

AN ARMAGEDDON SPIN IN THE TEMPLE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

(Oct. 30, 2011)

“PIERRE TEILHARD de CHARDIN” STANDING IN
THE 1948 “HOLY PLACE”—FULFILLING AND
FUELING THE PROPHECY REGARDING THE
ABOMINATION IN CONSCIOUSNESS

Epistemic premise (thinking about thinking)—

“Evolution” (now a word as pretentious as a surplice covered cassock) in general usage means that human life had its origin on earth, i.e., it developed from the simple (defensively and apologetically now being extending to the cosmic-simple) to the complex and most recently developed into human consciousness and its mind, which cognizing extrapolated and conjured up a god that “percipients” (allegedly the most informed) now know to be a figment of the imagination. This epistemic premise, this thought within the pale of thinking (mind confined) can be reacted or transacted to within the pale but not without using the mind to conjure up a greater imagined ontic-entity or force.

Being clearly perfectly against this tenet—I refuse to take that oath of “evolution” and do not believe in, and oppose without imposing, the usage of the word “evolution”. “Evolution” has become a credence-table in the sanctuary of pop-consciousness, a sanctuary that even U.S. presidential candidates must prostrate in and recite the primate-creed that they “believe in evolution”. See below, item 32. **If a moderator asks a presidential candidate, “Do you believe in evolution?”** there would only be enough time for a U.S. candidate to say and repeat:

If you mean do I believe that humankind developed from the cosmic-simple to the complex and upon reaching the level of consciousness the mind invented god and that god is therefore but an epiphenomenon, i.e. a figment of imagination, then my answer is “no.”

(We have to know what we are doing when talking about God, for it goes without saying that God is ineffable.)

Abridgment: Using temple-mount “evolution-oath” statistics (Israeli, Muslim, and “Christian”) this Webpage searches comprehensively for the abominable that is approaching to firmly stand in the holy place. Samples from below: **11. The “Evolution Oath” is also used in Israel:** Gavriel Avital (chief scientist in Israel’s ministry of education) stated that there are those for whom “evolution” is a religion and aren’t open to anything else. He dared to question the reliability of “evolution”—like: “If textbooks state explicitly that human beings’ origins are to be found with monkeys” and then he declared a preference for wanting students to grapple with its exclusivity. Radical calls for his dismissal then came from academia’s bulwarks, such as Israel Prize winner Yehoshua Kolodny. Schoolyard Bullying continues against those who “don’t swear”: **15. The Middle East is experiencing skirmishes** for Israel and Ishmael’s souls. But the front lines converge like a tsunami in the U.S where there’s more time and space to go to court and wait. The battle’s here, as Kenneth Miller’s book shows: “Only a Theory: Evolution and the Battle for America’s soul”. For more see: <http://karljaspersapplied.net/ExistenzKjsnaPart6.htm>. “Battle” is Kenneth’s choice of words, and he is committed to the offensive side of the war to enforce “evolution”. Teilhard, the E-evolutionist of his “Church”, unsuccessfully tried to avoid offending opposition by finding an agreeable starting point. He succeeded only in unwittingly clarifying the difference between the Catholic and protestant principle, the latter being that there is no mind-only conjured intermediary between the heavenly Father and humankind. The former vatic expositions through conventions and insider-determined consensus determine humankind’s goal.

1. From physics to psyche—The Holy of Hollies is near where the circumcision of the heart is to be found. It is consciousness’ brain’s mind—to put it too simply. Psyche is the subject of “Be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit [such as by a principality], nor by word, nor by letter as from us [i.e., vatic bull]...(2 Thessalonians 2:1-5)”. This potential holy place involves the understanding and the mind, the more comprehensive than geographic meaning of Matt 24: 15 regarding seeing the “abomination of desolation...stand in the holy place”.

2. Where the Holy Spirit dwells—Proverbs 23:7 is speaking about one with an evil eye: “For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he [the greatest argument possible for

inverse “evolution” if there’s anything to human transformism (Teilhard’s word to be made clearer below –see 36.)). Jaspers writes, “if an ape looks into the mirror, no apostle looks back” (Reason and Existenz, “Origin of the Contemporary Philosophical Situation). Jaspers is referencing Kierkegaard and showing that thinking without understanding has consequences (while noting that it’s Lichtenberg’s physiognomic-epigram, i.e., wisecracking against surface comparisons).

3. Consciousness research—Currently, in this eon, research into the origin of consciousness has come to fore and stands in the foreground...again, as in the time of Moses...regarding thoughts about humankind’s origin. The situation shows that research at some point must begin and remained involved in epistemology (thinking systematically, the logic of thinking). See: *Ontology of Consciousness—Percipient Action*, ed. Helmut Wautischer. Also see *Philosophical Faith and the Future of Humanity*, editors: Wautischer, Olson, and Walters. For a current critique see *Periech Ontology of Consciousness’ Philosophical Faith...and Humankind’s Future* at <http://karljaspersapplied.net/pdf/files/Periechontology.pdf>. Also see my “Review” <http://www.amazon.com/Ontology-Consciousness-Percipient-Action-Bradford/dp/0262731843>.

4. Impurities in the academic air affecting the soul—I personally don’t require statistical verification regarding what’s in the air, i.e., that contamination has reached critical mass and the meltdown of the global soul of humanity is well underway. Although Wikipedia can be subject to subtle maneuvers regardless of how complete

“documentation” might be or how disambiguous data might appear, it is still a dependable—trendy—place for the critical thinker to wet the finger and test the atmosphere and currents. Below, due to some obviousness Wikipedia references will not be provided—in matters so easily researched. But here is some research using exploitable statistics that are subject to...understanding.

5. The Pew Research Center charts the percentage of religiously identified (United States) respondents that believe “evolution” is the best explanation for the origin of human life on earth. Only a few of the most powerful groups will be mentioned: Buddhist 81%, Hindu 80%, Jewish 77%, Unaffiliated 72%, Catholic 58%, Orthodox 54%, Mainline Protestant 51%, Muslim 45%, Historical Black Protestants 38%, Evangelical Protestant 24%, Mormon 22%, Jehovah’s Witnesses 8%.

6. Statistics suggest that there’s a current 48% of the U.S. population opposing “the best explanation”—But it’s a relatively unstable force with a short fuse, because each of these groups (except the alleged unaffiliated) are inclined to maintain a redeeming existence. There’s a commitment to the organization while leaders are poised to maintain a forceful existence among forces. In other words as a worldview or ontology grows influentially so does the harvesting of propagating forces exponentially. In more other words, repeated loud bass low-frequency drumbeats have an intoxicating pied-piper effect.

7. Harvesting is a constant especially regarding the most influential of these groups, like the “Jewish” “Catholic” “Orthodox”, and “Mainline Protestants”. The “unaffiliated” also collect forces because most of these are probably in some way non-practicing due to disagreements with anything but “evolution”. For example a non-practicing Catholic can be a greater back-porch entrance for the Church than the pretentiousness of pomp and stained glass. The commitment to an inherited and adopted group and tradition can be enhanced by guilt plus the need to justify their apostasy.

7.1. A good example of a non-practicing Catholic serving the back-porch by influencing others to go around to the front porch is found in the 1993 book “Karl Jaspers, Philosopher Among Philosophers” by Richard Wisser and Leonard Ehrlich, in particular Gregory J. Walters’ article on “Jaspers’s Philosophical Faith and Revelational Faith Today. Can the Two Faiths Meet in the Struggle for Human Liberation?” In the clear context of Karl Jaspers being a Philosopher among Philosophers, Gregory shows an awareness of and engages in the struggle for souls that unfolds and reveals the frontline side of...the battle where even the poor and oppressed are used as funneling corrals to the porch.

7.2. Using Karl Jaspers in exploitative style he expounds off Jaspers and propounds Gustavo Gutierrez’ liberation theology. While I’m not judging Gustavo regarding his political-forces-motivation for converting to Catholicism, like it or not, his renowned priesthood status serves as a porch to Catholicism, with Gregory in effect pointing to

the front porch. (How one can convert to something that greatly contributed to the problem Gustavo sought to remedy is a mystery to me—but I defer judgment to a higher power than that to which he converted.)

7.3. One could ask why the need to spin off Jaspers by reducing his Philosophical faith to a “Jaspers could not foresee...” a Gutierrez liberation faith. That’s not a question, for the answer is that Gregory was around that time representing Catholicism in an obligatory manner, like at “St.” Mary’s University, San Antonio, Texas (there as Assistant Professor of Theology). Note, Gregory’s research on Jaspers—as a known protestant with prophetic insight befitting a top psychopathologist—coincided with one of Gregory’s awkward moments while bowing to the forces like the propagation of the “faith”. It seems to me that what Gregory is apparently quietly murmuring is that none having the stature of Jaspers could predict that a liberation theology and its tenets could save Catholicity from its historical reputation unless one were an undercover small “p” protestant and a small “c” catholic.

8. (On this Webpage my use of a Catholic “priest” is due to the fact that a “Jesuit’s” commitment is hard to surpass—a plus. That commitment includes propagating the faith through academia—a plus. And the first commitment plus the mission is always a complementing force in their “vocation”—a triune minus. Guilt’s creative affects can be manifested in wannabe priests, “fathers”—

that choose marriage—and institutionally-shunned “fathers”.)

9. So, under conditions deemed most favorable for the survival of the group, that 48% could explode suddenly. Example: For survival the Muslim percentage could suddenly jump to 60% (especially with Shiism)—like others under vatic centralized control—due to a hierarchical trickle down view (prospective guess about courses of action for survival) that it would be too detrimental to the organization to oppose a forceful movement (a lesser tendency with Sunnis).

9.1. Inversely, if “evolution” is conveniently seen as contributing to terrorism in a might-makes-right scenario, then there could be a decrease in the percentage for beast-origin reflected in surveys. Much of this possible fluctuation could depend on how much nominal “evolution” is seen as polluting general consciousness.

10. Safe extrapolation—“evolution” in Israel—It seems safe to assume the country of Israel will go the way of modern day conservative Jewish views—Orthodox and Reformed Judaism—that have no problem with “evolution” by entertaining a cosmic-ontology, i.e., religiously sanctified nationalism, i.e., verbalization about “theistic evolution” but quiet about its theocratic implication.

11. The “Evolution Oath” is also used in Israel: Gavriel Avital (chief scientist in Israel’s ministry of education)

stated that there are those for whom “evolution” is a religion and aren’t open to anything else. He dared to question the reliability of “evolution”—like “If textbooks state explicitly that human beings’ origins are to be found with monkeys”. He stated a preference for wanting students to grapple with its exclusivity. Thereupon there were radical calls for his dismissal coming from academia’s bulwarks, such as Israel Prize winner Yehoshua Kolodny. Schoolyard Bullying continues against those who “don’t swear”.

12. “Evolution” statistics from Israel—A 2006 survey done by Samuel Neaman Institute showed that only 28% of the Israeli public accepts the scientific theory of “evolution”, and 59% believed that God created humankind. These statistics reflected so badly against the hopes for a higher percentage that the report ended with an explanation that the ignorance of those surveyed shows that more “evolution”, i.e., “science” education is needed. It’s that old way of handling insider weakness within the pale of the system: if this time around the indoctrination has apparently lacked success, the next spin has to show how well an “evolving” academia has worked.

http://www.neaman.org.il/neaman/publications/publication_item.asp?fid=757&parent_fid=488&iid=3428

13. So, The National Center for Science Education (where I found these statistics) reverted to a preferable Social Survey Program done in 2000; they liked it that 54% of those surveyed accepted that human beings developed

from earlier species of animals. Reverting to the earlier survey made the Center look like academia had performed better. The NCSE ended noting that Israel is ahead of the U.S., which is at an ... “unfortunate” ...46%—last place.

<http://ncse.com/news/2010/02/controversy-over-evolution-israel-005334>

14. Armageddon for souls on U.S. soil—So, here again with Muslims at E-45% (see 5.) and Jews E-77% if academia’s propaganda and subtlety works and the Israeli public follows into that captivity, it could commence the Muslims/Israeli’s race for the “E” force—the “E arms race”. Although there is more immediately at stake than the “evolution oath” in the Middle East, the battle there is, like the U.S., a battle for Souls, i.e., the consciousness, conscience, and faith of humankind. It’s consensus mustering through compulsory education’s conscription.

15. The Middle East is experiencing skirmishes for the souls of Israel and Ishmael’s descendents. But the front lines converge like a tsunami in the U.S where there’s more time and space to go to court and wait—as the title of Kenneth Miller’s book shows: “Only a Theory: Evolution and the Battle for America’s soul”. For more see: <http://karljaspersapplied.net/ExistenzKjsnaPart6.htm>

16. Meanwhile back behind the 1948 scene—When the world was focused on a place for Jews, in the more real but opaque spaces the construction of a platform began for judging and testing faith...in the “eternal” city (its in the winds of propaganda). This structure includes a credence table; it’s backstage behind the place where religious

consciousness and post-war conscience was manifesting itself regarding a nation for Israel.

17. This structuring process (Teilhard's works) formalized in 1948 has resulted in an inquisitional power that demands, for instance, that a US president take the "evolution oath". A first, second, and third estate (clergy, spiritual, and temporal Lords), and now modern fourth-estate (academic journalists) consensus exists that demands that those aspiring to the pinnacle of the American dream must mouth the belief that human morphometry (measuring forms) and consciousness have a primate origin.

17.1. No presidential hopeful, like a Mormon or a black protestant can be elected—barring supernatural intervention and my no-vote—unless that candidate takes the evolution oath. This attitude that God is a figment of mind's imagination has resurged in great part due to the following:

18. So in 1948 while religious attention was focused on prophetic-sign-based-faith, behind this diversion a devout Jesuit was setting the stage for administering the test for advancing the continued incarnation of the coming universal Church of evolution.

19. In 1948 the paleontologist and biologist with a beggarly title of "father" was in Rome and addressed an appeal to the "General of the Society of Jesus". In essence the defense and prayer amounted to seeking permission to

publish “The Phenomenon of Man”. The “The most Holy” forbade it; Teilhard was not yet a large enough force to be identified with. (I read the work sometime in the sixties—it was in the small original library at Lincoln Christian University.) The book was not published until 1955 and then in French only, and the first English translation was in 1959. In a real sense Teilhard had non-practicing Catholic tendencies that showed up in his writings. But the overt ban, one could guess, probably covertly and subtly empowered Teilhard’s efforts while only he took all the risks in the religious battle he had helped promote.

20. But he was a good Catholic, and his mission included conscription—through his academic “vocation” once church approval had been obtained. If approval never came, then he could eventually be beatified with the same logic that biblical Paul used when he said that he would suffer being accursed from the Church for the Church. He could then be lauded as a Catholic martyr.

21. Jumping decades ahead in the war—Karol Wojtyla (“John Paul II”) displayed a guarded but positive attitude toward Teilhard’s expressions, and in 2009 Joseph Ratzinger (Benedict) praised Teilhard’s idea of the universe being a living host—and I can easily see that Teilhard was seen as closer to being confirmed complementary to the Universal Church. But the Church’s acceptance is still waiting for more re-enforcements by other forces before leaping and feeding on Teilhard as a host and claiming he was right because he was Catholic.

What then remains is for some miraculous healings to surface.

22. Back to 1948 and the Big Bang that Echoed round the world—In his letters to the “General” he argued that the work would serve as “a ‘porch’ which for many of our contemporaries...provides a way into the Church” (Letter to “Father” Janssens, General of the Society of Jesus, Oct. 7 and Oct 17, 1948). The “porch” he is talking about is the influential work of “Cannon” Lemaître (Big Bang Catholic), and that back-porch into the Catholic Church provided by the non-practicing Catholic poet Charles Péguy. Péguy’s was an indirect porch because he was a non-practicing Catholic but a quite effective expounder of the Catholic Church. If you’re designated officially as non-practicing, it provides you with more time and space for non-approved conduct that benefits the Church. He was a socialist consistent with the universal brotherhood mission of his Church and a nationalist consistent with Catholic theocracy.

23. The “marine” with the opaque biretta —So in 1948 the “prophetic” savior of the Catholic Church came to fore, came to Rome, i.e., fully bloomed for grooming during this time. The healing of the wounded evolutionary church by none other than the Catholic Church’s marines began with appropriating “evolution” and establishing vocational strongholds in academia. Mr. Chardin said: “It would be a biological blunder for me to leave the religious current of Catholicism”. Though written in 1921, he never wavered from the tenet, that “it [what he envisioned

openly the Church of evolution] is the most perfect approximation to...Truth...and...we must not abandon it to seek our road by ourselves” (116 “My attitude toward the official Church”). Here, as on the northern front against the Reformation, he is seen positioning himself as a “father” advocate for “all” in the true nature of “Priests” who support the institution that honors and ordains them. “It evolves as a man does...” stated Teilhard.

24. Teilhard under duress in the vocation—Mr. Chardin is speaking under duress, for he not only uneasily believed but also knew that he was not afforded the right “to break with the Church” and parenthetically adds “(it would be suicide)”. Mr. Chardin is pleading, if not praying as one prays to the Court, for his defense, for saying things that might meet with Church disapproval.

25. What he is struggling with is what he cautiously and too tactfully calls the Catholic Church’s “accidental and ephemeral lapses from generosity”, but what I and the less inebriated with institutional power would call instigating in...burning dissenters alive, and now also, at least in the epistemic-consciousness sense. (At this moment I am thinking of the Anabaptists and those that were even suspected of being lenient regarding insisting that infants should not be immersed, but later immersed if they willed to be when capable of decision. After all they are not bred or conscripted to be soldiers of the Church if given a choice.)

26. “Marine” Teilhard attempts to take refuge in “Christ”, the mercies of Christ, by reducing Christ to the essence of the “Catholic Church”, in effect saying that without the Catholic Church Christ would be nothing except a wasted transformation in the “evolution” of man. The formulas of the CC can practically all be reduced to “this single one: Christ is the physical centre of the gathering together of souls in God” What Teilhard seems to be doing here is exploiting “Christ” by attempting to distract from views that would not fully bloom or big-boom until in 1996, 30 years after 1948.

27. Suicidal mission—Teilhard concludes his plea with a recommitment to the Apostle’s Creed, as if to remind his primate critics that Christ is the center of the Catholic Church and they should not do to Teilhard as the religious did to Jesus. Here Teilhard, by implication, is identifying himself with Christ as regards taking up the cross. Though it is an exploitation of Christ, it is one that can be forgiven as shown in Luke 12:10. Teilhard thinks that by casting Christ as a pearl of great price before the assembled Bishops, that he is preserving his standing with the Holy Spirit that works through Teilhard’s “evolutionary process”, the noogenesis (Greek nous meaning mind, genesis meaning source).

28. Ratzinger and Wojtyla apply force—Teilhard inversely was exploited by the CC when his level of public popularity was worth empowering by the Institutional growth-forces that move when worthwhile. This Teilhard-force was reinforced by the CC’s

restraining bans against his works; the bans actually tended to draw more attention to the “evolution” of that CC, a process completed by Joseph Ratzinger but begun by Karol Wojtyla. It was safe for the CC to proceed this way by a few clerics because in 1950 Teilhard, an academically entrenched Jesuit was named to the French Academy of Science.

29. Direct Propaganda begins—By 1981, Teilhard’s pop-force (academically speaking) had reached the critical mass appeal point for the CC to begin capitalizing on his priestly influence, for in that year Agostino Casaroli (“Cardinal” primate not bird) was given front page space on the “Vatican” newspaper to say that Teilhard is “...a man possessed by Christ in the depths of his soul. He...anticipated the response of John Paul II’s appeal: ‘Be not afraid, open, open wide to Christ the doors of the immense domains of culture, civilization, and progress’”. That was Karol Wojtyla. With that pronouncement Teilhard was promoted to the chief-prophet in the U.S. battle for souls through establishing the Catholic church of “evolution”.

30. “NOMINALISM”/Miraculous titles of distinction—

—(Nominalism’s meaning can be complex and confusing first of all due to its use in an immanent (names merely point to particular sense experiences—closed) or transcendent sense (names can also receive inspiration from beyond—openness). There is at least a third meaning: in the final analysis, for the sake of solidarity under one authority, that authority determines whether name-symbols should be questioned or not. A good example of sanctified nominalism is “transubstantiation”, where the Church says that the wine and bread by decree turns into the real flesh and body of Jesus. The same logic occurs in titles of distinction and in

particular sanctified nominalism occurs when Church-consensus says we should all be “evolutionists”. One can be a nominalist and see nominalism for what it is; one can be reasonable about word symbols and know that the communion emblems are emblematic, denoting all that is immanent and connoting the transcendent. In other words, regarding the analysis of linguistic symbols, one can be a nominalist but certainly not given to nominalism. As a linguistic nominalist, one can see-through titles of distinction.)

Titles of distinction are used in this battle for the American soul, even though the U.S. Constitution leans away from approving this sort of force-by-association (Nobility Clause, Art. 1, Section 9 and 10). For example, academia by in large immediately responds and via university pressure academicians flaunt invitations and attend called-conferences arranged by “The Holy See” as though it’s got country or nation status. Nominalism is seen at work in the confusing titles: The “Holy See” is the government of “a sovereign juridical entity under international law”, and we hear “Papal States” as though they really exist. The U.S. had no ambassador to the “Holy See” between 1951 and 1968. I’d like to think it was the sane time of reaction to nominalism. (

30.1. The Roman Church really ought not be more than an imaginary “Siegfried-line” south of the Alps—it’s like a conjured god by minds given to the belief that humankind came about by developing from something simple to complex thinking that invented idols. Now, as a result of sanctioning by Roman Church—the “Holy See” and the “Holy Father”—the word “evolution” is used epidemically here, and those nominal signs have empowered the pandemic through the force of its myth. In

short, in part due to yielding to major religions, the “evolutionary” battle is engaging the unprepared Israelis and Muslims. “Christians” have more E-cannons on and around the Temple Mount—in a metaphoric arms-race perspective. The word “Christians” needs clarifying: “I prefer to speak of biblical rather than Christian religion” (Jaspers, PFR, Faith in Revelation, The Church, 2).

31. That ontology of consciousness, rather, this word “evolution” is almost at critical mass in its popularity, so much so that the physician Luke’s Jesus-quote seems to apply now no less than then: “Ye are they which justify yourselves before men...for that which is highly esteemed among men (even now by institutional religious primates) is abomination in the sight of God” Luke 16:15, for none can serve two masters.

31.1. Postmodern insurgence of Gog and Magog type—

(*Modernity* reflects a highfalutin degree of certitude regarding scientific knowledge, whereas *postmodernity* reflects a smug uncertainty. The former positivism has regained ground, e.g., by mapping genomes, and then taking note of similarities in species’ DNA. In effect the certitude is still based on common observation of morphological similarity and difference, though with an emphasis on superficial similarity of form—rather than overall differences—because it fits better the view that the “evolved” mind can not only know the origin of the god epiphenomenon—figment of imagination—but human-consciousness origin too.)

Although there’s a greater caution about submitting to universal ideas (a truth accepted by all, and because accepted, it is truth—circular thinking), modernity’s “E” insurgency continues at fever pitch. But it is not new, and so old a movement that it’s not unanticipated. That an “evolved” mind can imagine the existence of God—due to its immanent (intrinsic) neural activity—has been around

since the Hellenistic period. For instance, the etymology of Gog and Magog (Israeli descendents) seem to have represented the upper-class occupiers of Mediterranean coastal regions, Islands, Northerly Mountains, and Inland lakes. They assimilated foreign ideas and that fusing with the cultural forces was at odds with the Israeli ethos. These were probably Hellenized Jews that had assimilated and were assimilating Roman Empire forces also to the point that they were not really religiously Jews but religiously mutants in a social “evolutionism” sense.

31.2. Josephus appears to depicts the Magog in general as being aristocratic snobs, those having a superiority complex, a complex intensified by being Jews that are known as out-of-touch because believers in a real God. What is more revealing is that Josephus speaks of them in terms of their being the authors of mutations, controlled, perhaps, like through infant purging if measurably different morphologically (differing in appearance including gender or questionable gender). Most probably he is referring to genetic engineering.

31.3. I think Josephus’ word “mutations” here is being used in the same sense as Teilhard uses “transformist” (“evolution”). In the NT “immutable” (αμεταθετος) or "unchangeable" is found, and for my purposes it is taken to mean what Teilhard means by "fixists" (meaning those who react against simple to complex and then mind imagining God). In the NT use of only the negative use of mutation, (Hebrews 6:17,18) it is God that is immutable and humankind is made in that image, but mutations or

apostasies from the norms of biblical thinking are negative changes if that anchor of immutability is compromised. The immutability of consciousness is prerequisite to evaluating apparent mutations.

32. If a moderator asks a presidential candidate, “Do you believe in evolution?”, there would only be enough time for a US candidate to say:

“If you mean do I believe that humankind developed from the cosmic-simple to the complex and upon reaching the level of consciousness the mind invented god and that god is therefore but an epiphenomenon or a figment of imagination, then my answer is no (or yes).”

33. So, that radical confrontational response to the oath-test requirement would eventually put a damper on its universal usage. As it is, its universal usage works the same way that naming a newborn “Holly Mother”, “Mister”, “Lord”, “Holy Father”, “reverend”, “God” or “Holy Evolver” guarantees a constant degree of respect whether it is appropriate, democratic or not. If repeated often enough...you know.

34. So, to be together on this use of the word would mean we would have to come to better terms as to what a student’s curricula should be named and what word’s should not be used as signs indicating it is unlawful to question.

35. A simple armistice—The word that should not be used is one that has been religiously propagated to the point where it amounts to swearing. Moreover now its use tends to establish universally Teilhard's Catholic Church of Evolution. Its use establishes as well the atheist's position that God and Church dogma "evolved" and continues to adjust to an induced consensus. The E-word sprouted and grew within the raging controversy between differing views on what determines truth: and the Bible became the best alternative to one dominating standard, the Holy Roman Empire's Church. And, when Genesis 1:2 was more correctly translated to say that the earth became disorganized, it was time for mass destruction by getting the first (clergy) through fourth estates to blast the atmosphere with...that word. And, by the way, the U.S. Constitution's nobility clauses limiting the establishment of a powerful aristocracy (first and second estates clergy and Lords...) went a long way toward managing the power of the fourth estate (professional journalists).

36. Teilhard had proposed an armistice more Catholic-favorable—He attempts to resolve the "cleavage between our minds" (1920 Note of the Essence of Transformism). He proposes that there is a point of agreement between fixists and transformists. In short, he says there is something clear to everyone even pre-Darwin; that "...there is a resemblance between Man and the monkey..." and this sort of observable universality of agreement is that spot. But then the spot gets messy as an attempt is made to assume a divergence in the morphology difference to be caused by something

intellectual or physical, i.e., “logicalist” and “physicalists”, objecting to former he saw it as an irresponsible escape into the “First Cause”. He concludes that when the “logicalist” (fixist or opponent of the ape descent) sees the morph-link, the transformist position becomes too self evident to question. Tailhard’s faulty reasoning here is the subject of the physiognomic-epigram referred to in item 2 above.

36.1. It is obvious to me that his transformist logic is moved along by being against anything extra-cosmic, but for a created intermediary acceptable to a “physicalist” thus leaving room for an “progressive church” development. The Jesuit-work on the front lines against the Reformation clearly shows up in the proposal. It’s that old battle between the logos as standard or the C Church, or Revelation is autonomous and includes reason that has its center in the individual, rather than in a conjured institution.

37. A simpler and unenforceable armistice—except for the power of confrontation—is that objection to the use of the “E” word as shown above in item 33. As disquieting to mental calm as it might be, it is proposed that there be an understood moratorium on the word based on arguments against nominalism. Nominalism includes those who exploit a term the clarity of which has come about by authority and its common usage the result of academic manipulation and religious propaganda. Nominalism is one reason I have deliberately avoided using “Pierre” or “Pope”. Titles of distinction are like

begging hats in hand or subtle demands for handicapped advantages. Clerical collars, prelate dress, are signs like words. Instead of clerical collared educators being out front they are now shrouded—"Evolutionism" comes to us now in surplice and Cassock. A nominalist identifies and rejects nominalism and places it in the category of an intoxicating drumbeat. But a nominalist can slip quickly into the other side of nominalism and miss the value of signs in reacting to nominalism.

38. Interviews on the occident's frontier frontline—This Webpage began with a spin on Armageddon and a portal regarding the holy place mount. It is also a spin on spins, such as in nuclear phenomena. In the trench separating ordinary matter from dark matter, Philip Benjamin <<http://biodarkmatter.webs.com/>> is holding the line. He has recently shared some emails with me and they have been pasted below. Some names have been deleted because prior approval for posting the comments had not been sought.

39. It should be said that our thinking-gears do not perfectly mesh—his apparently linked more to the lab than mine. He might not even use the word mesh or modify it. For that reason this section ends with my reaction to his comments, to which he has not taken issue at me...yet. He seems most comfortable relying on catching incomings disarming them and/or tossing them back. I am comfortable in preventing them. He seems more realistic and works with ordinary material de jure, and from a spongy-tethered point works de facto with extraordinary material.

40. The dialogue:

Phillip,

Are you rejecting all of evolutionary theory - natural selection, Mendelian genetic research, adaptation, genetic variation, genetic mutation, sexual genetic recombination, genetic drift, and more recently epigenetics as well? Or just the theory?

As a past student of genetics and having worked hybrid corn research early in post college days, I think we have to be very careful what we throw out with the bath water

40.1. Philips' response:

No, not all!! I am not and I never had rejected any of these. They all meet the scientific protocols. What you have carefully or otherwise omitted is what I object to: i.e. SPECIATION. None of these very scientific principles has anything to do with EVOLUTIONISM. I am all in favor of teaching evolution or for that matter briefly including any other philosophy or belief systems on ORIGINS, in schools or colleges. What is disturbing is presenting this as an incontrovertible FACT with "no questions asked" to the despicable detriment of all "critical thinking" in the young formative minds.

I am all in favor of teaching Evolution or for that matter briefly including any other philosophy or belief systems on ORIGINS, in schools or colleges. But it should be under the auspices of the humanities. No physicist will be a lesser physicist, or no physician will be a less competent physician because he does not "practice" Evolution!! Evolution is not for "practice". It is for speculation and critical evaluation as a philosophic hypothesis. I think it is a good subject for debate. A good rational well-organized debate on ANYTHING will sharpen the intellect. No doubt about

that! But the "no question asked" scientific fanaticism and dogma can only produce more Hitlers and Maos, another 200 million mass murders and an additional 200 million killings of innocent babies which are also performed by evolutionists posing as professionals.

Best regards

Philip Benjamin

41. My Response to Philip:

(It is mostly unchanged, and includes responses to other emails wherein Philip was confronted by a blogger—unwittingly subjected to an ontologism—propounding radically that evolutionism and atheism is not a religion. Also a few sections below were pasted in the piece above. For the most part they were left also in the piece below for to remove them distracted from the flow of thought. I apologize for comments that are repeated in the piece above.)

00. To Philip, [emailed Oct 6, 2011]

Thanks for routing these. Regarding the use of “evolution”, the expression that evolution is not a religion, and that atheism is not a religion: it most certainly is now and standing in the most holy place (that is, in the sense that if there be anything holy we should think on these holy things).

The dialogue fits in well with what I am currently working on, specifically that there is a mind-set, a pathos that is pervading human consciousness. It came to fruition religiously in 1948 with the eventual publication of (paleontologist) “Pierre” Teilhard Chardin’s Phenomenon of Man, which involved his earlier efforts (begun in 1919) about The Heart of Matter.

01. His publication (ready in 1948) trumpeted what he said in 1955: This ordained Jesuit (an Order sometimes referred to as God's marines in the propagation of the Catholic faith) said: "Whether we admit it or not, we have today no choice: we have all become 'evolutionists' (The Christic) and "...Christ is saved by Evolution?" [that's an imperative in interrogative form].

02. My comments should not be taken to be derogatory regarding individuals, except for the pretentiousness imposed or demanded by one wearing a biretta and cassock, though those vestments are opaque but translucent too—with Jesuits. Now, i.e., currently, if I were an "evolutionist", I would, if intellectually honest and moreover ontologically bound, concur with Teilhard. But that would mean I would be a Catholic like Teilhard (he considered it suicidal to withdraw from that Church) and an atheist like Oxford's atheist bulldog, Richard Dawkins.

03. My proposal is that it is not so much Israel becoming a Nation in 1948 that fulfills prophecies, but that "evolution" becoming a religion via the works of Teilhard is the greater reality behind the overt scene. He said, "A Religion of Evolution...is what Man needs ever more explicitly if he is to survive and 'super-live...' (Christic). He uses the mind that has supposedly "evolved" more than less out of or from what he called "the Noosphere" (the mind-sphere) to show that besides the complex having its origin in the simple, it has a greater origin that he refers to as the stuff of the cosmos having the capacity for "consolidation by complexification" (The Heart of Matter). The simple and complex fact is that he is using his consciousness' mind to conjure up a god of "evolution". This conjuring is then made to complement his Church. Like Teilhard the Roman Church exclusiveness, to Jaspers, is an "evolving" church (Philosophical Faith and Revelation, "The Church, 1 an augustinian line")

04. Now it is not Israel as a Nation with a temple into which can stand something idolatrous but what stands most esteemed in humankind's consciousness. The abomination is the way humankind by consensus is thinking—just like in biblical terms the mark of the beast is humankind's deceptive thinking.

05. Consciousness' cognizing, being near the most real temple of God, is where bodies are a living sacrifice and conscience-concepts are oblations (like that spoken of in Daniel 9-27).

06. Personally, I can think of no greater abomination than to think that humankind (morphologically and consciousnessly) had a simian origin—thus “primate”—rather than “[originating] from the hand of God and...[humankind being] created after His image” (Psychopathologist Karl Jaspers, *The Origin and Goal of History*, Introduction).

07. This ontology of consciousness, this word “evolution” is almost at critical mass in its popularity, so much so that the physician Luke's Jesus-quote seems to apply: “Ye are they which justify yourselves before men...for that which is highly esteemed among men [even now by institutional religious primates] is abomination in the sight of God” Luke 16:15, for none can serve two masters.

08. That is the abomination that is overspreading humanity, but relating this perversion to primates augments it. It is a sacrifice of that species that should not be continued. It is relevant but not comparable to the sacrifice of Jesus; he pointed humankind to the closest relative, the heavenly father during a time when Hellenism's evolutionism was the craze. He paid the price, and should have been the last human sacrifice—but the abomination is repeatable.

09. So this is where Philip Benjamin and I make an understandable departure in answering ***'s question:** “Are you rejecting all of evolutionary theory...?” I agree with Philip’s answer except that “evolution” belongs in the category of nominalism. It is not just theory. When that word is used by and for humankind it generally includes Origin, and that that pragmatic linguistic sign’s momentum and origin-explication is such a test of faith that one would have to explain extensively what it ought not mean, before the dialogue could proceed harmlessly—a laborious effort to avoid someone’s “Holy Ground”.

010. If a moderator asks a presidential candidate, “Do you believe in evolution?”, there would only be enough time for a US candidate to say:

“If you mean do I believe that humankind developed from the cosmic-simple to the complex and upon reaching the level of consciousness the mind invented god and that god is therefore but an epiphenomenon or a figment of imagination, then my answer is no (or yes).”

011. So, that response to the oath-test requirement would eventually put a damper on its universal misuse. As it is, its universal usage works the same way that naming a newborn “Holly Mother”, “Mister”, “Lord”, “Holy Father”, “reverend” or “God” (or even “Holy Evolution”) guarantees a constant degree of respect whether it is appropriate, democratic or not.

012. So, to be together on this use of the word would mean we would have to come to better terms as to what a student’s curricula should be named and which words should not be used as if not to be questioned. A word that should not be used is one that has been religiously propagated to the point where it amounts to swearing and moreover now its use tends to establish universally Teilhard’s Catholic Church of Evolution, and

establishes as well the atheist's position that God and Church dogma "evolved".