rights," sun worshippers who watch Oprah and write flowery poetry, not to mention those millions who neither have a home to live in or food or clothing or water. It's easy to work out how to design Utopia; politicians are struggling with that every day, but compromise rears its ugly head and phutt, idealism goes out of the window.

People all over the world, including the United Kingdom, India, *and* America, have their extremes of the poor and the wealthy. However, if money is seen as the sole motivation for everything, love, caring, doing favors, and so on, we are losing sight of the real world. No, nothing to do with weekly rituals by unquestioning people being told what to believe. I'm talking about sharing the efforts toward survival.

Larry M., September 21, 2010, 1:38 p.m. EDT

Jerome,

That's why you need to read the book. Without that, you will have all sorts of misconceptions about the system. You have been conditioned like everyone else (me included) to view the world via our current kind of money. The systems it imposes are nothing like my system. You will read that last sentence but not believe it. That's the conditioning again. When I say "nothing Like it," I really mean it.

All those examples you give will do just fine in my system. My system doesn't bribe in the current sense of the word. No offers are made. If they do certain things, then certain consequences follow. That's it. It isn't a bribe because no offer is made beforehand. None of this "if you do so and so, I will give you money." It is "if beneficial consequences result from your actions, then you will have more money." No specifics about what actions or about what consequences.

Why in the world you think that money in my system would be the *sole* motivation for everything? It's just background. It frees people to do good things for other reasons besides money. It allows people to pay attention to the "real world" because they don't have to be concerned with gaining money to take care of themselves and their dependents.

Please read the book so you can see how it all works. From your comment, it seems to me that you have a very warped and distorted image of how it operates.

Nicholas Ginex, November 17, 2011, 10:05 p.m. EST

I just read this post again on Thursday, November 17, 2011, and found that I was remiss in providing some thoughts on "How can integrity, love, and understanding be instilled in humans?"

This can be answered in many ways, and there are those who will want to include the love of God as a premise or start to develop integrity, love, and understanding in people worldwide. To me, I will like to start out with the most simple and most basic answer, which is to begin with the love given to a baby by its mother and father. There is no God involved to attend to the baby's needs by feeding it, cleaning it, and interacting with it to make it feel it is in good hands.

Yes, love begins with the sexual embrace of two people who desire to bring their human qualities together in a newborn, and it is that love that is transferred to the newborn baby. All people who respect and love their partner in life want to emulate the qualities they admire in each other. That is why it is a sin to bring a baby into the world that is unwanted because of a young foolish mistake of unprotected sex, a rape of the woman, or the decision that the act of love was only sexual and was devoid of any real love between the two lovers. Here, unless another couple is quick to take responsibility as loving parents, an abortion is justified, for no baby should be brought into our world without the love necessary by its mother and father.

With the love that is given to a baby, that love never stops as the baby grows into adulthood. But now it is the parents that serve as the best teachers to instill integrity, love, and understanding into the young mind. These are the qualities that are like rain and sunshine needed to nourish a flower or tree.

As I look back to my past, I always remember the words of my father who was not an educated man with the schooling of a professor, but he had qualities that I emulate as a grown man. He was a man of his word; when he said he was going to do something, he felt the honor in getting his promise completed. But it was his qualities to protect his children (I have a fraternal twin Louis) and love them. As a twin, my mother never took to one or the other with favoritism but always treated us with the same love.

So love begins in the family. There is no God that can nourish, feed, and raise a child like its own mother and father. But the belief or concept of God is a good thing for not all parents are capable of giving love and serving to instill the behaviors that develop integrity, love, and understanding. God is a belief that allows people to feel love and have hope where it is missing from their own family life. God serves to be the standard of truth, justice, and righteousness that we try to emulate with our fellow humans.

This is why I support the religious organizations and strongly urge them to unite their beliefs in God whereby people have the same aspirations to develop integrity, love, and understanding toward their sisters and brothers of all nations. The simple Word of God must be taught by all religions—*love one another*.

Excessive Personal or Corporate Wealth

Posted by Richard Regener, December 09, 2011

Does excessive personal wealth serve any useful purpose? The question of what amount is considered excessive is not relevant at this juncture; however, for the sake of argument, let's use a sum of ten million dollars per person. How much more does any one person need? Now think about this carefully within the present national economic framework, where excessive wealth is used more often than not as a cudgel over others or a governing administration. A governing administration is designed to benefit the majority of the population according to the will of, for, and by the people and *not* for a minority of wealthy elitists and their well-compensated minions. If this is accurate, does it make any sense for excessive individual wealth to be continued? The question refers to the future practically of avoiding a repeat of the present economic battle for power via financial manipulations at the public expense. The real question is whether it is our wealth or is it ourselves which need to be controlled?

Then of course there is the other economic reality of creating businesses to stimulate employment balanced by the ability to generate sustainable individual income (purchasing power) for economic stability. Some of you may have noted I did use "balanced by and sustainable economic stability" as opposed to economic growth. Economic growth is not a requirement for a sustainable economic balance; growth is only a factor in corporate and governmental greed and corruption, so there is a gigantic difference between the necessity of balance for sustainability as opposed to growth for excessive greed. How can balance be developed? First of all, stop with the meaningless derogatory isms and start applying some common sense to today's problems and utilize every venue of political theology, since there are some valuable and positive applications to every form of governing. Then yes, the present economic system has to collapse, which it will in the foreseeable future

as I see it, regardless of any hopeful assertions or projections to the contrary by the elected illusionists. More importantly, learn from the past hundred years of uncontrolled greed and corruption so it's not repeated. It means the core valuations that have led us here need to be replaced.

Economic balance means supporting the ecology (resources) and the human population, not just the financial establishments and scientific technology utilized to destabilize and literally destroy human populations as is presently the situation. The simple fact is our unrestricted use of scientific and technological advancements is killing us, and this has to stop if the global economic disaster is to be reversed. Corporations are not our friends and never have been; they are only power constructs designed to control and limit the public freedom via financial and media manipulations. It has always been the mom and pop business which have mostly contributed to the overall economic and employment stability of the nation, which needs to be rebuilt.

Just a couple of suggestions before I end this; if you consider this discussion regarding personal wealth or economic stability worthwhile for debate, then please add your two cents' worth. All comments and recommendations are welcome.

If monetary valuations, currency printing, security, etc are controlled exclusively by government to begin with, then why do we require any form of private or corporate banking concerns whatsoever? Government lends to private banks at little or no interest now, so why not take over banking entirely as an exclusive publicly owned financial concern (owned by every citizen) that is only permitted to generate sufficient profitability to maintain its own operations under strict public controls, also with an annual revolving board of governors chosen by random selection from the public as a whole.

If all businesses (corporate) above a certain standard required a minimum of 90 percent public investment by registered nationals to a limited amount per individual investment with an annual revolving board of directors from the investment pool, would it help to balance the overall economy and limit potential corruption?

Comments and Responses

Nicholas Ginex, December 29, 2011, 11:04 p.m. EST

Hello Richard,

You bring up a thought-provoking topic that will receive many different comments as I have observed from what has been entered on this post. As a young man, I have always thought of the kings, dictators, and rulers who have been strong and bright enough to live off the backs of their people. This is a fundamental consequence of many organizational relationships within every community.

However, there is a balancing out of power because as the ruling class gets bigger, it becomes more unstable with more and more people rising up the ranks. As the more powerful become richer in resources and land, they also have to rely on the intellect and abilities of others to keep them in power. This outcome has several different effects on the rulers themselves. Do they become complacent, less challenged to develop their own abilities, and with power over men and women eventually become corrupt by taking advantage of them personally?

To avoid the uprising by their people, rulers must enforce stability, and the Egyptians of a forgotten past figured out how to maintain control between the growing communities along the Nile River. Of course, our ancestors were of a spiritual nature as they were in awe of the wonders around them, and they conceived gods that controlled the elements or represented nature's wonders, such as the sun, moon, oceans, and the myriad of animals, trees, and flowers that enriched their lives. A priestly class rose in parallel with the rulers and together they were able to harness the spiritual energy of their people to lead moral and righteous lives with laws, a moral code by which their people would live by to protect the rulers from an uprising and maintain stability for their people. Why do I bring up this history of the past when the basic question of this post is "Does excessive personal wealth serve any useful purpose?"

My answer to the question is no. Is there a limit as to what constitutes excessive personal wealth? Again the answer is no. The answer depends upon what are the ethical and moral codes of a society? It is good to be able to attain as much riches as possible, to lead the good

life that is far superior than other people. But is there a limit to the satiated desires for wealth and perhaps the physical appetites of men and women for that matter.

The answer, for me, is the respect we have for each other and the honor of being known as a person of integrity. Now how is that attained? No matter how powerful one is able to become or how high one attains wealth, the human aspect of love for their fellow beings is the key to happiness. The ability to share the wealth with others who are not as endowed with the mental and/or physical capability one has is what brings smiles on the faces of others and earns the respect of being tolerant, caring, and compassionate toward others.

So the answer boils down to fairness which becomes a natural consequence of love for your sisters and brothers. If you were fortunate to have millions and hopefully billions of dollars that gives you all the comforts you would ever have, would you not share that which is just sitting in a storehouse or bank? I believe wealth balances out when we are brought up to respect one another and assist those who are less capable, for certainly we are not all made equal in ability. Those who have the greatest gifts mentally or have talent are able to love and share those gifts with others. That means the riches they have acquired with their gifts will be shared in a beneficial manner. This is a roundabout way of answering your question, Richard. But your question is not an easy one to answer without a possible solution.

Richard Regener, December 30, 2011, 12:19 a.m. EST

“Absolute power corrupts *everyone* absolutely, without exception, Nicholas!”

Nicholas Ginex, December 30, 2011, 4:52 p.m. EST

Your answer indicates a defeatist view about integrity of human beings. I agree that at our present stage of development, most people are not capable of loving others with compassion and desire to share their good fortune.

Perhaps I am ahead of my time. But I have always admired those who are honorable to keep their word and help others who are in need. Unfortunately, to rise to the top of any organization, there must be

backstabbing and cheaters, and yes, when they finally get to the top, we have people who have become corrupt.

The human race may not be ready to follow a moral and ethical standard that can balance out the cheaters who live off the works of others. Perhaps, after World War III, nations around the globe will realize that we all have to live by the same moral and ethical rules. If not, we will continue to have our differences and blow each other up. The greatest prophet once said the *Word of God* is to *love one another*. It appears it is easier said than done because there are many ways to make that saying a possibility.

Richard Regener, December 30, 2011, 6:02 p.m. EST

All I intended to point out with this single statement, Nicholas, is without consistent emotional understanding and development toward balance in every generation the repetitive cycle of extremist terror will have no ending. The fact that religious conditioning and indoctrination has been to all intents and purposes a dismal failure it is time to end this three-thousand-year-old farcical deception and replace it with an acceptable, ethical standard of behavior based on sustainable values. "Love one another" just doesn't cut it, my friend. Otherwise all that will remain is to continue fighting the same old battles in an endless cycle.

Nicholas Ginex, December 31, 2011, 4:41 p.m. EST

Hello Richard,

Thank you for clarifying your one-liner "Absolute power corrupts *everyone* absolutely, without exception, Nicholas!" by stating that "without consistent emotional understanding and development toward balance in every generation the repetitive cycle of extremist terror will have no ending."

We agree that "religious conditioning and indoctrination has been to all intents and purposes a dismal failure. It is time to end this three-year-old farcical deception and replace it with an acceptable, ethical standard of behavior based on sustainable values."

However, just as you needed to clarify your one-liner, I also need to clarify my one-liner "love one another." I agree that these few words

by themselves mean nothing without indicating what it means and how it can be done. It was Jesus in John's Gospel who stated this simple solution as a command and was so emphatic; he stated it three times. Knowledge is built upon valid thoughts of the past that makes sense for balance we desire to achieve from generation to generation.

To amplify, I perceive "love one another" means is to be honest, sincere, and truthful with all people for further understanding, compassion, and well-being. Well, well, nicely said, but how is this done? It begins with love starting with the caring from a mother and father. They are the two people responsible for nurturing new life with not only proper food, warmth, and love, but also to instruct it with knowledge and understanding that will prepare it for the challenges of the world.

My, my, Nicholas, you state an obvious answer, but the fact also remains that there are many parents who are incapable of preparing a newborn for the world's challenges. So do you have any suggestions to remedy this dilemma? Yes, I do. We have educational institutions, but they all miss the one educational tool by which people can achieve emotional understanding of themselves and one another, and that is instruction in ethics and morality. But what the hell does that mean if there is no standard and consistent knowledge to teach them?

From the religious history of the past, mankind has evolved certain laws, commands, and wise thoughts that help direct a person's choices in life. The problem is that the religious institutions have developed dogma that worship a god specific for a unique people. Religion was born in ancient Egypt where there was a formal religion for thousands of years. It grew out of the necessity to have people work together, and their works still stand as monuments, temples, and pyramids. But, Richard, as you stated so accurately, "Absolute power corrupts." The religious priesthood and ruling pharaohs became more concerned about their wealth, power, and retention of control that they lost their great following that helped their civilization to grow and prosper. Along came Moses and he was able to, with a great following, establish a new religion for the Hebrew people.

Few people credit Moses with the fact that the Bible clearly states Moses wrote *The Book of the Covenant*. This book laid out the groundwork for the initial draft of the Torah written by Hebrew priests around 950 BCE. Judaic religious leaders give credit to Abraham and

ignore Moses because he was taught the religious beliefs, laws, and commands that were followed by the Egyptians.

Forgive me for backtracking a little bit. My purpose was to reveal that the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions all have their roots from the beliefs of the Egyptian religion, but their dogma is not consistent. The problem occurred when a unique people, the Hebrews, emulated many of the Egyptian beliefs and created their own god. This same god was adopted by the gentiles who instituted an Egyptian concept of a son of god, Jesus. Because the Christian dogma of Jesus raised Him to the level of god, the Muslims reverted back to the one god concept, Allah. The inconsistency of the dogma of these three religions has caused division between the different groups of people causing much bigotry, hatred, violence, and the killing of innocent human beings.

So what are we to say about the effectiveness of these religious institutions? As Richard has stated, they are indeed dismal failures to bring about peace through love and understanding of the psychology of human beings. The answer for instilling the ability to love one another is to have an educational system that teaches morality and ethics that gravitate to understanding our own emotional makeup.

Ha, ha, but there is a problem. The different ruling systems of different countries wish to maintain control of their people, and they will insist upon retaining the mental controls they now use. To teach people all over the world that they can love other people of other cultures, all with the same basic principles of honesty, integrity, and compassion for one another, may mean that the rulers give up their control. They will not concede to the principle to love one another because they will not be able to aggressively take the resources and dominate people of other countries.

Richard, the dilemma exists. The only solution is people all over the world should start a *new renaissance* that institutes a common code of morality and ethics. *Future of God Amen* provides some recommendations whereby the religions themselves can become effective institutions along with the educational system we both agree on.

Richard Regener, January 2, 2012, 5:34 p.m. EST

Nicholas, forgive my outright laughter here, in so much as you have articulated the circular logic that has stumped the majority for so long.

In essence, morality and ethical standards should reflect the nature of our physical and mortal environment, since a spiritual construct of ethical morality based on infinity is counterproductive for the practical purposes of a sustainable environment, of which we are an intricate part. Aspiring to something more without laying a sustainable foundation first has been our downfall and will continue to be so. All the wishful thinking in the universe won't change this reality.

Morality and ethical standards might be better served if divided into two parts, one as a mandatory environmental standard and the other as an optional standard of spiritual reflection limited to a personal choice.

Nicholas Ginex, January 3, 2012, 12:00 a.m. EST

Richard, it appears a solution is at hand. You stated that morality and ethical standards might be better served if divided into two parts. Please clarify what you mean as a mandatory environmental standard and the optional standard of spiritual reflection limited to a personal choice.

The option of spiritual reflection limited to personal choice is very nebulous. What are the choices upon which to reflect on? Are they the choices between a religion's dogma or a personal choice developed by one's own hypothetical construct of decent moral behavior? Are the personal choices based upon standards of integrity based upon honesty, sincerity, understanding, and compassion? The choice is determined by the kind of instruction one receives, and it is not arrived at by reflection alone. Reflection must be based upon good grounding in understanding why morality and ethics are needed to make intelligent choices that benefit society as a whole.

Ethical morality, at least to me, does not necessarily have to be based upon a spiritual construct based upon infinity. Do you mean an energy force such as God as infinity?

I agree with you that a sustainable foundation needs to be laid down, and my proposal is an educational system, which may be supported with a spiritual option using God. That educational system of morality and ethics, in my opinion, would be needed to be applied at all levels of education, including the higher levels of college. But as I pointed out in my comment you responded to, would the ruling authorities of

each country allow people to learn to love one another based upon the codes of morality and ethics?

I think not. This would mean that people would learn to think for themselves and would not kill another human being because of some fanatical leader's ambitions. Ethics and morality encompasses love and compassion, which means to share one's good fortunes with others when possible. Until leaders of every country are willing to teach the same standards of ethics and morality there will always be division as one people determines to take what another people has in terms of resources for a better life.

Is Unconditional Love Sensible?

September 18, 2010 11:42 a.m. EDT

A Gather post by Richard Regener “Unconditional Love” prompted a response by this author of *Future of God Amen*. Richard recommended I post my reply—a high compliment from a man I have a great deal of respect for. The book is mentioned only because many of the thoughts I share in this post were conceived in its writing, which may be examined with an Internet search on its title.

I would like to preface my reply with a leading statement: Love is a universal feeling and is felt in many kinds of relationships between two people and even with God.

Nicholas Ginex, September 18, 2010, 2:35 a.m. EDT

Hello Richard,

Unconditional love can lead to poor decisions and, in your words, even madness. To me, love is not an unconditional matter whereby reason, trust, and justice are ignored in a relationship. Love applies to many circumstances, be it a baby’s love, a mother’s love, a father’s love, love for a friend, and most importantly, love for your lover. In each of these cases, love is tempered with reason and care for the people you deal with. In all cases, there is much to be said for sincerity and truth in the relationship. Love is a feeling that can be felt with many people in this world. For every person you find a wonderful joyful love; upon the loss of that love, there are a thousand more that can give you an equally or better relationship. The problem is that many people do not know how to express their love, which is due to their own insecurities and lack of experience.

Regarding the love of God, this is a substitute for the physical, mental, spiritual, and deep emotional linkage one shares with another human

being. God cannot give my children the love my wife and I can give them. Nor can God give my children the upbringing nurtured with understanding, hours of teaching, and guidance in life. God is a wonderful belief and serves a purpose in setting a construct of morality for all people to live by, including the parents who raise new life for this world.

Many people misconstrue God as being a religious institution, and there is where the belief in God has been corrupted. The dogma and guilt put upon worshippers lead them to bigotry, hate, and violence because the religions that represent God are in competition with each other. Hence, one person is led to believe they are better than another.

God is symbolic of truth, righteousness, justice, and the highest command conceived by man (perhaps through the Spirit of God), which is to *love one another*—nothing more; except for no better scientific answer, God is the creator of all there is. When religious leaders agree that they all pray to the same God and that the sole command that stands above all others is to love our sisters and brothers, from any nation, then mankind is ready for their next adventure, the universe. For only when mankind finds they have sisters and brothers in common, when they can feel the same things and share their hearts and minds and do not make fools of each other, then they deserve the stars and the wonders of the universe.

Comments and Responses

Jojoy John Alphonso, September 18, 2010, 12:01 p.m. EDT

Thanks for sharing!

Richard Regener, September 18, 2010, 12:58 p.m. EDT

As I apply a god concept, Nicholas, it is as an overwhelming respect, appreciation, or love if one prefers of the infinite life force in all its permutations without the constrictions of limited understanding (beliefs, doctrines, etc) we impose by our conceptual constructs. With this in mind, at least for myself there is no overriding ultimate authority figure required to live a respectful and peaceful life based on the pursuit of understanding and enlightenment notwithstanding

the necessary applications required for our daily existence. Just my thoughts on the matter.

Nicholas Ginex, September 18, 2010, 6:27 p.m. EDT

Hi Richard,

Please read my six paragraphs below in response to your comment. You bring up very complex thoughts and ideas that I felt need a greater airing of my views about the usefulness in the belief in God, another extension of unconditional love.

Larry M., September 18, 2010, 6:12 p.m. EDT

I'm not sure that unconditional love can lead to poor decisions, and I am quite confident that it cannot lead to madness. I can see a monomania expressing love being involved with madness, but in that case, I think the madness leads to the monomania and being expressed by statements of love. But the madness precedes the statements of love, and depending on the actions, there's a good chance there is no love of the other present at all.

As far as the quality of the decisions, I have my doubts as to whether expressions of love or actions influenced by love of someone make the decisions any worse than they would have been. Of course, unconditional love could easily lead one to sacrifice one's own best self-interests for that other person—the throwing one's self on the grenade phenomenon.

Nicholas Ginex, September 18, 2010, 6:59 p.m. EDT

Unconditional love can lead to poor decisions. What makes love unconditional depends on one's own perceptions of right and wrong. If your loved one is in pain and is sure to die within a span of time, be it a day or five months, would your unconditional love keep that person alive in spite of a request to assist in ending life? Your unconditional love may decide to ignore the request because of your own desire to extend your feelings of love. This would be a wrong choice when the request is made by your lover to depart from a life of pain. Your example of somebody throwing oneself on a grenade is not an example of unconditional love. It is an instinctive reaction for even strangers because that was the makeup of your personality and a decision to

save many for the loss of one. I recall saving a child being caught in a rapid stream of rushing water. I had no love for that child, but yet I instinctively jumped in to save that child. I must admit, I did survey the threat to my life but knew I could pull it off.

Larry M., September 18, 2010, 7:04 p.m. EDT

Nicholas,

Your example of the dying loved one assumes (it seems to me) a selfish feeling (I want you to stay alive to keep me happy) rather than a love of that person (I want to do what's best for you).

People do not "instinctively" react to a grenade. That is not something that is taught in training. That is a decision.

I applaud your saving of the child, but as you say, you knew you could pull it off. There was risk but no sacrifice on your part. You were not giving up your life for a stranger. Troops who are among strangers do not sacrifice for them. They act as if they were alone (usually).

Nicholas Ginex, September 18, 2010, 7:41 p.m. EDT

Thank you, Larry. It seems that you agree that unconditional love can make errors in judgment when you said the person with unconditional love for the dying person selfishly decided to keep that person alive. The grenade example has nothing to do with unconditional love; you were the one who gave that example. My example of saving a child's life was to show there was no unconditional love involved. Unconditional love does not have to apply to life or death. One may love another unconditionally to the point that no matter what that person does, be it unfaithfulness and rejection of your love, you still love that person. This is an example of what Richard and I refer to as madness in unconditional love.

Nicholas Ginex, September 18, 2010, 7:12 p.m. EDT

The concept or belief in God would not exist were it not for the visual and perceptive image that God embodies, not only the omnipotence of being the "creator of all there is," but also, and this is why I support and endorse this belief, God is mankind's symbolic standard of the

finest attributes man must aspire to: trust, righteousness, justice, and love for one another.

I believe we can agree that God is “the infinite life force in all its permutations.” However, let us not cast a negative idea that God is responsible for “the constrictions of limited understanding” due to dogma that is coupled with lies and myths. To say human beings owe an overwhelming respect, appreciation, or love for God is a subjective view based upon one’s ability to impress a vision of God in one’s mind. Nobody, however much one prays and appeals to God, really knows God. God is unknowable, mysterious, and incomprehensible to every human being. What is known about God are the attributes we humans ascribe to Him, namely, truth, righteousness, justice, mercy, and His knowledge of our very being.

The attributes we admire in God serve to induce in our imaginations a figure that each individual constructs within his or her own mind. This figure takes on a real personality and is felt as a spirit that resides within us and pervades all of space. Something may be philosophically said that the Spirit of God is the force that created all there is, and that force exists in all things, which includes the creation of the universe and all its life forms. This is a philosophical thought and may have no validity at all. What is true is that human beings have the capacity to love. That love is part of human nature and the force that has helped humans to survive and multiply on the earth.

That love is within a human being and is not received from God. Love is an attribute that is gained through understanding of ourselves and respect for others. God does not give a person the ability to love; it is earned by being sensitive and honest in our relationships with others.

As I stated in my post, God is a subjective belief and a substitute for human love. However, this belief was capitalized by human beings from past generations to enforce the attributes that are conducive to harmony, peace, and love within a civilization. Although God was introduced as a strict and jealous God to be feared, today He is the standard of truth, righteousness, justice, mercy, and love—attributes for people to get along with each other.

To say civilizations can do without God or some other belief that promulgates attributes for us to follow is to put all reliance on parents to teach their children. But we all know that parents, educational

institutions, governments, and religious organizations have their faults. The variance of the respect and application of the attributes needed in a society will be so large that what is wrong for one person is right for another because without God the standard of behavior is lost or nonexistent in a complex and varied society of human beings.

In *Future of God Amen*, there are recommendations to religious leaders and their followers to unify their beliefs in God and teach the overriding command above all others—*love one another*. This book is a history of how man first conceived God and how that God has profoundly influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. Based upon facts and findings by our most respected Egyptologists, the book offers a logical sequence of man's development of God. Are readers of this post curious enough to learn about this development or are many of the view that God is a figment of the imagination or that they already have learned enough in life about God? Whether one believes in God or not, the journey to find out how and why man has conceived God is of great value in understanding human nature. I humbly urge readers to visit www.futureofgodamen.com to find out why this book was written.

Richard Regener, September 19, 2010, 5:38 a.m. EDT

Your first paragraph presupposes a defined state regarding a god concept which is no more than your own precondition. You could apply things to the tooth fairy.

Infinite life force called god is also nothing more than a hypothesis, and beyond that I will not go without at least some evidence. *Attributes of a God concept* are *not known*; they are assumed without validation.

Number three we totally agree on.

In theory yes, in practice questionable, and certainly not by the majority.

Since religious organizations will not give up their power to unify or acknowledge their own corrupt culpability this is a non-issue, which must be dealt with by us as best we can. There is a great deal more understanding today than there ever was, so we will have to learn to actually think for ourselves through life experiences.

Nicholas Ginex, September 20, 2010, 2:32 a.m. EDT

My first paragraph only states what is accepted by all believers of God, namely, that He is the creator of all there is and embodies the attributes that human beings try to emulate, which is truth, righteousness, and justice. These attributes along with moral and civil rules of conduct were developed by the Egyptian priesthood and ruling pharaohs to control their civilization. I have not applied these attributes and moral rules of conduct as my own precondition. As enumerated in *Future of God Amen*, tables 3-1 and 3-2, there are, respectively, thirty-seven and forty-seven observances of moral and civil behavior that an Egyptian followed in life to qualify for the honor to reside with their God after death. This was not a tooth fairy belief for the Egyptians but a belief that was real enough to be adopted by our major religions of today. The belief in God, symbolic attributes, and moral codes directed the behavior of Egyptians to conduct their lives in a civil and humane way.

Of course, the attributes of God are assumed and are not validated. The attributes of God were created by the minds of men, namely, the Egyptian priests. We should know that with a bit of Egyptian history the Egyptians believed in the following attributes ingrained by their priesthood; He is the universal God of all countries, God of Creation, God of Truth, God of Perception, God of Righteousness and Justice, God of Mercy, God of War, to name the most revered attributes. These attributes are created to form the symbolic vision and image of God. God is a psychological concept and therefore any validation of God is not possible. God is a man-made construct for humans to visualize in their own way. Every person has a different vision of God based upon their imagination, their temperament, intelligence, and sensitivity to the experiences they encounter.

One does not need evidence to prove God exists. God is a spiritual feeling that man has had about his world as he came to know the world. That feeling was powerful because man has the curiosity to want to know his world. To fill in his ignorance, man came to develop gods to explain what he could not comprehend. In spite of the scientists' hypothesis that it was the big bang that created the entire universe, this is almost a myth because the proof does not exist. Scientists are unable to explain how the first atom was born and cannot explain the enormous amounts of matter that make up our universe. I could believe that our galaxy was created from the explosion of a black hole, but to

say the billions of galaxies, many five and ten times larger than ours, came from one big ball (bang) is nonsense. The laws of gravity would not allow that mass to accumulate into a big ball that encompasses the mass of the universe. So the scientists have a dilemma; they cannot explain where the first atom came from. They, the scientists, are just as dumbfounded as believers in God as they, respectively, do not know where all the matter came from just as believers do not know how God was created.

Until we know the answers to the birth of the universe and the birth of God, man will continue to believe in God. Why? Because God is a very natural solution to what we don't know.

Regarding the idea that "there is a great deal more understanding today than there ever was so we will have to learn to actually think for ourselves through life experiences." This idea is a dream of self-made and intelligent men. What these men neglect to understand is that they are the exceptions in a world where there is much ignorance, poor education, extremely poor upbringing of young minds, and millions of people who only think of their self-gratification in wealth, sex, and abuse of those weaker than they. I will not count on an individual being able to figure out the best path of life without the guidance of a moral code. If this code is envisioned with the idea of God as the highest form of excellence to attain, I see nothing wrong with that idea. Yes, it is an illusion, a hypothetical idea, but some of our greatest accomplishments were born out of the thinking minds of a perceptive theory that gradually led to something tangible. In this case, belief in God gives a tangible outcome of producing human beings with integrity and love.

Is Love a Concept or Real Human Attribute?

October 07, 2010 07:38 p.m. EDT

Is love really a concept or a reality that humans experience through the very act of giving and receiving love emotionally, physically, mentally, and spiritually? In my mind, love is definitely a word that has meaning, feeling, and substance that describes the relationship felt by a mother for a child and the absorption of that love by the child. This is the beginning of a love relationship that continues throughout life of the child as other people—the father, teachers, friends, and relatives—interact and strengthen the reality of love.

Should Jesus Christ or John who wrote the fourth Gospel be given the credit for the command *love one another*? I believe it was John, who after witnessing the downfall of the Judaic kingdom in Jerusalem, Syria, and Palestine by the Romans in 70 CE wrote his Gospel around 90-120 CE. As revealed in *Future of God Amen*, entire cities and towns of the Judaic empire were destroyed, over 1,100,000 Jews were slain, and 97,000 were captured. It was this devastation of the Jewish nation and decimation of the Jewish people that motivated some religious leaders, namely, Mark, Matthew, Luke, and John, to respectively write the Gospels in 66-70 CE, 80-90 CE, 80-95 CE, and 90-120 CE. This assertion may be highly credible since the conflict with Roman control within Jerusalem began before the start of the war in May 66 CE.

The above Jewish-Roman War lends credence to the assertion, albeit conclusion, that it was John that contributed the command by Jesus Christ to love one another. This is a natural observation by a righteous man, John, to realize that unless human beings learn to love one another, there is sure to be more bloodshed and devastation occurring between other people. Here is a case where love is learned

by experiencing the deadly outcomes of past events. Today we are experiencing fanatical religious men of the Islamic religion that do not acknowledge the command to *love one another*. Due to their scripture, the Koran, Muslims are taught bigotry, hatred, violence, and the killing of innocent human beings in the name of Allah. This conclusive finding is readily available by reading unadulterated suras in *Future of God Amen*.

The point of this writing is to clearly remind us that love is experienced and learned through the interaction of those that exhibit love. Love is not a concept but a human need that is a prime physical attribute. Its opposite, hate, is also not a concept but a human reaction to failure of receiving love. We have learned by the devastation of the Jewish nation that love is a conclusive answer within John's Gospel—love one another. I believe this command belongs to John's magnanimous disposition. To give it more credence and authority, he attributed it to Jesus and elevated Him as a Son of God. Only in John's Gospel does John infer that Jesus is not only the Son of God but that he is God. Previously, in all four Gospels, Jesus stated he was the Son of Man. To gain a broad understanding of how man conceived God and how that God has profoundly influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions, readers of this topic are encouraged to place an Internet search on *Future of God Amen*. This search will allow access to some press releases and its website.

There are several conclusions that you may wish to debate or differ with, and your inputs or acceptance will help to address them from other points of view. They are questions that many people avoid, but only by thinking upon them will the truth be known:

Do you find you agree that love is a human attribute that is experienced, felt, learned, and expressed and not a concept we learn within a book? Is love an inherent characteristic of human beings and of the animal kingdom within each species? For love to be successful, does it need to be supported with truth, honesty, sincerity, and altruism to assist another in need? Do you feel that the command love one another was originated by John, but he gave Jesus Christ the credit because the Word made flesh as the Son of God would give it greater authority? Do you feel that it was the devastation of the Jewish-Roman war that motivated Jewish religious leaders to write the Gospels because their greatest belief in one God, which distinguishes them from all other people, could be lost? Do you believe that the one command, love

one another, can replace the Ten Commandments? Does the Koran advocate the command love one another?

Comments and Responses

John Doyle, October 7, 2010, 7:44 p.m. EDT

Love is an uncreated energy.

John Doyle, October 8, 2010, 5:42 p.m. EDT

If you don't choose to agree with the theologians, that is up to you. Every concept is flawed as no word or idea can encompass reality. In the first epistle of St. John, chapter four, verse 8, it states clearly "God is love." What I believe or don't believe is totally immaterial; the same applies to you.

Belief does not create or alter reality. In the Tao Te Ching it says that the Tao that can be named is not the eternal Tao. The same applies to God and to love.

Nicholas Ginex, October 8, 2010, 11:08 p.m. EDT

Thank you, John, for your response because you offer another point of view that should be discussed, and perhaps we both can benefit. Simply because a person becomes a theologian does not mean the ideas and beliefs proposed by that theologian has any real value to the human race.

To say God is love is a very new view of God that has only surfaced over the past few centuries. The history of God reveals He was one to be feared and His authority was not to be questioned. He was the creator of all there is, but to say God is love does not answer the topic of this post, which is "Is love a construct or a real human attribute?"

You fail to realize that the love relationship with God is very different from the love between two human beings. One love is spiritual and depends upon the mental ability of one to feel the presence of God. For without a feeling of His presence, there is no love from or to God. The love this topic deals with is the love between humans, and it does not require a belief in God.

To say what you or I believe is totally immaterial is to say we do not matter how we relate to each other. To say God is love has no meaning unless the believer has a spiritual connection. But more importantly, you should promote the Word of God. Do you know what the Word of God is? It is stated three times in the Gospel of John. As a believer in God, do look up the Word of God and let me know what it is.

To say the Tao Te Ching saying “applies to God and to love” does not explain anything. God and love are two separate things: God is an entity one believes in, but love is a word that human beings use in their relationships with each other. Surely, you have loved another human being. That love is the human love this topic alludes to. The love between two humans is very different from the love you may feel for God.

John Doyle, October 8, 2010, 11:21 p.m. EDT

I disagree with almost everything you say, but that’s OK. I realized many years ago that such discussions provide no light but a great deal of pointless heat. Forgive me if I seem rude, but I simply do not wish to play. I would suggest if you are serious about your researches you might profit by reading Karen Armstrong’s *A Short History of God*.

Nicholas Ginex, October 9, 2010, 5:31 p.m. EDT

John, thank you for your reply. As a believer in God, I was looking forward to your answer as to what is the “Word of God.” You are not rude, and I respect your beliefs. My book *Future of God Amen* provides a history of how mankind came to conceive one universal God. It provides for anybody who is interested in knowing God how the same God has profoundly influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. More importantly, it provides recommendations for believers in God to preserve their beliefs well into the future. That is why the subtitle is “A Call to Daughters and Sons of God.”

Research in writing the book required knowledge of religious historians, such as Karen Armstrong and the findings of Egyptologists. In fact, I have quoted Karen Armstrong from *A History of God in Future of God Amen*. My mission is to inform people worldwide about the truth of the beginning of the creation of God. This truth will strengthen the belief in God because no longer will God-loving people have to believe in myths and dogma that dispels the belief of a universal God.

John, I do believe in God as the creator of all there is because our greatest scientific theories still do not know how the first atom was formed nor can they explain how billions of galaxies, with their billions of stars, came from the explosion of one big ball/bang. Read *Future of God Amen* and you will see that I support the legacy we have inherited from the Egyptians and promote the Word of God. I still would like for you to tell me what is the Word of God. Hint: John's Gospel.

Larry M., October 7, 2010, 9:20 p.m. EDT

Love is both a real thing of the human "heart" and a concept the topic of which has filled books. Mankind would not have survived without love.

Nicholas Ginex, October 8, 2010, 3:41 p.m. EDT

I agree with you, Larry, that love is the one guarantee for the survival of any species. Love is not a concept but a desire we learn to respect and enjoy. It is very real as our own body yearns for release upon being attracted to another.

Love is experienced in many forms of relationships due to the wonderful differences in the physical, emotional, and mental makeup of the partner one loves. Every love relationship is different from another. A successful love relationship, however, is built up with values that draw two people closer together; those values are truth, sincerity, tolerance, and care for the well-being of one's partner. These values are taught and strengthen a love between two people.

Nicholas Ginex, October 9, 2010, 10:43 p.m. EDT

John, thank you for continuing our conversation about love being a concept or a real human attribute. You allow me to understand a perspective of a devoted believer in God, and I thank you for that. You have indicated that the Word of God as taught by Christian theologians is the Bible with the evolution of God beginning with the name of EL, which later became *Yahweh* or *Jehovah*. Unfortunately, the theologians you have put your faith in lack a history of God. Even Karen Armstrong in her book *A History of God* was remiss to research the evolution of God by neglecting the fact that much of what the Hebrews learned about God was obtained from the Egyptian civilization.

Jesus Christ was knowledgeable of the origin of God, but theologians have not properly understood His words in Revelation 3:13 and 3:14. There Jesus proclaimed the Egyptian God *Amen* as *the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God*. It is no wonder that Judaic, Christian, and Islamic worshippers announce Amen at the end of a prayer, supplication, and while giving thanks and praise to God. Only recently, over the past hundred years, Egyptologists have deciphered hieroglyphics in the tombs and temples of Egypt to learn that Amen was the greatest Egyptian God for over two thousand years before the birth of Jesus Christ. The historic development of God may be read in *Future of God Amen*.

I am sorry to have to reveal to you a truth that has only surfaced over the past hundred years. However, this truth should not shatter your belief in God. On the contrary, you are now able to understand that God first introduced Himself to the Egyptians and, later, belief in Him extended not only beyond the borders of Egypt, Nubia, Palestine, and Syria, but also the entire Western world as Moses, Jesus Christ, and Muhammad introduced God to their people. Of these men of God, it was Jesus who announced the Word of God. It is strange that many believers in God do not know the Word of God. They refer to the Bible, which is made up of many stories, commands, and judgments. However, Jesus Christ has boiled the whole of Scripture down to one command. I believe that believers in God will be able to state His command for our readers. This command was stated three times in the Gospel of John.

Nicholas Ginex, May 19, 2011, 11:40 p.m. EDT

I have mentioned what the Word of God is, but to be complete, I humbly quote for our readers the Word of God, which was proclaimed by Jesus three times, as a command from God in John's Gospel.

The Word of God is *love one another*.

Must Worship of God and Moral Beliefs Go Together?

January 21, 2010 11:28 p.m. EST

The answer is an obvious no when one considers the fact that there are numerous types of religions, even those that do not advocate one universal God. All religions have a philosophy of beliefs by which people can lead moral, righteous lives and achieve harmony and happiness. The following dissertation focuses on the universal God taught by the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions because most people do think of God—whether it's their own personal God or one acquired from a formalized religion. This post is an extension of the post entitled "Is Pain and Suffering Needed to Learn of a Better Life?" Let us examine the question "Is it necessary to worship God to follow the beliefs taught by a religious organization?" The idea of worshipping a God we have no knowledge about but envision based upon faith alone is really very strange. As a consequence of creating God in our own minds, everybody has a different image of God. Just how real and personal God becomes to an individual depends on one's imagination, life's experiences, intellectual sensitivity, and what was taught about that God.

To worship a God that is unknowable, incomprehensible, and mysterious is the ability of one's mind to be so convinced that a person would not only bow and worship that God, but also even die for the belief in that God. Is there anything wrong with this worship of God? Yes, when people worship a God but not what that God represents, then there's a disconnect because it is the beliefs that make us who we hope to be—not the worship of an unknown entity.

What the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions inherited from the ancient Egyptians is the concept that God is the creator of all there

is and therefore the Father and authority of His creations—human beings. The idea of God as the authority figure helps to enforce the beliefs that the priesthood ordains to guide the conduct of their people. But to guarantee that power of enforcement, religious leaders have also introduced the concepts of reward and punishment. God has power if it is believed that God can punish those that do not follow the ordained beliefs and reward those that do with eternal life.

Now that we understand the powers assigned to God to encourage belief in Him, it is instructive to examine the beliefs that are provided by religious leaders and associated with God through revelation. Revelation is simply another word for what has occurred in the mind of an imaginative individual to communicate beliefs received from God. One must question, however, whether the revelation was contrived by religious, righteous men to establish dogma that can be associated with their God.

The beliefs developed by religious leaders have many good attributes because it not only sets up God as the supreme standard by which to guide our lives in terms of truth, integrity, and fairness with others, but it also establishes a set of moral codes/laws by which we can conduct our lives. The ancient Egyptians established thirty-seven solemn protestations that the deceased would declare when entering the halls of their god, Osiris, and another forty-two protestations before divine jurors by name before being accepted into the Osiris hereafter. These are the beliefs that established a moral code during the life of the deceased such as follows: “I have not done evil to mankind, not oppressed members of my family, not wrought evil in the place of right and truth, have not caused pain, made no man to suffer hunger, have not carried away the milk from the mouths of children, etc.” (extracted from *Future of God Amen*, pages 79, 80).

The number of righteous beliefs by the ancient Egyptians far exceeds the Ten Commandments and incorporates eight of the Ten Commandments. What many people do not realize is that the Egyptian priesthood established their moral codes/laws more than two thousand years before the Ten Commandments. This period of time goes back to the Predynastic Period, much beyond 3200 BCE, when they worshipped Osiris as their god to enter eternal life.

The above discourse reveals that there are beliefs by which people can conduct their lives to avoid conflicts and achieve a life of happiness

and harmony. Is it necessary to also believe in God to obtain the reward of heaven? That is a question that may not be relevant because most people are more concerned about leading a life of happiness on earth. The prospect of living eternally is rather infantile. Do people actually believe they would like to exist millions of years when they do not know what form they would take? Would it be a body at the prime of life instead of an old or young body one expires with? Would it be in some spiritual form that does not experience sensual pleasures in life? Would there be black-eyed, beautiful women and couches inwrought with gold and jewels? Or would it be simply reading scriptures received from God with wonderful music played by angels? Nobody knows.

The beliefs in the attributes of God to set a high moral standard and beliefs to conduct our lives can be separate. However, there is really no harm in keeping the two together. The harm that is created is when one religious institution believes their God is greater than another. Harm is created when they ignore trying to teach there is one God and try to unify their beliefs. The Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are corrupt and hypocritical by not teaching the Word of God to love one another. However, they have an opportunity to work together and unify their scriptures by acknowledging the words of Jesus Christ who proclaimed *Amen* as

The faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.

Until the major religions acknowledge the words of Jesus and realize that *Amen* is the *common bond* between their religions, they will continue to cause bigotry, hatred, violence, and the killing of innocent human beings. The Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions will crumble and die if they continue to ignore the words of Jesus. Worse yet, they will cause the loss of man's greatest spiritual heritage—the belief in God.

Why does this author predict this outcome? Growth, harmony, love, and peace can only be achieved by accepting the past truthfully. By being honest and objective people grow intellectually. But hiding and ignoring the truth of a wonderful legacy we have been given can only cause more deception, lies, and myths that can only stunt the mind and continue us into the path of ignorance and corruption.

Comments and Responses

Richard Regener, January 22, 2010, 3:15 a.m. EST

Congratulations are in order, my friend, an extremely well-written post.

Gary (The Eclectic) Timothy, January 22, 2010, 9:49 p.m. EST

Well, written. And I agree for the most part on the content of your stance taken. But I am confused by the seemingly contradictory path you seem to be taking. On the one hand, you seem to expose modern religions as to their origins as mere constructs of humanity's effort to explain the unexplainable and as artificial constructs of religious leaders to exert some measure of control over behavior. On the other hand, you seem to encourage a coming together of religions to develop a common grounding between them and even merge into one encompassing religion.

I'm not sure you can have your cake and eat it too! My own preference would be for people to "grow up" and acknowledge religions as simply a rich mythology in the same way most people acknowledge the ancient Greek and Roman gods and attendant mythologies. And, after "growing up" in this way, we would then "outgrow" our need for religion altogether. I believe that only in this way can we take the next step in human ascension toward defining their own meaning and purpose, in essence freeing us from the bondages of religious notions that currently stifle the search for the real truth of our existence.

Nicholas Ginex, January 22, 2010, 11:41 p.m. EST

Thank you for your response to this post entitled, "Must Worship of God and Moral Beliefs Go Together?" You discover some very important thoughts that religious leaders and intellectuals need to think about. For which reason, I have decided to use this commentary below and post it for others to read.

You're right that I am not willing to let go of the moral beliefs that have been developed and applied to ensure the stability of a growing civilization. It happens that moral codes/beliefs were initially

developed many thousands of years ago by the priesthoods of Egypt. They, together with setting up the pharaoh as an authority figure, were the two controlling factors that helped to ensure stability between the growing communities. The harnessing of manpower to build the water canals to grow crops and build pyramids during less agricultural efforts created a highly technical class of artisans, craftsmen, engineers, priests, and nobility. Much of the success was due to putting in place a set of beliefs that made each citizen conscious of their lives to make proper choices that would lead them into a hereafter after death.

Today our civilization does not function within a closed system. It is bombarded with traditions and many levels of education made up of many different people, many of which have their own religious views whether they are personal or inculcated formally within a religion. As a result, we have many independent thinkers who support the concept of a God, deny its existence, or just refrain to deal with the idea at all because, to be fair, they cannot accept an idea without proof.

It is my belief that the values contained in a moral system do build character, honesty, integrity, truthfulness, and desire to treat others as humanly as possible. A belief system, such as devised by the ancient Egyptians, is a positive way to build a people with a sense of righteousness and provides a framework to not only treat others fairly, but also to be better able to make wise choices/decisions in life.

The question arises as to who should inculcate the moral beliefs into our young minds to help build a framework by which they can later conduct their lives? Do we rely on our parents, educators, or a religious organization? Here is where I would like to see our intellectuals solve that question. Too many bright individuals find fault with religions, but they do not use their minds to say what should be done to replace them.

Then, too, the intellectual community does not separate the moral beliefs, an important elemental system, from the dogma that a religion creates—such as a belief in God. The belief in God is not such a bad thing when God is used as a high standard for human beings to obtain. To associate the attributes of truth, love, integrity, and justice with God can be a positive thing. But when religious leaders use God as an instrument to judge whether one is to feel pain or gain life for eternity we are now attributing to God our own instincts, which leads back to arrogance that perpetuates into lies, myths, and deception.

I subscribe to a God that is unknowable, incomprehensible, and mysterious because nobody knows what God is like. However, I will not rule out something I don't know about. Yes, God is a concept, but we have the mental capabilities to explore our world, and perhaps someday we will get a better appreciation of what or who made the first atom and all matter that comprise the universe. It may be the other side of Einstein's equation, energy, which we may be better capable of understanding in the future.

If our intellectual beings can tell me who and how the universe was created with a sound analysis, I could forego the idea of God. But let's face it; there is no good explanation by our greatest scientists. The big bang theory is a stupid one. It suffices because it appears to be in line with a God-like beginning. But anybody that thinks from one big ball came all the galaxies of our universe, some galaxies hundred times bigger than our own, is not a clear-headed thinker, not when astronomers have found the existence of pulsars and quasars that emit matter and energy back into the universe to start the creation of other stars. This assumes a self-sustaining universe, not one that starts with the explosion of one giant ball of matter.

I end this discourse by stating that until we know more about the entire universe I subscribe to God as the creator of all things and highly support a moral belief system to help conduct the lives of human beings. Regarding our wonderful intellectuals, I recommend they look for solutions to implement moral beliefs rather than just knocking God, which is a totally separate idea to improve the conduct of human beings.

Gary (The Eclectic), Timothy January 23, 2010, 12:07 a.m. EST

“The big bang theory is a stupid one. It suffices because it appears to be in line with a God-like beginning. But anybody that thinks from one big ball came all the galaxies of our universe, some galaxies 100 times bigger than our own, is not a clear-headed thinker.”

You *are kidding*, right? If you are serious, then you need to learn a whole lot more about science and the big bang/inflation theory! There is no giant ball of matter from which everything came; big bang theory doesn't say this at all! And there was no explosion; big bang theory, while its name is a misnomer, does *not* include an explosion at all!

For more information, see *misconceptions about the big bang theory*.

G. M. Jackson, January 25, 2010, 9:33 p.m. EST

Aw, common, Gar, you can't eat your cake and have it: a big bang without an explosion? Tch! Tch! LOL!

G. M. Jackson, January 25, 2010, 9:58 p.m. EST

“My own preference would be for people to ‘grow up’ and acknowledge religions as simply a rich mythology in the same way most people acknowledge the ancient Greek and Roman gods and attendant mythologies.”

Well, when I grew up I realized that fence posts and atheists have something in common: neither believes in any gods. I also starting wondering why the most intelligent creatures on earth could believe in such nonsense as what is proffered by religions. After further examination, I discovered that there is more to the world's religions than dogma and persecution. There is this whole body of morality and philosophy embedded in the “mythology.” I then learned to think with my right brain as well as my left. The end result is my life, personal power, emotional state have improved immensely. Real or not, a personal god can be an excellent role model and an inspiration. I have even pondered the nature and value of reality itself. To me, that is what personal growth is all about.

“And, after ‘growing up’ in this way, we would then ‘outgrow’ our need for religion altogether.”

They tried this experiment in the Soviet Union. Ironically it failed. On paper, it always looks like the experiment should succeed. I think the major flaw is the assumption that there is a one-size-fits-all ideology. Both religious powers and non-religious powers have made this assumption. “If everyone could just be like me, the world would be a better place . . .,” and its variations never seem to pan out—people are too diverse.

“I believe that only in this way can we take the next step in human ascension toward defining their own meaning and purpose, in essence freeing us from the bondages of religious notions that currently stifle the search for the real truth of our existence.”

Gary, this sounds like Captain Kirk's monologue. *Lol!* But yes, it would be an improvement if religions could drop the dogma and just seek the truth like a curious child, but then maybe it is better not to grow up too much, eh?

Gary (The Eclectic) Timothy, January 25, 2010, 9:58 p.m. EST

Gary, I was there at the big bang, and I can assure you that I heard no bang. There was cake however!

Nicholas Ginex, January 26, 2010, 6:47 p.m. EST

William, I am encouraged that you share a view that I have, namely:

“Real or not, a personal god can be an excellent role model and an inspiration. I have even pondered the nature and value of reality itself. To me, that is what personal growth is all about.”

G. M. Jackson, January 25, 2010, 10:07 p.m. EST

Great read! Keep them coming!

A Moral Code Is Essential to Stop Wars

January 27, 2010 08:13 p.m. EST

In a well-presented article by Richard Regener, “Are We Forever Doomed to Continue this Endless Process of War?” he stated, “*It is everyone’s responsibility to contribute to the social environment in which they live beyond simply voting if we want to improve our social environment.*” To this *appeal for responsibility*, it can be beneficial for everyone to investigate, aye, study, and implement a moral code. It can greatly improve the conduct of people to lead productive lives and make decisions based on integrity, truth, and justice, the ultimate outcome—world peace.

Many people think and wonder about what is this person talking about? What does he mean by a moral code? How can a moral code benefit society? Will a moral code help to eliminate wars? Yes, is the answer when *people accept the responsibility* to implement a moral code. It is a way for them to contribute to the harmony and peace of a nation. Before going any further on this topic, it will help us to understand a moral code or system of laws and beliefs used to improve human conduct. Excellent examples are the moral laws established by ancient Egypt that were developed before 3500 BCE. To view Egypt’s extensive set of moral codes/laws, the reader is recommended to read *Future of God Amen*.

This author believes that people can “see” much more than they permit themselves to “see.” Hopefully, *Future of God Amen* will lift the veil from the eyes of those who wish to “know God” founded on truth. It provides an opportunity for perceptive and courageous religious leaders to unify their scriptures and create a path of love for all sisters and brothers.

The first recommendation *emphasizes people have the responsibility* to stop aggressive leaders from taking advantage of those nations that live by a moral code. Success does not come easy. It takes dedication by responsible people to reflect on the recommendations provided in *Future of God Amen* to make it happen.

Are Theists and Atheists Both Right?

January 25, 2010 11:13 p.m. EST

An eye-catching start of the article “Theists and Atheists Are Both Right?” began with “WTF?! What in God’s name or no god’s name am I trying to say? How can both theists and atheists be right? Either gods exist or they don’t, right?” This is a good start by an engaging writer. In the writer’s opening discussion, he presented the biggest and oldest question, “Why are we here?”

Fortunately, we humans have the ability to think and have concluded the earth and heavens have been made for us. I feel sorry for the creatures like cats, dogs, elephants, rats, worms, and bugs because they are not able to pose such a philosophical question.

However, since we are gifted with the ability to think, it is good to try to understand if we have a purpose in life since somehow we do exist. Some people are not convinced that we evolved by an evolutionary process but believe we were created in the image of God. This is another topic that has been won through the scientific method because actual archaeological findings have shown mankind has developed from forms of life that are very similar in body and brain structure (notice I did not say apes because some people will be offended). But I digress; let’s get to the answers given to the question: “Why are we here?”

The most popular answer is God created everything that exists. This answer then provokes another question, “Where did God come from?” Now this is the ultimate question because the only answers are that He always existed or He comes from nothing, meaning He created Himself. To each of these two questions is a profound question, “How did God come into existence from nothing or is there a side of Einstein’s equation we need to know more about?” That is, Energy =

mass times (speed of light) *squared*. Is it possible that the relationship between matter and energy presumes that we need to know more about energy?

To say God was created from nothing is a false premise because you can only get nothing from nothing. No amount of hypothetical thinking can make any fool think you can get something from nothing. So the reasoning power of the analysis given is faulty. This false analysis has led the writer to state the following: *Nothing is the ultimate cause of everything. Nothing is the other set: non-existence. Non-existence is not real. Therefore, if God created the universe, then God is nothing, is non-existence, is not real.* As you can see, the statement that nothing is the ultimate cause of everything is simply ridiculous. This analogy deserves some respect for the “therefore conclusion.” But we have here a play on words that does not prove anything. Again the reasoning is only a made-up hypothetical analogy. It was made to placate theists and atheists so that they can walk away thinking that they are both right. But when we try to pick the meat from the bones to feel we really got something out of this conversation, I venture to say both parties are disappointed because the real question “Why are we here?” has not been answered.

Does it serve our interest to try to answer the biggest and oldest question instead of bringing in whether God existed or not? Do we really care to please atheists and theists? The answer as to whether God exists needs to be solved by the scientific method. Until scientists have determined how the giant ball exploded to expel mass and energy that makes up the billions of galaxies, some hundred times bigger than ours, we are at a standstill. It is foolish to think it all started with one singularity that exploded because scientists have already found that quasars and pulsars emit mass and energy back into the universe, which allow the formation of densely packed matter that initiate the birth of other suns. This finding means that the universe is a self-sustaining system and follows Einstein’s equation that matter and energy are interrelated.

I recommend that our brightest minds try to work with the real world and analyze how people can live productive lives and make wise decisions. One alternative that has worked for thousands of years and allowed a civilization to become the greatest nation in engineering, art, and science of the stars is ancient Egypt. *This country is the originator of the concept of one universal God.* More importantly, they developed a set of moral beliefs that allowed their people to live productive and

meaningful lives. This writing is already too long. However, I will try to take the time to illustrate what kinds of moral codes were followed in another post (that post was “A Moral Code is Essential to Stop Wars” in which I removed more than three pages of moral codes and instead referenced the book *Future of God Amen* for those readers who seriously desire to learn about the moral codes of the Egyptians.)

Our bright minds of today should stop throwing stones and quibble too much over God’s existence and spend our energy on how we could make our world better by raising the moral quality of our people. Do you have any recommendations?

Comments and Responses

Gary (The Eclectic) Timothy, January 26, 2010, 12:30 a.m. EST

“No amount of hypothetical thinking can make any fool think you can get something from nothing. So the reasoning power of the analysis given is faulty.”

I stopped reading at this point because you obviously don’t know enough about science to know any better. Something can indeed come from nothing! Virtual particles pop into an out of existence with regularity around the event horizon of a black hole. It’s called Hawking radiation. It has to do with the quantum instability of “nothing” or the vacuum. Indeed, some versions of big bang theory posit that a “nothing” suddenly became “something.” The quantum world is quite strange, my friend! It has to do with the nature of the quantum itself. The theory would involve a quantum fluctuation from a zero average to a higher state that happens to exist for a critical amount of time and then blossoms into an expansion that results in a universe. Other serious theories have it that baby universes are being born from our universe all the time.

Now all this is not proven beyond any doubt yet. But the potential for something to come from nothing is indeed recognized as a valid alternative. It may be that our universe did not start this way. But the process of something coming from nothing is valid. As I have suggested before, some more science research on your part would be well worth your while. A Google or two about quantum instability,

quantum fluctuations, and Hawking radiation may be of great value to you.

Tristan Russell, January 26, 2010, 12:39 p.m. EST

I'd be careful about how you phrased that. Indeed, virtual particles are intriguing, but they don't come from *nothing*. The colloquial definition isn't what physicists are using when they say "nothing." Nothing isn't *nothing* in that sense. What we thought was empty space is filled with stuff. *Lawrence Krauss* explains it better than I could.

Nicholas Ginex, January 26, 2010, 4:03 p.m. EST

Hello Gary,

You indicated that "*something can indeed come from nothing! Virtual particles pop into an out of existence with regularity around the event horizon of a black hole.*" But you are not consistent in logic because a black hole is something.

I would like your thoughts of the big bang theory versus the self-sustaining theory. Note that if stars are born within highly dense matter, why is it necessary to have a big bang? It appears that the universe is very capable of making the interchange between matter and energy.

You also made the statement that "it may be that our universe did not start this way. But the process of something coming from nothing is valid." I cannot disagree with you because I don't know this new concept about "nothing." However, something might be said for Einstein's equation whereby energy may be the answer. The interrelationship between energy and matter would introduce some very philosophical ideas and possibly a breakthrough on whether "nothing" really exists to initiate a beginning or "energy."

Have you considered trying to solve real problems in our world? It would be helpful if you would contribute some recommendations to the following appeal:

Our bright minds of today should stop throwing stones and quibble too much over God's existence and spend their energy on how we could

make our world better by raising the moral quality of our people. Have any recommendations?

Patrick C., January 26, 2010, 2:36 a.m. EST

Humans are amazing. We seem to fear the possibility of “nothing,” just as we may fear we are not the center of creation. Is this fear of “nothingness” related to our own mortality or “nothingness?” When the last human consciousness dies will there then be nothingness? Egocentrics simply invent eternal self-perpetuation in various forms.

Nicholas Ginex, January 26, 2010, 4:29 p.m. EST

Hello Patrick,

Your assumption that humans are amazing regarding their fear of “nothing” is not valid. My father, not an educated man, said when you’re dead you’re dead; there is nothing after death. Now here was a man who had no fear of the possibility of “nothing.” He had no illusions of a life after death. Just as stars are born and die in our universe, we humans have got to face the reality that we also die never to return as a spirit or some wonderful form of energy.

This is a beautiful world we are so fortunate to exist in. To spend time on “we” living in an afterlife is somewhat foolish. Few people have considered what they would do with their time if they had to live (in some form) for billions and billions of years. Many of us waste our precious time on earth being nonproductive and lazy. By being good and worshipping a God they know nothing about, they still want to live billions and billions of years. Somewhat ridiculous, isn’t it?

However, it is plausible that mankind will always think of God as the creator of “all there is,” at least until scientists figure out if God is energy or not. But the concept of God is not a bad idea. It is only the religious organizations that have corrupted a wonderful concept devised by man after many thousands of years of mental development. Let me know if you have a better idea.

Gary (The Eclectic) Timothy, January 26, 2010, 7:31 p.m. EST

Nicholas, have you considered joining the *Losing Your Religion group* here on Gather? I’m sure they would welcome your posts, past

and present. And it would give you an increased audience for your material.

Nicholas Ginex, January 28, 2010, 6:21 p.m. EST

Thanks, Gary, for the suggestion.

I am a member of this group and many other religious groups. But would you know, many are called, but few answer. Unfortunately, many people do not reflect upon many aspects of life or care to take time to share their thoughts.

Gary (The Eclectic) Timothy, January 29, 2010, 1:50 p.m. EST

From my observations so far, the LYR group has pretty good audience and the discussions are lively. Both sides of the religious coin are addressed there. And people seem to be polite enough also. Just my two cents.

Patrick C., January 27, 2010, 12:22 a.m. EST

My “amazing humans” statement was tongue in cheek, just so you know.

Actually human behavior appears primitive. And so it should be, due to our relatively short existence. Our wonderful imagination and powers of reason seem to have overstretched our genetic primal core. Art, religion, science are great. They stumble over one another, though, when the animal within wants his share of meat. We are still but a step from the jungle. And what a step it has been!

When humans are able to live minus the astronomical weight of societal or religious laws . . . then we may have a chance to witness the true power of imagination and reason.

Nicholas Ginex, January 27, 2010, 6:14 p.m. EST

Patrick, thank you for your reflection on man’s advancement from the jungle. The true power of imagination and reason can only be viable when, like a tree, the mind is properly nourished. The weight of societal and religious laws is nothing more than a set of guidelines to assist people in the conduct of their lives.

We may not need the dogma taught by religions, but the moral codes are essential. It is a fundamental base of knowledge acquired over thousands of years to help people get along with each other. I have just released a post that presents why a moral code can be beneficial to the point of eliminating war. It is titled "A Moral Code is Essential to Stop Wars." I would like your thoughts and comments on it.

Is Pain and Suffering Needed to Learn of a Better Life?

January 21, 2010 06:10 p.m. EST

A comment provided by a thought-provoking individual was made to the post “Are Religious Scriptures Cast in Concrete?” The implications of his comment deserve to be examined because many people have the same reservations. It is provided below:

“The concept of God and the concept of religious beliefs are two completely and distinct philosophies that do not work in harmony as they exist today. Why is there any need to worship God if we were given life to become aware and learn about ourselves through pain and suffering?”

Two ideas surface by the above statement. Few people are aware that the concept of God and the concept of religious beliefs are two separate philosophies. For one, I have not separated religious beliefs from the concept of God. So I am curious enough to explore this idea further. The other idea is there any need to worship God if we learn about life and ourselves through pain and suffering? I would like to express some of my thoughts on the last idea first.

It is unfortunate that many people learn the lessons of life through pain and suffering. The hurt and isolation cause one to think about what could have been done better to avoid the pain caused upon oneself or others. Perhaps, out of this reflection, one learns better ways to conduct one’s life to achieve happy and satisfying outcomes. But this is not necessarily so. Pain and suffering has no real impact unless there is the exposure to happiness, peace of mind, and joy in one’s life. If one cannot compare the differences between an unhappy life with what it was like to be happy, the degree of pain may not motivate

one to understand there is a better way. For example, consider a slave who has never known the joys of finding and giving love, has not known the laughter of people singing and dancing, does not respond well to a joke because the opposite extreme that is being ridiculed is not understood, has not been given the luxury of time to reflect on life and learn from the experiences of others. I can go on and on to show that without the knowledge of knowing happiness any degree of pain and suffering may not cause a person to seek ways to learn how to lead a happy and more meaningful life.

I contend that pain and suffering through the experiences we have in life may not contribute to the learning process unless there is balance in knowing also the joys of life. But what can improve one's possibilities to lead a happy and resourceful life? Is it possible that the ancients have learned to reduce pain and suffering by teaching certain beliefs that allow people to live together in harmony? A wonderful civilization that has been isolated from the rest of the world during its development into one of the strongest nations was that of Egypt. Through thousands of years, the priesthood of the Egyptians learned a lot about human nature and devised beliefs and a moral code to conduct the lives of their people. Out of their worship of the wonders of earth, the sun, moon, animals, rivers, birds, stars, etc. the spiritual nature of the Egyptians created gods until, finally, they created the concept of one universal God.

In *Future of God Amen*, a book that presents the beginning, development, and future of God, it is shown that the concept of God was a gradual development that was finally articulated during the reign of Ramses II around 1270 BC. The Priesthood of Amon wrote their belief of one universal God in the hymn (scripture for it states the beliefs of the Egyptians) known as *Amon as the Sole God*, It was this concept of God that was introduced to the Hebrews and taught by Moses. That God is known to us by the name of *Amen*. It is no accident that *Amen* is announced in temples, churches, and mosques at the end of a prayer. Perhaps, now with the knowledge that Egyptologists have found over the past hundred years, religious leaders and their followers can better understand the words of Jesus Christ stated in John's Revelation 3:13 and 3:14 that *Amen* is

The faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.

In answer to “*Why is there any need to worship God?*” there is the notion that this may not be necessary. As brought out by the astute comment, it’s the beliefs that have developed in concert with God that are more important and fundamental to a civilization. But to clarify why this idea may have any merit and if God is necessary in conjunction with moral beliefs, I will respond in another post for this writing is already too long to keep the attention of the average reader. However, to learn more about the beginning, development, and future of God, you can acquire that knowledge by reading *Future of God Amen*. Place an Internet search on the title to review its press releases and visit the book website.

Comments and Responses

Libramoon., January 21, 2010, 6:33 p.m. EST

Suffering and pain exist to let us know something is wrong. Thus, potentially they can help us to learn to live better if we understand their message and act accordingly to fix what is not working for us.

Nicholas Ginex, January 22, 2010, 2:38 p.m. EST

I agree. But consider that based upon your upbringing and moral belief system that provides a framework to make decisions, pain and suffering may just be experienced without any mental growth.

Gary (The Eclectic) Timothy, January 22, 2010, 10:20 p.m. EST

But I contend that pain and suffering can be experienced *with* mental growth without the need to have experienced the opposites of well-being and joy. Our brains are wonderful organs and can easily extrapolate and extend itself. And we can at least observe things or states of being of other people without ever experiencing these things ourselves. Vicarious experiences are relevant here too. And our communication abilities allow us to evoke a unique experiential response in other people. For example, I have “experienced” a unique feeling as a result of merely reading a poem or story without ever having experienced the particular experience that the author is writing about.

Nicholas Ginex, January 23, 2010, 2:04 p.m. EST

I agree with the statement that pain and suffering can be experienced with mental growth; but not in all cases. A lot depends upon one's intellectual sensitivity and system of beliefs that has set a framework for judgment. Yes, you may vicariously experience learning through communication with and observation of others regarding their association with pain and suffering. But again, much depends upon one's educational background and moral system of beliefs that has been instilled or acquired. A blank mental blackboard that has no moral code to live by makes one an easy target for making many, many mistakes and poor decisions because the knowledge and direction those beliefs provide are missing. Therefore, it is not necessarily true that pain and suffering will cause mental growth. In fact, it may lead to further depression and disillusionment because the ability to understand and compare the hurtful experiences against knowledge acquired is missing. A part of that knowledge are the moral codes that man has learned through many centuries of experiencing pain and suffering.

Richard Regener, January 22, 2010, 3:07 a.m. EST

By making things easy for our children have we fared any better? Take a good look around you today and every day for the next few years and watch the results reveal themselves.

Will Science and Religion Ever Be Compatible?

March 03, 2011 10:42 p.m. EST

At a very young age, I was not immersed in the biblical Genesis account of the Creation because both my parents had to work for a living while my brother and I were raised by our Sicilian grandparents, who spoke very little English. It was not my parents but my religious Catholic instruction that acquainted me with the belief in God. At that stage of religious development, I had no real appreciation of the Creation account except that Adam was the first man and that Eve was created from Adam's rib.

Fortunately, I received a public education and in high school enjoyed learning biology and was introduced eventually to the theory of evolution. I admired Darwin's work and courage to document his research efforts that had, in my mind, much credibility. For even I, at a tender age, realized that man has many of the same organs and functions of dogs, cats, and our closest relatives, monkeys and apes. Funny, I thought, these animals have the same two eyes, ears, nose to breathe, arms, legs, and sexual and breathing apparatus as humans. Wow, we have so much in common. So even then, I found it difficult to believe man was independently created by God but was a more complex and fortunate creature to have had a greater brain, a voice to develop language, and hands to build and eventually write what he had learned in life.

Regarding God, very few people discount the belief in God. Those that do discount God as taught by a religion believe in God from a personal point of view. Even atheists and agnostics, as well as scientists, have no idea how the first atom was created and how billions of atoms came into existence to form matter. It boggles the mind to learn that there

are billions of galaxies with billions of stars and billions of planets that make up our universe. Until scientists are able to answer how matter was created that eventually gave birth to living organisms, mankind will always believe in God. I do. The God I believe in has no form; He is incomprehensible, mysterious, and yet responsible for initiating the universe. So I believe in a force that pervades the universe. That force has found its way to conceive life, and all things are made from the same stuff that started the universe.

After receiving my indoctrination in Catholicism, I ventured into many different types of Christian churches and even attended Greek Orthodox and Jewish houses of worship. I was always impressed listening to the radio, with the talks given by rabbis, in fact, more so than sermons given by priests. So I had an open mind seeking to understand who was God. All my life I was interested in philosophy, sociology, and the humanities because I loved learning about the accomplishments of mankind and some of their greatest thoughts that I might embrace.

Well, into my forties, I read books by many religious scholars and became engrossed in learning more about what Egyptologists had to say about the past history of an almost forgotten civilization. Egyptologists such as Henry H. Breasted and E. A. Wallis Budge brought to life great works of beauty revealed within Egyptian temples, pyramids, and monuments. More importantly, upon reading their deciphered hieroglyphics, I learned how man first conceived one universal God; that God existed for over two thousand years before the birth of Jesus Christ. Having acquired quite a bit of knowledge from men who dedicated their lives to unearth and reveal history of a very spiritual people, I unintentionally started to write, upon my retirement as an engineer, to produce a *Legacy of a Father* for my children.

This was the first book I ever wrote and I say unintentionally because I never planned to write a book. Sitting at my computer, the book unfolded itself into a logical sequence of who were the Egyptian people, their history and beliefs, and how their beliefs were imitated by the Hebrews who developed their religion based upon the beliefs in a soul, a hereafter, a morality based on truth and righteousness, and a belief in one universal God. Upon writing about the beliefs of the Egyptian people, I naturally was obligated to read the Torah, the Gospels and Revelation, and the Koran. This education allowed me to provide an objective critique of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic

scriptures. Of greater worthiness, I was able to reflect on what I wrote and provide recommendations to the religious leaders and followers of these faiths, which would be helpful in bringing their beliefs into a more unified version.

I have said enough about why I believe the idea of God will always prevail as long as science has not learned where the first atom came from. Those who desire to pursue how man first conceived God and how that God has profoundly influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are encouraged to do an Internet search on the title *Future of God Amen*. As a man of optimism and love for the human race, I do believe that there are many men and women in this world who are intelligent enough, like you, who recognize that changes must be made in our religious beliefs about God.

It is easy to rant and rave why people should or should not believe in God and that it has been religious people who have caused the deaths of millions upon millions of innocent people. But there is a solution whereby science and religion can advance in parallel in our quest to know God by revealing the truth of our past. I recommend people to read *Future of God Amen* to understand that the truth of the past can complement our scientific advancements. Perhaps this book will motivate daughters and sons of God to emerge and assist religious leaders to undertake a revision of their holy scriptures so that all people will not only tolerate each other's religion, but also learn to love one another.

Anything is possible if the people themselves motivate and pressure religious leaders to wake up and revise their dogma to reflect what people have learned about themselves and the universe. Just as the Egyptian priesthood updated their scriptures many times until they arrived at the belief of one universal God, so can scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions be revised and not prevail with the idea that they are encased in concrete never to be changed. What the modern world needs today is a religious renaissance.

Comments and Responses

Larry M., March 3, 2011, 11:02 p.m. EST

To answer your title question, they have always been compatible. They apply to different aspects of our life experience.

Nicholas Ginex, March 4, 2011, 2:23 p.m. EST

Thank you, Larry, for making me reflect on your point of view. To me, the only compatibility I can think of between science and religion is man's unending curiosity to understand himself and the world he lives in. One approach is by actual investigation of the world around him, and the other approach is use of his mind to try to comprehend the unknowable where philosophy and theology take over. Both approaches complement man's efforts to bring meaning and purpose to his life.

The underlying pulse of the two approaches is to operate on truth. There is no harm in learning how man first came to conceive God. By becoming knowledgeable of how man's conception of God evolved, we have a greater appreciation for why we worship an entity we cannot see or understand. But that is why I believe it is essential for science and religion to be given their proper respect for both can be used to arrive at the truth of our being.

Larry M., March 5, 2011, 8:00 a.m. EST

Science eliminates wrong answers to questions. Religion provides truth based on faith. For the fundamentals of religion, there is no science to test them. For the fundamentals of science, religion doesn't "care."

Nicholas Ginex, March 5, 2011, 4:42 p.m. EST

Hi Larry,

You made a few statements that deserve some reflection. I am not disagreeing with you, but I like to think further about your thoughts. Both science and religions have made errors in their respectable fields. I have already indicated why the big bang theory is one that holds no credibility because there is evidence today that the universe is a self-sustaining one. Regarding religions, they are all developments by the imaginations of men to resolve how their fellow man can lead a better life though morality and virtues that promote peace and love.

Yes, science has the advantage in that their developments can be tested and proven to work. Religion has an advantage in that faith does not permit a believer to question but accept the dogma taught. But here too, religions have weaknesses because in some cases myths are propagated or what was acceptable in their more tribal traditions are

now out of date and ignored, such as animal sacrifices. Both science and faith are two worthy methods for man to better understand himself and the world he lives in. Faith is mentally built upon a set of values that enhance truth, integrity, justice, and love. These are not things but principles by which man lives by, and I believe, it is best taught by organized religion in order to effect a standard and uniform code of morality.

Larry M., March 6, 2011, 8:14 a.m. EST

Scientists have certainly made errors. Detecting those errors is what science is all about.

As to whether religion (the faithful?) has made errors, I could not say since I am very ignorant in that area. I only have learned what some people say.

As to whether the big bang is true, I would doubt it since virtually all theories in science are proven to be untrue, even such theories as Newton's which were confirmed for hundreds of years before we discovered their flaws. So I think that with the big bang theory it's just a matter of time. (Get the joke?)

Nicholas Ginex, March 6, 2011, 3:48 p.m. EST

Hi Larry,

Thank you for the joke. I decided to give a serious reply, and it is provided below where I recommend a movement for a *religious renaissance*.

Lynn P., March 3, 2011, 11:09 p.m. EST

Good luck keeping up with what scientists believe. Darwin's "survival of the fittest" has been proven wrong. Man coming out of trees in central Africa has recently been given a jolt. (They found some hominid much older than Lucy and discovered the "jungles of Africa" at the time of these hominids were plains.) And as for this one—

Even atheists and agnostics, as well as scientists, have no idea how the first atom was created and how billions of atoms came into existence to form matter.

Not so much. Hawking believes the universal is eternal—forever expanding and contracting, thus giving question to the big bang theory.

Will science and religion ever be compatible? Probably not. That's the very realm of both fields—to ever change ideas. On the other hand, when I was a teen (many moons ago), I saw a poster I liked. A Christian is sitting on top of a mountain, and a scientist is taking his last strength to get to the same summit. I can no longer remember the words, but the idea was plain—one day scientist will gain enough knowledge to realize what Christians knew all along.

Of course, our societal “norms” have gone downhill since then—to the point where scientists are removed from their jobs when they come to the point of understanding there is “intelligent design.” When scientists aren't allowed to explore the results of their theories, *well*, let's just say someone threw a whole lot of garbage on that mountain for them to have to climb through. (Check out the documentary *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed* for more info on what's going on in the scientific community, if you're interested.)

Nicholas Ginex, March 4, 2011, 3:07 p.m. EST

Dear Lynn,

Thank you for providing your thoughts about science and God. I found your analogy of a Christian sitting on top of a mountain while the scientist was struggling to get there was very funny but a point well made. It seems that you have little faith in our esteemed scientists whose only ambition is to find out more about our world from realistic hypotheses and facts.

If you believe the Christian on the top of the mountain has a better understanding of the world and sees the world as it actually is over the scientist who searches with what can be verified, then as long as you are happy that is all that matters. Of course, you realize that scripture has been written by very righteous men, and whether they were touched by an inspiration from God to write their words or simply wrote what experience with his fellow man has taught him, you have no way of knowing.

You must realize that the Bible does have myths that are false and more truly shown to be wrong than Darwin's theory of evolution. For example, the wonderful story of God's Flood was about God being so upset with mankind that He only allowed Noah and family to survive a flood that killed every living human on earth. But this is false because Egyptologists have learned that the Egyptian people lived before and after the flood. In spite of this grievous error in the Bible, people believe that the Bible is infallible. We must all carefully accept what we choose to store in our minds. But most people read a book and swallow and ingest its words as truth. This is unfortunate.

What did you think of my analogy about dogs, cats, monkeys, and apes having DNA very similar to man? Mankind has the arrogance to believe they are made in the image of God. But nobody knows what God looks like, so how can they make such a preposterous statement?

Richard Regener, March 4, 2011, 12:13 a.m. EST

Regardless of anyone's beliefs, "*Future of God Amen*," in my opinion is a worthy read, and I am not an advocate of religions as is well known.

Nicholas Ginex, March 4, 2011, 3:20 p.m. EST

Hello Richard,

Your support for the book *Future of God Amen* is greatly appreciated. Of the many people on Gather, your experience and ability to think with an open mind has given me many hours of reflection that has made me think and rethink about conceptions and conclusions stored in my mind. Thank you for hopefully motivating readers to inquire about the book.

Texas Rocks, March 4, 2011, 12:59 a.m. EST

There would be no greater "action of God" description of *let there be light* . . . when the big bang happened. The simple explanation of it screams God all over the place. I believe creationism and evolution are the same story.

Nicholas Ginex, March 4, 2011, 3:52 p.m. EST

Hello Texas Rocks,

Thank you for your thoughts about the big bang and “let there be light.” It allows me to share some information with you that you may wish to consider and modify your thinking about the beginning of the universe. Scientists do not know how the universe was created, and the idea of a “big bang” is, at least in my mind, an infantile answer in light of what scientists, astrophysicists, and astronomers have discovered over the past two decades. An interesting book by Carl Sagan, *Cosmos*, introduces the findings of quasars and pulsars. Quasars are galaxies that have its stars collapsing inwardly, causing tremendous explosions of radiation, gases, and matter back into the universe. Pulsars are stars that are spinning at such a high rate that at its poles are radiated particles, gases, and matter being spewed back into the universe. Under gravitational forces, the expelled matter eventually, after millions of years or more, combine to form another star. That star, with its great amounts of internal heat due to the gravitational forces, will ignite and radiate light much like our own sun. This outcome of the birth of another star stands up against the theory of a big bang because if the universe is capable of forming stars and galaxies there is no need for a big bang. That is to say, the universe is self-sustaining.

Creationism and evolution are two different stories. One story tells about a God that creates man in his own image. The other story tells about man being a highly evolved creature capable of creating God within his mind. I used to believe in the big bang and the Genesis story of Creation, but I rather cling to truth provided by the history of man and what man has been able to prove about the world around him. This does not mean that one discredits the idea of God for God is an unknowable, mysterious, and incomprehensible force or entity that is man’s only answer to the beginning of the universe.

Hev L., March 4, 2011, 7:36 a.m. EST

I think that religion and science are both a part of our lives, but as for compatibility, I don’t think they will ever be like that. Science

believes one thing, and religion believes something almost completely different.

Nicholas Ginex, March 4, 2011, 6:38 p.m. EST

Hello Hev,

Thank you for coming on board. Yes, you are absolutely right science is based upon verifiable observations on which to base valid conclusions, whereas religious beliefs are based upon hypothetical ideas, for which reason theology is one of the ologies that are constructs of the mind.

I couch the question as to whether science and theology can ever be compatible, and certainly they cannot be in their approach in determining the existence of God. However, they complement each other in trying to understand the beginning of the universe. Mankind will always try to understand who is God. For even when scientists are able to determine how the first atom was formed and multiple atoms came together to form mass, mankind will still wonder where did this unknown energy come from to stimulate the creation of the universe and the birth of life.

Hev L., March 4, 2011, 7:36 p.m. EST

I think that you're right. But if we stop wondering, then we stop exploring, and if we stop exploring . . . well, then there goes all the fun.

Nicholas Ginex, March 4, 2011, 7:52 p.m. EST

How true, Hev! It is wonderful to be able to think and let the imagination roam.

Steve Bishop, March 4, 2011, 8:14 p.m. EST

Science isn't supposed to be logical. And until science can explain the origins of life, I will lean on philosophy. As a deist, I accept the first cause theory until it is disproven by science. Until science disproves it, I will remain logical.

Nicholas Ginex, March 4, 2011, 10:22 p.m. EST

Hello Steve,

Thank you for entering the discussion. As an engineer, with a lot of science and mathematics under my belt, I have to defend the scientific profession. You are using a computer, have driven a car, flew on planes, enjoy viewing TV, seen our entry into space with the prospects of landing on a planet someday, and are reading with the use of electric energy. These are all contributions from the scientific realm. It has been science that has turned around the Catholic view that the sun revolves around the earth and put poor old Galileo in prison for telling the truth.

I also love philosophy for even philosophic thoughts have developed into breakthroughs in discoveries that have contributed to wonderful inventions. At first, it was simply the thoughts of the mind that imagined the world of electrons and atoms, but through hypothetical thought, scientists have been able to develop ways to control the source of energy involving electrons.

Please share why you believe in the first cause theory, which I believe is God. But how do you characterize the first cause? I ask you this question because I am not sure if you are referring to the big bang theory.

Steve Bishop, March 4, 2011, 11:04 p.m. EST

To explain the origins of life, you must invent physics that have never been observed by science.

The big bang theory can't be explained by known physics. So is that science or faith?

For me, it's logical to assume that only a supreme being could defy the laws of physics.

Nicholas Ginex, March 4, 2011, 11:27 p.m. EST

Hello Steve,

I share your belief that only a supreme being could defy the laws of physics. But you need to be careful in characterizing God as

a “Supreme Being.” I do not know if God is a “being” that can be described by anybody. For me, God is mysterious, unknowable, and incomprehensible. To believe we are created in God’s image is a rather arrogant assumption by man. Yes, there is a God and it is wonderful to try to learn about God by learning all we can about the universe. I believe science and faith are the two parallel efforts in man’s search for God, and in that way, they complement each other.

Nicholas Ginex, March 6, 2011, 3:40 p.m. EST

Hi Larry,

What did you think of my reasoning that the universe is self-sustaining due to the phenomenon of pulsars and quasars? In both fields of science and theology, there will be errors, but the important thing is to learn from and correct those mistakes. Science people are open to revise their mistakes. But this, unfortunately, is not true with religious leaders who will fight tooth and nail to defend their religious dogma. I strongly believe that, in light of man’s knowledge of his existence today and a greater understanding of the world he lives in, scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions have got to be improved upon. This means eliminating the errors, myths, inconsistencies and incorporating higher levels of truth that allows discerning and educated people to believe in God.

A religious renaissance is needed today to have the three great religions develop a unified belief in God and eliminate the bigotry, hate, violence, and killing of innocent people because of differences in the belief in the one universal God. The book *Future of God Amen* provides many recommendations for the leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions to work together to teach a fundamental precept—love your sisters and brothers from every nation. Readers are encouraged to read an overview of the book by placing an Internet search on the title.

Larry M., March 6, 2011, 5:50 p.m. EST

Nicholas,

I don’t understand how the phenomenon of pulsars and quasars would indicate anything about whether the visible universe needs sustaining or can sustain itself. I reread this post and saw nothing about that. Perhaps a link?

The religious reawakenings that I am familiar with were not associated with tolerance, acceptance, and love for one's fellow man. I have greater hopes for my economic system which, I believe, will greatly reduce the bigotry, hate, violence, and killing of innocent people. But we are coming at the world with different backgrounds, so that isn't a surprise.

Best of luck in your endeavor. Whether mine succeeds or not, the world also needs your solution as well.

Nicholas Ginex, March 6, 2011, 6:30 p.m. EST

Larry, thank you so much for your kind words of support. Many times, like you, I feel like a lone reed in the wind. But you know, nothing ever happens unless you continue to reveal what you feel can be worthwhile for the human race.

If you would look up my response to Texas Rocks, you will see my explanation as to why pulsars and quasars emit matter back out into the universe which, under the forces of gravity, recombines and ignites into a star. In addition to the pulsars and quasars, there are black holes, which can also explode after absorbing tremendous amounts of matter, gases, and light.

Resurrection of Does a Savior Exist?

August 04, 2010 08:23 p.m. EDT

The subject title “Does a Savior Exist?” was a post by Richard Regener on June 14, 2010. It prompted my interest because I immediately thought of some savior initiated by God. But behold! I was pleased that the responses to this post dealt with imbalances of wealth and its effects on our economic system. The arguments were very interesting because they centered on our own economic downturn of today.

As a retired engineer, I often thought of the unfairness of a corporate executive receiving a salary that was as much as twenty times my salary, that is, \$70,000 against \$1,400,000. The unfairness of it all was that it was the intelligent engineers and project managers that thought of all the ideas and developed the products that made the company a success. The corporate executives simply were in the envied position of simply evaluating which of the great ideas and plans were to be chosen. That is, all the groundwork was already laid out so that a high school student with average brains could decide which one was the best course to pursue. Why should an executive make a salary of twenty people who have, perhaps, even more college, training, and experience? Is it because that executive had one great idea to exploit the ideas of others with the money they did not have?

Some solutions advocated the distribution of wealth to allow all to benefit by the economic progress of the country. However, it was clear that this socialistic solution would dissipate the desire to strive for excellence and dampen initiative to improve one’s lot. More importantly, the discussion revolved around the poor use of our money by the government in trying to stimulate the economy. Many government officials have little or no knowledge how to operate a business with a profit and loss mindset. As a result, stimulus money has been approved without the government representatives reading the

bills. Instead, they eagerly incorporate fat for their states or districts they represent.

How sad! But it is we the people, the dopes, who are stupid enough to be swayed by a charismatic man with a beautiful speaking voice, namely, our president—Obama. Here is a man who did not even know how many states made up the United States of America and is somewhat slow of mind that he needs a teleprompter to appear intelligent and fluid.

If we contrast President Obama with the fluency and spontaneity of Sarah Palin, we see the differences are quite obvious. We have a man who has less managerial, executive, and business experience than Sarah, but many people fell for the slogans “change” and “yes, we can”—words that we now know mean nothing, for Obama has repeatedly lied and has made miscalculated decisions. The prime example is that the stimulus money would reduce unemployment to 8 percent with shovel-ready programs. This miscalculation adds up to a man who has surrounded himself with other inept people.

Worse yet, he has increased the division between our people by playing the race card. His great opportunity to show he could work with both the Democrats and Republicans was a dismal failure. He rushed his health care agenda without any participation from the Republicans and he allowed deals to be pursued behind closed doors. This is a man who spoke about transparency. He also leans strongly toward favoring the Muslims as he mandated that they be employed in the space program—a decision that should only be based upon merit and competence. Hey, what about his praises for the contributions Muslims made to the United States while ignoring the contributions made by the people who built this nation and nations in other countries? I wonder, is President Obama secretly a Muslim?

Yes, I am mad about how our government is being run today, and hopefully, many of you will be proactive to go to the polls and help clean up the mess. My vote is for Sarah Palin and the many candidates she supports. It is about time we have a female instead of a male run this country. Our country needs the earthly values of this woman and the honesty, integrity, and straight shooter that she is. What man now exhibits her character of goodness and common sense? She is not the dope many try to make her out to be. We are the dopes for believing the propaganda that slanders her. Yes, I am mad, mad as hell!

Comments and Responses

Richard Regener, August 5, 2010, 2:58 a.m. EDT

An interesting perspective, Nicholas, although Sarah Palin from her press releases is not someone I would be looking at as a public policy advocate. Just an opinion.

Nicholas Ginex, August 5, 2010, 2:16 p.m. EDT

Hello Richard,

As a father of four beautiful and intelligent women, and in my lifetime having associated with women from all walks of life, my admiration and respect for their sensitivity and intelligence outweigh many of the men I have met. The prime reason I point to Sarah as a savior of our dismal economy is her experience in the business and political world that far exceeds that of our president. It is honesty and the application of fairness and common sense that Sarah Palin projects, at least to me.

I would like to be informed about where the press releases against her are negative or wanting. Of course, if you are referring to the pro-Obama media press releases, a very poor picture of her is purposely part of their propaganda campaign.

Richard Regener, August 5, 2010, 4:51 p.m. EDT

Your points are well taken, Nicholas, and for the most I would have to agree with them. It could just be my perception of the lady at present that is faulty and the fact that I don't keep up with U.S. politics like I used to. Either way there is going to be a hard struggle ahead no matter who is in power.

Dorothy H. Aug 6, 2010, 8:48pm EDT

Sarah Palin? No. I have intelligent and beautiful daughters, too. There are an enormous number from which to choose, as possible candidates, but Palin? Uh, uh! She's barely average. Willing? Yes. From what I've observed of her tactics, and willingness to blatantly lie? No way!

Nicholas Ginex, August 6, 2010, 11:04 p.m. EDT

Dear Dorothy,

I am surprised to learn that Sarah Palin has blatantly lied. Please inform me what she has lied about. Your uh, uh impressions of Sarah Palin left me thinking that a post in Sarah's defense should be made. You will see it shortly under the title, "Why Do Many Women Disrespect Sarah Palin?"

Jerome k., August 5, 2010, 8:52 a.m. EDT

Without a degree of what we call "democracy," which some may take for granted (bearing in mind the interesting ways that other countries "run" their "governments"), there might well be a branch of anarchy in action. A healthy option some might think, but we would have the "top dogs" being those who have enough material wealth, enough men in their tribe as being the most powerful, the ones who "do" things. The poor and the weak, the sick and the dying would have little place in the world then.

At least, with the voting system (and I'm not familiar with the minutiae of the U.S. one), we have an illusion of civility between the candidates and a chance for the "people," those without the time to do the stuff which the candidates can do, to make a choice about who is doing that stuff for the people.

The allusion, however, to there being a "savior" among us already, with the obvious references to the historic hopes and alleged promises in a collection of documents written some 1,700-2,000 years ago, with the oft forgotten tinkering and translating, reinterpreting, and re-selection (Emperor Constantine et al.) to suit certain persuasions, we cannot but think that the person might already have come and gone. Who's to say?

Further, in terms of what any deity thinks, does, says, and hears could only be, again, interpreted by those who think they are "privileged" enough or capable of hearing such voices. To depend upon the wisdom of two millennia ago might well be to find the beliefs, practices, and thoughts of that time are somewhat inappropriate for the twenty-first century and to willingly ignore what has been provided, discovered, invented since.

Perhaps the implied promises were an attempt to reach out for hope rather than actually “knowing” that there would be such a person as “a savior.” It could be that, after all, we are our own saviors.

Nicholas Ginex, August 5, 2010, 2:31 p.m. EDT

Hello Jerome,

Yes, I agree with you that “we” are our own saviors. We must act collectively in the country elections to evaluate who will lead us with the attributes of truth, justice, and righteousness. There have been men in the past who recognized that these attributes were fundamental in the stability of their civilization. I would like to refer you to my website www.futureofgodamen.com

There you will be able to review a book that goes into the history of the *Creation of God* and how that God has had a profound influence on the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions.

But also a critique of the Torah, New Testament, and Koran is provided with an examination of some of our saviors whose mission was to provide morality and rules of conduct for us to live by. Finally, the book provides recommendations to the leaders of the three major religions to unify their scriptures and teach the Word of God. Funny, many people read the Bible but do not know what the Word of God is. It was stated three times in the Gospel of John. Do you think you know what it is?

Henry Feng, August 5, 2010, 5:41 p.m. EDT <http://www.gather.com/viewArticle.action?articleId=281474978424267>

Nicholas Ginex, August 6, 2010, 3:19 p.m. EDT

Hello Henry,

Upon reading the article you referenced in your response, I was motivated to write a post. “It Is a shame! Surfaces Again.” Thank you for informing me of newsworthy information.

It Is a Shame! Surfaces Again

August 05, 2010 11:57 p.m. EDT

This post was motivated after reading Henry Feng's response to the Gather post "Resurrection of Does a Savior Exist?" Henry directed me to read the article, "*It is a Shame!*" by Sen. Weiner of New York. This article has my total agreement with the points and issues made. Trying to put all the issues into simplistic terms, I believe there is a breakdown in the values our country was built on. As the American people became wealthier, their children enjoyed the benefits of a higher education. But also for many of them it came easy, and they were spoon fed as they enjoyed a better life. But also their education was not challenged with the trials of disappointments in life by gaining successes on their own merits. The ease of American life and taking our freedoms for granted has caused an indifference by some people. There are people who stand by when somebody burns the American flag or swallows the garbage of rhetoric given them by corrupt politicians and misguided teachers.

I have had discussions on how we can improve our relationships with each other and how we can all strive to achieve a better world for all of us. These discussions have been examined by righteous men throughout the ages. A bit of history will reveal that it was the ancient Egyptians that were first to develop the concept of one universal God, the idea of a soul, and the reward of a hereafter upon living a righteous life. They were the first civilization to be successful in establishing an empire that existed for more than three thousand years.

What made this civilization so successful whereby men dedicated their lives in the arts, engineering, agriculture, planning of irrigation systems, and the building of great structures as the pyramids and temples?

I venture to assert that it was their profound belief in God, at first local gods, but it was the Priesthood of Amon that finally endorsed the concept of *Amon as the Sole God*. This belief was ingrained into the Egyptian belief system a generation before Moses walked out of Egypt. But what was the greatest attribute of this God? *It is truth*. This attribute was fundamental to all the moral codes of conduct Egyptians followed so that they can join their God for eternity.

The need for *truth*, which engenders trust and leads to honest and sincere relationships, is needed today in every aspect of our lives. Be it in the political, educational, and scientific spheres, without truth our country will be reduced to more materialistic desires, incentive to demean others, and corruption as people take advantage of others.

Please visit the website www.futureofgodamen.com

There you are introduced to a book that deals with the history of how man first conceived God and how that God has had a profound effect on the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. The book provides a critique of the Torah, New Testament, and Koran and reveals deficiencies overlooked by the religious leaders of these religions. But also recommendations are given for these leaders and their worshippers to follow the *Word of God*. I am dumbfounded by how many religious people who read the Bible extensively do not know the *Word of God*. *Future of God Amen* provides a truthful understanding of God's Word stated three times in the Bible. Do you know what the *Word of God* is? If you find the website portrays an author who is trying to teach people worldwide about the origin of God and why it is essential to accept the *truth* about God, I would be honored if you would buy the book, read it, and share its information with others.

Knowledge Is a Wonderful Gift

At a cost of only \$20, the book should be available for sale in September 2010.

By the way, on the contact author website page, let me know what you think about the information on the website—pros or cons.

I do not care to get rich with the sale of this book. All profits to me will go into giving this book away at a lower cost. It is education of the masses that is my agenda. Support my mission if you feel the same way.

Comments and Responses

No comments were received.

Commentary on the Dignity of Difference

January 12, 2011 06:11 p.m. EST

Jonathan Sacks, a conservative rabbi, exhibits exceptional scholarship and dedication to his profession. His book *The Dignity of Difference* advocates respect and tolerance between peoples of all religions who have different conceptions and ritual traditions in the god(s) they worship. He supports the dignity of people who are of different religions, and this is a fundamental ethic principle that should be honored and embraced by people of different races and beliefs. Rabbi Sacks presents several cornerstones that are necessary for people to respect the dignity of others who have different spiritual beliefs. The rabbi lists them as control, contribution, compassion, creativity, cooperation, conservation, and conciliation. A chapter is devoted to these seven “C’s,” whereby Rabbi Sacks shows how economic, political, technological, and global issues affect groups of people and play a role in affecting how people live and work together.

Although much is written to define “what” the “C’s” are and how they affect the relationships between people, Rabbi Sacks was weak in providing “how” people can respect and tolerate each other’s religious differences. It is wonderful to embrace the differences of other religious beliefs because it allows people to expand their views and become open to how special other groups of people are. It is like learning to enjoy different foods of different flavors from different countries rather than living on a limited diet with a few variations of taste.

The dignity of difference between people of different countries and cultures is easily achieved when it involves humane feelings of affection. Personally, having been raised in the heart of New York City

and been exposed to many different people of different nationalities, I have played, eaten, and embraced friendships with races of many colors. They had accepted me just as I enjoyed their friendships and the smiles on their faces. A melting pot of many types of people from around the world, we were friends and supported each other. This is an easy dignity to attain between different people even though we went to different churches and temples of worship. In fact, I went to houses of worship other than a Catholic church. There is no problem in respecting another's religious beliefs.

However, there is a problem with the dignity of difference when religious beliefs themselves include intolerance of the beliefs of other religions, and it is this very problem Rabbi Sacks avoided discussing in his book. He constantly brings up that there is a problem in having all humanity share the *same* religion. We all agree this is foolish in light of the love and dignity each group of people have for their own culture and traditions. But we cannot agree to respect a religion that advocates bigotry, hate, violence, and killing of innocent people, a religion that is forced upon people by intimidation and force. Rabbi Sacks identified that there are Muslim religious fanatics that are a danger to other people that follow another religion. But he was remiss in not identifying the problem and possible solutions. A scholar of religions, he certainly knows what the Koran contents advocate, but he was not perceptive and courageous enough to identify the problem starts within this document and runs counter to the dignity of difference.

As a conservative, Rabbi Sacks has a strong belief of the Judaic religion and is proud to remind his readers that it is his religion that is the root of the Christian and Islamic religions. He is correct, but he fails to acknowledge that the Judaic religion also has its roots in another belief system from which the concept of one universal God first originated. Let us read Rabbi Sacks's statement that deprives the Egyptian religion of the dignity it deserves by giving credit to Judaism for developing the first monotheistic belief in one God. He states, "*What makes Judaism significant in a global context is that it was **the world's first monotheism**, giving rise not only to its own faith but also to the environment from which Christianity and Islam both emerged.*"

A critique of Rabbi Sacks's statement is necessary because not only do Judaic religious leaders refuse to acknowledge that the belief in one universal God was inherited from an ancient civilization, but it is

also endemic of Christian and Islamic religious leaders, out of pride, fear, intolerance, or ignorance that they do not recognize God first introduced Himself to mankind in the name of Amen.

Let us examine why the first half of Rabbi Sacks's statement is false. Judaism was not the world's first monotheism. Every respectable scholar of religion knows that the first introduction of a monotheistic god was conceived in Egypt by the uncelebrated pharaoh, Amenhotep IV, who changed his name to Ikhnaton to revere his god Aton. A few generations later, the Priesthood of Amon wrote scripture titled Amon as the Sole God. It was written in 1270 BCE, two decades before the Moses Exodus. This is a highly significant oversight by religious leaders which, if continued, will eventually lead to the breakdown of the Judaic, Christian and Islamic religions. Why? It is because the truth of the very roots of these religions is not acknowledged. It is no accident that the name Amen has been announced through the centuries up to our present day. It has never been forgotten in the minds of worshippers as they state Amen at the end of a prayer, supplication, giving thanks and praise, and singing the name Amen.

Only by acknowledging that they, the three monotheistic religions, all have their roots in the common God Amen will they release hypocrisy and establish truth that allows growth in the belief in God. By acknowledging the legacy of our belief in God, mankind can understand that God has introduced Himself to groups of people in stages, first beginning with the Egyptians. We must embrace knowledge from the past rather than hide it due to arrogance and pride that one people flaunts over another. With truth, religious faith can rise in parallel with our scientific quest to know God. Perhaps God has given the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religious leaders a test of truth, a challenge to accept that Amen is the beginning of the creation of God. Are these religious leaders truthful and courageous to acknowledge Amen is a *common bond* whereby they are able to unite their beliefs in the one universal God? Jesus Christ in Revelation 3:14 proclaimed Amen as *the beginning of the creation of God*.

These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the
beginning of the creation of God.

Many scholars of religion and Egyptologists conclude that it was the Egyptians that developed the belief in one universal God. In 1375 BCE, the pharaoh Amenhotep IV laid the groundwork of creating

and disseminating, in just seventeen years, the concept of one god. Upon his death, the priesthood desecrated his tomb and erased his name from monuments and temples throughout Egypt. But a powerful idea *that embraces and lifts mankind to a better understanding of God and His world cannot be erased. Only two generations later, ca. 1270 BCE*, the Priesthood of Amon wrote scripture extolling and venerating their God by writing *Amon as the Sole God*. A few decades later, in 1250 BCE, Moses walked out of Egypt and taught a following of over 600,000 people the belief in one God.

A further review of this pharaoh's contribution reveals that he was also the first man of God to include not just his people in the new belief in one God, but as stated below, *his God was universal for all mankind* by including the countries of Syria and Nubia.

Universal Creation

How manifold it is, what thou hast made!
They are hidden from the face (of man).

O sole god, like whom there is no other!
Thou didst create the world according to thy heart.

Whilst thou wert alone: all men, cattle and wild beasts,
whatever is on earth, going upon (its) feet, and what is on high,
flying with its wings.

The countries of Syria and Nubia, the *land* of Egypt;
thou settest every man in his place,

Thou suppliest their necessities. Everyone has his food,
and his time of life is reckoned.

Their tongues are separate in speech and their natures as well; their
skins are distinguished, as thou distinguishest the foreign peoples.

Upon reading the above extract, can it be said that the Hebrews also included people other than their own kind in the belief in one universal God? History shows this was never the case, and in fact, the Judaic religion is not noted for proselytizing their faith and embracing people from other countries. Therefore, to say Judaism should be equated as being significant in a global context is a distortion of the truth.

The birth of Christianity and later Islam emulated the belief in one God, but the development of these religions was not a consequence of any effort by the Hebrews. On the contrary, it was the Council of the Pharisees, in John 11:47 and 48, that expressed a fear of the rising importance of Jesus Christ as stated below:

What do we? For this man doeth many miracles. If we let him thus alone, all men will believe him: and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation.

The high priest of the council, Caiaphas, stated in John 11:49, 50:

Ye know nothing at all, nor consider it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation (Israel) perish not.

Caiaphas then prophesied that Jesus should die for their nation. From that day forward, the council was determined to put Jesus to death (John 11:51, 53). John's Gospel therefore clearly indicates it was the high priest and members of the council that were intent on killing Jesus as opposed to Jesus giving up His life so that the sins of mankind may be forgiven. For Rabbi Sacks to say Judaism was the first monotheistic religion that gave rise to an environment that stimulated the emergence of Christianity is disingenuous.

Rabbi Sacks wrote *The Dignity of Difference* to extol the uniqueness and differences of each religion. Each religion serves to teach ethical and moral values, which is the basis of their existence in addition to love and worship of God. However, it is religious dogma that causes divisions among people. A prime example is the Koran, which does not advocate tolerance for the belief and worship of gods other than Allah. Does any reasonable person really believe that there is *dignity of difference* that needs to be praised for the Islamic religion when their scripture advocates bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent people that will not worship Allah?

Is there a possibility for peace and love between the people of the monotheistic religions? I believe there is if these religions acknowledge there is a *common bond* of the Egyptian God Amen that gave rise to their belief in one universal God. This God has existed for over two thousand years before the birth of Jesus Christ. His name has been appended to the throne names of more than a dozen pharaohs since

2,000 BCE. Jesus Christ has acknowledged Amen as the beginning of the creation of God, and yet religious leaders, up to the present, due to pride, arrogance, and desire to maintain power, will not endorse the belief that one universal God first originated within Egypt.

The *Dignity of Difference* by Rabbi Sacks is well written to define “what” the problems are and “how” those problems have created animosity between different groups of people. However, in light of Rabbi Sacks’s knowledge of religions, it appears he lacks the fortitude and courage to admit a truth in Revelation 3:14 that indicates Judaism is an outgrowth of Egyptian religious beliefs and that there are suras in the Koran that advocate bigotry, hate, violence, and the killing of innocent people who do not accept Allah as their God.

Conclusions supported in this article are as follows: (1) Judaism is *not the world’s first monotheism*, (2) the pharaoh Amenhotep IV was *the first to conceive and establish* the worship of one universal God of Egypt and other countries, (3) the Priesthood of Amon wrote *Amon as the Sole God* at least two decades before the Moses Exodus, and (4) Jesus Christ proclaimed *Amen as the beginning of the creation of God*.

Detailed factual findings by respected scholars of religion and Egyptologists that support these conclusions may be obtained by placing an Internet search on *Future of God Amen*. Is it possible for religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions to respect and embrace each other’s religious beliefs and differences by agreeing that they all have a *common Bond*, the God Amen? Such an acknowledgement will initiate the building of a new relationship of love and understanding between their worshippers.

Comments and Responses

X Tabber, January 11, 2011, 6:27 p.m. EST

Interesting! Just a clarification, a “conservative” rabbi means the conservative flavor of Judaism and hopefully won’t be confused with political spectrum. In Judaism, orthodox refers to the literal interpretation of Judaism, most often represented by the Hassidic

and other fundamentalist Jewish sects. Conservative Judaism is misnamed—it is more aptly called mildly secular Judaism. The last major flavor is reform Judaism, which is very secular.

Arguably, Zoroaster might precede Aten (who you've called Amen), but that's a scholarly debate that I'm unprepared to participate in.

Nicholas Ginex, January 11, 2011, 11:05 p.m. EST

Dear X Tabber,

Thank you for entering this post. Your distinctions as to my naming Rabbi Sacks a “conservative” are appreciated. I realize people are very sensitive being labeled in a particular category. However, it was Rabbi Sacks that made an autobiographical admission on page 10 of his book, *The Dignity of Difference*, that his faith is orthodox. He further justifies his position by stating, “I am used to being called, by my liberal colleagues, a fundamentalist, and it is precisely here that contemporary challenge is most acute. The revivals in most of the world's faiths in recent decades have been at the conservative rather than liberal end of the spectrum. The power of conservative religious movements has been precisely the fact that they represent protests against, rather than accommodations to, late modernity.”

A clarification about Aten (I believe you meant Aton) as being Amen is not correct. Yes, the pharaoh Amenhotep IV introduced Aton as the one universal God of Egypt, Syria, and Nubia, but it was the Priesthood of Amon that extolled *Amon as the Sole God* around 1270 BCE (Amon is an alternate spelling of Amen). The book, *Future of God Amen*, provides a detailed history that further clarifies that the Egyptian priesthood developed the belief in one universal god that was later taught to the Hebrews by Moses who had learned of the new belief in his forty years living as an adopted son of an Egyptian pharaoh. This book will be available as an e-book in about three weeks.

X Tabber, January 12, 2011, 10:35 a.m. EST

Ah, thanks for the clarification. If he is orthodox, it's likely he's also conservative as well. The passage from the book supports that. His statement about reacting to modernity is also telling.

I'm still not 100 percent clear about the timing of Aton/Amon, but the point about it preceding Judaism is understood.

Nicholas Ginex, January 12, 2011, 5:10 p.m. EST

You're a man with an open and inquiring mind, and I am encouraged by your response. I can understand you're not 100 percent clear about Egyptian history as it is not taught at a level that teaches their culture and religion in depth. This is very likely due to the fact that the Egyptian hieroglyphics were only deciphered a little over hundred years ago and the writers of history books have been slow to reveal new findings by Egyptologists.

Nicholas Ginex, January 13, 2011, 4:14 p.m. EST

The following comment and my response "was deleted" without my authorization and is added. It appears that Susan's comment for use by students and my reference to a dissertation fee caused the deletion.

Susan bell84, January 12, 2011, 5:48 a.m. EST (Comment)

The good thing about your information is that it is explicit enough for students to grasp. Thanks for your efforts in spreading academic knowledge.

Nicholas Ginex, January 12, 2011, 5:33 p.m. EST (Response)

Dear Susan,

I am pleased to read that you found my information useful concerning the book about *The Dignity of Difference* or specifics about the Egyptian creation of one universal God Amen. Whether you are a teacher or student, you can find a wealth of information about the Egyptian religion and how its beliefs have had a profound influence on the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. The book *Future of God Amen* was written to inform people about a legacy we should embrace and serve as an educational resource for those interested in sociology, civilizations, theology, psychology, and humanity studies. It will be made available as an e-book and obtained at a cost of only \$10.00 dollars (which is a better buy than investing in a "dissertation"). If you have a few moments, place an Internet search on *Future of God Amen*. Thank you.

Fren W., January 12, 2011, 4:34 p.m. EST

I read through your opening paragraphs and a bit of the closing; perhaps I should've completed the reading before drawing my conclusion? Repetition of this word stopped me:

The word "accept" would be better replaced with "respect." There is a very important difference. I, too, found living in NY (for a time) quite the learning experience.

Thank you for your respectful approach to this topic. Refreshing.

Nicholas Ginex, January 12, 2011, 6:00 p.m. EST

Hello Fren,

Your use of the word "respect" for accept in the fourth paragraph of my article is a better intended action. The sentence has been revised as follows: But we cannot agree to respect a religion that advocates bigotry, hate, violence, and killing of innocent people.

If you revisit the article and have any thoughts you would like for me to respond to, I would be honored. Thank you.

Fren W., January 13, 2011, 9:35 a.m. EST

I really appreciated reading your closing too. That is what haunted me as I read the beginnings. There are some differences that God would not condone; however, various faiths may refer to or profess to honor Him.

Having read countless social site blogs about faith, it was refreshing and seems sadly unique anymore to find opinions that are as flexible (nonjudgmental) as God is with us.

Richard Regener, January 18, 2011, 1:49 a.m. EST

Hello again Nicholas (smiling),

Although I have not read *The Dignity of Difference*, I gather this book is another in a long line of publications directed toward a singular belief system to be headed by one dominating faith, which also does

not acknowledge its origins. This of course does not surprise me as you well know. Unfortunately your nemesis is the desire for control that equals power, which can never be defeated although it can be neutralized through the application of balance and turning away from the extremes found in the life cycle.

Nicholas Ginex, January 19, 2011, 4:17 p.m. EST

The Dignity of Difference, written by Rabbi Sacks, was not an attempt for any one religion to dominate other religions, but to respect and tolerate the differences of other religions. My commentary only served to highlight the misconception by Rabbi Sacks that Judaism was the first monotheistic religion. As demonstrated by this rabbi, the leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions are very proud of their dogmas and scriptures, which is the reason why they advocate the dignity of difference. However, they will eventually cause the downfall of their religions because they all will not admit that their beliefs originated from the Egyptian religion. They all have a common bond, and they announce that bond whenever they say or sing *Amen*, who was the greatest Egyptian God. As you know, my mission is to reveal to people around the world that the book, *Future of God Amen*, was written to reveal a legacy in the belief in one universal God by the Egyptian priesthood. To this day, that legacy has not been acknowledged by leaders of the three monotheistic religions.

Knowledge Is a Wonderful Gift, Amen

October 12, 2010 06:57 p.m. EDT

To members of this group, I look to you to share knowledge I have acquired over a lifetime as a working man. When I retired, at sixty-eight, I sat down at the computer to write a *Legacy of a Father* for my four daughters. However, after several weeks into the writing, I realized that the book was creating itself into a universal topic—the beginning of the creation of God. Originally 650 pages, the book was too long for the average reader, and I decided to rewrite it to deal specifically with the origin of man's conception of one universal God.

The new edition is titled *Future of God Amen*. I encourage all readers and students of sociology, civilizations, philosophy, theology, history, and humanities to visit the website www.futureofgodamen.com

There you will find the key to a wealth of information that presents a history of the development of the belief in a universal God, the creator of all there is. Upon introducing the reader to who were the Egyptians and what were their beliefs, the author shows how those beliefs influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. More importantly, after an objective critique of the Torah, New Testament, and the Koran, recommendations are provided for religious leaders and worshippers of these religions to unify their beliefs and teach the Word of God—*love one another*.

I look forward to your reviews of the website and hopefully your comments about the book. I would appreciate your thoughts via an e-mail from the website or e-mailing me at *nickginex@gmail.com* It is the youth and individuals of all ages that I wish will join in bringing to light the truth to their friends and associates about a wonderful past, a legacy we should be proud of.

Yours truly,

Nicholas P. Ginex

Hello to Elsie Duggan

August 03, 2010 07:07 p.m. EDT views:
94 | 2 people recommend this | comments: 3

Invite your friends who aren't Gather members to view this post.

Dear Elsie,

I visited your home page and was impressed with the beautiful poetry you wrote. I invite Gather members to visit your home page and benefit from the words of a wonderful human being.

Nick Ginex

Comments and Responses

René Allen, August 3, 2010, 9:25 p.m. EDT

Now that is very *true*, Nicholas.

Elsie is the *queen* here in Gatherland. I think that there are not too many people who do not know that.

Thanks for sharing this . . .

Blessings

René

Dana F., August 3, 2010, 9:30 p.m. EDT

What a wonderful compliment to Elsie and very thoughtful of you to take the time to say it!

Have a great evening.

Steph-in-NE, August 4, 2010, 12:34 a.m. EDT

She is a dear friend of mine. She loves to hear from us all.

A Review of Edward

September 17, 2011 07:50 p.m. EDT

Dear Gather readers,

I just finished reading *Edward*, a novel by Mike Voyce. So impressed was I by his writing style and storytelling, I am compelled to provide my review below:

A Review of Edward—A Novel by Mike Voyce

Hello Mike,

My first impressions of your novel are that you have a fine writing style. Your sentences are not long, flowery, or pedantic but clear and enjoyable to read. You entered into your two main characters very nicely and the tension of affection you created between them was charming and offered anticipation of greater things to follow in their relationship. I have only read the first nine pages, but I must say I have enjoyed the conversation between Sarah and the unknown main character I take to be Edward. It was amusing to read our hero felt he was manipulated by possibly being placed under a hypnotic spell.

The following comments will be made as I read on. I just wanted you to know that you are very good with words and unfolding an interesting story.

In the following pages (after page 9), I see you did a master's job in getting our main character (MC) to dig into the past, which was initiated by the initial hypnotic spell of Sarah. MC learned to recall the past through meditation and successfully found there was an Edward born in 1478 and died in 1521 for treason.

You entered into the life of Edward when he was just a little boy. Your novel is beautifully written in a story-spun fashion that takes the reader to another period of time. Good work! I liked the way you transitioned from the present into the past and back with your “*past*.”

As the author, you constantly talk to the reader, which shows a masterful touch at writing. I liked how you explained to the reader that you will later describe why the duke of Buckingham rebelled. I also tend to talk to the reader in making a point. You did so with the following on page 24, “Man proposes but God disposes and Man’s destiny is not in his own hands.” But also I like the way you digress to read a novel within a novel; “the novelty is to reveal what lay in my mind” (page 39).

It’s funny that you mentioned Giordano Bruno on page 40, for he was introduced to me by overhearing a conversation between my father and his brothers. In writing *Future of God Amen*, I researched the life of this man and was impressed with his perception and existence of life in other parts of our universe. He was presented in the first chapter as one of the reasons that motivated me to write the book. It was after he wrote “*De I’Infinito, Universo e Mondi*” that gave the Church fathers reason to burn him at the stake.

After reading pages through sixty-six, I was interested in your wanderings into the question of the soul. You had channeled many times by now into Edward’s life, and I particularly enjoyed your association of Eadie to Sarah. At this point, I became interested in your thoughts about the soul and how one’s life may be linked to past lives. In any case, I have enjoyed how you weave a story and the style of your writing. It was as if I was reading something I would have written but only in terms of its writing style.

The brief history of England’s kings, princes, and so on was somewhat interesting for I never was exposed to the many marriages that were legitimate verses secondhand picks toward the throne. I plodded on through those pages that ended on page 88 only because it was new information for me. All the names and different avenues to the kingship were overwhelming, but the exposure was a learning experience. In gaining knowledge, there must be tolerance for pain in absorbing details that may not be of great interest but rounds out a clearer perspective of the past.

Upon reaching page 195, I learned much about Edward, in particular, the growing love relationship and intimacy with Eadie, his first true love. I was impressed with the training Edward received from Thomas in swordsmanship. It was exciting reading to see his success with somebody that challenged him to the death and later how he stood off five upstarts intent on killing him in an inn. After the two fights to defend himself and save his life, Edward got some wise counseling from William Gibbons, and it is repeated here for others to add to their store or wisdom: "Listen to me, Edward, if you remain so open and honest, if you continue to be ruled by your heart instead of your head, it will lead straight to the block."

The interview Edward had with Master William Gibbons and Sir Reginald Bray was most interesting concerning his use of rental monies for servants that made life more tolerable for Eadie, Thomas, and Aletia. In spite of Edward's letter of defiance to Margaret and the reprimands received from William and Sir Reginald, Edward countered with a commonsense reply in defense of his actions. The conversation was a believable one and conducted on a noble level (pages 247-51).

As a writer, you have a great understanding of love and fortunate to have met women with intelligence, good looks, and love of life; yet you are wise to know that what is really needed, by both man and woman, is to love someone who returns your love, with a pure heart and a true spirit (page 271).

Mike, your book has a wealth of information about kings and other nobles of England. I am curious. Are the relationships you describe of royal and illegitimate nobility factual? If so, I must say you have opened a new world to the average reader about the history of England and its bond to Christianity. I applaud you for revealing much information that, for the most part, appears to be factual. However, if I am wrong and the novel is purely fictional, it still was worthwhile reading for it gave a true perspective of that period in time.

There was a little philosophical thought you tinkered with about fatalism and predestination whereby Edward was bound to meet his duties as a subject of the king (page 286). In reverence to the king, duty and position had to be honored in deference to pride and arrogance in defending a principle. Still, Edward, you, and I share another point of view, and that is, "On the other hand, I railed against injustices and

demanded of Heaven and Earth my sovereign right to amend what didn't please me. What a sick joke does that same human misery make if we have the power but not the wit or the will to change it?" It is these words that reminded me why I wrote and continue to reveal to others how God was first conceived by mankind in *Future of God Amen*.

So, Michael, you brought me on a journey to a world I had no knowledge of. Throughout my life, I often envied kings, queens, and royalty and always felt that they lived off the sweat and labor of others. I always felt they should work as hard for a living as other people do. However, your novel has given me another perspective of royalty in that they also have a sense for duty and responsibility to their subjects. I sympathized with the life Edward had to lead, for he was not able to make choices of his own. Now I know that it took great courage for a prince to give up being a king to marry for love. Unfortunately, Edward was in a quandary, actually a box, in having to choose between duty to country and his young love. Here the reason of the mind had to dominate over feelings of the heart. But there are many other stories where heartfelt love, without use of the mind, leads to disaster once the passion is mellowed.

I will not critique the book further for I believe I have expressed my pleasure in reading about the lives of another period. But most of all you are a gifted writer, and I am very happy to have read your novel. In fact, I will be buying a few "Edwards" to give as gifts to my nephews and nieces.

Your friend, wishing you success always,

Nicholas P. Ginex

Comments and Responses

Mike Voyce, September 18, 2011, 1:07 p.m. EDT

I know, from other places, Nicholas Ginex has a sharp and perceptive mind. Nicholas, I am therefore most truly grateful for the time and care you took over this review.

It was particularly helpful that you quoted from the book and gave further details, so let me answer your question straight away: As far

as I am able to make it so, Edward tells the truth, both about Edward Stafford and myself.

The chapter “The Kings of England” explains the most complicated century of English history. It was politically critical that the Tudors had neither any claim to the throne nor wealth in land or honor while Edward had an overwhelming claim to be king (later recognized at law) and the greatest estates in England. Much of the way he was treated is explained by this.

Nicholas, thank you for mentioning aspects of the book which I, too, think are important—Edward is not just about setting straight the truth of history, and I hope it is very relevant to readers, including your nephews and nieces.

Nicholas Ginex, September 18, 2011, 3:30 p.m. EDT

Thank you, Mike, for writing a book that reveals some of the “truth” that has been bypassed by historians regarding the king and other royalty in England. But most of all, you give the reader a perspective of English nobility and their interaction with the common man that few people are able to relate to.

Once people have read Edward, they will very likely be inclined to buy it as a gift for their friends and relatives. Well written in style and a wealth of human content that make your characters dear friends of the mind.

Is Our President an Effective Leader?

August 08, 2010 06:35 p.m. EDT

There is a need to evaluate our president's ability to be an effective leader for America. An open forum among our members will help to see Obama's strengths and weaknesses.

Unfortunately, the news media and politicians have been distorting the truth about our president. So much so, that a Gather member stated that there is "incredibly unfounded hate toward Obama." Such an allegation breeds bigotry and hate. Instead, we must rationally examine "is our president an effective or poor leader?"

To have our members reply to this question, I will indicate why I believe *President Obama is a poor leader*. Upon being voted by the American people, white, black, brown, red, yellow, a representative sample across the country, President Obama had one of the greatest opportunities to bring the different parties in Congress and Senate together. That is his promise that he was going to unite the people in our country through transparency of government. He did not do that. He did not use his office, the power of the presidency, to publicly express unity of the parties and encourage them to work together. Instead, he favored his Democratic Party to control his agendas, such as passage of the stimulus bill(s) and health care. Therefore, he did not honor his promise to us to unite our country with transparency of political decisions. This is a weakness due to most likely his inexperience to work well with different parties that have different points of view. This outcome of being a weak leader may be due to his inexperience in the political arena where he only got his feet wet and his lack of business experience to be able to work with many points of view and decide on complex decisions.

His decision-making ability is very slow. Note how long President Obama took to determine how many troops were needed to support the war effort so long that his general had to eventually resign. Note how long President Obama took to send troops to assist at the Arizona, California, and Texas borders. His support proved to be too little too late. Rather, he believes in suing Arizona for trying to protect their people from illegal aliens and drug dealers. Also, he exhibited immaturity when he reacted to supporting a black man without having read or reviewed the facts. Later he did not apologize for his error. Obama also has shown a preference for Muslims by publicly stating to the American people that they have made great contributions to our country; what are their accomplishments? He neglected to mention that many immigrants from Europe were the founders and builders of our country. He even issued an order to the executive official of NASA to employ Muslims in the space program. Is that necessary? We all know that positions in any job should be based upon experience and education. Instead of apologizing for America to other countries, he could have shown that the American people have built many other countries and have offered food and medical assistance to those in need. Recently, we see how slowly he reacted to the oil spill in the Gulf and his quickness to blame others for his inaction.

The above reasons are presented so that we can discuss if they have merit, are true, or that there are positions by the president we are not giving him credit for. Your views, pro or con, to what has been presented will help clear the air and make us more intelligent of our president's effectiveness. It appears that Obama's performance indicates that he would have been wiser to run for President after he had acquired more political, managerial, and business skills.

President Obama was fortunate to win the presidency because he received most likely 95 percent of the black vote. There's nothing wrong with that. We all have our preference which, unfortunately, breeds some bigotry. But the women in our country do not appear to be as smart or loyal to their kind as the "blacks" by supporting another woman who can represent them in the highest office in the United States. That woman is Sarah Palin. If we can vote a man into office with less experience in the political and business world, then why not vote for Sarah Palin? Your rationale for supporting Obama or showing disapproval of his performance as a leader is welcomed.

Please do not degrade your person by writing inflammatory and insulting comments. This forum is for the benefit of seeking truth and understanding about our president. By throwing stones with stupid remarks, we miss an opportunity to demonstrate we are loving and compassionate human beings.

Comments and Responses

Ron Hall, August 8, 2010, 9:46 p.m. EDT

He is not as effective as I would like. He's put far too much effort into steering the middle course while getting very little cooperation from the other direction. He has continued to keep troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, which is very much at odds with the democratic voter base. He has continued to keep in place much of the secrecy that characterized the previous administration, which as you point out is contrary to his promise of transparency. His policy toward offshore oil drilling has baffled environmentalists. He does sincerely want to work with both sides, but the party out of power is not interested. I don't blame them of course. If I were them, I would be doing exactly what they're doing. Their best bet for recovering from their recent losses is to fight tooth and nail and not admit to any degree of competence on his part.

René Allen, August 8, 2010, 10:20 p.m. EDT

Hi Nicholas,

I'm sure this will stimulate discussion.

On your point of view . . .

"I will indicate why I believe President Obama is a poor leader. Upon being voted by the American people, white, black, brown, red, yellow, a representative sample across the country, President Obama had one of the greatest opportunities to bring the different parties in Congress and Senate together. That is his promise that he was going to unite the people in our country through transparency of Government. He did not do that. He did not use his office, the power of the Presidency, to publicly express unity of the parties and encourage them to work together. Instead, he favored his Democratic Party to control his

agendas, such as passage of the stimulus bill(s) and health care. Therefore, he did not honor his promise to us to unite our country with transparency of political decisions.” (Nicholas Ginex)

Your argument is not strong here to convince me to believe in the way you do. Where are the *facts*?

I’m just wondering when the Congress and Senate were ever together? You make it sound as if it is an extremely easy thing to do—bringing the parties together . . . (I’m smiling). If that were the case, they would not be separate entities in the first place. There are many underlying factors that you are leaving out.

I’m also wondering if you think you could handle the job. If so, how would you do it better? What experience do you have? Do you know how the government works?

This statement that you made is clearly erroneous:

“He did not use his office, the power of the Presidency, to publicly express unity of the parties and encourage them to work together.”
Nicholas Ginex

President Obama clearly expresses the need for *unity* of the parties over and over and over . . .

I’m going to continue reading your article, Nicholas, and I hope you share with us more details about *why* you believe that President Obama has not opened up *transparency* in *government*? Is it not more transparent than before?

Nicholas Ginex, August 9, 2010, 12:18 a.m. EDT

Hello René,

The facts are simply President Obama actions on how he has conducted himself in trying to pass bills that affect our economy and way of life. He allowed his party to have sessions behind closed doors where they were able to generate deals to acquire votes for passage of the stimulus and health bills. Here President Obama failed to stop that behavior and publicly announce that there must be a working relationship between both parties. Transparency was his promise to the American people, and he did

not live up to that promise. People thought he was going to bring *change*, but he is just another politician who is not interested in fairness and openness—only winning by any means. My god, he and his Democrats pushed bills that they did not even read. Are we going to accept that kind of behavior from our president and his followers? I hope not.

Regarding my experience in the political arena, I have none. What I do have is honesty and a love for the truth. Thank you for being civil, René. It's nice to be nice.

Nora J A., August 9, 2010, 9:50 a.m. EDT

René, you demand facts while arguing *ad hominen*. Where are your specific examples to counter? Yes, the president does “say” we need unity, but his actions speak much louder than his words. Nicholas gave specific examples of poor leadership. But all you do is slam Nicholas and say well the president *talks* about unity . . . Look in the mirror at your own demand, René!

Nicholas Ginex, August 13, 2010, 3:37 p.m. EDT

Dear Nora,

Thank you for your response to René. It is astounding how one-sided thinking finds it difficult to appreciate other points of view. I looked up “*ad hominen*” and found it is a great word which means **(1) appealing to a person’s feelings or prejudices rather than his intellect; (2) marked by an attack on an opponent’s character rather than by an answer to his contentions.**

Thank you for increasing my vocabulary and your support.

Sue B., August 8, 2010, 10:58 p.m. EDT

I was with you 75 percent of the way until you got to the second to last paragraph. I see Sarah Palin as the great white woman hope of the right, and I don’t see any difference between her appeal to them and Obama’s appeal to the left. We don’t vote for candidates based on their gender or race. We vote for them based on their abilities, experience, and integrity.

“If we can vote a man into office with less experience in the political and business world, then why not vote for Sarah Palin?”

You just gave several reasons why when you showed what a disappointment Obama was to the constituency that voted him in for whom he was rather than what he would or could do. I think he should serve as a lesson to think twice before voting for someone like Sarah Palin.

Nicholas Ginex, August 9, 2010, 2:27 a.m. EDT

Hi Sue,

You are absolutely right. You vote for the person who has abilities, experience, and integrity. I only pointed out that 95 percent of the blacks voted for their own kind. I did say that this is human and to be expected. But I drew the analogy that in the same way, women should also relate to the fact that they have an opportunity to get a woman into the highest office in the country. I pointed out that the blacks are smarter than women by supporting their own kind than women do. But also I indicated that Sarah Palin does have more political, business, and managerial experience than Obama. The liberal media is afraid that she projects honesty, integrity, a desire to fight for the American people, and most of all, she has intelligence rooted in common sense.

More and more people are starting to know the real Sarah Palin and not the propaganda put out by the liberal media. Look at her successes within the Tea Party and her success in getting Republicans with her endorsements voted into office. The press and people who do not appreciate the ability of Sarah Palin will continue to degrade her and her family because they are inadequate and cannot respect a woman who has been able to achieve great heights in the political arena. Hey, give her credit where credit is due. How many people who try to disgrace her are really people with less ability and less accomplishments?

Sue B., August 9, 2010, 9:44 a.m. EDT

Hi Nicholas,

Thank you for your reply.

I'm going to cut to the chase here. I have to point out to you your contradiction. First you said that I'm absolutely right to say that we don't vote on gender or race, and then you say that it's human and to be expected that we vote for our own kind. I'm human and so are you

and, as far as I know, so is the rest of what comprises the American electorate. If voting for your own kind is a natural expectation, then it doesn't matter whether someone has experience, abilities, and integrity. It is either an expectation that people will vote based on the kinds of qualities I mentioned or they base their decision on race and gender. Sure, sometimes they overlap, but we're talking about the basis of the decision. It's either race and gender or quality.

“But I drew the analogy that in the same way women should also relate to the fact that they have an opportunity to get a woman into the highest office in the country.”

Why would women do that based on only gender? I know many would, but that's the big mistake. That's what I just got through pointing out. Sarah Palin who is telling you that she doesn't know whether or not she's going to run in 2012 is lying to you. She recently put out the Mama Grizzly video, a part of Sarah Pac, to appeal to these very women who vote on gender. Barack Obama is no fool. He appeared on *The View* shortly thereafter, and I say that his appearance on that idiotic show was only to counteract her video and reach the same woman audience. This is preliminary campaigning and nothing but.

I had begun to become interested in the Tea Party movement, but when I saw that the ever-opportunistic Sarah Palin was going to use the Tea Party movement as her springboard, and that they allowed her to use them as her platform, I quickly decided that it wasn't something I wanted to have anything to do with. Sarah Palin is a Republican and very much a part of the establishment that allowed this man to get into office.

Sarah Palin is appealing to all these stay-at-home moms, but she herself has a Down syndrome toddler at home while she flits around the country to sign books and sell herself. Sarah Palin is about Sarah Palin and nothing more. She has not a snowball's chance in hell to beat Obama if she were nominated, and if she cared about this country like she says she cares about this country, she would rally behind people like Ron or Rand Paul and get out of the limelight.

She was a governor for a state that's only got a population of about 9 percent of New York City. She left her people in Alaska so she could go out and get ready to run in 2012. Sarah Palin shows again that she's all about Sarah Palin. Her victory there was largely due to an

incumbent with whom people were very dissatisfied, who showed a lack of integrity with cronyism and whom Sarah Palin had previously supported while she was mayor of Wasilla. Sarah Palin is a politician through and through, and she's getting better at being one, but that isn't the kind of experience I value. Even if it were, she's still got a long way to go before she can be a player with whom to be reckoned.

"How many people who try to disgrace her are really people with less ability and less [sic] accomplishments?"

That's not the point. Sure, there are many people who will degrade her for the wrong reasons and who are less accomplished, but that doesn't mean anything. They're not running. She's not the moron they try to paint her, but she's a long way from having the experience, ability, and integrity of a candidate I would support.

Nora J A., August 9, 2010, 9:59 a.m. EDT

Bottom line though, Sue, she has more executive and business experience than the president. That is the point of this article!

I guess you've never had to stand up against a nuisance law suit or you'd understand the money, time, and energy/worry drain. I don't fault anyone for trying to get out from under what was it sixteen to twenty such suits, *all* either found innocent or thrown out? Before she quit, her legal bill was over \$500,000. Could you sustain that kind of assault and continue your daily job?

Sue B., August 9, 2010, 10:43 a.m. EDT

I know you like her, Nora, but I find her to be little more than a self-absorbed hick with more education than the average hick. As I said, her executive experience amounts to governing one state with 700,000 people for fewer than three years. That's like saying because someone has been successful running a company of fifty people for thirty one months it means they're going to be successful as CEO of GE.

"She has more executive and business experience than the president. That is the point of this article!"

Show me how that's the point of this article because whether or not you think it's so, it certainly was not the point of this article. Show

me what this author said that makes you think so. The title might make you think that Nicholas is going to prove that Sarah Palin is an effective leader and the president isn't, but he does nothing of the sort in the article. He nicely points out many of Obama's foibles, but does nothing to show us how Sarah Palin has proven herself a leader.

Well no, Nora, I could not sustain that, and much of it was politically fabricated, but this is typical of the kind of scrutiny and attack a presidential campaign will render her. That's why I say that if she cared about this country, she would step back and support a viable candidate (if such an animal exists) instead of selfishly promoting Sarah who has no chance of winning a 2012 election should she be nominated.

Nicholas Ginex, August 9, 2010, 4:03 p.m. EDT

Hello Sue,

This forum is an opportunity to show others why President Obama is an effective leader of our country. Yes, I gave you my point of view with reasons that we are all aware of. That was to provide a springboard for people to agree or disagree with me.

Your reference to Ron Paul is a poor choice, even though he has my middle name. I will tell you why. Ron lacks the personality that Obama has, and on personality alone, he would not be a winner. There is something vibrant about Sarah Palin's personality, and that's what has got the Liberal and Democratic supporters worried. Let's face it. President Obama won with a charming personality and a beautiful voice. But that charm has worn away with the poor leadership he has shown so far. Please reread the reasons why I conclude Obama is a poor president.

You seem to be very negative toward Sarah Palin to the point that you are throwing stones against her family and blaming her for making the astute decision to get out into the public and let the American people find out who she really is. You need to give her credit for fighting the media and standing up for the principles and values of our country. She is a fighter for us.

Do you think Sarah Palin would have sued Arizona for trying to protect their border? President Obama is playing the race card and has created

more bigotry by trying to carry not only the black votes, but also the votes of Spanish people that have numbered into the millions through illegal entry into the United States.

Can you approve of Obama's political agenda to take from the rich, middle class, and low working incomes to provide for those who rather continue to receive stimulus money than work for a living? The key is to create jobs. Where are the shovel-ready jobs for people out of work? Is President Obama saving the release of stimulus money to work for him when he runs again for office? Where is accountability of all the stimulus money? How is the president planning to spend that money? Has his promise of transparency and an open administration to reveal to the people what he *plans to do* completely failed?

Yes, President Obama is failing as the president of the United States, and he has got to *change*. But as we so far can see, Obama is headstrong and incapable of working with people with other points of view. Sorry, but his actions speak for themselves.

Mooch, August 8, 2010, 11:06 p.m. EDT

I'm going to agree with you, but I have a huge gripe about Obama, and what I view as incompetence.

You've highlighted a lot of my major points.

He's pushing bills through that cannot be read in time before they are voted on, and the spending in these bills is only sending us deeper into recession, stagnating us at best.

Congress will vote themselves another raise, when in fact they should be cutting their own spending, focusing on the economy.

To many times now the real issues get ignored or pushed aside while the agenda of the party in control, Democrats this time around, pushes the United States toward socialism, torpedoed it toward socialism. Yet many turn a blind eye.

I really am tired of being called racist because I don't agree with Obama from a political standpoint.

As far as voting GOP, that might not even happen. If I can't stand behind a candidate, I will write one in. And if it happens to be Mickey Mouse, so be it; that's what I will write.

Mooch

Nicholas Ginex, August 9, 2010, 2:50 a.m. EDT

Please do not lose faith in getting a better person into the Whitehouse. Although I believe Sarah Palin is the best candidate based upon integrity, honesty, and love for America, she may still not be the person if there are others that reveal a greater capacity to improve the state of our economy and divisions in our country. So far, President Obama is a failure as a leader for the reasons I have already mentioned and he has also caused more division between the races. We all witnessed how he acted too quickly in condemning a white person over a black incident. He supported the black person without reading or looking into the facts and was proven wrong, a mistake he did not apologize for.

People believe President Obama is highly intelligent. Yet he did not know how many states make up the United States. Where was he brought up and receive his education? This is another reason why people would like for Obama to reveal his citizen or birth papers. They do not believe he has America at heart when he appears to laud the Muslims as contributing to the building of our nation and order NASA to employ many Muslims as a priority into top space programs. Many people are starting to think that he may secretly be a Muslim because he does not tell the world about the help America has given to other countries by building their economies and sending food and medical supplies. He should be proud of America and what we have achieved. America is one of the greatest nations in the history of the world. We should remember it has always been Americans who have helped other countries in distress—even our enemies.

Katie Scarlett (Proud Mom of a successful Son) O., August 9, 2010, 9:59 a.m. EDT

Sorry, but even I, a white/female/Christian/conservative, would not vote for Palin. She doesn't have the necessary experience (gee, I said that about BO too and was called a racist) that I feel we need in a leader in today's world. I feel she also lacks the necessary "sophistication" (just

like our current leader) that a president needs to conduct themselves in a manner that meets the position.

Nicholas Ginex, August 9, 2010, 4:06 p.m. EDT

Hi Katie,

I hope you are going to learn to believe that a woman can be as effective as a man in the White House. It takes very little to acknowledge that Sarah Palin is no dope. She is out there fighting for you and me. I like that.

Katie Scarlett (Proud Mom of a successful Son) O., August 9, 2010, 4:48 p.m. EDT

Oh, believe me, I think a woman is more than capable of making the tough decisions. Hillary comes to mind; she would have been very decisive and strong, but I don't care for her policies. I believe Sarah goes a little overboard. Give me Condoleezza Rice and we have a deal.

Nora J A., August 9, 2010, 10:06 a.m. EDT

I've been saying for almost two years now, "Give a person enough rope and he'll hang himself." With his education, he ought to have made "smarter" decisions, but the fact that he's screwed up just about everything would lead to a conviction of incompetence or crookedness as the problem . . .

Our country is desperate for business growth and jobs, so he gives us Boondoggle spending bills . . . Sigh!

Katie Scarlett (Proud Mom of a successful Son) O., August 9, 2010, 11:49 a.m. EDT

There was an article on the Internet news today that it is the rich and wealthy who keep our economy going. So yeah, tax them to death so they don't spend any money and watch the *total* collapse of our country. It's ideas like this that the fools were all (and still are) for, not realizing the ramifications of such ideas. Many of the followers believe that the economy is getting better because "he says so," but read what the financial analysts and economists have to say and you

see a whole other picture. I see articles about how the housing market is slowing down . . . Well *duh*, it always does this time of year. *Most* people who buy houses do so early in order to be in their new homes and settled when school starts again. It has nothing to do with the economy getting better or worse; it's human nature. He takes credit for things that "look" good or promising (even though it has *nothing* to do with him or his decisions), and when things go wrong because of his incompetence, it's blame *Bush* again.

Nicholas Ginex, August 9, 2010, 4:15 p.m. EDT

Hello again, Katie,

Happy to know that you are a proud mom. I have a great deal of respect for the opposite sex. Without them, we are lost. Women are man's greatest partner in life. I have four daughters and proud of all of them. I wrote a book when I retired to write about what I have learned in my lifetime. You can visit the website www.futureogodamen.com

There you will find some book reviews and a message for all of us to love one another. It is a history of how man first conceived God and how that God has greatly influenced the development of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions. It will be released for sale in September.

Thank you for comments. You have a good head.

Why Do Many Women Disrespect Sarah Palin?

August 06, 2010 11:41 p.m. EDT

This post was generated in a response to a woman who accused Sarah Palin of being a liar without stating what she lied about. The comparison below between President Obama and Sarah Palin may be disconcerting but true.

Response: It is surprising that you do not have any respect for the intelligence of Sarah Palin. Here is a woman who became the governor of Alaska, was chosen by Senator McCain to be his running mate, and has established a reputation of rooting out the corrupt politicians in her state. She definitely has more business and managerial experience than President Obama. She also does not need a teleprompter to express herself. Yes, she may not have Obama's eloquent voice, but she is certainly more fluid of mind. Yet she is maligned by the pro-Obama news media that also feel inferior to or cannot accept the idea that a woman can run the White House. Worse yet, women like you fail to give credit to another woman who has made it to the top in the political arena.

Can you tell me the lie(s) you believe Sarah is accused of? What about the lie of President Obama who said he was going to run a transparent government? Instead, he *failed as a leader* to allow the Democratic and Republican parties to work together and allowed his Democratic Congress to operate behind closed doors to consummate deals hidden from the people.

Many people have been hopeful that Obama was going to bring *change* and bring our country together. Well, our young people who voted for him have been lied to as well as people like you and I.

People who continue to support Obama who has created the biggest stimulus to foster social programs have created the greatest deficit in American history and thereby have made fools of us and our children of generations to come. These are some of the reasons why I support Sarah Palin. She has the loving heart of a woman, a belief for truth, integrity, and a natural intelligence that is rooted in common sense. You cannot say that about Obama who shows indifference in protecting our borders from illegals, recently forced NASA to employ Muslims on top-level programs, and will not reveal his American citizenship papers. Do you think President Obama is secretly a Muslim? This is something to think about.

Comments and Responses

Vickey w., August 7, 2010, 12:09 a.m. EDT

I like her bubbly personality . . . I think a lot of woman are jealous of her because she has almost what seems to be a perfect life . . . They vilify her but yet most of them support Hilly . . . I think Hilly has been through a lot with roaming Billy boy, but she chose to stay with him to get her groomed for the presidency and he has some clout . . .

Palin on the other hand seems to be able to do it all by herself, a loving, attentive hubby who supports her and doesn't mind giving her space, but yet she is a loving parent, became a governor . . . I think she has lived the dream and she did it her way . . . She didn't need to ride someone else's coattails . . . I think she is the Libs worse nightmare . . . She can't do any worse than Obama and crew . . .

Marilyn M., August 7, 2010, 1:28 a.m. EDT

I love her bubbly personality too, Vickey. Speaking of that . . . have you noticed that Libs always seem to be sour and conservatives the bubbly ones?

What's sad is that if Sarah was a liberal, they'd all be flocking to her.

Vickey w., August 7, 2010, 10:07 a.m. EDT

You are right, Marilyn . . . I think it's because most of them don't have a religion to give them something to look forward too . . .

Jim G., August 7, 2010, 12:37 a.m. EDT

In answer to your title question: because she's a dumb ass. Gender doesn't matter; she's just a stupid neocon taking advantage of people who are stupider than her and taking the money to the bank. She's standing in line to make her deposit right behind Rush Limbaugh's fat ass. Wink, Wink. You betcha . . .

Texas Rocks, August 7, 2010, 12:59 a.m. EDT

Jim, you don't like her because she removes politicians that are corrupt?

Oh, I just got it. Afraid she would bust the entire Democratic Party?

Marilyn M., August 7, 2010, 1:30 a.m. EDT

Actually, she's not dumb, Jim. Her IQ is right up there with the rest of them. You need to read the post I did about her accomplishments. I know the liberal media doesn't want you to know that she succeeded in anything (since they also know Obama never did anything important), but you should do your own research.

PoppaDave, August 7, 2010, 12:39 a.m. EDT

I think women dislike her because of Tina Fey. Tina Fey managed to prove that Palin's persona is that of a "dumb blonde."

I personally like Palin, but would not vote for her even if she was the best choice. It is because I wouldn't ever vote for a Republican. They ruin things and blame it on the next guy! She is a quitter is another reason women don't like her, and she ran with the worst of the worst. Who could forgive her for that? . . . That dude is an old creepy creature. He did not help her image one bit.

We all know that the road to hell was paved by Republicans . . .

Nicholas Ginex, August 8, 2010, 2:45 p.m. EDT

Hello David,

It seems that you do not have an open mind with your statement, "Wouldn't ever vote for a Republican . . . my bad." I have been a loyal

Democrat for many years. But as I matured and became educated, I realized that you vote for the man and not for the party. I have voted Republican, and yes, I would vote Democratic if the man had the intellect, honesty, integrity, and character to deeply believe in and work for the American people.

Do grow up and put your bias aside.

Chuck Larlham, August 7, 2010, 11:34 a.m. EDT

Actually, however bright she is, she's terribly ignorant. She's a religion-ridden person who thinks America is a Christian nation, that we should teach "Bible truth" in science class (I *heard* her say that one . . . can't remember the venue), that homosexuality is a "sin," and that public schools teach "socialism" (whatever *that* is). She understands little to nothing of international affairs, and McCain choosing her as a running mate says very little about *her* abilities and intelligence . . . but it says worlds about his.

Nicholas Ginex, August 8, 2010, 3:03 p.m. EDT

Chuck L . . . You are at it again accusing Sarah Palin as being "terribly ignorant." If you truly believe that, then you have no respect for the opposite gender who is smarter than you. She has accomplished more in her life than you ever will in yours. Think about that for a while because you will find that the truth hurts. You cannot "see" truth, honesty, integrity, and love of people in another human being, and I really wonder why. You do lack the ability to recognize a beautiful human being, and it is something you need to question.

Norman chambers, August 7, 2010, 2:45 p.m. EDT

Why do many women disrespect Sarah Palin? I think some of it has to do with self-loathing. These spiteful women see Sarah living the life they wish they had, and this is the way they telegraph their frustration. I just have to smile when I read about it.

Norman

Marilyn M., August 7, 2010, 2:52 p.m. EDT

I agree. When I was young and in college, I was approached by some about joining the women's lib movement. I was all for equal pay for

women and for true equality. But when I was told that I couldn't be a women's libber and be a conservative, I realized that "they" had a real problem. How in the world can a movement that supposedly addresses equality and fairness for women decide that only liberal/progressive/Democrats can be part of the group?

Don't "they" realize how absurd that is?!?!?

Nicholas Ginex, August 8, 2010, 4:04 p.m. EDT

Hello Shandi,

I am beginning to find you very entertaining, and I thank you for making me smile at some of your quips. But I must say the banter going on between you and others is a little disheartening because I do not like it when you try to degrade others by throwing stones. I had to laugh at this one comment you made, "Palin, however, shoves her stupidity out there like it was dangling from the tips of her nipples. She can't afford to look any 'stupider' than she's already proven herself."

You then stated to the people who commented to you, "You guys need to put your heads together to come up with comments that don't show your ignorance. I'm beyond laughing at you and am now bordering on outright disgust. Check yourselves."

Shandi, you're a card, a very interesting person, and I am sure a very personal one who knows how to laugh. I hope you can also laugh at yourself. I do continually because I do make mistakes or do things I find I can later laugh at. But this is because I know that at heart I am a loving, truthful, and confident person in my abilities. I know there are ups and downs and I can ride the waves because I believe in myself and the human being I try to be.

Shandi, keep me laughing but try to avoid throwing stones because I believe you are a much better person than you are portraying.

I love you,

Nick

Wow, that was not nice. You know, I believe in the saying, "It's nice to be nice."

Ed Da Head Toker, August 8, 2010, 4:32 a.m. EDT

In most cases, it is not Obama's failure to work with the GOP. *But* the GOP refuses to do what is good for the country.

Over three hundred judges for the federal courts have not been voted on, but since this is summer recess, once Obama gets back to DC, he can then file an order so that the open positions are filled immediately.

The fund that was generated to help her defend her as governor was declared illegal.

Frankly, someone who is elected to an office and then resigns halfway through it, without a medical reason, is not worthy of my vote and not worthy to be called anything else but a quitter.

Karl Leuba, August 8, 2010, 2:12 p.m. EDT

Not worth the time and effort. Nicholas Ginex, you wasted my time. Palin is a lot of things. But she *quit* the governor's office in Alaska in the face of a corruption investigation.

Nicholas Ginex, August 8, 2010, 4:22 p.m. EDT

Hello Ed and Carl,

You call a woman a quitter who has worked herself up to the top as governor? Sarah Palin is smart to realize that to fight the biased news media she needs to devote more of her time to show the American public that she is a fighter and a contender for the presidency of the United States. Look at the strides and gains she is making with the Tea Party movement and her success in getting people she supports elected. Now, really, do you think she is a dope, a very stupid woman? Hey, give credit where credit is due.

She gave the governorship to another very capable woman, and there is nothing to accuse her of being a quitter. This is just another stone being thrown at her by the liberal press and the hard left. But, of course, you believe it because you are easily led by others who have only a bigoted point of view. They appear to be people who cannot trust a woman because they may never have received the love, compassion,

and warmth of a mother. Too bad, because it really has affected their views about women.

Karl Leuba, August 12, 2010, 7:57 p.m. EDT

Nicholas, anyone who is driven by partisan politics or *power* hunger is not a good choice for *anything*. She had a contract. *She broke it*. She has an excuse; *she wanted a better job*. Her choice! *I wouldn't hire her to watch my watch*.

We were not talking about Obama. But since you brought it up, *how does he change* Washington when *his every attempt is dogged by Republicans*? They obstruct and oppose. Then they *whine—exactly as you are doing here—that he is not doing what he promised*. Well, *he is*. What is not happening is *the Republicans are not leading, they are not following, and they are not getting their asses out of the way*.

Karl Leuba, August 12, 2010, 8:01 p.m. EDT

Nick, you wrote the article. You asked why Sarah Palin is disrespected. *I told you*. If you already knew, why did you bother asking? Sarah Palin is, as my mother-in-law so aptly put it, a flibertygibit. And just in case you don't know what that word means, the updated illustrated dictionary puts a picture of Sarah, I don't have to finish *anything*, Palin next to it.

Nicholas Ginex, August 12, 2010, 10:57 p.m. EDT

Hello Karl,

This comment is provided for your two comments of August 12.

You are misinformed about what I wrote for this post. I deliberately showed why Obama is a weak president with reasons so we are not discussing only Sarah Palin. You need to reread the post and answer why my reasons are wrong instead of just using stupid name-calling and making inflammatory remarks. I will not lower myself to your level of dialogue, which would only result in hard or bad feelings. I have a great deal of respect for the Gather members who have commented on this post, and I do not want them to be offended by name-calling.

Please use your intelligence to respond with facts and do not throw stones. You were quick to write that Sarah Palin did not keep her promise to complete her term of governor. However, you ignore President Obama for not keeping his *promise*, which is a greater sin because he holds the highest office in America.

You need to be fair when you attack a person. I gave you credit for your point of view, but you ignore it when I presented a fact that President Obama made fools out of the American people by not keeping his promise for transparency.

Please stick to facts when attacking somebody and stop the name-calling. Show Gather members that you are trying to be objective and fair.

Karl Leuba, August 13, 2010, 1:38 a.m. EDT

OK, here is my position. *You* say Obama is a “weak president.” That statement is ridiculously *wrong*. So saying I failed to respond to it and was insulting in my tone is *absolutely correct*. There is no response possible to a piece of pure nonsense.

Example: *The sky is on fire and it is George Washington’s fault.*

Only one response possible—“No, it isn’t.”

Nicholas Ginex, August 18, 2010, 6:16 p.m. EDT

President Obama is a failure as a leader for the American people. He has done more for honoring and catering to Muslims in our country than for any other group of immigrants. But this is endemic to his being raised and educated in a foreign country which has very little knowledge of America. His history of America is sorely lacking when he gave a wrong answer to “how many states make up the United States of America.” Is he really as intelligent as the media makes him out to be? President Obama has a mindset that has been nurtured by a number of radicals that he has maintained a close friendship for many years before becoming our president. He lacks the wisdom and maturity of a politician who thinks before he speaks and not jump the gun as he did in defending a black man over a white incident and setting the groundwork for building a mosque blocks away from the greatest terrorist act on American soil by publicly announcing that Muslims have a right to build on ground they have legitimately

paid for. *It would be instructive* if there are comments to show why these poor decisions do not define Obama as a *poor leader*. Please provide comments to counter what is provided below and not just use mud-slinging, insults, and cursing to prove a point.

President Obama lied or failed to keep his *promise* when he said he was going to run a transparent government. He failed as a leader to encourage the Democratic and Republican parties to work together. Instead, he allowed his Democratic Congress to operate behind closed doors to consummate deals hidden from the people.

President Obama has created the greatest deficit in American history and thereby has made fools of us and our children of generations to come. President Obama shows an indifference to protecting our borders from illegals. He recently forced NASA to employ Muslims on top-level programs. With the threat of a nuclear bomb capability by Iran, President Obama is silent. Does he have an affinity for the Muslim people? He may have been born in an area that is strongly influenced by Muslim traditions and culture. Note his public announcement to the American people that the Muslims have contributed greatly to the building and development of the United States. But he did not state what those contributions were. Note President Obama's reluctance to prove he is an American citizen by revealing his birth papers. In addition to having failed as an effective leader, do you think President Obama is secretly a Muslim? *Your comments in defense of President Obama* are appreciated because we must be fair and objective of his performance.

These are some of the reasons why I support Sarah Palin. She has the loving heart of a woman, a belief for truth, integrity, and a natural intelligence that is rooted in common sense.

Let Your Voices Be Heard

May 15, 2009 11:31 p.m. EDT

Dear Gather People:

I joined Gather to reach out to people who have a humanitarian interest that includes God. I believe that all people have a spiritual sense, and I wish to preserve a legacy they have inherited from the past. I recently sent a letter to 123 religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic faiths to request they support or join a *Council for Religious Unity*.

The objectives of the council are that they acknowledge Amen as the beginning of the creation of God (Rev. 3:14), that they unify their beliefs in the one God, and that they honor the mandate of their profession to teach our sisters and brothers the Word of God—to love one another.

I would like for you to assist me in a worldwide effort to have people's voices heard for their support of the council. To find out why I am an advocate for the council, please visit www.futureofgodamen.com

If you can support the effort to have religious leaders work together to unify their beliefs, please e-mail me at nickginex@gmail.com and let me know.

The website should prove interesting and informative. Although the website describes a book, I only desire that you see why I have become an advocate for the *Council for Religious Unity*.

I hope we become friends. I have added my photo and information to my profile.

Nick Ginex

Comments and Responses

Jewi lim, May 15, 2009, 11:49 p.m. EDT

Thanks for sharing . . .

Richard Regener, May 15, 2009, 11:49 p.m. EDT

Please define your version of god.

Nicholas Ginex, May 16, 2009, 3:00 p.m. EDT

To Jewl Lim and Richard Regener . . . as you can see from my first Gather message, I love to share what I have learned in life and help people to better understand their world.

Regarding my version of God, I have none. To me, God is unknowable, incomprehensible, and mysterious. However, I do believe in the spiritual nature of mankind and respect it. The one legacy mankind brings to all people is that God is the creator of all there is.

If you have a better version of God, let me know. I would like to learn what I can from others. If you would visit www.futureofgodamen.com, you will find out why I have a great respect for some of the wonderful ideas developed in the past by an ancient civilization.

Nick

Rose T., April 26, 2010, 3:22 a.m. EDT

Hi Nicholas!

Nice to meet you! God is a movement greater than our own. The council for religious unity is all well and good, but I believe it is the spiritual unity God inspires us to have *Amen (so be it)*.

The dogmas of the past *have* distorted *all* that God *is, was, and shall* always *be*, but the tides are finally changing as this generation will see. **Nothing man or other gods can do to change God's will**, as the gods of this world have tried for eons to *no avail*.

And yes, Ammeni/Ra was the God of the past also known as (so be it) His will not ours. If people did their research, they would see the transition of God's name through the pagan past.

Nicholas Ginex, January 27, 2011, 5:36 p.m. EST

Dear Rose,

I am so sorry not to have seen your response to this post earlier. I agree with you that the dogmas of the past have distorted our vision of God. But do not be too harsh on those who have given us their vision and belief in God. They were righteous men who did their best to bring us to understand our spiritual nature. God was conceived after many, many centuries until the Priesthood of Amon wrote scripture extolling *Amon (Amen) as the Sole God*. It was man that taught man the belief in God, and our belief in God is still evolving. Our scriptures, which proscribe our dogmas, are in need of revision. Just as Jesus Christ came to enlighten us that the Word of God is to love one another (John's Gospel, stated three times), Jesus also said as follows:

Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go to my Father. (John 14:12)

What Jesus is saying is there will be others (women as well as men) who will do greater works in bringing us to know God but more importantly to guide us to emulate the wonderful attributes of God. Surely, God would rather have his creations love their sisters and brothers than focus on loving Him. God would not accept any of His children who have failed to love their sisters and brothers; for that was the command given to us by Jesus.

Jesus was a man of truth, for he acknowledged *Amen* as being:

The faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.
(Rev. 3:14)

We must not deny the legacy of the past that taught us the belief in one universal God. To obtain a factual history of how man has conceived God and why that God is acknowledged by Jesus Christ, place an Internet search on *Future of God Amen*. You will see some press releases and the website to procure the book, if you wish.

Dorothy P., January 26, 2011, 8:57 a.m. EST

Well, read John 3:16, for God so loved the world that He gave His only one begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life There is no other true God . . . He is the creator as it states in Genesis of all living creatures, including you and me. There may be a lot of religions, but there is One God. He is like I state the true God. I am not religious; I am a Christian.

Nicholas Ginex, January 27, 2011, 5:57 p.m. EST

Hello Lizluvsiesus,

I agree there is one God. For those of us who believe in God there is only one creator of all there is. God therefore created the entire universe, not just heaven and earth. This means there are other galaxies with their millions of stars and most likely planets that exist with other living forms of life. It is therefore arrogant to believe God made us in His own image. What is true is that man created God in his own image.

We are God's creations, as are other forms of life on this planet. We are special because we have the intellect to inquire and learn about ourselves and our environment. Through thousands of centuries, man has come to conceive many gods until a breakthrough was achieved by a pharaoh, Amenhotep IV, and the Priesthood of Amon who wrote "*Amon as the Sole God.*" The God *Amen* has lasted on the minds of worshippers as they, in temples and churches, announce His name at the end of a prayer, supplication, giving thanks and praise, and singing His name.

I am a Catholic and believe in the words of Jesus Christ, but my god is the God of all people on this earth. Refer to my response to Rose above for more of my thoughts about God.

Jerome k., September 30, 2011, 2:06 p.m. EDT

Interesting post, Nicholas, and interesting and enlightening reply of yours. The concept of "god" or gods is a human concept, the way man likes, and liked, to think of his own place in the world, a little lower than "god." But some of us, a few, realize that man's strength—and weakness—is the need for power of some level or other. We all like

to think that if we leave home in the morning we can return to our place of sanctuary, of rest, which will still be there. That's stability, part of our routine, something reliable. If we have a partner, we like to think the same for them—still there, reliable, loving, confirming our lives. Some, of course, do not have that luxury, and they are not all necessarily in Third World countries.

Leaders rise to the surface, those who have the time, energy, and willpower to energize, enthrall, and encourage the rest of us; all animals have a leader in their packs. However, man's thirst for power is a little more complex, largely because we, in the Western world, have objected to killing someone to whom we object. It's called morals.

In the early days of man's existence, he worshipped the sun, not because he knew much about this strange, plate-like object which rose in the east earlier in the spring, giving life to man's crops, but because he, man, was grateful and believed if he worshipped the sun it would arrive on time. In the twenty-first century, we now know the sun does what it does anyway and that man is a tiny part of the existence of creatures and plant life and geology and everything else on Earth; man has no power over the earth, only the ability to compromise with some of what naturally happens, like plants, animals, and so on. Man cannot stop volcanoes, earthquakes, tsunamis, and other events which are bigger than man; he can only get warnings through his clever inventions.

The creation of myths and stories went back to an age when man was able to reflect and paint on cave walls the stories of his conquests, his life, and his hopes. The evidence is available (e.g. France: <http://www.lascaux.culture.fr/#!/fr/00.xml>)

The fact that a certain group of ancient documents were collected and (via Constantine et al.) specially selected (?) and rewritten many times, studies in terms of the words written (but hardly ever the back story) by so many "experts" and claimed to be the "word" of "god," does not recognize or even acknowledge that man has written all the documents, with his various frailties and foibles, his creative talents, translated them all, rewritten them, and what's more, picked out various documents he (Constantine et al.) thought appropriate, for what could be personal and biased reasons. In academic and historic research, documents are not simply cast aside because they do not fit a certain religious belief. When science became recognized as a

respected discipline, it superseded much of the early theories which the religious society held fast, theories written down and believed without proof; of course, the early “church” had all the “education” without delving into the facts too much. Take Copernicus and his heliocentric model which was objected to by the church; they were faced with the idea that the earth was not the center of the universe any more, thus they would lose some credibility. Instead of embracing change, the church hung on to the past ideas until it was overruled. Take the persuaders of Catholicism, those nice people who created fear in the populations with the inquisitions. Again, what was the motive? Power, wealth, influence? Or the fear of losing all three? David Ketzler writes some brilliant works on the situation: <http://davidkertzler.com/>

Nicholas Ginex, September 30, 2011, 2:54 p.m. EDT

Hello Jerome,

After reading your commentary, I visited your Gather Home Page and was pleased to see that I had written you many thoughts about the subject of God on August 12, 2010, more than a year ago. It seems that we both think alike concerning the development of God by mankind. Have you read my book *Future of God Amen*? It provides a history of how mankind came to conceive one universal God. Few people know that it was the beliefs of a spiritual people in ancient Egypt that through their priesthoods and ruling kings they developed the beliefs in a soul, a hereafter, many gods that were finally coalesced into one God Amon, and even the Son of God (the pharaoh).

Thank you for thoughts on this topic.

Jerome k., September 30, 2011, 3:51 p.m. EDT

Ah! We meet again! It had escaped my notice! Mike Voyce’s review of your book drew my attention to your views. I shall look into obtaining your book (I’m in the United Kingdom, but an impoverished mature student).

Never forget that only dead fish swim with the stream.
(Malcolm Muggeridge)

Thank you for replying.

Nicholas Ginex, September 30, 2011, 4:16 p.m. EDT

So you're in the same country as Mike Joyce. Two peas in a pod! I was honored by Mike's review of *Future of God Amen* and would like to mail you a complimentary copy. Just provide your mailing address via my e-mail, which is nickginex@gmail.com

The Universe

Does Consciousness Pervade Our Universe?

July 18, 2011 10:43 p.m. EDT

A novel idea has emerged on which I would like our readers to share their thoughts. Recently in a response to a provocative Richard Regener Gather post, titled “The Olympians,” I thought of introducing a hypothetical idea that the unique positive and negative energy forces of an atom, which can coalesce into inorganic and organic matter, may have an inherent consciousness that tries to reveal itself. Ultimately, we, as thinking human beings, may be the product of that source of consciousness. We are part of the “stuff” that makes up the universe, and we are trying to understand our beginnings that could be due to the inherent forces of the atom that surface as consciousness. This hypothetical idea that matter, created by atoms that determine inorganic and organic outcomes, can assume consciousness may have some merit because we are proof as thinking products of our universe.

Another hypothetical idea that has surfaced is that our first awareness (consciousness) starts before conception through a transformation of energy into conscious awareness at birth. However, a question surfaces as to why only at birth of an organic form would consciousness come into play? I believe that the internal forces of the atom with its own negative, positive, and neutral properties create matter based upon its surrounding environment. Whether or not that matter is inorganic or organic will depend on the surrounding elements of heat, moisture, and an atmosphere conducive to life. Hence, for our earthly life forms (organic matter) to exist, the aggregate mix of atoms preordains with

conditions that support life the formation of different kinds of life forms.

Stated with earthly terms, plant and vegetable organic life begins first based upon inorganic matter (earth and minerals), heat, and moisture, and it produces a byproduct (air) that sustains life. Organic forms of life that become mobile, such as a fly, a bird, fish, and animals, are a consequence of the environment, and it all began with the mix of atoms that produced inorganic and organic matter. So I hypothesize that the atom has forces that somehow takes advantage of its surroundings and gives birth to inorganic and organic matter. To me, it appears that such forces within the atom have an intelligence or a consciousness that tries to express itself in many ways. It is this consciousness that reaches its height in human beings to think and reach out with hypothetical thoughts to try to understand its own existence. And that is why I believe that the transformation of energy is a long involved process whereby it transforms itself into matter that tries to express its inherent will to exist as consciousness.

Perhaps that may be why gifted people have developed the idea of a soul because it is an extension of one's being with the hope that its soul will continue to exist even after death. Is this due to the internal energy of the atom that initiates the will for survival? It appears that forces within the atom, from its very beginning, fight to express itself in matter. So I offer you the idea that the energy or forces inherent in the atom have a consciousness that seeks to find expression in the life forms it finally creates. The question then is what is this force or energy? Where did its positive, negative, and neutral forces come from? What gave this energy the will to exist as conscious entities that are very likely to appear in other parts of our universe? Are all life forms in other parts of the universe made of the same "stuff" that we humans are made of? I tend to believe "yes." The life forms on other planets may assume different shapes, colors, and organic functions that enable it to exist, but they are all part of the energy that originated within the atom.

One last matter that needs to be addressed, and that is, can the internal forces of an atom be attributable to "God?" I do so not because I have any conception of God. To me, God is mysterious, incomprehensible, and unknowable. However, I use the term God because it introduces a concept of the consciousness that many people feel within themselves, which is the ability to love. The energy or force of the atom has given life

forms the will to survive and therefore the desire to love and reproduce itself, for that is what the atom has tried to do from its own inception.

So the next question I offer is, if you give this unknown force a name, such as God, why not put it to good use? That is, why not sublimate our conception of the unknown force into idealistic forms of moral behavior that allows people from different countries and of different races to love and accept one another as sisters and brothers? This use of the unknown force is not a bad idea. The alternative is to say we are exceptionally bright, and since we understand the unknown force, just accept it, and let's live without any need for a moral code of behavior because we can control our lives without anybody telling us what we should or should not do. This attitude I cannot agree with because it negates the wisdom we have gained in the past through experience of what makes a harmonious society. This concept of God does not assume any preexisting definitions of God and therefore does not present any myths or images because as I had stated before, as with the internal forces of the atom, God is mysterious, incomprehensible, and unknowable. The idea of God becomes a sublimation of our finest thoughts as to what mankind can aspire to in terms of integrity and love for one another.

Do you agree with this hypothetical idea that the atom, after many transformations from inorganic to organic matter, strives to achieve a consciousness to express itself by ultimately producing life forms with the ability to think?

Comments and Responses

Shira C., July 18, 2011, 10:58 p.m. EDT

I don't actually find this idea convincing, *but* a version of this has been taught by the Yogacara school of Buddhist philosophy for about 1,600 years. According to this school, the essence of the universe is mind. Although mind is impermanent and has no essential nature, it is the source of all the phenomena in the universe.

I have to say that some parts of Yogacara make sense to me and others do not. I can't say I'm convinced that mind is the essential aspect nature. But if you want a fully worked out philosophical system based on the pre-eminence and pervasiveness of mind, there is (at least) one.

Nicholas Ginex, July 19, 2011, 12:47 p.m. EDT

Thank you, Shira, for informing me of the Yogacara school of Buddhist philosophy that developed the idea the universe has, in some way, the phenomena of mind. It is commendable that they were able to think of the universe having a mind capability as far back as 1600. I will try to search out some information on their approach to convey their understanding of the mind being a source of consciousness in the universe.

Shira C., July 19, 2011, 2:57 p.m. EDT

Sorry, I was unclear—Yogacara got its start in the 4th CE, so it's been running for 1,600 years.

My pick for a good introduction would be this book ([Internet link](#)).

Nicholas Ginex, July 19, 2011, 7:36 p.m. EDT

Thank you, Shira, for recommending the book. I was able to do several searches on the Internet and found some very interesting reading on Buddhism and Yogacara. My discourse runs parallel to some of their ideas but is very different in my philosophical approach.

Jerry Kays, July 22, 2011, 4:57 p.m. EDT

To me, the “mind” is in the same category as the “Spirit” of *God* that pervades the entire *universe intelligently . . .* that which we experience *intuitively . . .*

The mind of *God* though, being the cumulative mind of all, also is made up of the mind of mankind . . . Thus, for many of us, we will tend to “filter out” the mind of *God* in favor of the “seemingly” more powerful mind of our fellow men who we more readily believe in because they are more objectively evident for rational man.

Richard W., July 18, 2011, 11:38 p.m. EDT

The idea is not new. In Hinduism, it is known as the “Atman”: that is, the universal self which pervades all existence and of which the individual soul is a part. To get to know the Atman, you must look into your own soul. Do a search on “Atman” and “Brahma.”

Nicholas Ginex, July 19, 2011, 7:45 p.m. EDT

Hello Richard,

I added additional information after performing some searches on the Internet. Please refer to my response dated July 19, 7:43 p.m. EDT below.

Steve B., July 19, 2011, 7:01 p.m. EDT

“A question surfaces as to why only at birth of an organic form would consciousness come into play?”

That assumes that there is only “local” consciousness. But I think there is ample evidence of “non-local” consciousness. Why make the assumption that awareness can only be experienced materially?

“It is this consciousness that reaches its height in human beings . . .”

It’s quite an assumption that humans are the “height” of consciousness. My experience suggests otherwise.

“Do you agree with this hypothetical idea that the atom, after many transformations from inorganic to organic matter, strives to achieve a consciousness to express itself by ultimately producing life forms with the ability to think?”

I wonder that the atom may be the manifestation of consciousness in matter.

Steve B., July 19, 2011, 7:02 p.m. EDT

Is there any evidence to support your notion? Do you have any experience that informs your speculation?

Nicholas Ginex, July 19, 2011, 8:41 p.m. EDT

Hello Steve,

You raised four interesting questions, and though not a spiritualist, I will give simply my hypothetical ideas as a response.

You wrote, “A question surfaces as to why only at birth of an organic form would consciousness come into play?” But then you gave an answer stating:

“That assumes that there is only ‘local’ consciousness. But I think there is ample evidence of ‘non-local’ consciousness. Why make the assumption that awareness can only be experienced materially?”

Good question. It is my belief that the ability of consciousness is a capability of only organic materials. I believe a tree, a flower, and anything that moves has a process that exhibits consciousness. We, as human beings, have attained the highest form of consciousness that I believe our universe wishes to have expressed. This consciousness need not be local. As you indicated, there is ample evidence of “non-local” consciousness, which many of us have experienced as mental telepathy. Perhaps that is why prayer is a way of placing into space the energy of brain transmitted waves to hopefully find receivers.

The body is a receiver and a transmitter, and hence it is a prerequisite to exist materially. With no organic material, the energy required to transmit or receive cannot be generated. I do not subscribe to a soul, a hypothetical concept without a body, having the ability to transmit and receive because it does not have the engine for such a process, which is a functioning, living body.

Steve, you then presented a thought after paraphrasing my question, which was “do you agree with this hypothetical idea that the atom, after many transformations from inorganic to organic matter, strives to achieve a consciousness to express itself by ultimately producing life forms with the ability to think?” Your thought, which is worth pursuing, was as follows:

“I wonder that the atom may be the manifestation of consciousness in matter.”

My answer to your thought is that it is the negative, positive and neutral properties of the atom that enable it to somehow generate many different compounds of inorganic and organic materials. This phenomenon in itself is a marvelous observation to find that the atom can transform itself to higher and higher levels of existence. We, each of us, are made of billions of atoms. But we are fortunate that we are not simply inorganic forms of matter that are also made up of

atoms. So, hopefully, you can appreciate my hypothetical discourse that we are “all” made of the “same stuff” that make up our universe. The glory of it all is that we have attained the ability to think and appreciate what the very simple atom has done—made a solar system that sustains life.

Finally, Steve, your last question. “Is there any evidence to support your notion? Do you have any experience that informs your speculation?”

The only evidence I have is having learned as an engineer that the atom has positive and negative properties, opposites, such as a man (sperm) and a woman (ovum), that fight to express itself in the life forms it creates. Yes, the atom may be broken down still into other components, but as a simple man, I like to keep my thoughts at a level of understanding that at least I could accept. This is all hypothetical, but hey, that’s why we have brains—to think.

Thank you for allowing me to further express myself with your interesting questions.

Steve B., July 19, 2011, 11:19 p.m. EDT

“It is my belief that the ability of consciousness is a capability of only organic materials.”

Yet there is evidence that is not the case. “This consciousness need not be local. As you indicated there is ample evidence of ‘non-local’ consciousness, which many of us have experienced as mental telepathy.”

While telepathy has been demonstrated scientifically, a more profound—and non-organic—manifestation of non-local consciousness is near-death experience. Researchers, who write about near-death experience, theorize that consciousness manifests itself materially, but that’s not the same thing as being exclusively material.

“The body is a receiver and a transmitter, and hence it is a prerequisite to exist materially.”

Exactly. However, consciousness seems to operate non-materially, i.e., non-locally as well.

“With no organic material, the energy required to transmit or receive cannot be generated.”

I don't know about that. Perhaps it is only “translated” into material manifestation.

“I do not subscribe to a soul . . .”

I don't know what I'd call it—maybe just “non-local awareness,” but it is well documented that people experience awareness when they are clinically dead. There have been organic theories presented to explain those experiences, but they don't hold up when the evidence is analyzed. I don't think it's important to call it a soul, but I think it's a mistake to discount what people say they've experienced.

“So hopefully, you can appreciate my hypothetical discourse that we are ‘all’ made of the ‘same stuff’ that make up our universe.”

No doubt, we are all made of the same stuff, but again, are we the epitome of everything? I hardly think so, and the reported accounts of hundreds of people would seem to indicate that we are not.

“As a simple man, I like to keep my thoughts at a level of understanding that at least I could accept. This is all hypothetical, but hey, that's why we have brains—to think.”

To think, to be sure—also to observe, listen, learn. Maybe I over-value what many people say they have experienced. Perhaps that's only because I have also experienced things that I cannot explain simply in terms of materialism.

Steve B., July 19, 2011, 11:31 p.m. EDT

Another thought, I am a huge fan of science. But science is not perfect, and one of its less than admirable features is the tendency to be reductionistic. Many times, scientific “skepticism” rules out possibilities, which is not justified by evidence. Indeed, evidence often suggests that some possibilities are supported. Further research is needed. I don't think materialism is justified by evidence. Indeed, in a world in which we thought our single galaxy was the entire universe as recently as a century ago, I think it would be foolish to say, with solid evidence absent, what cannot be. Who would have thought that

there are a hundred billion galaxies in the universe? Who knows, there may be a hundred billion universes . . . I have no trouble wondering that our “knowledge” of things as they are in themselves is fairly limited.

Nicholas Ginex, July 20, 2011, 2:03 a.m. EDT

Hello Steve,

You are a very interesting person to chat with, for you do raise questions and present alternative ideas to examine. I like that. It may mean nothing in the end to continue a hypothetical conversation, but great theories have evolved simply by thinking in a systematic manner. And, if anything else, it is a pleasure to use our minds with what we have learned in life. The mere construction of thoughts and ideas is fascinating to me.

I do not desire to counter many of your ideas since we are simply trying to see if there is some agreement or merit in the hypothetical idea I have presented in this post. You wrote “yet there is evidence that is not the case” to my statement “It is my belief that the ability of consciousness is a capability of only organic materials.”

I would be interested in what evidence is there that consciousness exists after the organic body is dead? You did allude to the after-death experiences that researchers have been able to verify. To those claims, I can only say the person may still have existed in a quasi-like state of mind where portions of the brain were still operable even after the person was determined to be clinically dead.

You commented, “Are we the epitome of everything?” I agree with you that we are not. We know animals have the ability to think, and it is possible that there are other life forms in other worlds that have a high capacity to think. Regarding me being thought a materialist, I hope not. I only believe that it is organic matter that has the fluid chemistry to feel and have some sense of consciousness. Even a flower loves to bloom when the sun comes up in the morning and the dew on its leaves begin to dry. This is an organic response to its surroundings.

Your additional set of thoughts was with science. It is knowledge we have been able to discover over the past hundred years, which has led to an understanding of the atom and the power it possesses as

witnessed by the atom bomb. There is an inherent set of forces within each atom, and their ability to form different compounds of different elements is a fascinating area of discovery. I would like to learn more with what science can reveal. However, I also know that there are hypothetical ideas and theories that have advanced mankind onto a moral path of integrity, righteousness, justice, and truth. These are not materialistic in nature but values that we construct in our own minds to help conduct our lives in harmony with one another.

The idea of God is such a construct, and if we associate the force of the atom as the lowest denominator of God to explain the existence of the universe, I have no problem with that. But again, to believe there are souls that can live eternally from lifetime to lifetime, where each life can be better based upon one's conduct in one's present life, is at least to me the dream of a spiritualist or a priest to sell the concept of love and compassion for one another. I do not need the reward of eternal life to lead a decent life with love and compassion toward others. Fortunately for me, it is a natural consequence of my disposition.

Steve B., July 20, 2011, 6:19 p.m. EDT

“To those claims, I can only say the person may still have existed in a quasi-like state of mind where portions of the brain were still operable even after the person was determined to be clinically dead.”

Yet there is no brain activity, at least as it is measured. This “explanation” of the near-death experience is addressed in the book of which I give the link below.

“I would be interested in what evidence is there that consciousness exists after the organic body is dead.”

Near Death Experience Research Foundation:

Evidence of the Afterlife: The Science of Near-Death Experiences

I don't disagree with your notion that the atom is involved in the rise of consciousness. The evidence, though, I am pointing to suggests that consciousness finds ways to express itself in matter, but also seems independent of matter.

Steve B., July 20, 2011, 6:32 p.m. EDT

Also, another line of research supporting the independence of consciousness from matter comes from “parting visions,” in which people “see” or “experience” a loved one shortly after they have died—often before they know of that person’s death.

Parting Visions

Nicholas Ginex, July 21, 2011, 2:59 a.m. EDT

Hi Steve,

Yes, I have had the same experience when my twin brother was hurt. But I have had the feelings of somebody thinking intently about me, and it was also mutual. I guess it was a form of mental telepathy.

Jerry Kays, July 22, 2011, 5:17 p.m. EDT

For one to not interest themselves in other than this lifetime, it is perfectly natural to consider their ego the be all and end all . . . and a “balanced” ego is also perfectly (whole) natural . . .

For those who desire to see themselves “spiritually related” to other, then a soul is a required concept to designate a spiritual personality related to the eternal.

IMnsHO

Nicholas Ginex, July 19, 2011, 7:43 p.m. EDT

Hello, Richard W. and Gather readers following this thread. I have read several excerpts and definitions of Atman, Brahma, and the lower-case atman. Very impressive are the principles of Buddhism and Hindu philosophy dealing with the universal soul and human souls. It appears that Brahma can be defined as being located both in the physical, external world and also in the spiritual and inner world where it is present as Atman, “universal spirit.” At the individual level, every human being has an undying soul (atman) which lasts through eternity from life to life; this undying atman is a microcosm of Atman, the universal spirit.

It is to be understood that I have had no knowledge of Buddhism and Hindu philosophy except for having a faint idea of what is nirvana and use of the word karma. The ideas presented in this post are original and hypothetical ideas of my own. However, I can appreciate why it appears that my discourse runs along one of the central themes of Buddhism, which is that there is a spirit or consciousness that pervades the universe.

However, my philosophical ideas do not encompass the acceptance of a soul that lasts through eternity from life to life. It is my belief that the body is the engine of mental activity, and once it extinguishes, there is no more energy capable of being transmitted into the universe. Yes, I find merit in the idea that matter cannot be destroyed but transformed after being completely absorbed into dust or burned. But that transformation takes place billions upon billions of years after our sun has been dissipated or drawn into a black hole or becomes part of a quasar or pulsar phenomenon. What happens during such a period of time is that the gases, energy, and matter expelled back out into the universe gradually form other stars, planets, and galactic system that continue its life cycle process. At such a time, billions of years later, again inorganic and organic life forms take form.

The universal consciousness articulated by Buddhist spiritualists therefore subsides and begins anew, which, in my mind, nullifies the idea of a soul lasting through eternity from life to life. It is my belief that the life of an individual being enhanced by a higher order of life as its soul migrates is a philosophy to promote the value of living decent lives with love and compassion for one another. This is a good thing, but in reality, to achieve such an outcome demands instruction by loving, perceptive, and caring people for those young minds who join our civilization. Such men as Buddha and Jesus had the perception to teach us to respect ourselves and others. Jesus put it all in its very simplest terms—*love one another*.

Jerry Kays, July 22, 2011, 5:32 p.m. EDT

Nicholas, your view seems to be the ego (lower self) view, the natural dualistic man's view . . . a view that can be transcended to the spiritual view of a "higher self" (i.e. soul), *God*, Spirit of *God*, Spirit of truth, Spirit of Christ, Atman, etc., etc., etc . . . whatever name connects one with the highest truth representing *God* or his best representative allowable to you.

Abbie H., July 20, 2011, 12:11 p.m. EDT

This is very interesting, but nobody has invoked the presence of magnetic fields. Everything we (and I use that term loosely) know (right) is based on the idea of elements and compounds and not on magnetic fields. Magnetic fields are beyond and above most of the most educated individuals. And (because of an incident I experienced) magnetic fields control everything.

Nicholas Ginex, July 20, 2011, 10:53 p.m. EDT

Hello Abbie,

Thank you for finding this post an interesting one. I agree with you that electric and magnetic fields encompass much energy and exhibit forces that can be exceptionally powerful not only at the physical level that we can observe, but also at the unseen level within the atom itself. There are other levels within the atom, such as quarks, but for my hypothetical discourse, it was sufficient to have our readers understand that it is the different mix of atoms that forms different elements and compounds that create both inorganic and organic matter. It is my feeling that this is a unique way of billions of atoms expressing themselves into first inorganic matter and then into the higher form of matter that is capable of existing with its surroundings. Fundamentally, there must be heat from a star (sun), a planet, and moisture to allow for the growth of organic matter. It is marvelous to see we, and other living things, are the products of this phenomenon of creation.

What I would like to know is where did the atom come from in the first place? Does an atom develop out of nothing? And also, as you pointed out, how did the magnetic and electrical, positive and negative (and neutral) properties of the atom originate? These are questions that may never be answered satisfactorily. However, I am impressed that this force or energy finally can express itself through the intelligence it creates in a mixture of many life forms. Truly, I believe there is a consciousness in the universe that deserves our respect for we are part of, and made of, those atoms. Remarkable!

Ben Surbana, July 22, 2011, 3:16 p.m. EDT

Your comment, Nicholas, reminds me of the saying, "Being comes from nonbeing." Here we enter the world of potentials and actualities . . .

And perhaps it is the mystery behind the opposites you mention, i.e. polar opposites in which one cannot exist without the other.

Whereas “potential” and “actual” are not opposites, positive and negative are . . . creating a necessary “tension” upon which life is dependent.

Jerry Kays, July 22, 2011, 5:46 p.m. EDT

I see “dualism” as the “considered” opposites, such as right/wrong, light/dark, etc., where the (/) denotes the “separation” or “division” as the “void” or “gap” between them . . . the way the ego (especially the unbalanced ego) would look at it.

That is why I added the “bridge,” the “connector,” the “loving attractor” of (=) denoting the “spirit” (=) that replaces the gap (/) . . . and allows communication (via the mind).

Richard Regener, July 20, 2011, 3:03 p.m. EDT

Hi Nicholas,

You’ve gotten some rather interesting commentary in response to your post here, so let me add my two cents’ worth for clarification. To begin with, it should be noted that basic awareness and consciousness are two somewhat different states in that general awareness is a molecular or genetic response to external influences and consciousness is a developing awareness of self. One may evolve from the other with transformation, but they are by no means the same.

Your question as to why consciousness would form only at birth would suggest that the natural transformation from subatomic particle awareness into biological consciousness in new life may require a developed biological computer (organic brain matter) for consciousness to manifest in beyond the general molecular responsive coding of a single atom. Last time I looked, there is no brain matter to be found in plant life. Animal life on the other hand does think within the context of its developing consciousness and physical abilities.

The other part of this wonderful process of consciousness development involves what we call the soul, spirit, essence, energy, and so on, which I’ve always felt are one and the same. “You will note there is no

god concept in this scenario,” in so far as I consider the evolution of existence a semi-random process evolving from subatomic particles. As to the question of whether or not our consciousness can survive death, my experiences would indicate some memories do, although complete consciousness is quite another matter since without a physical brain to correlate and process data in a cohesive manner after death it’s quite difficult to accurately define this.

Nicholas Ginex, July 21, 2011, 2:53 a.m. EDT

Hello Richard,

Thank you adding your views to this discussion. In this post, I am attempting to describe a universal process that begins with the properties of an atom because I have accepted the premise that we, and all objects we perceive, are made up with a certain mix of atoms. On the other hand, I believe you are trying to further distinguish what do we mean by consciousness and when does it become activated. Now I did not go into such specifics because that was not the central theme of my discourse. It is true that inorganic matter has no consciousness or awareness as an inert object. But to what level of consciousness are we speaking of when an organic object has some kind of biochemical process in its life cycle?

In the plant kingdom, there is the process that takes in carbon dioxide and releases oxygen. But there are advanced stages of plant life that can in fact capture an insect and devour it for its subsistence. Is there some kind of conscious level in the plant that can make it react to its surroundings? This is truly an instinctive level of consciousness rather than the thinking level we humans possess. But it is a level of consciousness.

You bring up a distinction of consciousness that is worth understanding. You noted that “basic awareness and consciousness are two somewhat different states in that general awareness is a molecular or genetic response to external influences and consciousness is a developing awareness of self.” This distinction of two levels of consciousness is good, but both levels are associated with the ability to react to stimuli. In Buddhism and Hinduism philosophy, there is a consciousness-only teaching that originated in the fourth century and was referred to as the “Yogacara” school of philosophy. They define the five sensory organs that provide sight, hearing, smell, taste, and touch to influence the

consciousness of the mind. This may be called the awareness level of consciousness that senses the external world. The Buddhist teachings then go on to describe the “*manas* consciousness,” which consists of several levels that sustain self-consciousness and develop the concept of a soul that is affected by the actions of a person, which after death goes on to an eternal set of life cycles depending upon whether the life led was morally or destructively conducted.

Your comments alluded to a definition of the soul whereby there is no god concept employed. The Buddhist dogma does not present a god but does define the soul as the root of consciousness where “seeds” of good and bad deeds influence the karma of the soul and affect its transformations into the eternal life to life cycle. Herein, we “see” the Buddha purpose of the soul dogma is to direct the teaching of wisdom to lead a moral and compassionate life to attain immortality of the soul and enable it to reach transformations at higher levels.

We appear to be in agreement that the possibility of soul existing after death is difficult to define since without a physical brain to correlate and process data in a cohesive manner any kind of consciousness is highly improbable. As I have expressed in another response on this post, I do not believe a soul exists after death because as you have pointed out the body or engine no longer supports the brain. But then, the soul also has no material substance or for that matter any atoms to keep its identity alive. The soul is a mental construct to persuade followers of the promise of eternal life.

I have tried to be brief in this response but also tried to address your comments. The one thought I wish to leave our readers with is that there is inherent in the atom the ability to form inorganic and organic matter whereby organic matter possesses certain levels of consciousness. It is the highest level of consciousness that the universe achieves its purpose—the creation of life forms that reach out and try to understand the universe they came from. My comments about God in my last paragraph of my discourse were simply doing what the Buddhist and Hindus have done, and that is to devise a system of morality. The big difference is that the Buddhist-Hindu dogma teaches that by living a proper life of morality and compassion for others one is rewarded with eternal life. The difference in my discourse is that I do not accept the idea of eternal life for a reward nor do I accept the idea of hell for punishment. Both ideas, at least to me, are infantile religious dogmas.

Jerry Kays, July 22, 2011, 6:03 p.m. EDT

I see the source of consciousness as coming from *within* as an *output* of the original source of everything manifested, that being the micro expanded into the macro.

Our five objective senses read the macrocosmos manifested for egoistic attention . . . the *intuition* reads the *inner* micro source, the spiritual realm for references . . .

Between the two, we find our natural true balance, the (=) of all that is available (+=-).

As I see it, the higher powered, higher frequency relationships of “signals” is the mind of *God*, the spirit, the *universal intelligence*, which speaks in “codes” through our soul which is manifested in our very DNA/RNA codes as our *individualism* (personhood), which is our “transceiver frequency code” for two-way communication, aware by us or not, usually not.

Steve B., July 24, 2011, 9:38 a.m. EDT

Richard,

“As to the question of whether or not our consciousness can survive death, my experiences would indicate some memories do, although complete consciousness is quite another matter since without a physical brain to correlate and process data in a cohesive manner after death it’s quite difficult to accurately define this.”

I’ve read that consciousness may be actually limited by the brain (in the sense of being focused), rather than made possible. People experiencing near-death, for example, often report 360 degree “vision,” as well as a kind of “timeless” apprehension of everything at once. In other words, the experience of time/space is not limited. Also, there is very good evidence that consciousness survives death. For more information, see *Evidence of the Afterlife: The Science of Near-Death Experiences*.

Steve B., July 24, 2011, 10:10 a.m. EDT

Nicholas, “In the plant kingdom, there is the process that takes in carbon dioxide and releases oxygen. But there are advanced stages

of plant life that can in fact capture an insect and devour it for its subsistence.” Also, there is plant “communication.”

“The possibility of soul existing after death is difficult to define since without a physical brain to correlate and process data in a cohesive manner any kind of consciousness is highly improbable.”

Again, that seems to be a “materialistic” bias, and there is evidence to the contrary, which I referred to above—and linked sources. What seems more likely is that consciousness is “limited” in order to “fit” into matter. In other words, the brain is a function of consciousness, rather than the other way round.

Nicholas: “The difference in my discourse is that I do not accept the idea of eternal life for a reward nor do I accept the idea of hell for punishment. Both ideas, at least to me, are infantile religious dogmas.”

Of course, people are entitled to their beliefs. I am just trying to point to evidence, which has been researched and published. People who experience clinical death and then are revived report highly consistent and universal experiences. These reports have been studied and systematically catalogued. Attempts to “reduce” them to material explanations have not held up in the face of the evidence.

I do not know how the atom fits into this if it does. Is consciousness more basic than the atom? I have heard that overwhelmingly, the total mass and energy of the universe has not been identified; it is called “dark matter” and “dark energy.” No one seems to know what that is, but it is there. Theoretical physics speculates that “ours” may very well not be the only “universe.” There are so many open questions. I do not see any justification for conclusions regarding what is not possible—or even likely.

A recent film I saw opens with a very old woman on her death bed. Her grieving daughter is there with her. She asks her mother if she is afraid. The old woman answers with a single word, “Curious.” I think that is a profound and marvelous orientation to have.

Jerry Kays, July 24, 2011, 1:26 p.m. EDT

As to whether there are “other” universes or not seems to me a far-fetched question when we have yet to satisfactorily define our own *universe* . . .

I get the feeling that most who speak of universe have actually excluded the “things” from it that they cannot “objectify” . . . such as black holes, which are mentioned as “doorways” to “other” universes where black matter and black energy exist . . . things that to me are related (relative) to all that we do accept as allowable (or normal) . . .

In other words, to me *the universe* would be the *total mix* which included *all* of the *black* categories also . . . That of course goes right along with the *inclusion* of *God*, spirit, and even the “potentials” of the more “negative” aspects of those . . .

IMnsHO (+=-) > (+/-)

Steve B., July 24, 2011, 1:51 p.m. EDT

Jerry,

“As to whether there are ‘other’ universes or not seems to me a far-fetched question when we have yet to satisfactorily define our own *universe* . . .”

It was not even a century ago, when we thought the idea of “other” galaxies was “far-fetched.” Now we know there are a hundred billion of them, each with hundreds of billions of stars. The best theoretical—mathematically consistent—theory points to dimensions other than the four we’re familiar with. I have no idea what *is*, but I marvel at just the scope and breadth of it all.

From my work in mental health—background in analytical psychology—I have no doubt, none whatsoever, that there is “intelligence” or consciousness or awareness which is an inherent property of whatever describing—universe or multiverse. I also have no doubt that human intelligence, as impressive as it is, is not the “alpha and omega” of awareness.

Steve B., July 24, 2011, 2:12 p.m. EDT

Jerry,

“The ego sees everything associated with thought as limited to the brain, even memory.”

Perhaps one has to experience “non-local” awareness oneself to understand that there is a conscious awareness that is light years beyond everyday typical human thinking—a mere function of brain activity (if that even is an accurate statement).

I am continually emphasizing *experience*. I see no reason to discount, disconfirm, or otherwise “reduce” what so many people say they have *experienced*. There are also documented ways in which they are “different” after the experience.

Nicholas Ginex, July 24, 2011, 11:35 p.m. EDT

Hello Jerry and Steve,

I found your dialogue very interesting, and there is some merit to some of your ideas. First, I want to thank Steve for the link that supports plant consciousness. I have always had an affinity for plants and flowers and can sense their alive attributes. Experiments show that plants exposed to beautiful music tend to grow at a better rate. Of course care, as you would care for a baby, also helps.

As I indicated in an earlier response, I have had non-local consciousness transmitted to me, and I felt that in some way I initiated that transmission by my intent thoughts on that person, for, in a matter of days, I received a letter from that person whom I recently met but was unable to contact her. Again, I stress that I believe it was due to my brain activity in thinking intently about a particular person.

Steve, you indicated that you believe there is an inherent consciousness in the universe. I have tried to describe that the atom itself has, as Jerry indicated, opposites (electrons and protons) that are capable of sustaining itself. How the atom is able to mix with other atoms to first form nonorganic compounds and set the stage to create other elements to form organic compounds is a mystery. But that mystery seems to

point to some kind of inherent process that seems to know what it wants to do. It appears that, in the end, the atoms want to create life forms that are capable or have the ability of communicating at higher levels of consciousness. It may be the atoms seek to have individual life forms question the consciousness of the universe itself.

This is why I respect and have an affinity for the beautiful trees and flowers that surround us. I feel all life forms are expressing a way for them to exist, and we all are interconnected in the entire life cycle process. As you know, plants manufacture oxygen, and we depend on that element just as they depend on the carbon dioxide we exhale.

I just have one thought in reply to Jerry's idea or acceptance of reincarnation. Jerry, you wrote, "Nicholas, by eternity I mean the multiple lives available through reincarnation and then spiritual dimensions of differing orders . . . the idea that we are spirit and connected to other realms for evolving experiences." I have to address this idea because I do not believe in reincarnation or the soul transferring through multiple lives. Regarding spiritual dimensions of differing orders, these are words, and I cannot relate to any other dimensions of different orders.

If you have been able to convince yourself of the soul transferring into another life and have some experience confirming that, then you have some special ability that I do not possess. Again, it is my belief that the priesthood of the Egyptians, the Buddhists, and Hindus have fabricated the idea of a soul to sell the concept of a hereafter or a chance at another life if you mess this one up. Consciousness is a wonderful thing, and I appreciate the hypothetical ideas the human mind is capable of dreaming of. Some of those dreams have resulted in wonderful discoveries because the ability to think logically can build marvelous things such as the radio, TV, airplanes, etc. and not least of all, to be able to construct the model of an atom and synthesize the elements that atoms can make.

However, one must be careful not to develop hypothetical dreams or concepts that may prove to be false. I will agree that I share the idea that the consciousness in the atom and throughout the universe is an attribute of the mysterious, incomprehensible, and unknowable God that we will continually try to reach out to and try to understand.

Ben Surbana, July 22, 2011, 2:23 p.m. EDT

Jesus said, “If the flesh has come into existence because of the spirit, it is a marvel; but if the spirit has come into existence because of the body, it is a marvel of marvels. But I marvel at how this great wealth has made its home in this poverty.” (St. Thomas)

That humankind can be aware of consciousness itself is what separates mankind from all other species.

Concerning soul survival, one might more accurately describe “survival” as a *return* to God, rather than just merely surviving. And in what condition or state shall we best return? As perfected *individuals* through the unity of soul and spirit, as a state of “heaven.”

If we are made in God’s image, then God, whose presence dwells within us, is the primal consciousness of which we must manifest in order to return through the expression and the living of the highest love—as a gift to others—and as the desire to become whole, complete, perfect, holy.

Our will to receive the God is an elevation of human consciousness to a divine level.

Werner V., July 22, 2011, 3:22 p.m. EDT

I’ve been thinking about the oxidative state of things lately and redox reactions. But Richard Regener’s description of these things, which are all part of the living world, is not spiritual enough for me.

Nicholas Ginex, July 22, 2011, 3:56 p.m. EDT

Hello Werner,

Thank you for joining in this conversation. It would be nice to understand what level of spiritual consciousness or existence are you referring to? It appears that you are implying that the soul exists apart from the living world, and it would be instructive to explore this idea.

Werner V., July 22, 2011, 4:13 p.m. EDT

What is the spirit and what is the living world?

Nicholas Ginex, July 22, 2011, 4:23 p.m. EDT

Hello Werner,

Since you indicated that Richard's response was not spiritual enough for you, I thought you might share your thoughts on the existence of the spirit or soul. Speaking for myself, I believe that the idea of a soul is a noble one but taught to express the concept that God will receive your soul upon living a moral and ethical life. This is good. However, I rather believe in teaching our youth the attributes of integrity, honesty, compassion, and love for our sisters and brothers regardless of the reward of eternal life.

The spirit is the ability for higher forms of life to think and act for the benefit of others. The living world is what we experience with our senses while alive.

Werner V., July 22, 2011, 4:41 p.m. EDT

Your second paragraph answers the question.

But have you ever thought about the essence of the soul? Do you believe it exists in words or do you think of it as something which cannot be addressed?

Nicholas Ginex, July 22, 2011, 6:48 p.m. EDT

Hello Werner,

I try to answer questions based upon what I have experienced and learned in life. My answers are not authoritative but honest in what I think and feel in my heart. Regarding the existence of a soul, the best answer I perceive is that from the very beginning of creation by the forces within the atoms that we are composed of there is an intelligence or consciousness that seeks to express itself in matter. That matter first consists of the elemental properties that make up inorganic substances, and these substances form the basis for the beginnings of organic life to occur. This entire process by the inherent properties of the atom continues until very high forms of life begin to form whereby such life begins to reach out and question its own existence. Such consciousness may be characterized as the soul.

However, I do not believe in the transformations of the soul going from life to life as do the Indian philosophies of Brahma and Atman. To me, once the engine of consciousness is dead, such as the body and its brain functions, the consciousness that was once created stops existing. I am not afraid of death for I have led a life of wonderful experiences as well as pain, but through it all that is what makes us enjoy the reality of this life. To suppose there is an afterlife, I do not count on that. I only believe in what one of our greatest teachers left for us to follow and that was the Word of God—*love one another*. This does not mean I know or understand the mysterious, incomprehensible, and unknowable God, but it does mean that I subscribe to the wisdom we have been able to teach ourselves. If you think about it, God does not teach you anything. What you have learned has been taught to you by teachers of many generations. However, do not believe everything that is taught for much of it may need to be revised based upon the knowledge we have attained today.

Jerry Kays, July 22, 2011, 6:56 p.m. EDT

I see “wisdom” as being the essential balance of things, the peaceful harmony of said balance, of which the spiritual (=) view would consist of . . .

That is also the offshoot of the spiritual awakening where one transcends the normal intelligence of rational connectivity into the “heart” of the “inner knowing” (gnosis) of things . . . why it grants great peace of mind, the truth that sets one free . . . free from worry and fear, free to let things be, no more worries. Let go and let *God*.

Nicholas Ginex, July 22, 2011, 7:06 p.m. EDT

Hello Jerry,

Your description of a spirit soul as the universal realm of God previous to the making of a physical world is a hypothetical concept which is not necessarily true, but at the same time, it is not necessarily false. I frankly do not know. However, there are those human beings gifted with the insight to make and believe in such a concept.

Nicholas Ginex, July 22, 2011, 7:29 p.m. EDT

Hello Jerry,

Wisdom is not easily attained. I have found that much wisdom I have gained was from former teachers in the past who have been caring enough to write their thoughts down for others to examine and grow from. I have not been fortunate to gain wisdom from my own mind. However, from the wisdom and data input I have acquired over the years, I am able to hypothesize such thoughts as “*Does Consciousness Pervade Our Universe?*” The “*spiritual awakening*” you write of is motivated by a disposition to love and teach others how to lead wholesome lives. To have such an awakening and not put it to good use is a self-centered way to gratify oneself. This is why I admire such great writers as I have referred to in my book *Future of God Amen*. Their energy and time in providing us with written knowledge and findings they have been able to discover is to be applauded.

If readers of this post wish to avail themselves of some of the finest writers, I recommend they examine the bibliography of the book presented on the website www.futureofgodamen.com

Jerry Kays, July 23, 2011, 3:03 a. m. EDT

Nicholas, many have professed wisdom over the years and many have had it and expressed it properly and truly . . . but offsetting that are the many more, even who have made the same claims and written them into books who have never really had it; on the contrary, they have taught people the wrong way to think and act in so many cases . . . The institutions of religion have been as guilty of that as any . . . not to mention our leading politicians who daily set examples of what *not* to think and do . . . all accepted by too many as our leaders and authorities to be emulated . . .

When any person truly has a relationship with *God* through the spirit who seeks truth . . . that person automatically receives all the wisdom required to lead an exemplary life through their own *intuition* . . . There is no better teacher . . . bar none.

IMnsHO (and experience)

Nicholas Ginex, July 23, 2011, 2:38 p.m. EDT

Hello Jerry,

I respect your relationship with God as I do for all those who have beliefs they live by. However, my experience in life about receiving wisdom has been given to me by people who have been willing to share their thoughts. You are right that not everything written has validity, but all the wisdom I have acquired was by keeping my ears open and reading books by those who took the time to put into writing the many ideas and points of view that have added to my store of knowledge. As I reflect back on the knowledge received, I must admit that God never spoke to me or entered my consciousness to provide truth and wisdom.

The belief in the spirit or soul is a nice construct to accept the idea of eternal life. The Egyptians, Buddhists, and Hindus have developed very marvelous concepts of the soul and its passing to meet the Creator Spirit upon living an ethical and moral life. I don't know if this is true and therefore cannot subscribe to this hypothetical concept. However, I will continue learning from the wise men and women who have set their thoughts on paper for me and others to gain insights into our purpose in life and how to lead a life of integrity, honesty, and compassion.

Jerry Kays, July 23, 2011, 7:20 p.m. EDT

I agree completely . . . as to whether there even is a *God*, and how that may affect mankind will only be truly known by *God* . . . The rest are but our own concepts, and some could be right on and others way out there somewhere . . . in the final analysis, to each their own. IMnsHO

On Being and Doing

By Mike Voyce, April 21, 2012

Let me put forward a proposition.

Firstly, that which I hope is common ground; that part of us which is part of Creation is our soul. When we come into incarnation our physical body is animated by soul awareness and this awareness, as part of all that is, has awesome power.

Next, and this is highly unoriginal, incarnation on Earth is part of a great experiment in co-creation. Each incarnated fragment of awareness is invited to create a 'self,' a consciousness of being an individual. This individual is the person each of us supposes we are.

After this come some points which may not be common ground but which follow absolutely.

The most striking point is that, as part of all that IS, the soul awareness has the power to bring almost anything about; more than this, it not only sustains life and balance in our incredibly complex bodies, it creates and modifies the reality which surrounds each individual (by the way, diseases can be seen as a partial failure of this balance—although it may equally be planned for by the soul). On the other hand, the 'self,' not being part of Creation, in fact having no true existence, is utterly powerless except so far as its wishes are given effect by the soul awareness.

Starting with Sigmund Freud the 'self' has become known as the ego. Because this self-creation has no existence, its first concern is to establish that it DOES exist; furthermore it seeks to establish it is the only aspect of the individual which DOES exist. There are several results of this:

The ego drives out of consciousness all awareness of the soul, or, if it cannot do this, it hides soul awareness in expressions such as ‘subconscious’, ‘dream’ ‘coincidence’, ‘paranormal’, ‘supernatural’ ‘imagination’ or ‘superstition’.

Being part of everything which IS, soul awareness acknowledges the connectedness and being of everything which IS. The ego, not being part of anything which IS, defines anything outside the individual as separate (a product of some other ego) and probably threatening.

An evidence and gauge of this is religious ideas and people who speak of ‘fear of God’ rather than ‘love of God’. Such ideas and people evidently are only aware of ego, and are totally out of touch with God and soul awareness. Consequently they know nothing of what they speak or preach; this is a triumph of ego over God. And this is intimately associated with the fantastical bombast of ‘the Devil’ and ‘Hell’ since it is inconceivable that Creation would want to, or be able to, punish any part of itself. Of course, egos, not being part of Creation, can imagine that God would punish them.

As this error referred to looms rather large in the World, it is worth going into two consequences.

One is Karma, at one level this is no more than an operation of Newton’s law of physics, ‘for every action there is an equal and opposite re-action’—although this will apply more to the ego than the soul. At another level we have to look at the great experiment of co-creation: the soul must look at whatever the ego, to which it gave rise and which it empowered, has created. I’m sure I’m wrong to characterise the soul’s reaction to the overblown behaviour of an ego such as Assad, or any other tyrant, as embarrassment. Nevertheless, a soul which empowered such an ego clearly has work to do and cannot be regarded as mature.

The other is the poisonous strain of Judaism, Christianity and Islam (the fictions of the Devil and Hell), the degree to which ego has perverted these religions is evident in their histories. I defy anyone to claim those involved in Jihadism, Crusades, witch burning or any other bigotry had or have any understanding of divinity, no matter how revered they may be. On the other hand it is wrong to ‘throw the baby out with the bathwater.’ Even those who caused suffering have

sometimes been motivated by a desire for divinity, even if their means and actions were entirely of the ego.

It is also worth noting, in the modern age, those who display greatest religious mania, extreme Islamists, though dangerous, are individually the most pathetic; while the egotists who cause the most suffering now do so outside religion, Stalin, Mao Zedong, Hitler and many others.

You may notice my capitalisation of IS and DOES, this is the great distinction between soul and ego. What really worries me in the modern age is that a very high proportion of people see themselves exclusively in terms of ego labels, which are only ever about what they do or have done. This is essentially ‘noise without light,’ the vast bulk of achievements and targets in the World can have no significance whatsoever at a soul level. The net effect is to obscure from themselves the real nature of those who run after targets and achievements. The principle behaviours in Western civilisation are now so suited to doing, and are so dismissive of being, so calculated to reinforce the ego’s lies, that they produce the dissembling culture we now experience, in which many people have become incapable of distinguishing truth from untruth.

Teaching Psychology, in two different colleges, I have asked students, “Are you a human being or a human doing?” In both colleges a depressing majority answered, “I am a human doing.” And this from people who profess a wish to understand human behaviour—they don’t even understand their enslavement to their own egos!

Now here is a difficulty, if I rant against the errors I see then that behaviour is itself a pure product of ego. Here is another test, people will argue to the death for a lie, while the truth simply speaks for itself. I have mentioned these errors, on *Blogtalkradio* and on *Gather*; but the answer is not rational (ego) argument, it is simply being.

So here is the proposition, stand back from all your conscious wishes and needs. When that false creature the ego demands your attention, which it may do with increasingly insistent desperation, simply ask yourself, “What is my purpose in this situation?” If you think about it sufficiently deeply you will find the answer, in any situation, “Peace is my purpose in this situation.” As the demands of the ego recede you will rediscover soul awareness, and with it, almost certainly to your greatest surprise, the immense depth and richness of your own being.

I have been privileged, over very many years to have desultory and occasional contact with some of the very best spiritual mediums, the effect of this has been strengthened by the experiences recorded in my book, and I am encouraged to assert this ‘standing back’ is the first step in acquiring awareness not only of the true self but all that IS, including the spirits of others, both living and ‘dead.’ I am also encouraged to assert that it can be done.

I have lamentably ignored those similar opportunities I have had to experience the charismatic power to change the World, presented by a number of remarkable people who crossed my path. And yet I have learned enough to know something of the power of souls. My partner, at the time, and I sought to raise the spirits of one anxious and materialistic contact of mine: we did it by demonstrating the dispersing of clouds; but the bullying of small clouds, precipitating parking spaces, and changing traffic lights are essentially childish activities.

Where the miraculous power of soul and spirit mediumship meet is in healing, and it is not for nothing that Christ’s first recorded miracles were healing miracles. There is perhaps not a Spiritualist church in the U.K. which does not offer healing (without charge). If a healer can divorce soul awareness from the ego then the power of spirit (soul) healing can be great, but few escape the power of the ego sufficiently or for very long.

‘There is nothing new under the sun’ and all which is original in this article is my choice of words. For further reading I suggest *A Course in Miracles*, though I prefer the simple printed text, and, quite separately, the works of *Eckhart Tolle*. To advance one relatively original thought, let me risk giving offence by asking how, in pretty much one generation, the eastern Mediterranean produced three magi capable of altering reality and defying the laws of physics? These three were Jesus the Nazarene, Apollonius of Tyre and Simeon Magus, one of them became the Christos, and I suggest all three learned in the Greek Mystery schools. And what did they learn? I humbly suggest they learned what I have so weakly sought to express here—of course, they did it rather better, and demonstrated it more publicly, than anyone else we know about.

Using soul awareness to change the World is to be viewed with trepidation, you will recall the temptation of Christ, and true masters avoid it, at least outwardly, mostly keeping themselves low. Yet reality

responds to the wishes of any being which IS, as Quantum physicists are now learning, and your true self, your soul awareness, IS. What is NOT, and what cannot influence reality, is the demand of your ego's doing.

If you can turn your back on your self-important and self-aggrandizing ego you may one day look around you and be aware of the truth of the Tao Te Ching,

“The master achieves without doing . . .”

Comments and Responses

Ann Marcaida Apr 21, 2012, 11:45am EDT

Now featured at Examining Our Religion.

Mike Voyce Apr 21, 2012, 12:26pm EDT

Thank you Ann, your recommendation is greatly appreciated.

Ann Marcaida Apr 21, 2012, 12:29pm EDT

This is extraordinarily clear writing on spiritual issues.

Mike Voyce Apr 21, 2012, 12:33pm EDT

Ann, you are kind. Most people, if not everyone, can see clearly when they put their preconceptions aside—something I really try to do.

Jerry Kays Apr 21, 2012, 1:30pm EDT

Very well said Mike, the same message I constantly attempt to teach via much different methods . . . :-)

Mike Voyce Apr 22, 2012, 4:53am EDT

Jerry, you are kind. There is such great resistance to this message, from fear and habit, that it cannot be given too often, or in too many ways, or by too many people.

Thank you for your comment.

Mike Voyce Apr 22, 2012, 5:15am EDT

Jerry, thank you for your recommendation.

Nicholas Ginex Apr 21, 2012, 7:54pm EDT

Hello Mike,

You have written a fascinating article that I read with great interest. Very rarely is one gifted enough to articulate a very elusive concept, or shall I say belief, of the soul. What is interesting is that you touch upon the inner nature of a person and characterized it as the soul of an individual.

I try to reflect and understand your views as the soul being a part of the creative process and the ego the manifestation through which the soul subconsciously works its power. Now, what do I mean by that?

When I sit down to write about something I strongly believe in, I find myself transformed into another mindset. Somehow, I feel it is within my nature to reveal the truth and share with others what I have learned in life. My daughters and wife well know the expression I tend to use often, which is "I don't like to be made a fool of." Likewise, I am fortunate to be born with the disposition not to make a fool out of others by lies and deceit.

Your words, and I must repeat them here, were very significant, "as part of all that IS, the soul awareness has the power to bring almost anything about; more than this, it not only sustains life and balance in our incredibly complex bodies, it creates and modifies the reality which surrounds each individual (by the way, diseases can be seen as a partial failure of this balance—although it may equally be planned for by the soul). On the other hand, the 'self,' not being part of Creation, in fact having no true existence, is utterly powerless except so far as its wishes are given effect by the soul awareness."

You touch upon the very beginning of the creative process started with atoms that were able to form inorganic and organic elements that finally, after billions and trillions of years, evolve living organisms; the epitome being intelligent life forms able to think and question how they came to be in the universe.

It may be possible that the inherent forces of the atom have a purpose and that is to create the ultimate, which is intelligent life; the crowning glory of the creative force that made the universe. Could it be that you are identifying that creative force as the soul? Something that wishes to express itself into something noble and worthwhile to give meaning for its very existence?

I say this, hopefully in a humble way, because as I see my life coming into its final years, I feel an obligation to put time, money, and effort into words that may help direct mankind on a better journey for a successful and peaceful life based upon truth, sincerity, and love for others. We are all part of the universe but we must listen to our souls, our inner nature, so that all of us find a purpose in life and contribute to the well-being of all.

Regarding the ego versus the soul, it is like characterizing hell and heaven, or the devil and god. I prefer not to use opposites for both the ego and the soul form a partnership where one drives the other. The greatest dreams, inventions of the mind, are created within the mind wherein the soul operates. Without the body, or ego, the soul cannot achieve the wonderful outcomes that have resulted in the electric bulb, the plane, TV, and wireless communication we enjoy now over the Internet. The creative power, the soul, if you wish, means nothing without the mechanism by which it can feel it can achieve and make something of itself.

Thank you Mike for allowing me to reflect on your wonderful article.

Mike Voyce Apr 22, 2012, 4:35am EDT

Nicholas, your comment is itself an article of great interest. As to what you have written, I wish I had written it myself.

I think you find a proper place for the Ego, and that gives great hope if we can encourage ourselves to Do out of Love instead of doing out of fear—may I say this great transition is something you have achieved in yourself and which is very evident in AMEN. By the way, in this you have a great purpose, and you may find your ‘final years’ greatly extend to pass on this message.

Being transformed into a different mindset is exactly an example of soul working through ego, in other words inspiration. All great work

comes not through ego but when ego ceases to block the work of the soul, to encourage us to allow this is the point of my article.

Nicholas Ginex Apr 21, 2012, 7:54pm EDT

Mike, it was your article that inspired me to reflect upon your thoughts. Such reflection is rare and deserves to be pursued by others for the topic is one that is somewhat futuristic. Although the soul was a concept derived by man's conception of the ka and ba during Egypt's spiritual and religious development, we are starting to project another dimension of the soul. A dimension that links the soul to the creative force of the universe that began with the smallest set of particles that have somehow been able to design the universe we have not yet begun to explore.

I was tempted to add your article to my third book, which is a compilation of the many articles I have written on this Gather forum. It presents 50 articles and the many comments and responses that allow others to reflect upon. The title of this book is, ***God, Us and the Universe***. It should be available for publishing in about a month. With your permission, I will add your article in the third subsection titled, ***The Universe***. Presently, this subsection has only one article titled, ***Does Consciousness Pervade Our Universe?*** It appears that although this book already has about 740 pages, another ten pages would not matter. More importantly, the subject of the soul as the inherent creative force of the universe appears to fit under this subsection.

Let me know if you are amenable to having your topic as part of the third book, which precedes the last book I envision on the topics dealing with religion; the book is titled, ***Amen***; its subtitle is, *The beginning of the creation of God*.

Jerry Kays Apr 22, 2012, 4:51pm EDT

Nicholas, best wishes on your new book . . . our world can use it. :-)

Nicholas Ginex Apr 22, 2012, 11:39pm EDT

Thank you Jerry for wishing success of my fourth and final book. After writing *Future of God Amen* and *Amen*, it is my hope that there will be many people and religious leaders who will "see" the need for changes needed to dogma of Judaic, Christian, and Islamic scriptures.

The messages in these books are clear; religious leaders must insure their scriptures profess the worship of one universal God and that they all teach the Word of God—*love one another*.

Mike Voyce Apr 23, 2012, 7:53am EDT

Nicholas, not only would I be honoured for you to use anything of mine in any of your books, I should be happy to write something for insertion—just let me know what.

Your work, that I've seen so far, is fascinating and 'must read' please let me know the publication date for AMEN.

Nicholas Ginex Apr 23, 2012, 12:03pm EDT

Thank you Mike for allowing this article, with its comments and responses, to be added into the last subsection of *God, Us and the Universe*. Today I will initiate a contract with Xlibris to start working for the publication of Amen, which I expect will be available in August, 2012.

Regarding you providing a possible insertion in Amen, I will be honored. I will e-mail you to discuss how you may wish to add additional thoughts or a separate writing.

Mike Voyce Apr 23, 2012, 1:06pm EDT

Thank you Nick.

Let me state publicly, for all those interested in spiritual harmony and understanding in the World, it would be so helpful if all of would read and review AMEN.

Epilogue

Any author of history that has accumulated a wealth of information, chronologically presented with events that unfold a period of mankind's development, will most assuredly have formed logical conclusions that may serve to avoid the pitfalls and failures of former generations. In the case of man's proclivity to cling to religious beliefs, such information can unlock why we have inherited strong religious beliefs and why succeeding generations of people are captive to repeatedly emulate those beliefs.

As the author of *Future of God Amen*, I found myself on a mission to reveal to people around the world the findings of a most wonderful legacy that few people are aware of. This book presents a history of a spiritual people who had advanced their initial beliefs in multiple gods to a god that became the "creator of all there is." This god, whose name is Amen, is still announced in temples, churches, and some mosques.

My interest in communicating what I have learned in writing *Future of God Amen* prompted me to become an active participant on two Internet forums. I was able to write many of the thoughts a writer would not include in a history book because they are personal views, opinions, and assertions that may differ with the interpretation of religious dogma formally taught by religious leaders to indoctrinate their followers. Such constraint was necessary because a book of history must adhere to facts and verifiable findings in unfolding a slice of man's history.

In responding to many comments provided by members of two forums, I was honored to be able to gain their confidence and respect to deal at length with their interpretations, views, and defense of their beliefs. They provided many questions and challenged many of my

views, which resulted for each of us an illuminating understanding of why our views were difficult to resolve in a meaningful way. I knew *Future of God Amen* conclusively revealed how mankind developed the belief in one-universal god. However, because the major religions have not acknowledged that one god as being the catalyst for their development, these forums became an opportunity to air the views of believers, agnostics, and atheists. The exchange of comments and responses of many religious points of view spawned two books, *Amen and Jesus' Revelation* and *God, Us and the Universe*.

It is my hope that after reading the comments and responses of the fifty topics presented in *God, Us and the Universe* that readers become aware that the core scriptures of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions, namely, the *Torah*, *Gospels* and *Revelation*, and *The Qur'an*, respectively, are in dire need of being revised. Such an effort is needed to reflect the needs of a more educated and discerning people of today and, most certainly, tomorrow.

This book highlights that there will always be a clash between the major religions because in the case of Judaic and Islamic beliefs, one seeks to dominate the other in the belief of one God. To make matters worse, the Christian religion has taken a man of God, Jesus, and raised him to be co-equal and co-eternal with God ignoring his announcements that he is the Son of Man. In all four Gospels, Jesus states he is the Son of Man 76 times and only in the last gospel of John do others, not Jesus, state 6 times he is the Son of God.

This is just one inconsistency or controversy discussed in the many topics presented in *God, Us and the Universe*. The objective of this author and hopefully people around the world is to unite our voices and proclaim that the religious leaders of the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions must unite the belief in one-universal God and teach the Word of God—**love one another**. This objective is a positive and proactive way to stop the arrogance of one religion believing they have the true religion and seek dominance by spreading their beliefs. The benefit will be the elimination of bigotry, hate, violence, and the murder of innocent people in the name of God. More importantly, such proactive unity to revise old, out-worn scriptures will avert the strong possibility of a Third World War.

This does not mean the major religions forsake their beliefs for they certainly may retain their rituals and traditions, but they will have an

opportunity to revise their scriptures and unify their beliefs in one God. Jesus has presented a challenge to our present day religious organizations by acknowledging the truth that Amen is the beginning of the creation of God. By acknowledging Amen as the first universal God, it will allow mankind to attain a higher level of belief base upon truth. More importantly, the religious leaders must adhere to the last command from God. It was announced three times in John's Gospel. It is the Word of God—*love one another*.

In closing, this discourse provides a recommended approach for unity of belief that religious leaders and their followers may, nay, must pursue. Let us welcome the daughters and sons of God that will emerge to assist religious leaders in their efforts to revise their scriptures. It is human nature to resist change, for having been deeply indoctrinated in dogma, religious leaders will need their assistance for they possess love of humanity and a desire to preserve the belief in God based upon truth.

This supplement to the historical novel, *Future of God Amen*, has provided many comments from those concerned about their faith and belief in God. It clearly reveals that change will not come easily; however, it is necessary. By continuing to study scriptures that were written in different periods in mankind's development, the resulting outcome can only stunt their spiritual growth and dissipate the belief in God. Let us all try to understand the words of Jesus' revelation and assist religious leaders to unify their scriptures and teach the Word of God—*love one another*.

Author Bio

*Nick enjoys his
71st birthday
August 27,
2006*



Photo taken to
celebrate his first
published book with
Xlibris Corporation,
*Future of God
Amen*

Photographer: Jennifer Schwartz

Nick Ginex is a retired Electrical Engineer with an MBA in Finance. He worked in design and distinguished himself in the support disciplines of Maintainability and Configuration Management (CM).

As CM Manager of software and hardware products at top aerospace and commercial companies, his planning and organizational skills were applied for the successful operation of entire engineering projects.

While writing his first book, *Future of God Amen*, Nick sang and played his guitar at senior care centers and nursing homes for their enjoyment. The smiles on their faces and joy in their eyes has been his greatest reward.

His love for his children and desire to inform them about the God Amen and His influence on the Judaic, Christian, and Islamic religions—has motivated him to write *Future of God Amen*. To supplement this historical novel, Nick has written this book so that his readers may gain greater insights into his personal views about today's major religions.

God, Us and the Universe presents the exchange of beliefs and views of the author with believers in God, agnostics, and atheists. A book he hopes others will benefit by learning more about God and their purpose in life.