

Reason, Common Sense
and Atheism

By
Joseph More

Dedicated
to the
Sacred Heart of Jesus
and the
Immaculate Heart of Mary

TOPICS

Atheism.....	6
Supreme Being	11
Evolution.....	13
Instinct.....	17
Human Beings.....	18
Reason.....	22
Free Will.....	23
Conscience	24
Abortion	27
Rights	28
Philosophy of Life	29
Pride	30
Faith	32
God's Two Wills	33
Miracles.....	35
Warnings	37
Miracle of the Sun.....	39
Satan	40
Ten Commandments.....	51

FOREWORD

This is not a theological book. Everything that can and needs to be covered on a theological basis has been covered by the writings of the Saints – specifically St. Thomas Aquinas. His *Summa Theologica* can answer just about any question involving theology. It is a summary of all that can be known about God and humanity's relationship with God. It includes 631 questions and a total of 3000 articles. The *Summa*'s topics follow a cycle: God; Creation, Man; Man's purpose; Christ; the Sacraments; and back to God. Even his edited version, the *Shorter Summa*, includes his 8 Proofs of the Existence of God.

What this book will attempt to do, is to present some thoughts on a practical basis for non-intellectuals like the author. It is for people with normal intelligence, and is an appeal for that intelligence to be fully used. It is necessary, regardless of the level of intelligence, for a person to have an open mind. Having a closed mind does not allow the intelligence to be used in recognizing the Reason, logic, and common sense that will be presented here. This is an attempt to open the eyes, the mind, and the heart of individuals who are unaware of certain Truths that have been unknown or forgotten. Anyone who thinks like a mental lemming in following beliefs that require a close mind, will never make it through this book.

People who only operate on present knowledge and are not interested in new knowledge will also not make it to the end. And people who are not presently interested in - or become interested in - the salvation of their Immortal Soul will also not make it to the end. However, that is the choice of Free Will, which will be discussed in detail.

Therefore, this is the issuance of a challenge – to be open to new ideas that one may never have been introduced to before, and therefore could not have been considered. The challenge is to read this entire book before making any judgment on any part of it that is contained. That challenge is issued to anyone who claim to have an open mind - to prove it.

INTRODUCTION

Every author has to have a purpose in writing a book. The basis for this one is the concern for the salvation of Souls. It was initiated by two things that were taught by Jesus Christ. The first is, *"Many are called, but few are chosen."* - concerning the few people who will make it to Heaven. The second one is, *"What good does it do to gain the whole world and lose your Soul?"* This book will show how a lack of concern for someone's immortal Soul will mean a lack of concern for the most important thing in their life - as well as the life of others. A composer does not invent new notes. He simply arranges them in a new way to create a new melody. The concepts in this book aren't new. They may be presented in a new way which will help some people understand and accept the Truths it offers.

In discussing Christ's "few," an example from a Saint will bring that "few" into better focus. One said that he saw Souls going to Hell "like raindrops."

Saint Vincent Ferrer relates that an Archdeacon in Lyons retreated into a desert place to do penance, and that he died the same day and hour as Saint Bernard. After his death, he appeared to his bishop and said to him, *"Know Monsignor, that at the very hour I passed away, thirty-three thousand people also died. Out of this number, Bernard and myself went up to Heaven without delay, three went to Purgatory, and all the others fell into Hell."* (Purgatory will be covered later.)

If true, that statistic should be sobering to anyone who wants to go to Heaven - and should be frightening to anyone who wants to avoid Hell. We would like to believe that those figures would be reversed. It is not easy to believe that most people go to Hell. The purpose of this book is to try to assist people to not become one of the last statistic.

Now can that percentage of those that go to Hell really be true? A number of examples will be given as to why it very well could be. One concerns what the Bible says, *"Fornicators shall not enter the Kingdom of God,"* it doesn't make exceptions for "nice" fornicators - or anyone else living in an objective state of Mortal Sin. Being "nice" is a good attribute, but it doesn't take the place of following the Ten Commandments. It is the same as being "sincere" in atheism or a false religion does not replace the Truth. There is a "Flat Earth Society" in the U.S. and everyone in it is very "sincere" in believing the Earth is flat. However, it

doesn't change the truth that the Earth is round.

It is suggested, that if anyone wants to honestly consider the reasonable and common sense answers to the practical questions in contains, it may be necessary to put present beliefs, thoughts, and even possible prejudices on hold until finishing this book. As they read, they should continually ask themselves the following questions: "Does what has been presented here make sense? Is it logical?" If so, then the next question is, "Now what do I do with this new knowledge and understanding?"

A few definitions are in order, of principles that will be utilized all during this book. The first is the Law of Mutual Exclusiveness. It involves two possibilities – and the two possibilities include the only ones that can exist in a particular area. For instance, the most basic one, is that either there is a God - or there is no God. There is no third possibility.

Again using the Law of Mutual Exclusiveness, they are only two categories involving all the questions that have been put forth here. The first category is having all the answers, and the second category is having anything less - from some to none. Theists have one answer to all the questions-- a Supreme Being. Atheists have none of the answers. So their position of having no answers is not a logical, tenable position in which to have.

ATHEISM

To not believe in God is to be an atheist. The definition, in its broadest sense, is an absence of belief in any deities. Less broadly it is a rejection of belief in deities or simply it's a belief that there is no God. Atheism is actually a kind of religion, as a religion is a set of beliefs, so to be an atheist is to follow a certain set of beliefs - or not follow another set of beliefs. At first thought it might seem to be easy to be an atheist, as all it seems to take is to not believe in God. However, it will be shown that it is not as easy as it may first seem.

The term atheism itself originated in the 16th century. It got its biggest push in the 18th century with the French Revolution. The atheism of this movement advocated for the supremacy of human reason – with the irony that the true use of Reason has to be denied in order to be an atheist. While atheists may deny it, atheism is in actuality a religion – as a religion is the code by which one lives. At the present time in the world, 2% of people consider themselves atheists and 12% are considered irreligious.

Atheists like to claim that there is a lack of empirical evidence of a God. Even if they were all blind, deaf, and dumb, all atheists know that they themselves exist - and they did not create themselves.

Atheists have none of the *hows* and none of the *whys* as to anything that exists – including themselves. They cannot let themselves think of the *origin* of anything. Since there is no natural answer to anything - much less all - in the universe, by the Law of Mutual Exclusiveness, there must be a supernatural answer. And the only thing that answers all the natural as well as supernatural questions is the existence of a Supreme Being who created all things. If atheists admitted that, then it might come to their mind that they owe something to this Supreme Being - and it involves some type of obedience. And that is the main reason they do not want to believe in a God - they do not want to have to obey anyone higher than themselves - or anything inconvenient to their chosen way of life.

The next basic Law of Mutual Exclusiveness is that either the universe and everything in it was created by God - or it was not. There also is no third possibility here. There are important sub-topics involved here, as to how God performed his creation, or if there's no God, how it came into being. Our beliefs in a God or not, is not only the basis and guide of what a person thinks, but everything a person does. It is the cause and effect of a person's life. This book will attempt to cover both of these beliefs, and the results of having them - both in the life of an individual as well as the life of a society.

One of the problems, also under the Law of Mutual Exclusiveness, is that there is a hereafter - or there isn't a hereafter. The ramifications of both will be covered.

Let's look at the last one. If there is no hereafter, then everything that takes place in this world - or every choice that an individual makes – is pretty much moot. If there is no hereafter, and therefore no reward or punishment for the kind of life one leads, then it makes absolutely no difference whether someone lives the life of a Saint or of a serial killer. There would be no purpose for anyone to practice any kind of virtue and no purpose for anyone to avoid any type of action no matter how evil. The only possible discouragement for the latter would be the breaking of the law, getting caught, and serving time in prison. The reasons for any type of legitimate law will be covered later.

If there was no hereafter, then when a person died, that would be it. Nothing that they accomplished in this life would

mean anything. Their life would have been wasted. Even if they would have been what they considered happy, it would have meant nothing as there would be no hereafter for them even being able to remember it. If they were rich, famous, or powerful, they might be remembered by people still living or who would come after them. However those people would also die one day and so any remembrance would be a temporary thing and mean nothing to those people when they died. Without a hereafter, the only thing a person could look forward to in this life would be more money, more fame, or more power - which might give this kind of person some satisfaction in this life - but would still be temporary.

Now let's look at the other side - that there is a hereafter. They are two subdivisions of this - Heaven and Hell. In this scenario, it makes a gigantic difference in how one lives. Now if one lived, say 90 years on Earth, and followed all of God's laws and died in a state of Sanctifying Grace (which will be covered later) and then received 90 years of perfect happiness in Heaven, this would seem to be a good trade. However, a belief in the hereafter, is a belief - not only an equal time as lived on Earth - but in Eternity.

Here's one definition of Eternity: **If there was a globe the size of the Earth made out of diamond, and every million years a bird flew by and brushed it's wing against that globe - by the time it would be worn down to nothing, Eternity would just be starting.**

So a person who spends their 90 years on Earth trying to be as good as possible, which includes avoiding as many things that God calls sins, will receive an Eternity of perfect happiness. That is much more than a fantastic worthwhile trade.

Now let's look at the other option. A person spends their 90 years not following God's Laws - or even believing in him - and doing whatever they want without the thought of any penalty for doing so. Now if a person lived 90 years that way, and received 90 years of punishment by burning in Hell for that period of time, that would seem to be a horrible trade. However, just as any reward would be for Eternity - so any punishment will also be for Eternity. That is not just a horrible trade - that is the worse possible trade, and the most regrettable, that can ever be made. The point is, if there is no hereafter, then a person has nothing to lose by living their 90 years more or less on Earth according to any rules, ethics, principles, and laws except their own. If however there is a hereafter, they cannot imagine what it will be like to burn in Hell

for all Eternity.

It makes little sense for someone to gamble money with the odds always against them coming out ahead in the long run.

However, when you gamble money and lose it, you can get more. When you gamble and lose your Soul, it is a done deal. You only get one chance - and if you blow the one that you have now on this Earth, you will not get another one.

The 17th century scientist and mathematician, Blaise Pascal, suggested that if we cannot know whether there is a God or not, it is better to wager that there is one, rather than that there is not.

It makes absolutely no sense for someone to gamble with where they will spend Eternity. Even if there was only a one in a trillion chance that there is a hereafter - no one should ever take the chance that there isn't. Again, one has nothing to lose by putting God first in their life, obeying his Laws, and following everything that Jesus Christ said is necessary for salvation. On the other hand, one has everything to lose by not doing so.

“In the beginning.....”

Any discussion concerning the universe itself - to life in it - must start with *origins*. Let's start with the *origin* of the existence of our universe. The Law of Conservation of Mass is that “matter cannot be created or destroyed.” However science could not exist until matter existed. And matter cannot create itself. The Earth did not create itself; the sun did not create itself; the stars didn't create themselves. They can only be created by something - that theists call a Supreme Being - that not only exists outside of matter, but had to pre-exist matter. Now it is understandable how an atheist can deny the specifics involving this Supreme Being, which means a belief in the Holy Trinity, but how an atheist cannot believe in a Supreme Being - which answers all the questions - is not understandable.

To continue in the scientific vein, matter and energy was either created by God, or it came into being some other way. (The Law of Mutual Exclusiveness). There is no third possibility. So atheistic scientists - who don't believe in God - have to ignore their own acknowledgment of that First Law of Thermodynamics to even admit that they themselves exist - much less an entire universe. That should pre-suppose the fact that matter and energy has to be created by *something* or *someone* outside of the universe. It can't be *something* because matter and energy cannot pre-exist itself. That only leaved the *someone*. The only question should be

about that *someone*, and does that *someone* have any requirements from us from creating us. Since that is not the only question of atheists, it is necessary to go more into it.

When atheists try to explain creation without a God, they must come up with some other explanation. They usually use what is called the “Big Bang Theory.” An astronomer in 1949 came up with this idea, basing it on the hypothesis that all the matter in the universe was created in one big bang at a particular time in the remote past. Now a child could accept that at face value, as they have not reached to point of Reason to know all the non-answerable questions that are necessarily a part of it. So how do adult scientists who believe that premise, are able to close their mind to the first most obvious question, “Where did the matter for the “Big Bang” come from?” That matter didn’t just appear - according to their own First Law of Thermodynamics. And matter cannot preexist itself. Atheistic scientists have no explanation of how matter came to exist in the first place - they just don’t want to admit the only other choice.

Science cannot explain what caused the explosion they call the Big Bang - as it says that energy can also not be created. In addition, there is no explanation how any type of explosion could cause some of that matter to extend hundreds of millions of light years away from that explosion. There are supposedly 300 billion stars in our galaxy and millions of other galaxies. Instead of a “Big Bang” to end up with all that, it would have had to be an “Unbelievable Bang” and certainly an “Unexplainable Bang.”

Another part of that theory, is that the universe expanded from a very high density and high temperature state. Again, no explanation as to where did the high density come from and where did the high temperature come from? Then, after its initial expansion, the universe is supposed to have cooled sufficiently to allow the formation of sub-atomic particles and later atoms. Scientists offer no explanation of how that first atom came into existence - much less from where. There is also no explanation as to the existence of all the uncountable single atoms in space which all somehow became other planets, stars, and suns. There is also no explanation of why a cooling would allow that formation, and even less how that formation could occur in the first place?

Scientists also state that the universe is expanding. How can that be? The universe is space. What is it expanding into - other “space?” Then it is not expanding, as that new space had to already exist for the present universe to “expand” into it. It would

make at least a little sense if just the matter in our universe was moving into this new “space.” but that is not what is being claimed. It is that the universe itself is expanding. This brings about more questions. If the universe doesn’t end, how can it keep on expanding? And if it does end, what is on the other side of it? From what has been shown, it can’t be empty “space.”

Questions, questions, and more questions - and atheistic scientists have no answers.

The reason atheist scientists think they have answers to the creation of the universe is that they never start from *origins*. It is like teaching math by starting from $16+16 = 32$, instead of starting with $1+1 = 2$ - or a sprinter who would want to start the hundred meter dash at the fifty meter mark.

An unending universe would fall under the same concept of unending time - which is Eternity. Human minds cannot fathom either one. Again, it is not going back to the *origins* of anything for an explanation that would satisfy the Reason of their mind – if they choose to use it.

After this “Big Bang,” scientists think the Earth is 4.5 billion years old and that life began on Earth 3.8 billion years ago. Of course they cannot explain *how* or *why* life began in the first place. Simply saying that something took a million or a billion years to accomplish answers no questions. It is like using gravy to cover a piece of cowhide and then claiming that underneath it is a rib-eye steak. Camouflaging an unanswered question does not suffice as an answer - nor the false conclusions that follow from it.

There are also scientists who say the essence of everything is gravity. While they can define *what* gravity is, they cannot explain *why* it works. And if the gravity from the sun can be so strong that it causes planets far out into space to revolve around it, then why doesn’t that gravity pull us (and everything else on the Earth “not tied down), toward the sun? It's amazing - a coincidence? - that we have just enough gravity on this planet to keep us on the Earth, but not so hard that we cannot move around. There's just enough keep a feather from flying off into space. Where is the explanation of that? Scientists won’t even try to explain the *how* of the balance between the sun’s gravity and the Earth’s gravity to keep us here.

Let’s look at some more thoughts on the universe. If a person landed on another planet and found a U.S. penny there, he

would know that another person from Earth had been there, or had at minimum sent a satellite into space which deposited it there. He would not assume that even over a million or a billion years, the wind blowing over the surface would have created that penny. The non-accidental creation of a simple penny would prove that not only had someone made it, but also got it there. No one would assume that the gravity of that planet had attracted that penny and brought it millions of miles to land there. How much more is involved in the creation of the universe and the order within it? As one theistic scientist said, to believe that the order of the universe came from nothing would be like believing that a tornado going through a junk yard could end up building a Boeing 747. So, one bottom line, is that if a penny cannot be created without an outside Creator, how could the universe be created without an outside Creator?

As Bishop Robert Joyce in *“Thoughts to Ponder,”* wrote, *“Some truths are so obvious and self-evident that one must be truly blind, badly mixed up, or just hostile to deny them.”*

The other main theory besides the “Big Bang,” is the “Steady State Theory.” In it, matter is continually being created - it has no beginning or end in time. That is even a greater contradiction to the First Law of Thermodynamics. It is easy to promote a new theory if one doesn't have to not only have any evidence of it, but also not make any sense.

Scientists like to say that the Big Bang theory is now universally accepted. That can only be true as universally accepted by atheists as the “beginning” of everything. Actually if true, the Big Bang Theory causes no problem for theists or anyone else, as long as it is admitted that God - albeit one that we can't understand - created the elements and energy necessary for the Big Bang to take place in the first place.

How can atheistic scientists close their mind to all the existence of a Creator? A scientist discovering a law of nature is not the same as making that law. As an example, to understand the anatomy and physiology of the human body is not comparable to creating it.

The human mind is an amazing thing, and one of the things it can do is think any way it wants. It is evident that it can even close itself off to any questions that a rational mind would ordinarily ask. If it can keep itself from thinking the higher questions like , “Why am I here?” - then it can certainly keep itself from thinking, “How did I get here?”

There is a multitude about the universe that it's not understandable to anyone - including atheistic scientists. They accept that as it is. So why should there be a problem in accepting the God who by his very nature is not understandable to human beings? As St. Augustine said, *"I could not believe in a God I can understand."*

Atheist don't want to believe in a God because they would have to accept a principle that is beyond the capability of their human mind to comprehend. All theists believe in a God that they don't understand and cannot understand, but at least they don't have Pride to the level of denying that He exists. And that Pride must be overcome for the person to go from being an atheist to a theist. It is easy for an atheist to live by Pride, as he has no Reason to live by humility. And that Pride is even greater than the pharaohs of Egypt, who while considering themselves a god, at least admitted that there were other ones.

One of the unique things about Pride, which is of course the basis of all sins, is the fact that the people who have the most Pride often are the ones who insist the loudest that they do not have any. This is like the people in the insane asylums who insist that they are not insane.

Now when an atheist cannot answer any question - and many more will follow - all they can say is, "We don't know." Unfortunately, they do not carry that to the next step - much less the necessary conclusion. But what they refuse to acknowledge is that the definition of God answers these questions - and all others. While it doesn't help us understand this Supreme Being, belief in an omnipotent God does at least provide an explanation on a lower level that human beings can understand. Just as higher math provides explanations but doesn't provide understanding to those on a lower level of math knowledge, a human's lower level of intelligence does not provide understanding on a Supreme Being's level of existence.

Scientists should believe in a Supreme Being more than any other profession. Scientists are not only aware of more unanswered questions than any other profession, but for every answer they learn about the universe - they are two more questions.

Science has discovered the fascinating construction of DNA, but have no explanation of how that complicated structure got to be that way. When the scientists who discovered it won the Nobel Prize they should have said that it proved that there is a God

- as that structure couldn't have just "happened." How can an atheist close their mind to all the evidence of the Creator - in the absence of any evidence that the universe got here any other way? The human mind, however, is an amazing thing, in that it can evidently close itself off to any questions that a rational mind ordinarily asks. If it can keep itself from thinking, "How did I get here?" - then it can certainly keep itself from thinking, "Why am I here?" And that is the crux of the matter.

It is thought by some that religion and science have nothing to do with each other. Actually they have everything to do with each other, since God created the universe and all the scientific laws in it. There is also the connection in that God performs Miracles which scientific laws cannot explain.

Questions, questions, and more questions - and atheists have no answers.

SUPREME BEING

Now let's look at creation as coming from a Creator. The definition of God is that he "always was and always will be." Therefore, there is nothing that preexisted God. He created space, time, matter, and energy - the four things that make up this universe. This is not something we can understand, but it least it answers the questions. This is why Reason tells us there is a God - as there is no other explanation possible. This belief does not take Faith. (Faith only comes in when there is specific beliefs about God that He has revealed - as in the Holy Trinity.)

Our minds cannot comprehend a God who "always was and always will be." It is a Mystery, because for us, everything has a beginning and an end. The first time that we see anything in this world is a beginning for us. Later in life, our first memory becomes our mental beginning. In other words, when we see a mountain or ocean for the first time, it is the beginning of its existence for us. It existed before us, but at the time and at that age of youth - we do not consider its beginning. It is just there. At the same time, we are familiar with ends. One type of that is to see a building every day, and then it is leveled in order to build a new building. So we see the end of one and the beginning of another. The unpleasant end that we're most familiar with is death - which usually initially comes in the death of a pet and it or the death of relatives to whom funerals we attend. While we cannot comprehend a God with no beginning and no end, it is somewhat easier to accept the idea of Eternity. That is because we can simply

think that it goes on and on and never ends. No matter how far in the future we want to imagine, Eternity still extends further out. It is difficult to understand how so many people live their lives without Eternity in mind. While the world and the daily living of life is filled with seemingly way too many details and things to keep our mind off of Eternity - we should never be so busy as to not consider it.

Now what is the difference between a Mystery of theists, and the unanswered questions of atheists? A Mystery concern a supernatural belief which answers the questions of creation. Atheists have no supernatural beliefs, so they have to have natural answers to creation - which they don't.

So let's look at creation as stated in the Holy Bible. Genesis was not meant to be time accurate, only chronologically accurate. For instance, the Bible says that God created the world in six days and rested the seventh. Since God exists outside of time, it makes little difference if those days were 24 hours long or a million years each. They could've each been a billion years and it would not change the concept that He created the universe and everything in it over some period of time. Therefore, there could have been a period of time when the Earth was created, and then cool and come to the time of another "day" in which animals and then human beings were created to be able to live within the current confines of the temperatures on Earth.

The writing of Genesis was never meant to be a minute or minute, or eon by eon, of every step of the creation of the world and everything in it. However, it does give explanation of how things came to pass. The seven days of creation as listed in the Bible:

On the first day God created light. On the second day God created the waters and dryland. Since science says that water is never destroyed but only changed, where did the water come from in the first place? All the water had to appear at the same time. So how could that happen? We can combine a hydrogen and oxygen in a lab to create water. Why did the Earth have hydrogen and oxygen in the first place? Where did those elements come from? And what joined them? And while the combination of elements can become a new element, the simple combination of any cannot make life.

Also on the third day God created vegetation on the Earth. On the fourth day God created the sun and the moon. Again, isn't it a nice coincidence that the sun is just the right distance from the

Earth to sustain life? On the fifth day he can created birds and fish. Which one is supposed to have evolved from the other? According to evolution, fish would've had to come first. Not only how could a fish evolve into a bird, but again, *why* would a fish evolve into a bird? On the sixth day, God created all the land animals and man. The biggest difference between animals and man is that we have Reason and Free Will. (Those will be covered in depth later.) On the seventh day, God “rested.” He was not exactly tired after creating the universe over any period of time, but that seventh day of rest was an analogy for the seven day week in which humans live - and that we should reserve one day specifically for the worship of God.

Also created at the time of the universe, were Angels. They are supernatural beings with Reason and Free Will, but do not have bodies. The Bible tells us that the angels were created for one purpose: to do God’s will. To put it another way, they were created to be God’s instruments or agents to carry out His work. Because of their use of Free Will and the Pride that ensued, one-third of Angels - led by Satan - rebelled against God. The results for them - and subsequently for us - will be discussed in detail later.

A belief in an omnipotent God answers all questions about creation - but it doesn’t include all understanding. The more humans want to understand, and the more we try to understand, the more we realize what and how much we will never understand. To accept the Mysteries concerning God is the first step of Humility.

When a theist says that God can do anything, it obviously does not include natural contradictions. They fall under the Principle of Self-Contradiction. God cannot make something true and false at the same time. He can make not make something smooth and rough at the same time. He cannot make something exist and not exist at the same time. In other words God cannot make a square circle and he cannot make one and one equals three. Atheists also will use nonsensical arguments such as, “Can God create something so heavy he can't lift it?” All these natural contradictions are simply a way for atheists to try to bypass the real questions which they cannot answer. Atheists will deny that God exist because they say there is no evidence to prove it. Does this means they've never looked up at the sky, and never look down at the Earth, and have never looked in the mirror? An atheist can even say, “I don't believe you and I exist – I believe we are both a figment of the imagination of someone.” Of course even if that

were true, that someone would have to be God.

One of the heresies about God is that He created the world - but then left it alone completely. What this heresy allows people to believe is that there is a God - which Reason tells them there has to be - but it ends there. One does not owe anything to this God. Therefore, there is no price to pay for this belief. If there' is no more interaction of God with us, then that allows us to believe, therefore, that there is no necessary interaction between ourselves and God. Which would extend to no interaction between Satan and ourselves.

Can you see Satan nodding his approval?

A created thing cannot understand its Creator. A computer cannot understand a man. What computers can do today is absolutely amazing. However, try telling a joke to a computer and you get no reaction. Even if you could enter every possible human experience into a computer, it could print out something that would explain the incongruity of a joke - but could not laugh about it. There can be no emotional response. So inventors can talk all they want about a machine in artificial intelligence, but they can never create a mechanical man with the emotions necessary to equal that of a human - especially a woman. And any type of artificial intelligence from a machine still has to be programmed by a human in order to function in any capacity. In fact, just programming a computer that "thinks" with all the information about the origins of the universe that we know, would have it would come to a conclusion that there must be a Creator - simply based on all the evidence that we do have. And if a computer could laugh, it would laugh at the absurdity of the theory of evolution. Because if you entered all the information on every animal in the world and especially human beings, and asked that the chance of all that occurring from an accidental beginning, the computer would probably print out, "You've got to be kidding!" The odds of animals evolving - not to even include a supposed evolution to humans - would be like a tornado going through that junk yard again and building a 50-story building.

One gets the impression that to have a show involving any area of science on PBS, the word "evolution" has to be in it. When a speaker tries to explain anything, they (whether an atheist or not), also never discuss the *origin* of anything. They'll say something "became," or something "formed," or something "came about," or something, "developed." Of course they never say how anything did any of those things happened, because without God, there is no

explanation.

Since a Supreme Being created the universe and everything in it, He must have had a purpose, and with no hereafter in mind for us, then we have no purpose in this life. No matter how busy an person can be with making a living, focused on making money, taking care of a family, the pursuit of pleasure, and watching TV, does he ever stop for one minute and asks the basic questions of life? If he does not, how can he put it out of his mind on a permanent basis? It would seem as if he would have to ask himself those questions at some time, but also have to make a point of not even seeking the answers.

The Bible says that *"Fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom."* A deeper explanation of this means the fear of the Lord's punishment for not following Him. In a futile attempt for an atheist not to believe in a God, they accuse God of not being able to perform self-contradictory things. They like to ask if God can create something so heavy that he can't lift it. This is as self-contradictory as accusing God of not being able to make a square circle. A simple way to point out on a human level what a self-contradictory principle is, is to ask atheists if they can sit on their own lap.

EVOLUTION

Now since atheistic scientists do not believe in a God who created everything, then they by the Law of Mutual Exclusiveness must believe in evolution. They of course, cannot believe that human beings were created directly by God. Atheistic scientists not only have to deny what they don't know - but even what they do. The non-facts regarding evolution also involves the non-logic regarding evolution. School classroom have posters showing the "evolution" of a monkey into human beings in as little as four steps. Unfortunately, there are a million "missing links" between each of those supposedly steps. Before even examining those missing links, it is pertinent to cover the beginnings of any kind of life itself.

Science says that the first organisms to live on Earth were bacteria, and "made their appearance" three billion years ago. Science doesn't try to explain how that "appearance" just happened to take place. Even if it uses the theory that they were deposited here by some passing comet, that would not explain *how* they came to exist on that comet. As usual, no *origins*. Science also states that those bacteria performed photosynthesis from sunlight, water, and carbon dioxide. What a complex operation that was - but no

explanation of *how* that took place.

A living thing cannot evolve from a nonliving thing – which has to be the first evolution - as the simple must come before the complicated. Does a rock lying on the planet Earth suddenly become a one celled animal? It can be there for billion years, and after that time it will still be a rock. So how did the first one-celled animal come into being? Science doesn't even make an attempt to explain how it just “appeared.”

Do atheist scientists ever consider the implication of their own findings? One of their latest is that amoebas didn't evolve into cell division – it has always been there. (It is interesting that atheists do not believe in a God who always was, but believe that the cell division of amoebas has always been there.) And how did non-blood in a cell evolve into blood?

Let's consider some supposed “evolution.” Atheists cannot show that an animal evolved from a plant, and plants must have come first in evolution - as the simple must come before the complicated. Atheists could claim that plants evolved from one type of non-living material, and animals evolved from another type of non-living material. Of course, that theory only doubles the lack of answers as to *how*.

Life was supposed to have started in the oceans. So where are the missing links for a fish to evolve into gills? Since gills have to be 100% efficient for a fish to live, then how could a fish that evolved even up to 50% gills still live? There would be thousands of steps for an ameba to evolve into a minnow. If a minnow got enough food to live, then any evolution - even though it couldn't be explained - would have to happen to make it bigger. Again, it is back to no answer to the *how*. Any fish larger than a minnow has to have more food in order to live. Even if you give a minnow the slight bit of Reason, it wouldn't choose to be bigger in order to make it harder to find enough food. There's no purpose for that, so the theory of evolution ignores what is detrimental for a minnow to evolve into anything bigger. So again, besides no answer to the *how*, there is even less answer - or any sense - as to the *why* there could be any fish bigger than a minnow, as it would make no sense to evolve to that size. And how could a minnow evolve into a bird? Birds have hollow bones to be light enough to fly. So how does an animal evolve from a solid bone to a hollow bone? More questions - no answers.

Atheists get all excited because there found a fish that sort of “walks” on land with his flippers. Is that supposed to be the

missing link between water and land animals? Even ignoring the fact that if that species of fish didn't have enough food in the water to live, it would have become extinct before evolving the ability to "walk" on land. If there was not enough food in the water for that fish, what would make it think - if it had Reason which it doesn't - that there would be more food on land. There are even many more missing links between animals who traveled on land to birds in the air. Did a land animal look up and use his lack of Reason to think like a man that it would be nice to be able to fly? And then after making that decision, concentrate on making its bones hollow in order to be light enough to fly? Is this an absurd theory? Certainly. But not any less absurd to believe that some sort of unknown, unreasonable evolution somehow had this happen.

Questions, questions, and more questions - and no answer from science itself, or the atheists who want science to provide the answers.

There are fish that live in the deepest part of the ocean, and need a part of their body to light up in order so they can attract and see their food supply which is available. If they evolved, and were not created that way, then they didn't start by living in the deepest part of the ocean. If they existed without the light, then they didn't need to have that ability to start with. If they then had to develop a light to find food in the depth of oceans, why didn't they just stay in waters less deep? And in any situation, if they needed that ability to survive, they would have become extinct before that ability could have evolved.

One of the main steps of evolution would have to be from invertebrates to vertebrates. If invertebrates could function without a backbone, there would be no need to "evolve" into having one - much less explain the *how* of it. Did one cell in an invertebrate "accidentally" turn into a spinal cell - and then another one did the same. And then after a million years, a total of a billion non-bone cells became bone cells? Let's even step past the odds of that happening to the odds that they would all function together as a functioning spinal column.

Another part of the theory of evolution that involves no evidence, involves even a massive "evolution" within a species. The fossil record shows ancient water creatures with necks twenty feet long. Now since atheists don't (can't) believe they came into being that way, then their necks must have started at a smaller length. For the sake of discussion, let's say that this creature somehow "evolved" from some other creature and had a neck a

foot long. Then it must have been able to survive by finding food with a one-foot neck. In that case, besides the *how*, there's the *why* it would need to "evolve" into having a two-foot neck? And if it was able to survive with a two-foot neck, why would it need a three-foot neck? And why would that go on and on until it had a 20-foot neck? Atheistic scientists like to say that the fossil record backs up their claims of evolution, but the fossil records only shows that there are extinct creatures which existed before the present time. Even ignoring the lack of evidence of this, there would certainly have to be an evolution within the same species from a smaller size. Since it is difficult to find the so-called missing links from that one foot to twenty foot neck in the fossil records buried in the ocean deeps, we will go to a land animal where the fossil record should be able to be found.

Let's use a dinosaur – specifically a Tyrannosaurus Rex. The bones that have been found of these dinosaurs which became extinct 65 million years ago show them to be 12 feet tall at the hips. If they evolved from 11 feet at the hips, and it took a million years to evolve the last foot, then bones from the 11 foot ones from 66 million years ago should also be able to be found. And 10 foot T-Rex bones should be able to be found from 67 million years ago. That would just cover the very last two missing links and not even the thousand that had to occur before then for a T-Rex to exist. Because no bones have been found other than the 12 foot size, then it would suggest that T-Rex's were created at that height - since there is no contradictory evidence - and the only explanation is that they were created that size by God.

Since the fossil record does not show even one case of one distinct animal evolving into a another distinct animal, it is rather logically evident that each of the million species of animals were created as itself - at one given time - from the moment of its creation. Those moments of creation could have come at different times, which is why a day of creation as mentioned in the Bible could be one million or one billion years. Since God exists outside of time, He didn't have to be in a rush for any particular step or steps of creation to take place.

The complexity of going from invertebrate to vertebrate is simple compared to going from asexual to sexual reproduction. The original one-celled animal reproduces by cell division - one into two. As always, the *how* would be explained on a scientific level - as just happening - but it wouldn't explain the *why*.

Anyway, that system works. Asexual reproduction still functions for one-celled animals. So how did the “evolution” even start to make that change? Did two amoebas get together, and one tell the other, “This reproduction works but how about we work on a change? I’ll tell my offspring to start focusing all their time and energy on developing a male sex organ, and you tell your offspring to focus their time and energy on developing a female sex organ. Then maybe after a billion years, our evolved offspring will be able to have sexual relations.” The first problem is that amoebas don’t have Reason to decide to accomplish it. Second, they don’t have the brains to be able to focus on a change. And third, even the focusing on a physical change from asexual reproduction to sexual reproduction would not be accomplished even over the ubiquitous million or even billion years. (And even if they accomplished it, the odds are they might have forgotten to also make it pleasurable.)

Does this whole scenario sound completely ridiculous? It should - but no more ridiculous than any other attempt to explain the “evolution” from asexual to sexual reproduction. And over that supposed billion years, each side would have had to evolve at the exact same rate as the other. They couldn’t accomplish sexual reproduction when the systems had 25% evolved, 50% evolved, or even 90% evolved. And both the male and female systems would have to evolve at the same rate. So the exact same amount of evolution would have to happen at the same rate for each side of the species. That could never happen, especially over the billion years that is supposed to answer all the questions. And speaking for the moment of how sex came about, some years ago, a scientist said that after a careful study, he came to the conclusion that because of its greater complexity, the female sexual reproduction system took two million years longer to develop than the male’s. A number of fellow scientists - who has at least a little more common sense - told him, “You might want to rethink your figures.” As always, a scientist came up with a theory, but didn’t carry it to its logical conclusion.

Concerning the supposed evolution of even an ape: all organs would have to evolve at the exact same rate over whatever period of time - even millions and millions of years - to evolve into what it is today. To have all of them evolve at the same rate involves a million “coincidences.” Otherwise, how did a 10% liver, function with a 20% gallbladder, and a 30% kidney? There is even a more basic question – how did the liver go from a 1% to a

10% function, a gallbladder go from a 1% to 20% function, and a kidney go from a 1% to a 30% function? This is only naming three organs of the body that have to work together. What about all the others? Each organ has to operate at a 100% function, or it doesn't function at all. So human beings would never have existed if the human body as it exists, didn't get created with all organs functioning in the very first human being. So much for evolution on simply a physical basis. As always, the theory of evolution disproves itself.

There can be, and have been, evolution within a species. This is called micro-evolution. As an example, wolves have evolved into dogs. However, there is no macro-evolution, because there's no explanation as to what wolves evolved from. (Dinosaurs?)

Doesn't the creation of Adam and Eve as fully functional human beings answer the question of how we got here, more than the million unanswered questions of atheists as to how it could've happened? There is no concrete evidence of either one, but atheists and their evolution has the most unanswered questions. Theists base their evidence of a God on the Reason that this God gave them. Since atheists deny God exists, they are required to have concrete answers – which they do not.

It is evident that the debate between creationism and evolution has gone on for a long time. In that time, the religions beliefs has stayed the same, and the non-answered questions involving evolution has also stayed the same.

Can you hear Satan laughing at those who believe in evolution?

INSTINCT

While on the subject of animals, let us look closely at that attribute of all animals - instinct. Every type of animal has it's own instinct - that unexplained phenomenon that allows that animal to survive and to function. And each of the million different animals has its own distinctive instinct. And the definition of an instinct does not include that the animal developed it. So it must be there from the beginning of the existence of each animal. If it had to "evolve," then the animal would have become extinct before it could "evolve" into an instinct that allows the animal to survive.

Animals are created complete as they are. They never need any type of education to function fully as the animal they are. All they need is their instinct - and the definition of an instinct is to be there innately from the very beginning and the only learning that

they need or get is from the instinct of their parents.

Let's examine a few instincts. There is a fish that spits from under water to knock a prey out of the air above the water. To accomplish that, they must use an angle that takes into account the refraction of the water. Did they learn that? How much intelligence does an atheist have to give that fish to "figure it out?" And again, if that fish "evolved" from another fish that didn't have that instinct, how did it get it?

Science can tell you how an ant colony functions, but can't explain how the instinct that drives each ant came into being. And they can't explain how the instinct of the whole colony works together.

It is amazing (and funny) how Polar Bears put their paws over their black noses to be able to hide better from it's prey. Did the first Polar Bear lose a prey, look into a mirror, and use their Reasoning powers to figure out that their black nose was seen and was a warning to the prey? And what about the instinct of the prey to know that a black nose on a white background signified a Polar Bear? If one who got away learned that, how did it communicate this to others of its species? If the Polar Bear "evolved" from another bear that didn't have (or need) that instinct, how did the Polar Bear get it? That he Reasoned it out, is as ridiculous as any other theory that an atheistic scientist could come up with.

A wasp can build a nest on one of a thousand fence posts, fly off, and return directly to the same one. (Humans often cannot find their cars in a parking lot.)

Honey bees use two variations of a "wobble dance" to direct others to patches of flowers yielding nectar, to water sources, or to new nest-site locations. Bees change the angles of these body movements based on the specific message they wanted to transmit - including the location and distance of particular flowers. Bees have a large repertoire of movements, sometimes only differentiated by subtle differences which are practically imperceptible to the human eye. How did a bee - with no Reason - figure out that a wobble dance could notify other bees of a location of particular flowers? There is certainly no explanation of how that information is transmitted - much less how it's interpreted. The first bee that would have wobbled his body would have no meaning to any other bee. They couldn't have figured out that the wobbling meant something - much less what that something was. Even if it took just a thousand years to evolve into a wobble that could be used to accomplish this, then even just a thousand years

of evolution for other bees to have the slightest idea of what his wiggle was supposed to be for, and then just a thousand years to figure out what each wiggle meant. (They could have been just thinking that the first bee simply had a body spasm.) Even with that short period of evolution, there would be no plants in this whole world which need pollination that would exist in the world. Now all of this is even admitted by atheists to be an instinct of honeybees. But they have no answer to how that instinct evolved? It is theorized that there are over 1,000,000 species in the world - and each one has a separate and distinctive instinct. There is no answer as to how even one instinct evolved - much less over 1,000,000. And again, if instinct had to evolve, all species would have become extinct before evolving to each one's becoming 100% functional in order to survive. There can not be a 50% instinct that could function. The only explanation for these and a million other animals with their own instinct, is that the first two of any species - a male and a female - must have been created as is - with the instinct built in. So where is the explanation - as well as "missing links" between instinct and Reason?

There is no way to answer any of these questions without a belief in a Supreme Being. It takes an infinite God to answer for the almost infinite number of different animals and each one's different instinct.

Atheists have popularized an euphemism for God by giving credit to "Mother Nature" for all that happens with living things. They have to use that to cover all the unexplainable concepts because it works for them - but is not an answer to anything.

Again, because of the knowledge of scientists as to the inner workings of biology and chemistry, they should be the biggest believers in a God - not the largest group of unbelievers. When theists get together they can discuss the wonders of everything created in the universe. When atheists get together, it must be the one subject that is never discussed. If it was, then the proverbial "lightbulb in the brain" would start to glow for at least some of them. Since "birds of a feather flock together," and those of like minds get together, it must be an unwritten law of atheists to talk about anything but the *origins* of anything in the universe. By themselves or in groups, they must keep from asking the questions that can only be answered by believing in a Supreme Being. Any scientist that doesn't believe in God has not only been educated beyond his intelligence - he has been educated beyond his common sense.

An atheist cannot answer any one of any of these questions that have been presented, much less the million that accompany them. Evidently their thinking is “If I don't think about it and I can close my mind to those questions, then I don't have to admit to not knowing even one of the answers. An atheist doesn't have to start by being a theist by Faith - they just have to use their Reason.

HUMAN BEINGS

Now it is time to look at the highest “animal” of all - a human being.

If evolution is more than difficult to explain with the lower animals, it is impossible to explain with humans. Evolution is supposed to be from the lower to the higher. So why is a human baby so totally helpless instead of being the most self-supporting?

Since humans are the highest on any scale, it is necessary to consider their differences from animals on three planes - the physical the mental, and the spiritual. They will be discussed in that order - which is from the simplest to the most complicated. (Even though they all are very complicated.)

Under the “evolution theory” from atheistic scientists, humans “evolved” either from apes, or a newer theory, from a common ancestor. They couldn't show - much less prove - an evolution from an ape, so they come up with this alternate theory. That shows a lack of common sense, because it only doubles the “missing links.”

Evolutionists were ecstatic when finding out that apes and humans have 93.6% of identical DNA. So what? That 6.4% difference is the most important thing. Just because animals and human beings have some - or even many - similarities does not mean that they the latter evolved from the former. Diamonds and rubies have similarities, but one did not evolve from the other.

To be more technical, humans have forty-six chromosomes, while chimps have forty-eight. According to the latest data, there are 3,096,649,726 base pairs in the human genome and 3,309,577,922 base pairs in the chimpanzee genome. If humans evolved from apes, *how* did they lose two chromosomes, and *why* did they lose them and 7% of the base pairs of genomes?

Atheistic scientists know that they came into existence by the uniting of an egg and sperm. However that is not the *origin* of a created human being. The real *origin* is the chromosomes that make up the DNA of the egg, and the chromosomes that make up the DNA of the sperm. Science can say that the characteristics of a child come from the genes of the parents but can't explain why

those characteristics are transferred. What is in a gene that makes a child resemble a parent? What is it a gene that contributes to a child having the same talent as a parent?

The total DNA in a person is over 10 billion miles long. This evolved from a one-celled animal? And let's go even further back. A living thing cannot evolve from a non-giving thing. Since the length of DNA in one cell of a human being is 6.5 feet long, what are the chances of a DNA accidental lining up to form something more complicated than the first one-celled animal?

All coaches know that every athlete inherits athletic skill from their parents. What is in a gene that carries natural athletic ability and how is it transferred? Was once sperm faster than another? And if so, why was that sperm faster? Was one egg more appealing than another to that sperm?

If humans evolved from lower animals, why don't we have all of their positive traits and capabilities? If a starfish loses an "arm" it grows back. Why isn't it that way with humans?" An ant can carry 5000 times it's own weight. Only a rare human can carry two or maybe three times his body weight? An ant can survive a 300 foot fall. Humans can die from slipping on a banana peel. Birds can fly. Why do humans need planes? Fish use gills to draw oxygen out of water. Why do humans need scuba equipment? Many animals have fur to keep them warm. Why do humans need clothes and shelter? Animals have noses that can smell things up to miles away. Humans can smell farts a few feet away. Animals heal themselves by some unknown factor. Humans need doctors for anything worse than a hangnail. Ever hear of an animal with diabetes?

All of the previous about evolution can be superfluous, as atheists have never been able to answer the age-old question: "What came first - the chicken or the egg?"

Since atheistic scientists cannot explain where human beings came from, they incessantly hope to find life somewhere else in the universe. That is so they don't have to even think about - and can therefore deny - that the first two human beings, Adam and Eve, were created by God. One of the most absurd theories of atheistic scientists is that the first two humans were made by a female ape being impregnated by a male "creature" from outer space. As always, by denying the simple answer of the first male and female being created by God, even more questions that can't be answered are the result.

Just for fun though, let's take a deeper look at that theory.

First, those “creatures” would have to be humans like us, or very similar. If so, their world would have to be very similar to ours as far as a “breeding ground” is concerned. So it would have had to have the same “accidental” system that we have on Earth - a sun at just the right distance to sustain life by the appropriate temperature range, water, and the same components of air to sustain life.

Without all of these, they would be too different to be able to cross-breed. And, of course, they would have to have not only the same sex organs, but the same system of eggs and sperm.

Second, it's taking for granted that a horny spaceman would be willing to travel several light years to look for a female to have sex with. Then he would have to find a planet with the exact composition for him to be able to breathe on this new planet, as it would be difficult to have sex in a spacesuit. Third, he would have to also be the same size as humans on this planet, because if he was 1000th of our size or 1000 times greater than our size compared to us, sex would be impossible - even if the sex organs were the same.

And then we come to the final qualification: even if all the rest could be accomplished – a male spaceman would have to be sexually attracted to female apes. Without them just exiting a beauty shop with lipstick, make-up, a new hairdo, and stockings. it would be very unlikely. (And the female apes would also have to shave their legs, as stocking on hairy legs are not very appealing.)

Fourth - with the odds just as small - they would have had to travel here. And there's no logical - much less practical, explanation on how that could be accomplished. There is no logical way for travel at the speed of light to make it feasible to get here even from the nearest star which is four million light years away from the Earth. Not only there is no *how* they could travel to get here, but no Reason as to *why* they would want to travel that far to get here. (Did their Baskin-Robbins have less flavors to choose from than ours?) And of course, there is now another whole set of other un-answered questions as to how the life on that other world “evolved.” Is all of this ridiculous? Certainly. But no more ridiculous than this theory.

Another big difference between animals and humans is the sex drive. Anything involving sex in animals involves only instinct. In any discussion of it involving humans, it must start again at the very beginning - and that would be the *origins* of the sex drive. When God created Adam and Eve, He made their bodies in such a way that it was necessary for them to eat in order

to live. He could have told them that they not only could eat, but needed to eat in order to maintain normal health. He could've said, *"There is no pleasure in this eating - you just need to do so."*

It was the same thing with sex. He could've told them, *"When you want to have a child, then you need to engage in intercourse in order for the possibility for conception to take place. There is no pleasure in this act, it is just something you need to do when you desire a child."* The pleasure in eating was a bonus to eating - not the basis of it. The pleasure in sex was also put in there as a bonus - not the main basis of it. God's priorities of sex, and the pleasure involved, is to promote the procreation of children first, and second, for a bonding aspect between a husband and a wife. (God evidently knew that the possibility of a man and a woman living together without a pleasure in sex would be a very rare thing.) Now sex between a married couple is a very positive thing. Actually, it is not only positive - it is necessary. Without the pleasure of sex, when Adam and Eve were thrown out of the Garden of Eden, Adam would have probably told Eve, *"You ruined my life. You go your way, and I'll go mine - and I don't want to see you for the rest of my life."* The fact that he didn't feel that way was why you and I exist today. So sex only becomes a sin when it is taken out of God's plan - and in essence, fulfills Satan's plan for the loss of Souls. Trading Heaven for illicit sex is one of the worst possible trades that can be made.

Humans have three levels of action that involves everything in our lives – the spiritual, the mental, and the physical. High moral thoughts and actions concern all of the spiritual, and the top half of the mental. Immoral thoughts and actions involve the bottom half of the mental and all of the physical. When a man chooses to only use sex according to God's plan, the moral level is the one in control. Outside of God's Plan, the immoral level is in control. More specifically concerning sex, a single man living a moral life is chaste, and a married man living a moral life is faithful to his wife. These include thoughts as well as actions, as Christ said, *"Anyone who looks at a woman with lust has already committed adultery."*

Let's examine the inclinations and applications of the sex drive in humans as a result of Original Sin - specifically more of an issue with men, as they have a much higher sex drive. The high level of sex drive of men is what is responsible for certainly the vast majority of sexual sins. As strong as the male sex drive is, without a consideration of his Eternity first, he is very susceptible

to engage in fornication and adultery. It is a fact that most men get married for the number one consideration of having regular sex. (Fulfilling God's Plan for the pleasure in sex to encourage men to marry.) Even after marriage, a man will often follow the natural physical appeal of sex and are willing to commit adultery with any woman they're attracted to - or who is even willing. The spiritual aspect of sexual relations is something that seldom or never enters the mind of a man whether single or married. It again is another case of "the world, the flesh, and the devil." The world only advertises the seeking of pleasure and the avoidance of pain. The flesh - considered only as a sex drive - has no qualms of receiving satisfaction in any way possible. Unfortunately, any way possible, includes not only fornication and adultery, but masturbation, sodomy, homosexuality, and rape - even of children. All of these are perversions against God's plan for sex, with some more perverted than others. The proliferation of pornography - especially the visual kind - has certainly contributed greatly to all of those. It is an aspect of the human mind to remember things seen, much more than things heard or read about. That can be the basis of the expression, "a picture is worth 1000 words."

It is sometime surprising to women that men are not monogamous by nature - as one of the results of Original Sin. If Adam and Eve had never sinned, they would not have opened the Pandora's box of human weaknesses that we all are susceptible to - including the area of sexual sins. Without being controlled by the spiritual and the top half of the mental, a man can condemn himself to a life of degrading sex. Since atheists deny the spiritual, they are left with only the mental and physical - and therefore can focus on these without consideration of any moral element. The Conscience that God placed in us, as an example, after multiple cases of sexual sins, can come to speak either very softly or not at all. The human mind can shut off the Conscience and then anything goes.

Without a moral basis for not being involved in fornication or adultery or homosexuality, makes those participants much more susceptible to any and all sexually-transmitted diseases. It is interesting to note, that if a male virgin and a female virgin marry and stay faithful to each other, there is no chance for any sexually transmitted diseases. With no moral prohibitions against any type of sexual satisfaction, humans can lower themselves to acting like animals in the area of sex. The un-control of the sex drive gives the Devil one of his biggest weapons in his arsenal to win the battle for men's Souls.

All of this involving men is not to say women have no sex drive - just that it is nowhere as high, and therefore not as important for them as it is for men. The joke that women think of sex once every three days and men think of sex once every three minutes, has a lot of truth in it. Good men may regret the height of their sex drive and the temptations associated with it, where those who are not concerned in being good may most often relish in it. The truth of the matter is that resisting illicit pleasure in this life gains perfect happiness in the next, and seeking illicit pleasure in this life gains eternal suffering in the next. Can you hear the one Satan is promoting?

Again, it is always our choice.

REASON

Even atheist scientists will admit - begrudgingly - that two of the things that make humans different from animals is the presence of Reason and Free Will. In having a belief in God, one uses both of them. It starts with Reason to know that there must be a Creator. Once we use Reason to know there must be a Creator, then Faith which is an aspect of Reason, can take over. This means we have Faith in what this Creator has revealed about Himself for us to believe. It is the similar to the faith that a blind person would have if they believed someone who told him there was a such thing as colors. It is the similar to the faith that a deaf person would have to believe that there such a thing as music. In both of these cases it takes a kind of faith because it is outside their experience.

Let's examine the mental differences between animals and humans as a result of our Reason. An animal never can sit and think and wonder how do they exist, why do they exist, what is the purpose in life, and all the basic questions that a thinking human with Reason asks. Animals have brains, and some are smart, but none have the ability to Reason. Yes, they can figure some things out, and they can communicate within their species, but no animal has a vocabulary of thousands of words, and no animal has a written language. Animals can understand commands, but try telling one a joke. Animals cannot connect concepts, which is why they don't "get" puns.

Many atheists get excited when they hear that an ape has learned a few more words than a previous ape. That is about as important as finding out that there is a new star discovered out in space. An ape can be taught to type on a typewriter, but not form a sentence. An ape cannot conceive and build a machine. The "answer" to all that by atheists is that they didn't evolve far enough

to do those things. But it's the same question: If they function fully now as apes, then why would they need to evolve any further? And didn't that supposedly happen to get humans here? But just because no atheist living today will also be living on this Earth a million years from now, does not mean that the apes of today will be humans a million years from tomorrow.

Did one day an ape think, "I'm functioning okay but I think I'd like to have Reason." The problem there is that it would take Reason to figure that out - 100% Reason. The first thought takes 100%, so how would an ape have the first 1% of Reason to then evolve into 2% - and then to 3% all the way to 100%? It would have no function until 100%, so *how* would it evolve 1% at a time? Having a percentage of Reason is a contradiction in terms. And then there is the usual - what would make it evolve, and the bigger, *why* would it evolve? There is no purpose for an animal to evolve into Reason since it was functioning successfully by instinct? The only answer an atheist can say - as always - is "It took a hundred million years." That's convenient to shut the mind off from using any Reason, but as always, it doesn't answer the question.

Being a Christian depends both on Reason and Faith. Reason tells us that is a God. Faith is what has us believe that there is one God which was revealed to us, and then another step in Faith to believe in the Holy Trinity which Christ revealed to us. Evidently, after being cast out of the Garden of Eden, the minds of human beings became darkened and they lost all natural knowledge that had been originally infused into them. This is why our distant ancestors of different cultures at different beliefs involving God's. After having faith in a God, Reason would tell us that we owed something to this God - and that would include honor and maybe even some type of obedience. Then it took Faith to believe that Christ was the Son of God. Once we had Faith that Jesus Christ was our Savior, then it took Reason for us to believe that we needed to follow his teachings. It would seem that Reason, not Faith, would tell us that it only made sense for him to create an infallible, institutional Church which would not change any of His teachings till the end of time. Once our Reason told us that made sense, then it would take Faith to accept all of His teachings as defined by the Church he started - the Catholic Church. The road to Heaven involves increments of Reason and Faith from the beginning to the end. So if a person claims not to believe what should be believed because they supposedly have no Faith, what it really means is they have no Faith because they refused to use the

Reason necessary to get to that point of having and using Faith.

FREE WILL

The second big difference between animals and humans is our Free Will. Animals, again, act only by instinct. Free Will in humans gives us a greater autonomy of life because of choices we can make. No animal denies the existence of God - or has to choose to obey Him or not. This is why there are no animals in Heaven or Hell.

How is it that instinct is supposed to have involved into Free Will? Where is the missing links? The first animal that thought "I wish I could make a decision on the direction of my life," would be using a full example of Reason and Free Will. So how could an animal evolve from 1% Free Will and up to a 90% Free Will, before using 100% Free Will for the first decision using that ability. The very first decision that an animal would make involving Free Will is a full blown example of Free Will. Not only where are the missing links, but how could there even be any missing links? As always, atheists never go to real origins. There is no necessity to point out that the "fossil record" does not show any missing links in these areas. It only takes Reason, logic, and common sense to dismiss evolution completely.

An animal does not make choices and whether to have faith, hope, or charity. All their traits are there because of instinct. Humans however, because of Reason and Free Will, can choose what they want to be and what they will be. There will always be the debate of the percentage of influence from nature and from society, as both do have an influence on a person's natural attributes. However because of our Reason and Free Will, we can choose to be different than some natural traits that we may be born with, influenced by the particular situation in which we live, and the society in which we grow up. There have been Saints whose children turned out to be murderers, and murderers whose children turned out to be Saints. The final choice is always up one of us as an individual. That is the essence of Free Will. We can work at developing and improving on what are called Virtues. As one example, we can by nature be an impatient person. However we can choose to become more patient with ourselves and with other people. A person can choose to be more patient simply to make their own life better, or they can choose it in order to please God. So one can have a natural purpose for doing something or a supernatural purpose. Atheists don't believe in the supernatural level of the Free Will, but certainly believe in the natural element

of it.

The most important choice of all is to either believe in God, obey His Laws and go to Heaven - or to not believe in God, not obey His Laws and end up in Hell. Let's investigate some lesser choices first. Only humans choose not only to work or not to work, but what kind of work. Animals don't weigh the advantages of a college education. Animals don't make choices on the floor plan of the house in which they live. And very importantly, animals mate only by instinct. To expound on the sex drive again, male animals aren't affected by how a female dresses - or is undressed. They aren't attracted by how much of one female's body is exposed compared to another. Female animals aren't influenced by the males wearing uniforms, driving an expensive car, or made famous by newspapers, television, or movies. They aren't impressed by their males having a big bank account. Both situations for animals, whether mating for life or one-night stands, is strictly by instinct. No animals swear "till death do us part" until they end up in divorce court. (Humans choose mates by Free Will - even though it sometimes doesn't seem to involve much Reason.)

The most important difference between animals and humans is the spiritual element. While humans have a little or a lot, animals have none. Animals never look at the sky, and ask themselves, "Why am I here?" If an atheist never asks that question, he somehow keeps his brain at the same level as animals in that area. Only a human with Reason can say, "I think, therefore I am."

Reason and Free Will are not what is involved in the missing DNA of apes, as they are elements of the Soul - which, of course is not believed to exist by atheists. However, since they are not elements of the mental or physical, where do they come from? At least theists have the answer to all questions by believing in God. While not being able to understand God, that belief at least answers more questions than the atheist's "We don't know" for everything.

Free Will is a double-edge sword. The Free Will that the Creator placed into human beings, ironically is the very thing that can deny the Reason which can be and must be used for a believe in a Supreme Being. Animals do not believe in a God, because they do not have Reason and Free Will. But a human being must necessarily use his Free Will in denying to use his Reason to know that there is a God.

Free Will allows you to do good or not do good - even evil.

If God forced people to only do good, we would not have Free Will. If one obeys God's logical Ten Commandments and follows the other requirements established by Christ - and his Catholic Church - the result will be an eternal reward. If disobeying the Ten Commandments and refusing to believe, accept, and practice the sacraments instituted by Christ, there will be an eternal punishment. It is that ever-present choice.

CONSCIENCE

If nature of horrors a vacuum, so does the Conscience. Just as no one he is 100 percent good, no one is 100 percent evil. The most evil person still had some good in him. Adolph Hitler may have had compassion for sick animals or something like that.

Animals do not have a Conscience which is an aspect of the Soul. It is a part of the higher mental processes of a human being regardless of any education. While the Conscience can be developed, it cannot be created by anyone other than God. Ironically, atheists can use the Free Will that God gave him to deny the Conscience that God gave him.

It can be assumed, that an atheist, simply because of being an atheist, would not take a machine gun and go to an elementary school and kill a classroom of children. If this is correct, then it is because the atheist thinks it is wrong, and to think it is wrong would be an element of their Conscience. So the first question, as always, is how can any animal – which all operates solely on instinct – evolve into a Conscience? And to function completely as an animal, it doesn't need a conscience. While animals do not have consciences, one of the funniest videos anyone can possibly see is that of a guilty dog. However the dog only feels guilty because he has done wrong in a way that we have taught him to consider to be wrong. As an example, one could easily teach a dog that the only place to crap is on the middle of the living room carpet, and never on the grass outside. And since that is what we want to teach them, then we can make them feel guilty because they do crap in the place that is not where we chose for them. Dogs do not have the Reason to figure out that if he craps inside the house, he makes a mess, smells the house up for the humans living there, and is something they would step in which would not please them. A dog could never use Reason that crapping on the living room carpet is not a good idea and that the grass outside is a more appropriate place. He is being taught what we consider right or wrong - and will never have the Reason to understand why it should be that way.

Humans do have a Conscience. If an atheist doesn't like to see human suffering, he is showing evidence of his Conscience. Where they did that come from? A Conscience is evidence of a Soul - that inner voice that tells us that what is right and what is wrong. Even atheists who are raised as atheists, still have a Conscience, and that Conscience is infallible - but only the very first time it speaks in a particular matter or situation..

An example of that is one involving a tribe in Africa that many years ago had a ritual, in which a boy in his teens became a man in the eyes of his village when he would kill a man of another tribe. From earliest childhood, he was taught that this was a good thing. After this murder was accomplished, it was not only approved - it was lauded. However when the teen goes out and commits this first murder, he is ashamed and hides in a forest for days. Everyone told him it was right to do, but his Conscience told him it was wrong. When he went back to his village, he is welcomed with much fanfare and a feast. This celebration and approval eased his Conscience enough, that if he committed another murder, his Conscience would bother him much less or not at all.

The second case is that of a mafia hit man who was interviewed with his face hidden and his voice disguised, who admitted that he had killed 17 people. When asked if his Conscience bothered him about it, he said no because the only people he killed were not innocent people – they will only members of the mafia who knew they would be killed if they broke the rules of the mafia. At the same time, after 17 murders, even when his Conscience would have bothered him after the first one - like the teenage boy in Africa – he would not have remembered it. The second possibility is that if he had blacked in his Conscience before even his first murder by numerous other Mortal Sins, for instance fornication or adultery, then his Conscience would not have been in the state to speak to him clearly even after the first murder. We have to follow the Conscience God gave us, not the one perverted by “the world, the flesh, and the devil.” (Much more on those three will be covered later.)

Over time of not being followed, the Conscience can become erroneous in its beliefs. It can tell us that what is wrong is right, what is right is wrong - or at least does not have to be followed. Most often than not, it might be assumed that an atheist's Conscience may come to speak only in matters that concern them personally. Even a person who never commits a Mortal Sin against the Ten Commandments will go to Hell if not

believing in God and adoring Him. They would be exhibiting a case of natural goodness as a result of their Conscience, which is commendable, but it would be for the purpose of natural convenience and not because of the goal of supernatural goodness.

Now let's look at something that involves the mental. As an example of what may have been when Adam and Eve were banished from the Garden of Eden, is something that occasionally happens today. Whenever a person today "reads the mind" of another person, it is often thought of as an increased ability. That actually may be reverse thinking. It is certainly conceivable that Adam and Eve communicated with each other by thought transfer. Being almost perfect to begin with, they may have had this ability as it would be difficult to imagine both starting off with a spoken language. Once they were thrown out of the Garden of Eden as a result of Original Sin, they lost the perfection that they once held. As an example, there was no sickness or even death in the Garden of Eden. Once they left it, then their bodies were susceptible to both. That dealt with the physical side of them. On the mental side, they could've slowly lost the ability to communicate by thought. At that time, they would be the beginnings of spoken language to communicate. Adam might have said, "Gob blad noy zik," which meant, "Go fix me some dinner." Eve's first spoken sounds may have been, "Daxl vot bluz teul," which meant, "Not tonight, I have a headache." Over time, unintelligible sounds could have grown into a spoken language - with the same sounds which we call words would have had the same meaning. Then these sounds or words would then have been taught to their children for communication. Only very much later in human history would spoken language have become a written language. It is interesting to note that there are still people in this world who have a spoken language but not a written language. Therefore, when a person takes up a thought from another person, it is not like an example of an increase of mental ability as a percentage of a return to an ability that the first humans had in the distant past.

It is easy to be a theist. This would give one's life purpose, and give him answers to all questions – even if many of those answers were Mysteries. Everyone must have some type of goal in life. Everyone has to have something to give their life meaning and purpose. Since an atheist does not have the goal of getting to Heaven, their goal has to be something on a earthly basis. This can be money, fame, power, and the seeking of pleasure – or any combination of these – as their number one goal. Ironically, on the

flip side of this coin, a theist who has these for the main goal in life is for all intents and purposes a practical atheist.

Before going into some implications of not believing in God, a number of generalizations will be made here. They are not accusations - just natural conclusions that can be reasonably made about atheism and atheists, because of the held belief that there is no God. Being generally true, does not mean that they are not exceptions. At the same time, exceptions do not disapprove the rules. The negative generalizations that are made, will be in the area of individuals or organizations which can, if followed, contribute to the loss of Souls.

There is a gigantic difference in the reasons and purposes of what life on this Earth involves, depending on whether a person - or society - has an atheistic or theistic point of view. The normal results of those differences will be discussed. They are not a supposition of what is always necessary for any individual atheist to believe or to follow. It will just show that they have no Reason to act otherwise. In other words, it is not an absolute for an atheist to be selfish - there is just no Reason not to be. An atheist would have to have a natural purpose to be charitable - because he has no supernatural purpose for that virtue.

Now, how does one become an atheist in the first place? Every opinion that a person holds come from outside of themselves. Whether a person initially believes in God or does not believe in God comes from another person, usually their parents. No babies first words are, "I don't believe in God." In normal situations, a parent will teach a child not just what the parent believes in, but what is going to be a belief that is good for the child. A parent who tells their child that there is no God is not only affecting their child's whole life on Earth - but their life for Eternity.

If a child is not taught that God exists, then the idea of no God is there by default. An atheist has been heard to remark, "Even though my parents were atheists, I was not taught as a child that there was no God." What he actually meant, was that he didn't remember being taught that there was no God. From almost the time of being born until being five years of age, he could have been told that every day by his parents. They didn't have to ever mention it again, for that to be ingrained in him, and him being correct that he didn't remember his parents ever telling him that.

It is easier for a *child* to not believe in God, since they have

a tendency to believe or not to believe whatever they are taught. In Communist Russia, for instance, children in school have been told to put their heads down on their desks, close their eyes, and ask God to give them a candy bar. Then they would open their eyes and nothing was there. Then they were told to put their heads down on their desks, close their eyes, and ask the government to give them a candy bar. And, of course, when they looked up and opened their eyes, there was a candy bar on every desk. These children were not mature enough to ask the necessary questions that atheism cannot answer.

Can you see Satan nodding his approval of the Communists?

Atheists do have a kind of belief in a god - it is just that this god has to be themselves. Atheists have a morality - their's. Atheists have laws that they follow - their own. All of man's legitimate laws are based on laws of God. Even red lights and stop signs which are legal laws or based on the law of God - "Thou shalt not kill." One of the subordinate things in that Commandment, is that it is not right for one to put another in the danger of being killed. So those laws of man are legitimate for the safety of individuals, families, and others. Atheists obey the law of the land in order to not be penalized in one way or another - or the Conscience they deny having is working. Atheists have to focus on the artificial goals of that this life may have to offer, because if they let their mental guard down for any length of time, it would all be over. (The fact that the laws of the country have gotten away from the laws of God will be covered under a section about the influence of the Devil.)

ABORTION

Whatever atheists have as their standards of right and wrong - and whatever level of those standards - it is all based on their own Conscience. It is also based on the Free Will to listen or not to listen to that Conscience. Unfortunately, their Conscience needs to be an informed one in order to follow it properly.

A classic example of this involves abortion. Those with no right Conscience invoking abortion - whether atheists or not - want laws not only allowing it, but laws prohibiting showing films of unborn babies being chopped up while in a womb, and thrown in a garbage bag. They don't want the Consciences of others being affected by this barbarian practice. They also don't want enough politicians with right Consciences to vote to end the legalization of these murderous acts - which makes the human sacrifices of the

Aztecs paltry by comparison. (And, of course, all abortion doctors want laws allowing it because it makes them money.)

As an example, women who do not have God and His Plan as the first priority in their life, have an easier time in justifying killing their unborn baby. Because of their own convenience, or pressure from a man who just used them as a “sexual receptacle,” they can ignore their Conscience long enough to have an abortion. They can try to use an euphemism of the abortionists who want their money, that it’s just a blob of tissue, or a fetus, or not a “person” yet - but they still know it is a baby. No woman has ever said, “I’m pregnant - and I hope it turns out to be a baby instead of a turtle, a bird, or a monkey. This is why Planned Parenthood, which makes millions of dollars for killing innocent unborn babies, refuse to show a mother an ultrasound of her baby inside her. But since the human mind can rationalize anything, abortion doctors, their nurses, and mothers themselves can convince themselves that they are not murdering an innocent baby. And then they can dump the dead baby in a trash can and try to forget about it.

A man chooses an abortion for a girlfriend who is pregnant also convinces himself that he is not suggesting murder. One scenario is that the man doesn’t want to be inconvenienced by having any responsibilities of a child, especially the financial responsibilities. In other words, “I want my sex drive satisfied, without any possible consequences that come back on me.” In this modern day culture of death that we live in, we have the mass media referring to pro-lifers as anti-abortionists, but pro-abortionist not referred to as anti-lifers. They both have the same meaning but the effects of constantly hearing pro-lifers as negative and pro-abortionist as positive has a psychological effect – and that’s why the news media uses those terms. It is been well documented that 90% of those in news organizations do not go to church on Sunday. And if you believe that the new reports they write about or televise are not biased, you are just as naive as they want you to be.

Remember, the Conscience also abhors a vacuum. Women have a maternal nature. If they are not in favor of saving unborn babies (including their own), they usually turn their thinking - and maybe efforts - into saving animals that are in danger of extinction. (Are babies less valuable than these animals just because there are more of them?) It is a common occurrence, that when women do not think the killing of unborn babies is wrong, and do nothing to try to save them, they are often involved in activities to save unborn tigers, turtles, eagles, and all kinds of animal species. Their

Conscience doesn't work to protest killing human babies, but it must protect something. However, women - except those with a totally blackened Conscience - can keep it quiet for only so long. The fact that almost of them have to deal with feelings of guilt for the rest of their lives is a fact withheld from women contemplating having an abortion.

So an atheist who doesn't follow God's Ten Commandments must necessarily follow his own "commandments." They must consider it a coincidence that some of their commandments just happen to follow God's.

RIGHTS

Our forefathers founded this country on a belief in God - and stated it as such. The Constitution and the Bill of Rights gave individual rights that no other country in history ever gave its people. The Declaration of Independence gave everyone the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." (When the murder of innocent pre-born babies are killed in the womb, they don't even have a chance of "liberty, nor the pursuit of happiness.") No one can deny the fact that these rights are continually being lessened - even for the ones allowed "life," by people in all three branches of our government. Those who want absolute power in our country are doing everything in the power they already have, to remove God in general, and Jesus Christ in particular, from every vestige of public life in this country. The excuse most often given - and it's an excuse - not a legitimate reason - is to separate church and state. First of all, this is nowhere in the Constitution. It is a made-up concept. Part of the First Amendment was to give everyone the right to worship God as they wish, and to prevent the forming - and forced joining - of a national religion. This country was founded largely on the search for that individual freedom. And even if the Constitution had the concept of separation of church and state in it, it would specifically deny the forming of a national religion. Even that would not require a separation of "God and state." To show that our forefathers founded this country on a belief in God can be shown by statements of theirs. As examples, two of George Washington's are, "*It is the duty of all nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey His will, to be grateful for His benefits, and humbly to implore His protection and favor*" - and - "*It is impossible to rightfully govern a nation without God and the Bible.*"

While mentioning principles that should be held by

governments, those same governments are populated by people whose philosophy of life governs their decisions - if not the money placed in their bank accounts by lobbyists. It is a fact that there have been - and still are - people within our government that are bent on destroying our system - and all the freedoms that are inherent in it. Just because there is no more House Un-American Activities Committee doesn't mean that everyone in our government is a patriot.

This brings to mind a classic conversion from the past. Back in the 1940's, there was an atheist in the United States State Department named Whittaker Chambers, who had been a member of the Communist Party and a Soviet Spy. His conversion came about when he looked at his child's ear and thought that the shape of her ear could not be explained by Marxist materialism. "Something that beautiful and unique implied design, which implied the existence of God."

What happened was that he opened his mind for the first time by asking the questions which had to lead into a belief in God. Chambers didn't even need to know the process of hearing - which should be enough to convince any atheist that it couldn't just happen. That process is: *The outer ear captures the sounds we hear and channels them into the middle ear. This part vibrates due to differences in pressure caused by soundwaves. The eardrum is connected to three bones it vibrates and pass these vibrations to the inner ear. The cochlea converts mechanical sound into nerve signals which pass through several relay stations before reaching a complex part of the brain, auditory center, where the information is interpreted and understood.* So science can explain the steps of what takes place for hearing to occur - as that is the *how*. Unfortunately, science cannot explain the "why" of each step works, much less the "why" hearing actually takes place. Chambers then broke with Communism because he said he made a choice between irreconcilable opposites - God or Man, Soul or Mind, Freedom or Communism. He said that "The Communist vision is of man's mind displacing God as the creative intelligence of the universe." (More on atheistic Communism will be covered later.)

PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE

When you are your own God, there is no curbing of any appetite, regardless of what the results of a non-control of that appetite is. There is not only no focus on the next life, there is no consideration of it. Not only is nothing considered a sin, but the

things that are considered wrong are only according to the individual beliefs of that person. Some of those wrongs will harken back to the Conscience, but more often the things that are wrong are only wrong if it affects negatively the life of that person. Atheists do not want to believe anything that would necessitate a change of attitude - and especially a change of conduct. To believe in a God would mean a reorienting of thoughts, feelings, attitudes, beliefs, passions, habits, and actions, which all would affect the self-indulgence of the atheist. In other words,, don't mess with my life, which only answers to my personal wants and needs. A belief in God might interfere with their personal choices of greed, illicit sex, drinking to excess, illegal drugs, and anything else they choose that good people would frown on. Atheists can have pleasure, but it is doubtful they have any real joy - and any real peace.

An atheist can only live for what appeals to them. Therefore, human life has no value more than animals. This is why a person who was in all favor of saving any type of animal but approves of murdering unborn babies in the womb, is actually a practical atheist. And while not all atheists are pro-abortionists, they are usually not pro-life - which would put them on to being pro-God. It is also easy for an atheist to be in favor of euthanasia, for anyone who is not supposedly contributing to society. Euthanasia makes sense, especially when someone is suffering, but only to anyone who is not concerned about their Judgment Day. And when an atheist dies and finds out there is a Judgement Day, "Oops" is not going to do them any good.

Now an atheist can certainly be a nice person. One can even be an atheist and be a moral person. However this morality is decided by the atheist, and the lines are drawn by the atheist. There is no other consideration besides them, or above them, that sets any standard for them. They set their own standards and they follow them in order to satisfy themselves.

An atheist can believe in a certain level of charity, because he can see examples of it all around him. But he can only accept other's charity as being a natural effect of the same kind of charity that he would do, because it makes him feel good. It would not be charity under any guise of doing a good thing because God wants us to do good things. (And, of course, the number one charity that anyone can do for anyone else, is to contribute to the salvation of their Soul.)

When people do not have a supernatural God, which sets up

their entire philosophy of life and the living of it, they must necessarily set something else up in their life as their god. For example, most people “love” money – whether they have a lot of it, a little of it, or none of it. There is a big difference between wanting and needing enough money to maintain a simple level of living versus wanting to attain all the possible money that they can, and all of the materialistic possessions that it can buy.

PRIDE

There are two main aspects of the sin of Pride – one is the Pride of intellect and the other is the Pride of will. No one with either one will ever experience the spiritual peace which the spirit of man craves. Any act of Faith requires goodwill, a degree of intellectual humility, and a measure of obedience. Neither humility nor obedience comes natural to a person as a result of Original Sin. As a result, peace of Soul only comes to those who make a conscientious and consistent effort to replace the natural aspect of Pride with the virtue of Humility, and the natural desire to do as one pleases with the virtue of obedience.

One of the elements of Pride is to be self-centered. This would probably be a dominant characteristic of an atheist, as they have no Reason not to be self-centered. Another element of Pride is the escapism involved by not examining oneself honestly, to avoid discovering and admitting being self-centered. They can also be totally selfish, as they have no reason not to be. Therefore, any charity that comes from them would probably be from them wanting approval from others, or at least themselves. Or it had the approval of the Conscience that they deny having from God.

It is not a normal virtue for atheists to have humility - because there is no reason for them to want it. Theists consider humility to be a positive virtue, and Christians in particular consider humility to be the highest virtue. Catholics want to imitate Jesus Christ – and the Blessed Virgin Mary – who were the highest and best examples of humility that ever existed. An atheist does not believe that Christ is not the Son of God, and does not believe that they should honor His mother, have no Reason to want to imitate their humility.

It is par for the course for an atheist to be very materialistic. Since he doesn't live for the next life in any way, shape, or form, he has to be focused totally on this life. In this way, it is easy to see how he could never have enough money to be satisfied. It is also easy to see how he would be envious of those who have more money than him. If he lives just for pleasure in this life, he would

be envious of those who has, or even he thinks they have, more pleasure than him.

This brings into question why an atheist would ever get married? Catholics, for instance, believe that there are two purposes for marriage – the procreation of children, and the bonding of a husband and wife by taking care of the needs of the concupiscence of the flesh by the pleasure of sex. It is also under the umbrella of wanting to help the other person get to Heaven. Atheists certainly do not have the last intention. They may have children as a purpose, but it would necessarily involve only the number of children that they personally want. They could not be open to the number of children that God may want them to have. So there would be no Reason whatsoever for an atheist couple or at least one of them in that couple, to not practice artificial birth control for them to be the only decision-makers involving the conception of a child. And if an atheist did desire children, it would be for their own Reason - not because they would have the intention that this child would end up being perfectly happy in Heaven for all Eternity. So again, having children, would seem to be only for selfish Reasons - or to satisfy a paternal or maternal desire for children - even though they would have no explanation as to where this desire came from. At the same time, a married atheist man would have no Reason to be faithful to his wife unless it was be for the fear of her finding out, leaving him, and therefore no longer having the same amount of available sex as he had before. So he wouldn't even consider the temptation for adultery to be an action that is 100% approved by the devil.

They can have feelings, and emotions, and concern for another person. But this can only be for natural Reasons. If they do not care about the immortal Soul of another person, then it can only be the "luv" that the world talks about, and it can always be lust. In today's world, the words lust and love or interchangeable. Atheists cannot see, recognize, and appreciate value and worth in themselves and others. Not all atheists use people just for their own personal gain, but it does mean that they have no reason not to. A religious person who believes in God can have as part of that belief the idea of serving others. Atheists can only serve themselves because they have no basis not to. If an atheist feels and shows compassion for anyone and anything, it's an attribute of the same Conscience that comes from outside of himself.

If God created the world and human beings because he Loved us, and the basic definition of Love refers to God, then any

Love shown from one human being to another would have to be based on Love of God and is a reflection of that Love. Therefore, in its most basic element, atheists cannot Love. This is not to say that they do not care about anyone, or have feeling for anyone, or consideration for anyone. It only means that if they do not care about the eternal salvation of their Soul or the Soul of others - then they do not truly Love. A married atheist male may actually want to make his wife happy, but there's really no purpose for him to do so unless it was for a selfish purpose – usually more sex. And if an atheist marries another atheist, it would seem that it's basically a case of mutual selfishness.

Not having a supernatural basis for Love would mean that their caring only involves what will benefit them in the short run. By “short run,” it is meant the entire life on Earth - which is very short compared to Eternity. There are those who choose evil, and then there are those who just choose not to do good. There are those who refuse to obey God and there are those who just ignore him. There are those who follow some of Christ's principles, and there are those who ignore all of them.

Since atheists do not believe in God, they also would not believe that Jesus Christ is also God by being the second person of the Holy Trinity. Then they would not necessarily follow the two commandments in which He codified the 10 Commandments - *“To Love the Lord, thy God with thy whole heart, their whole mind, and their whole will,”* and then to *“Love thy neighbor as thyself.”* Any love of thy neighbor that they may exhibit, would have to come from the same conscience that they deny having - or for what they would get out of doing so. It would mean that they could only give for what they receive in return. If thoughtful and generous, It would be their personal philosophy, and not because it is something that is demanded or promoted by Almighty God or Jesus Christ.

Atheists also don't want to believe in a God, because they don't think they need a God. However when something happens in their life that involves a tragedy, they will then say that they will only believe in a God if that God answers the prayers they may say at that moment, and answer it not only exactly how they want, but exactly instantly.

Since God doesn't answer all prayers the way they want, or when they want, they use that as an excuse to not believe in Him. Of course, that only hurts them in the short run and in the long run.

An atheist must fear death because that isn't the end for him. Therefore his life has to be a constant rush for more money or fame and more pleasure. And he can consider nothing wrong in what he has to do to attain them. For an atheist, Eternity doesn't exist - at least not for him - as he has only today. Theists have not only today, but also Eternity, to give their life on Earth meaning.

When theistic scientists get together, they can discuss the wonders of everything created in the universe. When atheistic scientists get together, it must be the one subject that is never discussed. If it was then, then the proverbial "lightbulb in the brain" should start to glow for at least some of them. Since "birds of a feather flock together," and those of like minds get together, it must be an unwritten law of atheistic scientists to talk about anything but the *origins* of anything in the universe. By themselves, or in groups, they must keep from asking the questions that can only be answered by believing in a Supreme Being. This is why an atheist may want to influence others to also be atheists. The first purpose is that the atheist will not be criticized or looked down on by another atheist. And the second purpose is that their Conscience is less likely to be affected. Atheists who try to influence theists to become atheists is like the blind trying to lead the sighted. It's not easy to believe in evolution. One has to ignore all the lack of facts of any proof - and all the Reason that is left as the result.

Atheists say science does not know about something because they do not want to say "I don't know." This is because they are supposed to be the most intelligent life in the universe and their Pride doesn't want to admit that there is an intelligence beyond theirs. And if they admitted to a God, their Pride would prevent them from worshiping him.

FAITH

Our finite mind cannot understand the infinite Mind of God. We cannot wait to understand God before we obey. (We would never turn on a light if we waited to understand electricity.) An atheist might claim that he doesn't have "Faith." This is not true because an atheist shows some kind of faith every day in his life. An atheist has faith in electricity because he sees it in action. But he also has the "faith" to turn on a switch and expects a light to turn on, without checking that the electrician that hooked it up was certified, that the wiring is functional, or that the bulb is not broken.

Atheists have to be perpetual skeptics if they are consistent. They can't believe anything that is not a personal experience. Therefore, in school, that eliminates history, geography, social studies, foreign languages, literature, and psychology. The only thing left would be math and speech. They could not believe anything from history, because that would necessitate them believing something that other people have said is true and from way back in time. So when a teacher teaches that George Washington was our first President, the atheist has to either believe by faith that it is true, or have doubts or deny it. The teacher got that information from a book, as the teacher has no personal experience of it. They could not believe anything in geography class, if it did not affect where they lived themselves. Even to believe they are in a foreign country, they would be taking the word of someone else. And even then that would not be proof, as the place they went to, the people that could be lying to them about where they are. So even though they would consider that personal experience, they couldn't prove that personal experience was true. They could not believe anything in a social studies class, because again, it's information that comes from someone else. And an atheist cannot believe anyone else. It would be a waste of time for them to study a foreign language, because they couldn't know for themselves that these foreign countries even existed. It would be a waste of time for them to read anything that was nonfiction as again, they would have to believe the person who wrote whatever it is they were reading. And since they don't believe the Bible which was written by people, they couldn't believe anything written by anyone else. It would be a waste of time for them to study psychology, as they would be taking the opinions of someone else as to the basis for their thoughts and actions. If atheists believe anything that is told to them by people, books, or news sources, then they have to believe a lot that is outside their actual knowledge - and that is a form of faith.

Atheists don't believe in a God, even though that is what people from every age held. They could not believe that Christ was the son of God, and they would not believe in the miracles He performed, those of His Apostles, and all the thousands of miracles that have happened in the past.

It is like an atheist saying, we atheists have a tradition of having no traditions. This is self-contradictory. So an atheist who says I have no faith actually is expressing a faith in his thinking that he has no beliefs.

The point of that, is that theists, especially Christians, have all that faith as well as a much deeper kind. They not only believe the history books that say Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, but also believe in the Holy Bible which says that God gave Moses the Ten Commandments that He wants us to obey. Theists may be in favor of these laws that atheists don't want to have to follow. And theists are not in favor of laws that go against these Commandments. Prayer was not forbidden in schools by theists. Abortion was not made legal by theists. Laws allowing the easiness of divorce was not made by theists. Now it is true that the laws in those three areas were made by people who claimed to be theists - even Christians. However, "actions speak louder than words," and those "theists" would dare not insinuate that those laws were approved of by the God they claim to believe in.

This same Bible also tells us that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, and left us not only a belief in Heaven, but a way to attain it. (This will be covered in detail later.)

GOD'S TWO WILLS

One of the main areas of non-understanding of anyone, especially an atheist, is that "If there's a God, why does he allow suffering?" This involves God's Directive Will and his Permissive Will.

First of all, it's not God's Directive Will *versus* God's Permissive Will. There is never a conflict between the two. The first mistake that people often make about them is to use them interchangeably. Each one, however, has its own specific function.

A diagram analogy, which may be useful, is to draw a circle on a sheet of paper and then draw another circle inside of the first one. The outside circle signified God's Directive Will and the inner circle signifies God's Permissive Will.

God's Directive Will is what was operating when He created the universe and everything in it. The Permissive Will is operating when the human Free Will - created by God's Directive Will - is allowed to function independently by the choices made by each individual.

Now once Adam and Eve were banished from the Garden of Eden, maybe 98% (arbitrary figure) of everything that has happened with human beings since then has involved the Permissive Will. The Directive Will set everything in motion, but the Permissive Will then allowed human's Free Will to choose and determine 98% of what has occurred on this Earth since that time.

Everything that happens in this life involves a choice - either ours or someone else's. God's Directive Will, in creating human beings, involves a Plan for humans in general - and for each of us in specific. The means there is a certain way in which each of us is supposed to live our life - by our choices - in order to serve God and gain Heaven. While the Directive Will has that Plan, the Permissive Will allows us to choose to not follow it.

Our Free Will allows us to choose whether to be good or not be good. If God rewarded every good action performed on Earth and punished every bad action, the result would be a non-necessity of Faith. One would see the instant results of an action. It would be easy to be good if there was an instant reward for it, and it would be easy to avoid sin if there was an instant punishment for it. Our Free Will choices in this life, however, determines our reward or punishment in the next life.

If God made all the choices for us, we would not have this Free Will. Because God's Permissive Will is involved with humans maybe this 98% of the time, we see all the negatives that people choose. Those negatives, of course, do not only involve just themselves. Let's examine a possible chain of events. A person gets drunk, then drives 100 miles-an-hour, and ends up killing an innocent family. That is an example of the drunk's Free Will and God's Permissive Will allowing it. It is also an example of one type of Mystery involving God's Permissive Will.

It is often when there is a tragedy to hear someone say "It was God's Will." There is *some* Truth in that. (If you say, "March has 28 days," that is a true statement. But it is not a completely true statement. The completely true statement is "March has 28 days plus 3 more.") To say something is God's Will needs a delineation as whether it was the Directive Will or Permissive Will to make it completely true.

Let's look at another situation of a drunk driver. Suppose this time he crashes against a tree, and killed himself. It was again an example of his Free Will and a natural consequence of it. Unfortunately, relatives and friends often try to deny his choices which ended up in what happened, by saying "It was God's Will." This insinuates that it was part of God's Plan for him and there was nothing he could have done to prevent it. It is a classic case of someone trying to absolve themselves or someone else for the responsibility of their own actions. It also insinuates that it was "predestined" - which is a denial of Free Will itself. It was not part of God's Plan for that drunk. It could have God's Plan for him

to become a doctor and discover a cure for cancer. However, he may have chosen alcohol as a minor to “feel like an adult.” We’re back to Pride. He may have chosen alcohol to “fit it” or be popular with his peers who drank alcohol. That is Pride. He could have chosen alcohol as a minor for the thrill of doing something “forbidden.” That is Pride. Then he could have used the excuse not to stop by calling it a “disease,” instead of a developed mental and physical obsession and habit. That also is Pride. (The terms “tobacco” and “illegal drugs” may also be substituted here for “alcohol.”) So the *origin* of him killing himself and maybe others, all stemmed from Pride and the choices of his Free Will as an effect of it.

The point is that there were many choices along the way before the choice of the last bout with alcohol that led to his death. So if you hear someone say about a self-inflicted tragedy, “It was God’s Will,” ask them, “Which one?” That can lead to a discussion which may have a positive influence on that person, anyone else listening, and also anyone in the future who may benefit from this new understanding.

Another example of something that is not part of “God’s Plan” for someone is for them to commit suicide. For someone to say, “It must have been God’s Will,” is to put a big stamp of approval on suicide. To say, “His troubles are over now” is to actually promote suicide. And the worst possible thing to say is, “Well, he’s in Heaven now.” Depending on his mental culpability - not “state of mind” - he may not be in Hell for committing suicide, but it is certainly doubtful he is in Heaven. Any culpability at all on his part - for instance: drugs, then depression; more drugs, then despair; excess drugs, then suicide, certainly were all his choices and all those were allowed by God’s Permissive Will.

Whatever the Judgement of God on the results, can you hear the Devil applauding?

As stated, God’s Permissive Will also allows evil people to affect the lives of good people - as in the case of an innocent person being killed. An extreme case of that would be someone like Adolph Hitler.

To return to the 2% (arbitrary figure) of God’s Directive Will that is used since Adam and Eve, it is evidenced in two areas: 1) the answering of specific prayers of individuals and groups, and 2) Miracles. Since the first could include some minor things, some major Miracles will now be the focus

MIRACLES

Since atheists don't believe in God, then they obviously don't believe that the Holy Bible is the inspired Word of God. They probably don't believe in the Miracles that it chronicles.

A Miracle is an extraordinary event which is not explicable by natural or scientific laws, and is therefore considered to be the work of God. Since atheists do not believe in God, they do not believe in Miracles. They have to be denied because science cannot explain any of them. The explanation, however, is simple. Since God created the Laws of Nature, He can set them aside anytime He wants. There have been thousands that have been documented. When atheists don't believe in any of them, they are contradicting themselves to believe anything outside their personal experience. So we're back to then believing that George Washington was President, etc.

Many Miracles have been history, starting with the Old Testament of the Bible. Atheists would have to put all of them in the category of "coincidences." Was it a coincidence that the Earth just happened to flood just after Noah spent 125 years building an Ark? Was it a coincidence that a number of stars had to accidentally line up to create the Bethlehem star, which guided the Wise Men to the child Jesus? Was it a coincidence for an Earthquake to happen just as Joshua blew his horn for the walls of Jerico to come tumbling down? Was it just a coincidence that the plagues of Egypt happened just when Moses predicted them, and was it just a coincidence that a strong enough wind just happened to happen when the same Moses needed to part the Red Sea? Then that wind just happened to end when Pharaoh's chariots were in it and were all killed.

(And if most of the people on the Earth die from something like a solar flare that scorches the whole world, any atheists left will consider that a prediction for the world to be punished by God had nothing to do with it.)

Atheists then have to deny all the Miracles performed by Jesus Christ. Then have to deny all the healings and even the raising from the dead. Christ would have had very few followers without performing Miracles in order that His teachings would be believed and followed. The greatest miracle of all time was the Resurrection of Christ. But let's look at some less than that - but still absolutely amazing.

Many of the Miracles that are that part of the 2% use of the Directive Will since Christ, has been from His followers - as their

spreading of Christianity would not have been successful if Christ had not told them that they would also be able to perform miracles. So his Apostles, and many Saints since then, have been able to perform Miracles for the same purposes. For example, God set aside the Law of Gravity to save a woman. She was at the top of a castle, and jumped off to avoid being raped. She floated to the ground and ran off. It should be mentioned here that God does not do Miracles for everyone all the time. That was a choice of God's Directive Will, and He does them for whom He pleases, and as often or seldom as He chooses. That is just another of the Mysteries concerning God - which we cannot understand - but need to accept.

The recorded ones, and there are thousands, are amazing in their variety. A couple of famous ones involved St. Anthony. He went to a town to preach, and the people ignored him. So he said, if you won't listen - the fish will. They followed him to the shore and when he started preaching, all the fish stuck their heads out of the water. When he finished, they went back under. After that, the people were willing to listen.

Another time, St. Anthony was discussing with an atheist the belief that what Christ said at the Last Supper was true, that in a Mass, bread and wine was changed into the body and blood of Christ. (Another Mystery believed by Faith.) The atheist didn't believe it. He then said that he would starve his donkey for three days, and then bring him to the town square. On one side of the square, he would be with a bale of hay, and on the other side of the square would be St. Anthony with a Consecrated Host. If the donkey went to St. Anthony, the atheist would believe. Three days later, the square was filled with people when the atheist brought out his donkey. The donkey not only went to where St. Anthony was holding up the Host, but the donkey knelt down in front of it. The atheist and his whole family converted, along with others of the town. That event is still marked by a carving in the town square to this day.

St. Anthony was also one of the Saints that could bi-locate - be in more than one place at a time. He was seen preaching in towns many miles away at the same time being seen in his monastery.

While many Saints have been seen levitating, there was a couple who could actually fly. One was St. Gerard Majella - who flew as far as a half-mile - could also bilocate, and during the plague, was seen in numerous houses at the same time ministering to those who were sick. He also raised a person from the dead.

Then there are Saints like St. Francis of Assisi who had the stigmata - the wounds of Christ in his hands and feet which bled and never healed. One of the most unique Miracles involved a woman Saint who could hang up her washing to dry - on sunbeams. There are thousands of Miracles which have been extensively documented. God - who actually performed the Miracles - did so in order to have the holiness of these Saints admired and emulated.

There's no way atheistic scientists (or anyone else) can explain away any of them. They can always deny that they took place, but then again, they would then have to deny everything they didn't personally experience.

Actually, they can even deny that. In the 19th Century, Frenchmen asked Emile Zola, the well-known atheistic writer, what he thought about the many Miracles at Lourdes. In 1858, the Blessed Virgin Mary appeared to a peasant 14-year-old girl with a message that people needed to repent of their sins. To prove that her appearance was authentic, many Miracles took place at the site. Zola said that he didn't believe any of the reports, and would have to see a miracle for himself in order to believe. Zola went to Lourdes, and was in the Medical Bureau one morning when a woman was brought in. He saw an x-ray taken of the middle of her body, and most of all the internal organs had been eaten away by cancer. The doctors couldn't understand how she could still be alive. That lack of understanding was very small compared to what happened later.

That afternoon, Zola was standing next to her in her wheelchair when the procession of the Blessed Sacrament passed by. She suddenly straightened up, color came back to her face, and she said she was hungry. She was wheeled back to the Medical Bureau and another x-ray was taken. Where there was nothing a few hours earlier, was a complete stomach, liver, kidneys, and gall bladder. God had taken up the challenge and showed Zola a miracle. When asked what he thought then, he said, "I still don't believe."

It was a classic case of a human shutting down the very Reason that makes him different than animals. And the absolute denial of that Reason make Zola no better off than a dumb animal. If Emile Zola had admitted that what he had seen with his own eyes was a Miracle, it would've caused a big hole in his dam of disbelief - any possible bursting of that dam. He did not want what a belief in God would entail for him to do in changing his

life. (Incidentally, Miracles are still happening there to this day. To be declared one by the Catholic Church is a very complicated, thorough process - involving doctor's reports, x-rays, and permanency of any cures.)

The reason one does not hear about Miracles today, is that the news media prefers to cover every kind of violent death that takes place in the world, rather than the good - especially the religious good, including Miracles. This aids an atheist to be skeptical - but only in areas in which they choose. If an atheist refuses to believe any of the thousands and thousands of miracles that have taken place - and been documented - then they should refuse to believe anything else told to them by anyone about anything.

Atheists might ask, "Why doesn't God do a Miracle for the whole world to see to have everybody believe He exists?" That is a valid question - and God could do it. For instance, He could write "Abortion is murder" with the stars. It would be difficult for atheists to believe that was another "coincidence." However, if God did this, it would take away the necessity of anyone having any kind of Faith.

To go back to the time of Moses, God could have written the Ten Commandments in 100-foot letters on Mount Sinai. His Plan, however, was for people to have Faith that God gave those Commandments to Moses, and to have to follow His prophet. God has repeatedly used prophets to tell people what they needed to be told as to the worship of God and the life to live. Those prophets were a forerunner of the Son of God, Jesus Christ, who took human form to tell us exactly what was necessary to live a holy life and get to Heaven.

WARNINGS

If atheists don't believe in the Miracles listed in the Bible, they would probably also not believe in the warnings listed in it. Those warnings were of punishments that would take place for not obeying God and His laws. In the Old Testament, the first warning concerned the Flood, which killed everyone in the whole world except Noah and his family - because the rest of the world was evil. (And more and more evidence has found to point to a worldwide flood having taken place.) Then there was a localized punishment of Sodom and Gomorrah. They were warned what would happen to those cities because of their sins and non-repentance - especially their perverted sins of homosexuality. It was prevalent there even without movies and TV shows and

parades advertising and promoting that perversion. God not only punished those cities for those sins, but left us a record of that punishment in order to warn us that the same thing could well happen to us.

It is important to note that they would not have been destroyed if 10 just men could have been found in them. One theory is that they were at least 10 basically good men who lived there, but when it was time to step forward and be counted, they did not do so. Whatever the percentage that 10 men were in those cities, that same percentage may be what is required by God in order to not punish the whole world again as in the time of the Flood. The same situation may prevail in that there is a good number of basically good people, but when it comes to standing up for the Truth when it counts - they are not willing to do so. Most people are concerned with what relatives, friends, and even acquaintances think of them - instead of what God thinks of them. That's what could have been the situation in Sodom and Gomorrah. Also in the Old Testament, the city of Nineveh was warned that it would be destroyed without a repentance of the people. As a result the ruler of Nineveh and all the people did repent and the city was spared. So we do have a choice of preventing a coming chastisement that has been predicted, if enough people turn back to God and made him their priority, instead of materialism and the unending seeking of illicit pleasure.

Besides cities being punished, there was also a case of an individual - Onan. He was illicitly or even illicitly engaged in sex and withdrew before his ejaculation in order to for it to take place outside of the woman. God struck him dead. It was a case of God showing his disapproval of that particular form of birth control. While not having to struck a man dead for every type of artificial birth control that exists today, the message should be clear.

If atheists don't heed the warnings listed in the Holy Bible, they will also not heed the warnings that have been given since it was written.

Over the last 2000 years, over 70 seers of great sanctity and veracity, have foretold of a divine punishment, which is often called the Three Days of Darkness. According to their predictions this punishment will come suddenly, be universal, and wipe out three quarters of mankind. It will be the worst punishment given to the Earth since the time of the Flood. Simply evaluating the world today with its immorality - as well as ignoring God and his laws - make these predictions very believable.

This punishment is to be as follows as warned by Christ:

“How unconcerned men are concerning these things which shall come upon them, contrary to all expectations. How indifferent they are in preparing themselves for these unheard of events through which they will soon have to pass. Prayers, prayers, and again prayers, I desire of you. When the angel of death with the avenging sword of justice shall begin to mow down, and Hell’s uproar and rage shall cast itself upon the just to destroy you with their frightening terrors, then it is your faith and confidence in me that must be firm as a rock. I will protect you. I will give you a warning which will indicate the beginning of my threatening judgment.

The light of the morning sun shall be replaced by black darkness. Electric lights will not burn. Hence the faithful should light a blessed candle and pray the Rosary for protection. Provide yourself with sufficient food and water ahead of time. From that moment, I myself shall appear a missed thunder and lightning. There shall be great confusion because of this utter darkness in which the entire world shall be enveloped, and many, many shall die from fear and despair. Those who shall fight for my cause shall receive grace from my divine heart.

Then shall my elect not sleep as did the disciples in the Garden of Olives. They shall pray incessantly, and they shall not be disappointed in me. Hell will believe itself in possession of the entire Earth, but I shall reclaim it. Do you perhaps think that I would permit my father to have such terrible chastisement come upon the world if it would turn from iniquity to justice? No human understanding can fathom the death of my love. Pray, make reparation, be fervent, practice mortification.

Many, however, shall burn in the open fields like grass. The godless shall be annihilated so that afterwards the just shall be able to start afresh. On that day, as soon as complete darkness has set in, no one shall leave the house or look out the window. My elect shall not see my wrath. Talk to no one outside the house. Those who disregard this advice will be killed instantly. The darkness shall last for a day and a night followed by another day and night and yet another day, but on the following night to start shall shine again, and on the next morning the sun shall rise again.

My love for men is very great, especially for those who give themselves entirely to me. Pray and make reparation to me. Admonish others to do the same, because they have not heeded my graces. Persevere so that your adversary shall have no dominion

over you. Tell them to be prepared at all times, for my judgment shall come upon them suddenly, and when least expected, and no one shall escape my hands. . The godless and wicked people shall be destroyed without mercy. I shall find them all. I shall protect the just. Have courage, I am in the midst of you. Have confidence in me – I will protect you. Your confidence will honor me and will oblige me to come to your aid. My dear mother Mary, St. Elizabeth, St. Conrad, St. Peter, the little flower – St. Terese, and your Holy Angels shall be your intercessors. Implore their aid. Be courageous soldiers of Christ.”

MIRACLE OF THE SUN

One of the biggest examples of a warnings and a Miracle took place in Fatima, Portugal in 1917. With the power of God, the Blessed Virgin Mary appeared to three children over a period of months, with the message that the world would be punished if people did not repent return back to God. In one of the apparitions, she showed the children a vision of Hell - which terrified them. The oldest, Lucia, gave details of it in her memoirs. *“Our Lady showed us a great sea of fire which seemed to be under the earth. Plunged in this fire were demons and souls in human form, like transparent burning embers, all blackened or burnished bronze, floating about in the conflagration, now raised into the air by the flames that issued from within themselves together with great clouds of smoke, now falling back on every side like sparks in a huge fire, without weight or equilibrium, and amid shrieks and groans of pain and despair, which horrified us and made us tremble with fear. The demons could be distinguished by their terrifying and repulsive likeness to frightful and unknown animals, all black and transparent. This vision lasted but an instant. How can we ever be grateful enough to our kind heavenly Mother, who had already prepared us by promising, in the first Apparition, to take us to heaven. Otherwise, I think we would have died of fear and terror.”*

As a result, they increased their prayers, penances, and sacrifices for the salvation of Souls. That a proof that this warning was one given to the world by God, the Blessed Virgin Mary promised a Miracle in advance that would be performed to prove the Truth of these apparitions and the message. On October 17, there were over 70,000 people who had gathered in anticipation. At noon, in the Miracle - which lasted some eight minutes - the sun was seen to spin in many different colors and seem to detach itself from the sky and plummet toward the Earth. Many people thought

it was the end of the world - especially atheists and other non-believers who were in attendance. Also, all the people realized that their the ground that had been drenched by days of rain - as well as all of their clothes - was all dry. Many people were converted that day, and a number of people were instantly healed. One of the conversions was the captain of a regiment of soldiers on the mountain that day, who had orders to try to prevent the gathering of the crowd.

This Miracle was even reported by the secular newspapers of the time - including an atheistic one. A reporter for the Masonic newspaper, *O Seculo*, was sent to Fatima to cover what he believed would not happen, and he looked forward to being able to print that it was all a hoax. Instead, he was compelled to write what he and everyone else had seen. He could not explain it, but neither could he deny it. And he remained adamant in his account, despite vicious attacks from his colleagues. Not only would he not retract what he had written, but 15 days later he published another story about the events and included 12 pictures taken of the crowd during the Miracle. Throughout his second article, he repeated multiple times "I saw it... I saw it..."

It was the greatest public miracle in the world since the parting of the Red Sea. This Miracle affected more people who were present than even the multiplication of fishes and loaves in the Miracle Christ performed when He gave the Sermon on the Mount.

The Blessed Virgin Mary also said at Fatima, that "*More people go to Hell because of sins of the flesh than any other Reason.*" This is easy to believe, with all the sexual sins - including fornication, adultery, masturbation, sodomy, homosexuality, rape, artificial birth control, and abortion. The proliferation of sexual sins in the world today also makes it easy to believe why there is an eminent punishment of the Earth and everyone in it that is coming. Unfortunately, the good has always had to suffer for the bad, and it will be the same after the coming chastisement and its aftermath - famine and starvation. (It is considered a tragedy when someone dies unexpectedly, but the real tragedy is going to Hell. This is why everyone should be ready to die at every moment - and be living the life that God wants them to be living at all times.)

If one asks why God the Father has Christ's mother appear on Earth to give messages and warnings, it is because He wants everyone to honor her as He did when choosing her to be the

human mother of Jesus Christ out of every woman who would ever live. (And it will be covered later why dishonoring her doesn't please Christ in the least.)

SATAN

It is now pertinent to go into many more details about how the Devil works. By the Law of Mutual Exclusiveness, either the Devil exists or the Devil doesn't exist. If one believes in God, then one believes in the Devil. The proofs of God's existence has been shown by all the unanswered questions that make God reasonable and logical without Faith - and how the goodness in this world is explained by a belief in God. It will now be shown all the questions about how the existence of evil in this world is answered by the belief in the Devil - is the Prince of Darkness. It is always good to shed some light on him.

When Angels were created, they had Reason and Free Will, but no bodies. They were given some kind of test by God, and Satan and one-third of the angels - using their Free Will - failed that test and were banished to Hell, which did not exist until this first sin was committed. This first sin was Pride, and it was actually the only sin in which they could commit. Out of all the seven deadly sins - Pride, Greed, Lust, Envy, Gluttony, Anger, and Sloth, Pride was the only one open to them. They could not commit any sin by one of the others that were not available to them - because of not having a body.

When human beings were created, our Free Will also had to be tested, and evidently Satan was allowed to be the instrument of that test. God did not create evil as such, but it entered the universe through Satan, and entered humanity through the same sin, Pride. It was the first potential weakness as the other six deadly sins had not come into possibility until the Original Sin was committed. Once that wall was breached, then they could commit many types of other of spiritual, mental, and physical sins - including, and especially, sins of the flesh.

Just as each one of us is protected and guarded by one spirit, our Guardian Angel, we are probably also, each one of us, particularly attacked by one Devil. It is a good idea in times of temptation to picture our Guardian Angel on our right shoulder suggesting us to do the right thing and the Devil on our left shoulder suggesting us to do the wrong thing. As always, the choice is ours.

There are two things operating in this world: God's Plan for Salvation and Satan's Plan for Damnation. An atheist doesn't

believe in either one. So if these are true, an atheist can in no way can fulfill the first one (the Law of Mutual Exclusiveness), and therefore has necessarily chosen the second one - even if not consciously. Not to believe in the Devil means that his work is already accomplished. (To use a secular analogy, when someone doesn't believe there are any conspiracies in the world, then the work of dis-informationists has succeeded to their highest degree.) For theists who believe in the Devil, they need to be conscious of the ways in which he tempts us to not follow God's Plan in small, medium-sized, and large ways. Without that belief, there is no explanation of evil in the world.

Atheists who do not want to attribute the *origin* of evil to the Devil, then they probably just say that there is a "spirit of evil in the world," and that allows them to not have to define it - or think about it - any further. But it doesn't answer any questions about it.

Satan has a conscience, but it is an evil, reverse conscience. Instead of his guiding him to what's right instead of what's wrong according to God's Laws, it only guides him to what is wrong. And that involves trying to get other Souls to Hell with him. If he had no conscience at all, he would have no need to try to accomplish that. In other words, conscience does not exist in a vacuum. It must be used - one way or the other.

So the Devil's main strategy is for us not to be able to recognize our sins of Pride for what they are. If we do not recognize the temptations that lead to those sins - and we cannot be as conscious as we should be in fighting them, and the other sins that Pride leads us into. For some reason, according to God's will, he allows the Devil to tempt human beings, so there is definitely an interaction, as such, between these two sets of created beings. The Devil can even start tempting a child long before reaching the age of reason. Ever hear of the "terrible two's?" That early stage of rebellion is based on Original Sin.

There is a hundred other ways in which the Devil works that is either unknown or gets no publicity. The Devil is responsible for a multitude of things that he is not given credit for. The Devil has to laugh constantly on how easy it is to fool human beings. He succeeded with Adam and Eve, and he succeeds today.

We must know our enemies and their weapons to prepare a defense. That's why it's necessary to understand who the Devil is and how he works in our everyday lives. He would obviously prefer us not to believe that he exists, because with that, we would

make no effort whatsoever to know and understand what he does. And that's obviously what the Devil would prefer.

One theory in how the Devil acts, is that he is not interested in people breaking all Ten Commandments, or even most of them. If a person did that, then the natural Conscience, which God has endowed everyone with, may well start to bother them. The total amount of sins they would be committing and the total amount of ways they would be doing wrong, could very well then start affecting them, and if it did, they may just give up all serious sins that they are committing. So that theory is for the Devil to only wants you to have one sin, one Mortal Sin that you commit and justify. If you do so, then you can even tell yourself that you're a good Christian, you can even go to church every Sunday, and then all the other sins that you're not committing gives you this presumptuous feeling of being good. If you commit one type of Mortal Sin and can successfully rationalize it, then the Devil has you completely. At that time, he's not going to tempt you with any others. He's not going to mess up success. He already has a person using situation ethics to justify that one type of sin, and so that's all he needs to accomplish 100% of what he wants with that individual's Immortal Soul.

Can you see Satan promoting that?

There are two roads to hell – the direct road and the indirect road. The direct road is to simply not believe in God, or to reject his Laws, or to consciously commit sins without any intention of repentance. The indirect road is to not follow God's Plan completely. One is certainly worse than the other, but both can cause one to lose their Soul. If someone is on the first direct road, the only chance for Heaven is for a complete conversion - even if it's a deathbed conversion - to being a 100% orthodox Catholic. Those on the second indirect road have their whole life to believe all of the Truth which would necessarily change their life of convenience by accepting and following and practicing what is required instead of part of the Truth or even most of it. Both roads are a choice.

The Devil also tempts somewhat indirectly by inspiring the development of anti-God organizations – such as Freemasonry, Communism, and Socialism. He also inspires movements - such as Modernism and Liberalism. He even inspires organizations like Planned Parenthood. The first three listed want total control over societies and that is most often accomplished by taking over governments by force or by influence, and then exercising power

over everyone and everything in the country in which it has that power. Freemasonry is a secret organization that works at orchestrating entire political, financial, and cultural movements throughout the world. They had leading roles in the sexual revolution of the 1960s, and they themselves have stated publicly that they are behind same-sex marriage, euthanasia, and abortion. Freemasonry hates all religion – especially the Catholic Church. As far back as 1829, Pope Pius VIII said, "Freemasonry is a Satanic sect, which has its demon as its God." The essence of the Masonic religion "consists of the perversion, that is, of the subversion of the Divine order of creation and of the transgression of the laws given by God." Freemasonry rejects even the natural law. Freemasonry supported logistically and politically the revolution in Russia in 1917 which established Communism. They only differ in that who is to be in control of the whole world. Both Freemasonry and Communism deny a belief in God, and certainly, the following of His laws. They brag that when they have destroyed religion, they will have all law and all property at their disposal. While many people have heard of Freemasonry, very few probably know that to become a 33rd° Mason one has to commit to the worship of Satan.

It is interesting to note that Freemasonry is probably the last organization in the world that doesn't admit women – and are not criticized for doing so.

Communism is a political and economic system that seeks to create a classless society - by encouraging class war. Just two of its lies are that its major means of production are owned and controlled by the public - and there is no government. They do admit to abolishing any private property, and eliminates private initiative and enterprise by wanting wealth to be divided among citizens equally. Therefore, Communism is against any form of capitalism.

The second two want their philosophy to permeate society. Liberalism is a system of political and (im)moral ideas, which consider traditional beliefs as outmoded and dispensable. They favor forced "equality," and in favor of taking away individual rights - especially those of unborn babies. Liberalism is an infection spread by those who believe that a utopian Earth can be created without a belief in God - or at least not following his Laws.

Socialism is an economic and political system in which everything is owned or regulated by the government. I complete

Socialism, there is no such thing as private ownership of anything.

America was settled by foreigners who were looking for freedoms. They have always been the hallmark of this country – until rather recently. The first freedom that was sought was freedom of religion. Another of the Bill of Rights is the freedom of speech. However, it has since been interpreted by a liberal Supreme Court to include any kind of degrading language in almost all aspects of society. At the same time, there is no freedom of speech to allow children to say a prayer in public schools. In fact, it goes so far as to forbid even silent prayer by a child. Of course, even being hypocritical in denying this right is the basic purpose to deny anything in public that suggest a belief in God in general, and specifically in Jesus Christ. This is why in the educational system, the term BC (Before Christ) to denote the time before Christ has been replaced by the term BCE which stands for “Before the Common Era.” That would be laughable if it didn't show just how much the elimination of anything religious – and especially moral – has taken place. The atheistic minds in charge don't even want the insinuation of Christ's name to be mentioned. The organization mentioned, Planned Parenthood, is not satisfied in only being able to kill unborn babies in the United States, but also in the 12 foreign countries in which it operates. It's all about money, but it is also all about anti-God.

Can you see Satan putting his stamp of approval on that?

So again, no one chooses directly to burn in Hell, but they do choose either not to believe in God, not to believe in God's justice, or to follow false religions. Those are all extremely effective in the contributing of a Soul going to Hell for all Eternity

Since Satan wants everyone to go to Hell, he will use anything he can in order to accomplish that. He tempts people to make money their god- and justify any actions that help to accomplish that. That is always as aspect of Pride, and an appeal to the lower side of human nature.

Humans are tempted by “the world the flesh and the Devil.” The Devil wants people to focus on the world and on the flesh - but he does not want people to focus on him. When a person is conscious of the temptations of the Devil, in general, and can recognize temptations in specific, it is much easier to bypass on the sins involved. It always has been - and always will be - difficult to resist the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the Devil, because they are relentless.

Not believing in God makes one closed to His inspirations

to do good. Not believing in the Devil makes one susceptible to his temptations to do evil – or at least not do good. Atheists are not evil by nature, but the absence of them making any effort to save their own Soul - as well as that of others - is the biggest evil of all.

One of the Devil's favorite strategies in what could be called the “partial Truth.” It is composed of two things: A) part of a statement that is true, and B) a part of a statement that is omitted which is necessary for a complete Truth to be expressed. In other words, the first statement is true, but it is not a stand-alone statement. For instance, the statement, “March has 28 days” is a true statement, but it is a partial Truth. The whole Truth is “March has 28 days plus three.”

Let's apply that to religious statements. God loves everybody. That is a "partial Truth." It is not a stand-alone statement unless a qualifier is added: "God loves everybody, but not equally." Maybe the love is equal at conception, but it does not stay that way - depending on the choices one makes and the life one leads. God certainly did not love Adolph Hitler as much as He loves His Saints.

The Devil tempts some people to believe that there is no God, and most people to believe that because God loves them, they automatically go to Heaven. The Devil has had some success in the first area, but nowhere the fantastic success as he has had in the second one. Neither of those are the Truth, but people pick the one they want to believe. Every belief does not fall within the Law of Mutual Exclusiveness. If someone believes that $2+2=5$ and another person believes $2+2=6$ - they are both wrong.

STRATEGY 1 - It makes little difference if it takes the Devil one day or 50 years to win your Soul - as long as he gets it.

STRATEGY 2 - It must be a slow process for most people. (A frog put in hot water will jump out, but put in cold water and increase the temperature one degree at a time, and he will sit there until he boils to death.)

STRATEGY 3 - To get people off the center of the road (Truth) into the ditch (Error), he has to coax you onto the shoulder first (Partial Truth). And you have to think that the shoulder is safe and firm to try it out. Then the slide into the ditch is much smoother.

- STRATEGY 4 - To accomplish people accepting counterfeit Truths, the Devil uses human's own weak tendencies to fall into small sins, which lead to bigger sins, which lead to great sins.
- STRATEGY 5 - Use sex, sex, and more sex. Take it out of its proper context and make it an obsession. Promote sex education in schools to accomplish that with youth.
- STRATEGY 6 - Foment wars between countries, races, ethnic backgrounds, husbands and wives, and parents and children.
- STRATEGY 7 - Make people dissatisfied with being male or female. Destroy marriages and families. Promote divorce.
- STRATEGY 8 - Use anything to keep people's minds off of spiritual matters. (Communism's published blueprint was to get young people's minds on sports, music, etc. - anything except spiritual matters.)
- STRATEGY 9 - Use the media to accomplish No. 8.
- STRATEGY 10 - Tempt people with sins of Pride - especially in the drive for money, fame, or power.
- STRATEGY 11 - Remove God and morals from all public life - especially in schools - and movies and TV shows.
- STRATEGY 12 - Cause loss of Faith by attrition, neglect, or undermining Faith.
- STRATEGY 13 - Use "exceptions" that appeal to emotions to draw people away from Truth. It can become the rule later.
- STRATEGY 14 - Encourage situation ethics. ("I'm not saying it's right for everyone, but it's not wrong for me.")
- STRATEGY 15 - Always tempt with false choices. ("I had to become a prostitute in order to make a living.")
- STRATEGY 19 - Use the general weakness of women. Promote gossip.
- STRATEGY 20 - Encourage peer pressure from the bad in any group, especially among teens.
- STRATEGY 22 - You have plenty time left to be good.
- And the STRATEGY that trumps them all - Have people

believe there is no God, no Devil, and no Judgement Day.

Some years ago, there was a rash of movies where the Devil is either possessing people or impregnating women. While the Devil can not impregnate women, he does on occasion actually possess someone. Satan would prefer that you don't believe that he exists, but if you do, he would like you to think that he only works against us in actual cases of physical possession.

Can you hear Satan laughing at those who believe that?

If the Devil had a world headquarters, it could very well be in Hollywood - the unofficial capital of the entertainment media. It wasn't always that way. Back in the 1930's, there was a Production Code which stated what could or could not be shown in movies. It directed by Joseph Breen, who said, *"It is better to have no nation pictures at all than to permit what is objectionable to creep into our films."* The Code monitored the language, undressing of women, violence, and morals of films. As one example, a film couldn't show evil triumphing over good. Lawbreakers had to be caught and punished. After the Code ended in 1968, the studios had their own rating system. In the 30's the word "censorship" was a good concept. By the 70's it was a hated concept. The Devil had won the war in that area. No restraints were made on any movies, including ones that glorified criminals and their crimes. Remember, the Devil has patience. You don't change public opinion, much less public morality, in an instant. It's only accomplished slowly and methodically - at a rate that is not discernable to the general public. The Devil is the absolute master of the skillful manipulation of public opinion. This principle can best be explained by the well-known story of how to boil a frog in water. If it is put in boiling water, it jumps out. If, however, it is put in lukewarm water and the temperature is increased one degree at a time, the frog just sits there until he boils to death. The lowering of morals and principles follow this very pattern.

The Devil started the ball rolling with temptations of Pride, for someone to be the producer or director who introduced previously forbidden material into movies. Another one of the bylaws of the liberal is to promote their philosophy and lifestyle. Then the "world" and the "flesh" keeps it going.

One of the phony excuses that Hollywood producers and directors try to use to justify the filth in their movies, is to claim that they are just "giving the public what they want." Actually, they are just giving the public what it will accept. And, of course, as morality and public standards continually go further down -

aided and abetted by these same movies - the public is willing to accept more filthy language, nudity, and gory violence. Movies are a favorite tool of the Devil because they are made with the supposed intention of entertaining an audience, and a movie is considered entertaining if it has an emotional effect on them. This effect can be laughter, sadness, compassion, or fear.

People, however, leave the theater after watching a bloody, gory movie, and call it a “good movie” because it caused an emotional response. A filthy movie is a “good movie” if it made them laugh. Of course, they never seem to consider how a diet of these movies will affect them morally or psychologically for the rest of their life - and later.

Producers work from the philosophy of appealing to the lowest instincts of human nature to attain their goals, and to the furthering of their hedonistic agenda, which is generally anti-Christian and specifically anti-Catholic. Both “adult and “teen” movies suggest that fornication and adultery is normal in any relationship between a man and a woman, including on the first date. The latest in this ongoing portrayal of immoral behavior as normal, is the present positive portrayal of homosexuality as just another acceptable lifestyle. No use naming any movies, as that includes probably 90% of all the ones made today. Then people have a tendency to “follow the crowd” (Human Nature Principle A) because of the natural weakness to sink to a lower level when given the opportunity. Even George Lucas has said that film has supplanted religion as the shaper of values.

One of the psychological reasons film-makers make movies to influence people in joining in their degrading lifestyle, is to attempt to lessen the chance that anyone else, either by word or example, can bother their Conscience. You can’t criticize someone else who has the same weakness or commits the same sins as you do. (This could be called Human Nature Principle B.) It is, therefore, no surprise why even anti-religious movies are being made, once you know that 96% of the Hollywood elite do not go to church. It is a well-known fact that anti-Christians and anti-Catholic movies do not make money. The studios and independent producers can afford to have losses on these movies only because they make so much from the R and PG-13 movies that atheists to “Christians” patronize. (You can’t be part of the solution when you’re part of the problem.) Besides losing money, these movies offend a large percentage of the population - but evidently, not enough of the population.

It is important to remember that all pacts with the Devil are not direct. While there are some who actually *do* make these, most of the time it is an indirect pact. A person simply has to place God outside of their life, aim solely for money, success, pleasure, fame, or power, and the Devil is more than happy to do anything he can to help you get them. He knows that by attaining any or all of them, you will keep God out of your life, and you're his when you die. So if money, success, pleasure, fame, or power is your main goal in life, you've already made a pact with the Devil. Whether it is direct or indirect is only a matter of accounting.

Regardless of Hollywood's reasons for making filthy, violent, sex obsessed, and anti-religious movies, anytime anyone suggests that movie makers go too far, they start yelling "censorship", "freedom," and "rights." This is an appeal to emotion, not reason. People have been conditioned "to feel" something negative when they hear those words. The "right" to make filthy movies is supposed to outweigh the actual right of society to protect its own citizens from violence, sexual promiscuity, and homosexual perversion.

LIE NO. 1: "It's only entertainment - it doesn't influence anybody." There have been many cases of someone imitating crimes including murder, and they admit to getting the idea from a movie.

LIE NO. 2: "We just reflect reality. Don't blame us; blame society." Really? Where are the movies about:

- A) couples who practice abstinence before marriage;
- B) families who pray, and even go to church every week;
- C) adults who can actually participate in a discussion without arguing or violence;
- D) children who show respect to their parents and elders;
- E) crooks who are actually guilty, get caught, and go to jail;
- F) athletes who really are good role models;
- G) businessmen who treat their employees and customers with courtesy and fairness;
- H) a stay-at-home wife and mother who feels completely fulfilled;
- I) someone, anyone, resolving a problem without violence;
- J) men (and now women) getting upset without rattling off profanity or obscenities

K) a dedicated, even holy, priest or nun;

L) parents who teach their children about right and wrong.

While the total number of people who now fit into those categories are certainly less than the number who did, say 70 or 80 years ago, there are still many around. The movie and television industries seem to think they don't exist. As Michael Meved, a movie critic said, "*The true power of mass media is the power to redefine normal.*" As an example, if movies "reflect reality," why are there more movies showing women holding machine guns than babies?

Another point: why is it necessary to always reflect what is wrong and sinful in society. This preoccupation with the negative becomes, over time, a self-fulfilling prophecy.

LIE NO. 3: "We give the public what it wants. If people don't like it, they don't have to watch it." This is actually two lies. The first is that when appealing to the lowest side of human nature, movie makers are guilty of creating the demand and then presenting the supply. Where are the petitions requesting filthy language in movies? Where are the original surveys that point to teenagers asking for movies that show their peers getting chopped to pieces with blood flying everywhere? Where are the polls that indicate that the public requires all couples to engage in fornication or adultery? And where is the request for sacrilegious and blasphemous movies? The movie-going public never asked for these movies.

The second lie is the inference that if you don't like what a movie is about, just avoid it, and it doesn't do you any harm. It puts the responsibility on the individual viewer. This is true for that person. However, what about other people who watch it? What about the teenagers who did not see a movie in which a student kills several of his peers, and who then gets killed by a teenager imitating what he saw on the screen? The parents who prevented their own children from watching that gore still have dead children. Everybody with any level of responsibility tries to pass the buck.

An additional point needs to be made about people imitating what they see in movies. Hollywood producers claim that the only people who are guilty of copycat murders, copycat kidnapping, and copycat rape, are the people who have mental problems. Is this a result of moral brain dysfunction, or caused by a diet of immorality and violence?

The Devil definitely has his favorite movies. While there

are many worse movies, runner-up may be “Titanic,” from 1997,” because it contained nudity and still received a PG rating. It introduced nudity into that rating, much like “Ryan’s Daughter” introduced nudity into PG-13 in 1970. “Titanic” grossed a billion dollars worldwide, which means that its promotion of premarital sex was probably viewed by the most people ever for a movie on the big screen. And, of course, everyone thinks it’s a “good movie” (even “great” movie) because it was successful at wrenching emotions - especially out of women. Say the word “Titanic” to someone who liked the movie (they’ll say, “I loved it”) and they will get misty-eyed. Say the word “Titanic” to anyone in Hollywood, and their eyes will turn into dollar signs as they hear the sound of cash registers.

If you ask anyone who saw the movie, “What was the biggest tragedy that happened? - you would get one of two answers. Either A) the “hero” drowned, or B) Nearly 1500 people drowned. Actually, *according to the movie*, the real tragedy was that the hero, and many of the others who drowned - and later the heroine - evidently ended up burning in Hell for all Eternity. This is because the hero drowned without any regrets for his premarital sex, the heroine died as an old lady without ever showing sorrow, and after she dies, you see her joining her hero and other members of the crew and passengers. The movie shows them back in full costume back in the main ballroom of the Titanic. If they were, in fact, all together, it would not have been in Heaven. (If you suggest this scenario to anyone who thought it was a “great movie,” you will watch their face turn into a horror mask. Do not try this at a party with women in attendance, unless you are wearing a bullet proof vest.)

The Devil’s favorite movie, however, was more than likely another disaster movie, whose premise was even more deadly than “Titanic.” Coincidentally (or maybe not), it also involved a disaster. That movie was 1975’s “The Poseidon Adventure.” In the beginning of this film, we see a young, intellectual, ultra-liberal priest tell a group of people that, “It is a waste of time to pray to God. Everything is up to you, so don’t ever ask for God’s help, because you won’t get it.”

The rest of the movie is simply uses a disaster format to prove the young priest right. After a giant tidal wave capsizes the ship, the young priest tells everyone that they have to climb up to the bottom (the ship is upside down) to get out. An elderly priest says that they should stay where they are, pray, and wait for help.

They all drown, of course, insinuating that God ignored their prayers. The Captain says that they should stay where they are as the ship might right itself. He and everyone who trusts him drowns, of course. The authority figure on the ship is wrong. The only ones who believe the priest and follow him, just happen to be all the other big name stars of the movie.

The movie follows an emotional roller coaster as they make their way “to the bottom” and are saved. The priest’s heresy has been proven true. They needed one last emotional punch at the end, so the young priest gives his life to save the other non-believers. (Hmmm...The “hero” also died in “Titanic.” It is another tragedy to wrench the emotions out of the audience.)

Now let’s backtrack a bit. Before a book or screenplay can be written, the writer has to come up with an idea. There are two basic ways: A - come up with a plot, and then fill it with characters, or B) - come up with one or more characters, and build a plot around them. It’s a good bet that the latter was the case with the “Poseidon Adventure” and the former was the case with “Titanic.”

The Titanic disaster actually happened, so the basic plot was already there. The writer simply decided who the main characters would be, and chose a fornicating couple. To make it at first a “romantic,” and then a tragic setting, does not change the true nature of the characters. It only aids in their acceptance by the audience.

It seems unlikely, however, that the writer of “Poseidon Adventure” got an idea first for a disaster movie, and then out of all the thousands of possible leading characters, chooses a man who believes in the heresy that even if God had some kind of responsibility in the creation of the world and human beings, He has nothing to do with us after that. And then he uses a priest, no less. It’s kind of naive to think anything else except the fact that the entire movie (or book it was from) seems to have been written for the express purpose of spreading that heresy.

(Anyone want to place a bet that the writer of either movie falls into the 4% in Hollywood who attend church weekly?)

“Poseidon Adventure was worse than “Titanic” (and it was almost as big a comparative hit in 1975), because a sin of heresy is worse than a sin of sex. The sin of heresy was promoted somewhat more subtly than the sin of sex. It, therefore, works more on the subconscious level, which is even more insidious than the conscious level. (If you’ve seen the movie, did you pick up its

premise? No one should feel too bad if you didn't. Most people were in the same boat (excuse the pun). Always remember, the Devil and his associates - those in Hell and on Earth - are very sly.) Another thing that may place "Poseidon Adventure" as No. 1 on the Devil's favorite movie list, is that it had a sequel in 1979.

Poseidon Adventure was worse than "Titanic" (and it was almost as big a comparative hit in 1972), because a sin of heresy is worse than a sin of sex. The sin of heresy was promoted somewhat more subtly than the sin of sex. It, therefore, works more on the subconscious level, which is even more insidious than the conscious level. Always remember, the Devil and his associates - those in Hell and on Earth - are very sly.

Those in charge seem to have forgotten that with God, standards do not change. What was wrong 1000 years ago was also wrong 100 years ago, 10 years ago, last year - and today. (And it will never change.)

God doesn't grade on the curve. Immorality doesn't become morality because of popular practice. And who are the actual people that are issuing the ratings now? Could it possibly be that atheists and ultra-liberals have infiltrated that organization? What a shocking concept!

Satan has other favorites besides movies. His favorite invention could well be the birth control pill, as it then allowed single women to commit fornication without the worry and undesired effect of conceiving a baby. It also allowed married women to go against God's plan for procreation within marriage, by allowing them to also focus on sex without that same possibility. This was the most important and most widespread aspect of the Women's Liberation Movement. What it actually liberated them from, however, was following God's Plan for sex. By the Law of Mutual Exclusiveness, it put them in the camp of following Satan's Plan for Damnation. One of Satan's favorite words is equality, but his definition of it is when as many women go to Hell as men. While men are still ahead, the birth control pill and other methods of artificial birth control have women closing the gap.

Satan's favorite color is gray. This is because morality is black or white according to God's definition. If morality is gray, and there are no absolutes of right and wrong, then a person does not have to follow the absolute standards. The Devil uses the temptation of situation ethics to accomplish this. And so gray is also the favorite color of anyone who chooses not to follow the

highest standards in order to make it to Heaven.

The Devil also has his most hated things - which are the virtues of Humility and Love. The Bible says that God is Love. This means that his creations with Free Will - angels and humans - were originally done out of an act of this Love. Both involves the change of being with God in perfect happiness in Heaven for all Eternity. The Devil hates things in relationship to their closeness to God. For instance, the devil hates anyone who is Humble. So he hates the Blessed Virgin Mary more than anyone who has ever lived besides Jesus Christ, because she was totally humble - exactly the opposite of Satan.

Satan also hates true Love and wants it to be defined and based on emotion alone. With this, love is a transient thing, as humans change their emotions from one minute to the next. The highest Love of one human being for another should be the concern for another's Immortal Soul. Then it overflows into concern for their mental state, and then lastly, into concern for their physical state. Therefore true Love is concerned with the higher order of things before the lower order of things.

The Devil has rightfully been called the great deceiver. But as a form of that, he is also the great inverter. He not only replaces Truth with lies, but turns Truth upside-down. Since Love for another person involves interest in another's Soul, mind, and body, in that order, the Devil tries - very successfully - to invert any interest into body first, mind second, and Soul third or not at all. (But let's be honest; there is more physical pleasure in action with someone's body rather than someone's Soul.

Can you hear the Devil definitely promoting that exchange of values?

So, the Devil wants us thinking about nothing but this life, and since that's the only one that one can experience on Earth, then that's where the temptations lie, and the ones that we can fall for. We live in a material world; so we have material temptations. We live in a world that has the potential of pleasure, so he attacks us with temptations of illicit pleasure. So, a person who lives just for this life is continually bombarded with temptations of focusing on this life solely. It is ironic that they aim for perfect happiness in this life which is impossible, and at the same time give up the perfect happiness that exists forever in the next life.

A classic example of focusing on this life, and it may not even bring happiness here, was a man named Eastman Kodak, the

man who started the Kodak Film Company. He was a man who was very rich, had everything that money could buy, fame, and prestige. He committed suicide, and the note he left said, "My work is done. Why wait?" So for evidently his whole life, maybe from childhood, he was told explicitly, or in general by society, that the goal was all those things - money, fame, prestige, and that these things would bring him. They evidently brought him satisfaction, but not happiness. And even if he had happiness, it wasn't enough. It was because not having a spiritual life and supernatural Hope for the next life, he thought he had no reason to live. However, if he would have been taught the right principles, he could have kept all his money, fame, and prestige in the proper perspectives, have accepted whatever percentage of happiness it brought, and still looked forward to Heaven. All his life he aimed for the wrong thing. And evidently ended up in Hell for it?

Can you see Satan putting his stamp of approval on his life?

Then there are those who only live for pleasure. This is what can be called the "Las Vegas existence." They would like every day of their life to try to be a higher pleasure than the day before. When that cannot be accomplished by normal means or when they have exhausted those means, then they try something to try to heighten that. This is one of the main reasons people use alcohol or drugs, to constantly get that higher high. Then when the first amount of alcohol or drug does not accomplish that anymore to that degree of getting them higher than they were before, then they go to a harder one. This is a catch-22 situation, a very negative spiral that they're in, that sometimes they're in for life or until it kills them.

Satan is very patient. He doesn't attack a person with all the possible temptations at one time, and he is not concerned about having someone at any particular time heading on the road to Hell - as long as He gets them there.

Any time anyone worships false gods of any type, they are basically worshiping the Devil, or at least following the Devil. This includes any type of false god, whether the pagan gods or the modern gods of materialism, wealth, fame, greed, power, etc. At best, it's only one step from actually worshiping the false gods of wealth to actively worshiping Satan himself. Again, selling your Soul does not have to be directly to the Devil. To do so indirectly accomplishes the same thing.

One thought might be, why does the Devil bother with us? The Devil failed his test in obeying God, lost Heaven, and was

banished to Hell for all Eternity. Why doesn't he just leave us alone? A similar analogy would be the people who do negative or sinful things on earth. People who smoke want others to smoke. That way, they don't feel guilty because someone else is stronger than them. Or people who drink want others to drink. People who engage in illicit sex brag about it to anyone who will listen. It is a form of "the best defense is a good offense." If they brag about it, then their Conscience is not going to bother them about it, and obviously they're going to hang around with people who approve of it. They also want people engaging in the same activity because their Conscience is not bothered by people who have higher standards than them or who are obedient to God's laws better than them. So the Devil tempts people to commit sins that he cannot commit, by being only a spirit with no body, but uses things that belong to humans that will successfully have them on the path of unhappiness, misery, Mortal Sins, and eventually Hell. Since the Devil hates God, he also hates anyone who believes in and follows God's Commandments and the Church that Christ founded and wants us to follow. Since he is forever suffering, he wants everybody in the same situation.

While discussing all the subtle ways that the devil works against us, we cannot forget the unsubtle ways in which certain people make a direct contribution. And one of the most important is the O cult. It involves many practices similar to voodoo. It has secret rituals that attempt – and are successful – in interaction with the devil. It includes everything from witchcraft, casting spells, séances, astrology (Nothing is your fault. You were born under the wrong "sign."), spiritualism, and New Age. All of these things can open someone to demonic power – including actual possession. New age beliefs include Buddhism and Pantheism. It believes there are no right and wrong's, and no absolute truths. This makes the rationalization and justification of any sin very easy.

Can you hear the Devil applauding all of these?

Some of occult actions involve con artists that have gullible people believing that they can communicate with the dead. It also includes so-called harmless activities such as reading your daily horoscope, playing with a Ouija Board, and reading Tarot Cards - all in an attempt to foretell the future. It also includes transcendental meditation which is a process of emptying the mind. There is an old saying, "An idle mind is the devil's workshop." Emptying the mind is a very effective way of giving the Devil an effective opening. This emptying of the mind can lead to mental

instability and even schizophrenia. Occult practices are Anti-God, anti-Christian, and anti-Catholic - even to the extent of Satanic masses.

While it is not considered demonic by most people, yoga falls into the same category. There is nothing wrong with the stretching exercises that are promoted by yoga, but there is definitely much wrong with its philosophy which is based on Hinduism.

Those promoting the occult have been very successful with children and teenagers through the use of popular books and games. They are popular because of the element of curiosity which is a part of a weakness of human nature. The bottom line, is that anything that involves establishing any type of relationship with the Devil - whether small or large - will be successful. The Devil makes inroads without being called upon – so he is ecstatic when someone invites him in.

TEN COMMANDMENTS

Now let's examine a situation in which a God could give us a blueprint of how to live our life - not only in which we would have to obey Him on a spiritual level - but improve our life and the world we live in on a practical level. Let's use the Ten Commandments as an example of what that blueprint could consist of. So let's consider these Ten Commandments one at a time, and how each one understood by Reason, makes sense in order for society in this world to operate and function better – and on a higher degree.

The First Commandment is, “*I am the Lord thy God, thy shalt not have strange gods before me.*” If we believe in a Creator we would need to believe that this Creator wants us to believe in Him as He is and not as He isn't. Only in this way, can we obey this Creator if obedience under any form is required. This Commandment also forbids worshiping any “graven images” - as the pagan did. When a human creates a machine, he expects it to work as it was designed. God expects the same from His creation - us.

The Second Commandment is, “*Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.*” This means not calling God as a witness (swearing) to something that is frivolous - which should be reserved to only serious matters. It includes forbids treating something sacred with irreverence or contempt. It also forbids profanity and cursing - which is so common today.

The Third Commandment is, "*Remember to keep holy the Lord's day.*" If there is a God, and his God has a plan for human beings, it would make sense that part of this premise is that this God would demand that we respect Him, and give Him his due. This is reflected in the idea that one day a week is a special day to accomplish this. As an example, in the Bible, it says that God created the world and everything in it in six days, and then rested the seventh. Now as a definition of an Almighty God, He did not actually need to rest after creating the world. Since this was revealed to Moses when he wrote this beginning book of the Bible, it may have been to make two points. The first is that we can work six days a week, but the seventh is to a special day to worship God. The second point is that while humans need to work, it is a positive thing to take a day of rest once a week in order to function better for the other six days a week. This principle worked the same for times past for slave owners and slaves, as well as today's situation of employers and employees. The social situation and the just situation has changed, but the principles involving rest has not changed.

The Fourth Commandment is, "*Honor thy father and thy mother.*" As in all the Commandments, there is a natural as well as a supernatural purpose for this Commandment to make sense. On a natural level, a parent tells the child not to play with matches inside the house. The child has a interest and fascination with fire, and knows that striking matches gives them the ability to make fire. Without the parents prohibition of lighting matches in the house, it is obvious of what can happen, and has happened many times, in which the house ends up burning down. The natural purpose for the parents to teach the child this is to prevent a fire. Parents also have the level of Reason to know that if the child plays with matches inside the house, the child could be burned seriously or even die in this fire. The child does not have their Reason to the level of understanding this on its own. They can only be taught this by the parents, who have not only more Reason, but have the knowledge of the experience of others in which this situation has taken place. This increase in knowledge, from either personal or others experience, is the basis of many of the things that parents will teach children. Those lessons fall under the teaching of right and wrong, where the wrong includes dangerous situations. And when a child disobeys his parents, there is some kind of punishment - or at least there should be. A child learning to obey has a supernatural purpose, as a precursor to obeying God -

especially as an adult - even though not always understanding the Reason for that obedience to be required. One of the differences is that parents can give immediate punishment, while God waits until our Judgement Day.

The Fifth Commandment is "*Thou shalt not kill.*" Animals kill primarily for food. When smaller animals attack in a group a herd of larger animals, they will usually pick out the weakest one of the herd. They know that this is the easiest chance to make a kill for the food they require. This involves an instinct, not a Free Will. They do not have compassion for this weak animal, which is an attribute of the Reason of human beings.

Most situations of a human killing another human involve one of three areas. The first kind of killing involves human emotion. One person gets so mad at another person that they want to hurt that person even to the extent of killing them. The lower form of human emotions can overpower the higher form of Reason. When this happens, Reason is not operating, on the level that it could be and should be. When human emotion is on its highest level, then the Conscience also does not speak on the highest level. One or the other is always in control. As soon as the emotion goes down, the Conscience can take over, and that killing can be regretted. As an example, a serial killer who kills the first time will have it affect his Conscience afterwards. However, if he continues to operate and kill under his highest level of emotion each time, then there will be a point in time in which his Conscience no longer speaks at all. Examples of that have already been mentioned.

The second situation involves greed. One person wants with someone else has – and will kill to get it. This happens on an individual basis, and also to the level of one country against another country. The Devil fully supports all wars, not so much because so many people die, but that so many people die in a state of mortal sin - and go to Hell. Whenever a leader in a country starts a war, it starts it from greed, but a greed initiated by Pride.

The third example of killing involves common sense exceptions to those four words. This Commandment doesn't apply to two cases of self - defense. The first is immediate danger to the life of oneself or another, involving personal contact. In a strange twist, an atheist's level of morality involving this Commandment can be to the point where they believe there is no exception whatsoever to this Commandment. It is ironic that atheists take

this Commandment from a God they do not believe in, and define it according to their Conscience – which they may even deny exist. This is why there are some who refuse to follow any of the other nine Commandments, but will insist there is no exception involving “Thou shalt not kill.”

In a discussion with a young woman, an atheist, she said that there was no exception to “Thou shalt not kill.” A hypothetical situation was posed to her: “Suppose you any your baby in her stroller went to a park, and were enjoying the day, and you left the baby sleeping to go thirty yards away to get a drink of water. Then you saw a man about to stab your baby with a knife. There was a rifle there on the ground. Would you pick it up and kill him to save the life of your baby?” She thought for a minute and then said, “No.” She was told, “When you have your first baby, this question will be posed to you again.” After she moved to another state, a wedding announcement was received, followed later by a birth announcement. She was asked that question again. She didn't answer, so her answer was obvious. She only understood the exception to that Commandment when it became very personal.

The second form of self-defense is a “just war.” It is never justified morally to offensively start a war, which is always some Proud leader wanting someone else's country to satisfy a lust for power. In an offensive war, the killing has to be also accomplished by soldiers led by Pride. As an example, when World War II was started by Hitler in Germany and Hirohito in Japan, both men wanted to control the entire world. It is easy to understand how one man can have this desire. It is harder to understand, how these men got millions of their countrymen to a similar level of Pride of being willing to go out and kill innocent people of another country in order that their egomaniac leader can accomplish his goal. While it does fall under the psychology of following a leader, it does not explain why people are willing to put their own life on the line to follow that type of leader. The desire for power always comes from an unlimited Pride – and there is no limit to Pride.

It is easy to understand, however, how soldiers of a country can be involved and kill in a defensive war, when they are protecting their country or another, as well as the lives of the people in that country. It is morally justifiable to kill a guilty person who is trying to kill you - or another innocent person. Christ said, “*Greater love than this no man hath, that a man lay down his life for his friends.*”

The point is, everyone has a morality involving “Thou shalt not kill,” whether involving humans or animals. It is just that many people have the wrong priorities. Once babies are saved, then it is a positive thing to try to save endangered species. When killing unborn babies in abortion is considered acceptable, but not the killing of endangered species, is it because there are more babies than the number in an endangered species? Are unborn babies less valuable? That can only be to an atheist, or someone who thinks like them in this matter.

In a related area, there are those who have a tendency to claim that there should never be any type of capital punishment. Those who believe that capital punishment is acceptable in certain cases take their legitimacy of it by going back all the way to the Old Testament in the Bible. According to it, God took the side of one country in battle against another country. In modern times, it has been considered moral to execute the greatest of criminals who have committed murder or other evil acts, such as multiple rapes, instead of believing that society should pay for them to be incarcerated in prison for the rest of their life - and make citizens have to pay for it. These hardened criminals cannot function - or actually choose not to function properly - within the society in which they live. (Maybe one alternative to capital punishment would be to forcibly parachute these hardened criminals onto a island in the middle of the Pacific Ocean, where they would not have to live within a society in which they choose not to follow its laws - which, by the way, are based on the Ten Commandments. It is also ironic, then after enough of these people would have been parachuted to this island, that it would not take long for some kind of society to be set up, and would be controlled by the most powerful of all the hardened criminals that would be there - who would establish rules to follow.)

The Sixth Commandment is *"Thou shalt not commit adultery."*

It has been proven that since the family is the basis of any society, the integrity of each family is important for that society to function on its highest level. Anything that is a detriment to a family is harmful not only to husbands and wives, but especially their children. Adultery is a major cause of to family break-ups, and children - especially boys - need to be raised in a home with both parents. It is well documented, that whenever boys are not raised in a home with a male presence, the multitude negative problems that ensue do not just involve the boys themselves in specific, but

also society in general. So on just a practical basis, adultery is harmful on many levels. (The moral side of adultery has already been covered.)

The Seventh Commandment is, “*Thou shalt not steal.*” This is one that is not hard to understand or to justify. Everyone would agree that to be guilty of stealing is to have to suffer some type of punishment. Whether an atheist concedes that this principle was first given by God to live by, or believes that societies follow this Commandment in order to protect the people within it, it is considered not only Reasonable, but good. Both atheist and theist would agree on the concept of private ownership of any type of property. This is possibly the easiest Commandment to be accepted as is. No one could conclude that any society – whether civilized or uncivilized – could function without it. Suppose one left their house, their tent, or their cave, and came back to find whatever they considered as their possessions had been stolen. Even if they forgave the person who stole everything - which is a Christ promoted virtue - they would still have nothing and would want it back. If there was no law against stealing, they would then have to wait for someone else to they leave their house, their tent, or their cave in order to retrieve the same or similar possessions that they once had. No work could be accomplished by anyone, because they either had to stay home 24 hours a day to protect what they had, or spend at least half of their time trying to steal back what was stolen from them while they worked. It is interesting to note, that there were Indian tribes who had no word for stealing – as it simply was not done in their society. This had been taught from generation to generation long before any of them had heard of it as a Seventh Commandment. Again, it was an element of the Conscience God had given them, and then fulfilled as a simple case of common sense for their society to function.

The first three Commandments involve our relationship with God, and the last seven involve our relationship with other people. While “Thou shalt not steal may be the easiest to be followed by the obvious effects of a lack of this Commandment, all six of the others involving our relationships with other people are just as valid.

The Eighth Commandment, “*Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.*” This is another one that can be looked at and evaluated in two ways. It may seem very unimportant when one person lies about another person – as long

as the lie doesn't involve one personally. Then the attitude can be, "I don't care as it doesn't make a difference to me." However, that attitude would certainly change, and the Commandment be considered valid by any atheist or theist, when it involves their own reputations. Laws against libel and slander, however, which is the legal application of this Commandment, is for the protection of everyone. The seriousness of breaking this Commandment depends upon the seriousness of the lie that is being told.

The Ninth Commandment is, "*Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife.*" Here we once again visit the physical sex drive, and the mental involvement in all its applications. Like all Commandments, it includes subdivisions. One of these is, "Thou shalt also not covet thy neighbor's husband." However, since the male sex drive is so much stronger than a woman's, the application of this Commandment concerns far more men and in a much greater degree than it does women. This Commandment also has a mental prohibition as well as a physical one. Christ has already been quoted as saying, "*Anyone who looks at a woman with lust has already committed adultery.*" (Other applications of not following this Commandment have been covered previously.)

The Tenth Commandment is, "*Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods.*" This could be considered the mental side of "Thy shalt not steal." In other words, it is not only wrong to actually steal someone else's property, it is even wrong to desire to steal it. This Commandment involves envy. It is not wrong to desire the same type of possession that someone else has if one is willing to work for it in a legitimate manner. That would simply be a goal of wanting to attain something more than one already has. Of course, that could also go to an extreme and become a sin of greed. The essence of this Commandment is actually wanting what belongs to someone else.

Everyone follows at least some of the Ten Commandments - but often only when it is to their benefit, or fulfill their interpretation of it. A few possibilities - always with some contradictions - are pertinent. A professional thief believes in "Thou shalt not steal" - but only concerning what he owns. A serial adulterer believes in "Thou shalt not commit adultery" - but only when it involves someone else with their spouse. (What is good for the goose is not good for the gander.) "Honor thy father and thy mother" is only important when it involves their own children.

In a discussion with an atheist, one shouldn't spend all the

time promoting God's Ten Commandments. Ask them what their list is, and inquire from where did they get their ideas of right and wrong? Did it come from a person and from whom? Did it come from a book, and who was the author? Did it come from an organization? (If it came from one, an atheist would have it taking the place of a god, by having to follow it's standards. He would no longer be the only authority in his life.) In either one or all of these cases, what was their agenda? Why did they want you to have the same set of beliefs? For a Catholic, it is to help you get to Heaven. What is the other's purpose?

And it is good to keep in mind, that there is a large gap between being a lot smart and a little wise. Knowledge tells us what we know; wisdom tells us what we do not know. Science only asks questions it can answer; religion asks questions that only God can answer.

Now it is time to ask atheists if they now see that this universe and everything in it has had to have a Creator. Then they can use their Free Will that this Creator also gave you, to decide you want to have any Faith that He has revealed himself to us in order to obey his logical Ten Commandments for everyone to have a better life - and more important - a better Eternity. It's not easy to be an atheist - one has to keep his mind from thinking of anything that is really important. One almost has to live like an animal and just react to external stimuli - or at least only follow that stimuli.

Simple blind Faith is good for some and necessary for others. The more you want to understand and the more you try to understand, the more you realize what and how much you will never understand. To have one question and no answer can leave us a little frustrated; to have a hundred questions and no answers can leave you more frustrated.

In a discussion with an atheist, he expressed a non-understanding of why Christians wanted everyone to go to Heaven. The answer was simple: it is because this God atheists don't believe in, wants everyone to go to Heaven. However, by this same God giving Free Will to everyone, they can choose differently - either directly or indirectly.

Many, or even most, people - even theists - will either blame God for their crosses or at least blame God for not taking it away. They are willing to pray - but only if their prayers are answered - not only in the way they want, but immediately.

Because God does not answer all prayers to our satisfaction and immediately, then they will either curse God or at least no longer give him the worship and honor that He deserves and requires. Of course abandoning God at a time of great trial, is exactly the last thing that a person should do, and which receives approval from the devil.

For a theist - and especially a Christian - life on earth is just a means. When a person does not have Heaven as an end, then their whole life on earth is their end. Goals for this life may be the most money, the most fame, the most power, and the most pleasure – often elicit. To put the goal of money in perspective, a billionaire could spend \$10,000 a day and it would take him 27 years to spend all his money. And when a billionaire dies, he doesn't get to take even one dollar with him.

A Catholic writer said, *“The very fact that you can conceive of greater happiness than you possess now is a proof that you are not perfectly happy.”* This means we are not going to find perfect happiness on Earth, and the sole pursuit of it here is self-defeating. This means that there must be a place of perfect happiness - and that is Heaven. It involves delayed gratification - and will only be fulfilled by following God's Commandments and all of Christ's teachings especially the reception of the Sacraments.

If there is only one in a trillion chance that there is a Supreme Being who demands worship from his created beings, that chance should be taken by all atheists. If there is no hereafter, and therefore there is no answering for what is considered to be sins on earth, then there is no problem. If there is no hereafter, those who ignored any rules of morality, any rules of good behavior, any rules of fairness, or ethics, will not even be able to say to those who followed all those rules, “I told you so.” There is nothing that a 100% orthodox Catholic has to lose if there is no hereafter. That person, living within the rules - if nothing else - has piece of mind while living on this Earth. It would have given this person not only a purpose in living but a meaning to everything that happens in this life. If there is a hereafter - a Heaven and a Hell - the atheists has everything to lose. Not only would atheists not attain the perfect happiness of Heaven for all Eternity - which would be bad enough - but will burn in Hell for all eternity.

Every person has two things that are 100% theirs - their Free Will and their Judgement Day. What they do with the first will determine what will happen on the second.

As always, it is a choice.