

Two to Sin One to Win



David Paskell

Foreword: Past-Present

This book integrates logic, physics, theology, and psychobiology to provide reformed, history backed solutions for:

- 1) the origins of the universe (ex nihilo resolved)
- 2) why evil exists (the mystery of iniquity solved)

Note:

I do recommend one reads all footnotes in this book.

Acknowledgments:

1) The approach to this draws from Chris Langan's Cognitive-Theoretical Model of the Universe for Reality's origins but is separated when addressing reality's connection to morality

2) this book was proofread for coherence and theological soundness by my dad, Chris Paskell

3) the book cover (front and back) was created using ChatGPT

© 2026 David Paskell

Last

In The Beginning, God Said, 'Let
There Be Darkness,' And There Was
Darkness, And God Saw That It Was Evil.

Intro: Reality

Object-Subject

The combination of capabilities that a person's mind has (and their uniqueness specifically attributed to the prefrontal cortex which deals with logic) allows for the defining of expressed symbols (usually words) hierarchically and in synonymity to another symbol, and each one of these symbols can be called a concept, and all concepts can be sorted as pointing to one or more of the following:

- 1) a metaphysical subject (abstract, intangible)
- 2) a physical object (concrete, tangible)
- 3) the metaphysical object (the self-referential case: the mind itself)
- 4) the physical subject (the brains of the mind)

and all concepts can be classified in relation to the broadest category of existence:

- 1) space and time (a metaphysical subject)
- 2) energy and matter (a physical object)
- 3) the metaphysical object (mind)

The relation of these concepts to one another is what defines how the universe came about, and so what it means to exist, particularly as a person on Earth. The best relational arrangement of all these concepts together I've found is like this:

- 1) the mind (The metaphysical object) is reality containing physical objects and subjects and metaphysical subjects
- 2) physical objects only in exist space-time (a metaphysical subject)

3) space-time, then, must materialize all that is also in the mind and so in reality, including itself (space-time) as it is a metaphysical subject, otherwise space-time is empty nothingness

3) space-time cannot materialize reality's contents from nothingness

4) therefore, the mind must start space-time and all in it out of nothingness

5) in this, this mind also contains itself as the self-recognized metaphysical object

6) also, in this, the universe, all monitored by this mind, is all energy and matter making up all physical objects and subjects

Light-Dark

The only possibility then, for reality's origins is for a mind to make reality's space-time and its universe' energy and matter (physical objects) simultaneously perceivable- not created- in a changeable, perceivable state of light matter in contrast to imperceivable dark matter. This aftermath stands in contrast to a preceding low-density, nigh nothingness with only mysterious, unperceived density and a dormant mind, like before birth. It is with this logic that Ex Nihilo is resolved.¹

If one refutes this claim by saying that a mind does not have to awaken Reality- that it can be awakened by some other, unexplainable means- I could still argue that those unexplainable means would also have to trace back to a mind or some self-awakening, metaphysical object of the like.

1 Ex Nihilo- a Latin expression meaning something coming from nothing. Ex Nihilo is applied to the issue of the universe being an effect of energy, but energy being an effect that has no cause.

Reality-Consciousness

Now, it is from this point that mind and matter perpetually coexist, making up, in terms, the reality-consciousness continuum. Since reality is the mind that materialized (substantiated, made perceivable) energy, matter and the space-time continuum in the moment of its awakening- which was possibly followed by a time of energy condensing then exploding if one works this in with the big bang theory- it follows that it must constantly materialize these things in order to maintain the appearance of the universe as we know it. This means it must understand and see all contained in it, down to the last atom. This constant looking at Itself, keeping in mind that its contents are part of itself along with its mind, means it can never unsee itself. In this, it also can never forget what it looks like. In other words, what reality sees cannot be unseen or misunderstood, making reality eternal, omnipresent, and omniscient, and

the collection of these traits also innately comes along with constant foreknowledge. This follows because if reality fully understands and materializes its own contents and knows exactly how each thing operates, then it also knows what each thing will do next, and in every moment of eternity. In this, reality knew the entirety of its own possible and occurring events in the past, present and future instantly upon its initial awakening. So, in the moment, it is effortlessly able to predict with a 100% accuracy its own actions and simultaneously execute each action with pinpoint precision. In other words, it is a perpetual self-fulfilling prophecy.

So, bringing it all back home here, the argument that reality's self-creation cannot be proven by science is weakened by the fact that the universe could not have evolved over time without any mind to perceive it happening. With this argument, the field of physics is exited, and the field of metaphysics is entered, which deals with the

logic of what exists and what it even means to exist. This is because space-time, the four-dimensional (reviewing theory here, space being three dimensions and time being one) container of all substances in the universe, is not a concept requiring proof by experimentation, which is a method of the natural science of physics, but simply by observation leading to deduction, which is a method of the formal science of logic. It is in this that one can argue that the universe can only develop if it exists, but it can only exist if it can be perceived as existing, and this is only possible with a mind.

God

Deity-Reality

Now, if reality is only possible with a mind, it brings in the uncertainty of what this mind is or what it can be identified as. However, while I do believe it is shrouded in mystery, I also believe it can be clarified to a certain extent, and in attempting to do so, I argue that Reality being self-aware, eternal, omniscient, and foreknowing of all energy, matter, space, and time makes reality equate to God, particularly Adonai aka Elohim of the Bible, as one who investigates its historical records can't deny. Also, the logic of reality origins (for a brief overview, read object-subject section) fits in well with the creation account of the Bible because the Bible makes no claim of God creating reality itself; it only makes the claim that He created the Heavens and the Earth.

Continuing here, the clearest evidence for this is that the Bible has the most documentation compared to any other book in ancient history, and all ancient

manuscripts stay consistent to the point where no doctrine is changed from one manuscript to another.¹

Also, the Bible takes its roots in Judaism, which is in the running with Hinduism as the two oldest religions in the world. The argument for Hinduism being true though only takes a little reading on its history to break down. Just looking at its disarrayed, scattered documentation alone is enough to favor the Old Testament writings when choosing a religion based on its merits.

So, if any religious book is making a compelling case for its representing God, it's the Bible.

1 This summarized analysis of Biblical manuscripts is taken from Archaeology and Bible History by Joseph P. Free.

Mono-Poly

Now, getting to a more theological point in this, there is also a case to be made for monotheism as a concept (which I will use as support now for the Biblical God by default here). The case for the monotheistic God of the Bible is more inductively strong than any polytheistic religion, because of its claim that God is Reality Himself and innately knows everything, like the back of your hand. So, there is no reason to think He divvies up responsibilities of maintaining the physical universe since He perpetually fulfills all these requirements effortlessly, making polytheistic historical accounts more myth than truth. These accounts, coming from places like ancient Babylonia, Greece and the Nordic countries and suggesting fighting between gods and apathetic attitudes towards people also do not line up with the idea that God must be Reality itself.

This is because God being Reality means He must keep track of and understand

all contained within His- in a manner of speaking, body of contents- including all people, constantly.

The idea of multiple gods, then, each serving different purposes for the Universe or having certain powers can be left to be viewed as cool when pictured in fiction but simply a fantasy originating from flawed minds, searching for idols to worship when they felt too uncomfortable worshipping God. These idols are spoken of in the Old Testament, and even if one were to say that these less powerful gods existed, they would still only be allowed to act in line with what God allows. In this possibility, these gods would be Heavenly beings like angels allowed to cross into and appear in the natural dimension.

Now, the idea of demigods like Hercules from this lore is also fantasy, but possibly derivative of the Nephilim, the mighty beings of old, described as giants. One theory I have heard on these Nephilim is that they are the offspring of Satan along

with his band of fallen angels having kids with the "daughters of men."¹ This makes the dead Nephilim equate to what we know as demons. This argument makes sense to me, and there is nothing in my argument that contradicts this, so I believe in this until I find a more convincing theory.²

1 I was presented this theory in my bible study group.

2 Also, an off-shooting theory in the mix of this is that the daughters of men were of the line of Cain, and that the sons of God marrying them were just men from the line of Seth. In this- as there would have been no other people around- the possibility of interpreting "sons of God" as heavenly beings like fallen angels is ignored, and being giants fully human becomes true, but only true if they had fluke giantism genetics, as is understood in modern times. I am not entirely convinced about this possibility though and am more intuitively inclined to go along with the theory that the sons of God were the fallen angels. In any case, however, neither theory contradicts my view, so I take this as something for me to possibly come back later to clarify, if only just for kicks.

True-Or-False

Onto more pragmatic views though, it is also clarifying to acknowledge the argument against God passionately relayed by atheists aligning themselves with reasoning and science that the Bible is fake, only containing fairy tales cleverly made to seem possible. A counter to this is to say that the Bible talks of fantastic, supernatural occurrences, but life itself can be called a little fantastic and supernatural too, when you think about its impermanence and the absurdity of our own behavior as people. This also doesn't discount testimonies of people who claim to have been miraculously healed or who claim to be declared clinically dead before coming back to life, and who had seen a tunnel of light in that resurrecting experience. Just one of these testimonies being true obliterates any indignant atheistic argument of telling it like it is and being a person of science, but while these intuitive or testimonial counterarguments do not

logically prove anything upon being shared, the logical structure of the argument of origin stands strong enough to support their validity. In fact, that argument stands strong enough on its own to mesh well with much of science itself, including extra-dimensional theories which back up the possibility of these testimonies being true.

Micro-to-Macro

In these extra-dimensional theories, physics gives a place for the heavenly lands to fit into Reality. This point is still vulnerable to scrutiny though. One reason why is that just because we can currently only understand the universe to the extent of what we can see through a telescope or under a microscopic or what can be put into a test tube doesn't mean you can say a dimension exists because you want it to. Another reason why is because extra-dimensional theories like string theory do not present these dimensions as being made up of some mysterious kind of matter and energy, but simply as being too tiny to see. These extra-dimensional possibilities are closer to the idea of subatomic realms than heaven. Additionally, there is a theory of a grander dimension than ours, and that is the Randall-Sundrum Model. This makes our universal space-time contained within a warped space-time dimension, which seems

more befitting of a Heavenly realm than that which is presented in string theory, but this model is also still not yet proven.

So, all that can be said in terms is that no deductions can be made about God or His Heaven. However, it is the case that scientifically constructed extra-dimensional theories themselves cannot ever disprove God or Heaven regardless of what is found in space, as one can always argue that Heaven is something beyond all physical limits we could understand at the time. So, if science ever can prove anything about the nature of existing, it would be first and foremost that God is Existence Himself. It is because of this that one could just as easily argue in faith that heavenly pastures are hidden by God in these infinitesimally small dimensions, or that His Heavens are the warped space-time of the Randal-Sundrum Model. Additionally, string theory and m-theory aligning with anti-God rhetoric are mathematically clever just as a God-aligned model like the CTMU is, but again are also

not yet provable, so the scales of reason said to tip one way or the other in truth are balanced.

Three-In-One

Now, staying on the topic of theories in physics in arguing for the Biblical God, the concept of the trinity seamlessly fits into the idea of Reality having a balanced mind, body and spirit.

In this view, God is the consciousness, or simply the mind, awakening and perpetually maintaining the body and spirit. There is no spirit or sacrificial body of Christ sent to Earth without the mastermind. Every task is carried out through the chemical and electrical reactions of His Brain, that is His forces of nature acting on His atomic contents of the Universe.

The Holy Spirit is energy here and their connected forces of nature like gravity. I also currently hold the theory that any move of The Holy Spirit, like the miraculous, sudden healing of cancer, for example, can be equated to some phenomena in physics, although I have not

yet determined what, but I consider this a minor detail for future studies.

Lastly in this, Jesus is the matter. The three-day event of His death and resurrection is the symbol for grace, allowing people to be redeemed upon death if they can unblind themselves to the truth of this event occurring. In this, the limits of known physics are pushed, but I'd think God allowed Jesus to be resurrected on a quantum level, manipulating the subatomic particles which behave different from larger scale particles like atoms. This is because, for one, energy is God's means for change and is subject to only His limits, and two, of all the unknowns about physics and the potential of energy's ability to change forms, it is no shock to me that Jesus was capable of this. Additionally, this idea of energy also fits seamlessly into the idea of the Trinity, making them a 3-in-1 form that was not created and cannot be destroyed. Instead, they are always taking some form of Reality,

no matter if they appear separate or blended
as Reality.

Evolution-Dev-elution

However, in this concept of trinity, the uncertainty about how the body- that is the energy and matter of Reality- changes over time is brought into view, in line with a debate over evolution. In this, to say that nature, including the existence of minds in all living organisms, is too complex or too much of a fluke to not have a creator are two arguments tossed away as being unprovable by science, but it looks inductively stronger when the logic of reality's origins is applied. So, I say that by God's hand, everything in the universe can be and has been reshaped as necessary.

Also, archaeological discoveries of differences in fossils don't require their cause to be evolution but could just as easily be God making animals slightly varied to thrive in different places and times on Earth. The underlying forces of natural selection and adaptations causing the survival of the fittest are of the same category, and this

includes when there is overpopulation, when there is endangerment or extinction, and when there is mutation: God has a time and place for it all. This also includes the prehistoric age, in which archaeology places the existence of dinosaurs. This time is estimated to have been from around 252 to 66 million years ago. Varied estimates of this time place them as existing for around 165-180 million years in total before an asteroid came crashing down on them.

Now, there was no consequence to God in allowing dinosaurs to roam the Earth for a while and then die off, and I also see no reason to disregard the time span given in this view because there is nothing in scripture that contradicts it. In fact, a span of millions of years fits well in the timeline between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 (possibly referred to in Jeremiah 4:23), leading to six days of creation representative of geological ages. I currently take this geological age view of creation because it better aligns with both what I know about fossil records and

the Bible, not just one or the other. I will say though, I am open to the idea that there is evidence for far later dates of some fossils than what the mainstream archaeological and scientific communities want to show, though all these claims seem to just have the stigma of conspiracy as of now.¹ In any case, I do not completely disregard the interpretation of the creation account of Genesis being literal days, with there being apes on day five and then man on day six, but I consider this just another minor detail to be adjusted as necessary for the sake of my overarching argument anyways.

1 See *A Closer Look at the Evidence* from Richard and Tina Kleiss for specifics. Note that I do not currently endorse their views of a 10,000-year-old universe that makes God fit into a view of Genesis that isn't required to be held.

Crime-Punishment

Now, concluding this argument for a deity reality, I maintain that the Biblical God fits the description. However, if I am wrong here, I'll just have to accept that when I die, although I don't see much punishment given to me by other religion's gods in the afterlife if I do. For example, Buddhism, if you could even call it a religion, doesn't even have a god to judge me. Furthermore, Hindus can see Christianity as an acceptable variation on their religion, and I don't trust in Islam's history enough for me to fear Allah punishing me. My feeling on this I accredit to the claim that Islam's conception of truth is based on their supposed prophet Muhammad thinking he was seeing visions of demons before his wife convinced him that they were angels giving him the truth about life.¹ Even if one could falsify this claim though, I can point to Islam's claim of adding to the Bible but denying Jesus Christ

as Messiah, while the Old and New Testaments have no such contradiction.²

Additionally, on the nonreligious side of things, I see atheism and agnosticism offering me nothing but a meaningless life and inconsequential death, albeit with the chance for great highs in the midst of the lows making for the love in between, but this love is not itself a purpose for life, no matter how you try to spin it or flip it. All that can truly be said about this love, synonymous diction aside, is that it can make life precious regardless of its lack of purpose. However, this is nothing to me but taking pride in false hope unnecessarily, although it is all an atheist has left to cling to until they can think outside the box of their own pride and look to God.

1 This claim is taken from *The Best of Josh McDowell: A Ready Defense*, a book which also covers the inconsistencies of other religions or cults not mentioned here, although for as of right now my argument against these is that the volume of consistent biblical documentation in comparison to their texts and claims is palpable.

2 Islam being a violent religion is not necessary to argue. Terrorist attacks, such as 9-11, do not represent the whole of Muslims or the Quran just as white supremacist speech does not represent Christians or the Bible.

All-Or-Nothing

Now, it is here that I come to a divisive point of tension in debates over God, and that is the paradox of the perfect God- eternally: all-mighty, all-knowing in each moment, everywhere at once, foreknowing, and all good- allowing sin to exist regardless of His presence, and while it is preached in churches, claimed by the bible-thumper, sung in worship songs and cited in the Bible itself (including in Mathew 19:26, Mark 10:27, Mark 9:23, Luke 1:37 and Jeremiah 32:17) how awesome, how limitless, and how good God is, none seem to directly answer the question of this paradox. This question, in terms, can put as, "If nothing is impossible for God, then why not prevent sin?" This seems to prove that God is not actually all what has been claimed about Him, that he cannot be all-powerful and all-good if he cannot stop the actions of imperfection. While I thought up the answer of how this is true, that-

nothing is impossible for God, including thinking up something that is impossible for Him to do- this still doesn't answer why God allows for sin, unless it can be logically deduced that stopping sin was in fact impossible for Him. The thing is though; this cannot be deduced. This is because the Bible makes the claim that God is the same, yesterday, today, and forever (See Malachi 3:6, Hebrews 13:8), but God chose to stop many a sin in the Bible: God chose to plague the slave-drivers of Egypt, he chose to bring the flood down to Earth to wipe out all the evil people and he chose to spare his Son from being murdered as a child by His foreknowledge. He also implicitly prevented further sin in all these cases: He stopped more Israelites from being enslaved by the Egyptians, he put an end to the corruption of the time of Noah with His flood, and He allowed future sinners to be saved by grace when he spared His Son. Now, one could go on with this, but the point is that He has in the past chosen to stop this sin as it occurred

and prevent further sin, so why wouldn't He act against the infamous character Satan before he fell, or man before we fell? This seems like God either not honoring His words or being dumb enough to make a mistake,¹ and neither of these options are character traits of the perfect, omniscient Being He is supposed to be. However, things aren't always what they seem, and this holds true in this scenario, where, for centuries, God has been characterized as choosing to do things- like looking past sin- just as we do.

1 There is the view that Jesus can make mistakes, but God cannot. Jesus having this capability may only be true in the sense that He may not be good at time-passers like sports or playing an instrument, and so not omniscient and omnipotent in this sense.

However, this does not change the idea that he was still perfect in virtue. This view I overheard from my dad talking while writing this book, and it reminded me of when Jesus had bad hands playing toss in "The Chosen" show.

Fate

Choice-Fate

The idea that God chooses to do things in the sense we are accustomed to in everyday life is based on:

- 1) God being mentioned as 'choosing' to do things throughout the Bible, like creating the Heavens and the Earth, or anointing people as leaders
- 2) more indirectly, God creating people in His own image, with minds like His, at least relative to all other life on Earth
- 3) The problem with is that the usual definition of the act of choice or any act done by choice, such as creating something, does not align with God's nature, though the church has been trying to make it align theologically for two thousand years.

This claim of contradiction in theology is made in accordance with the

Cognitive-Theoretical Model of the Universe (CTMU), where God is described as acting as a Self-Configuring, Self-Processing Language, or SCSPL, perpetually speaking Himself into Existence. This essentially means that God is in complete self-control of everything in the Universe, including His own Mind. With this self-control though, there is no change in syntax, or here the arrangement of imperatives (commands) in God's language. This equates to having no free will, or a choice-less state, and a choice-less state, God must act in line with the following:

- 1) His traits of omniscience and foreknowledge
- 2) His omnipresence in nature and attached inability to act against the laws of physics as He knows them
- 3) His inability to change

4) His inability to act on two or more available options for any given particle in space and time

So, again, God can only have one option to act on in any given moment; God's eternal omniscience and foreknowledge cannot allow for two or more options to be held as both viable at the same time, as we as people intuitively do. Furthermore, God does not have intuition- or an unexplainable gut feeling or reaction about things- at all, because God is able to explain everything. It is in this way that intuition goes hand in hand with choice. Now, this can all be alternatively translated as the following:

1) God only ever has one choice left to select

2) having one choice left is the same as having no choice left, or synonymously no ability to choose

3) this equates to a Fated Existence, essentially meaning God Himself is Fate

This equating of God to Fate may be hard to handle at first, especially if you grew up being taught that the synonymous concept of predestination is bad, particularly in the demonized, Calvinistic, "live and let live," sense of there being no purpose in witnessing to people. However, this view avoids this issue through its more thorough deductive approach, as well avoiding the usual issue of an all-mighty, all-good God allowing evil. It does this by playing on the varied levels of ambiguity or clarity of scripture, as expressed in the following:

1) any traditional biblical doctrine should be changed for the sake of what makes sense; this is the one option left

2) all claims about God's actions must be consistent with his eternal omniscience,

static (unchanging) character, omnipotence, omnipresence, holiness and foreknowledge

3) the claim of God having free will based on the Bible saying he chooses to do things requires that the original Hebrew and Greek Biblical texts define any concept synonymous with choice as selecting between two or more options and no less

4) there is no such numerical specification in any of these original texts, so the word's meaning is left ambiguous

5) it is necessary to look for other clues throughout the Bible which remove this ambiguity to maintain consistent doctrine

6) this case of ambiguity has traditionally been removed by first overlooking claims 3-4, then by assuming that God chooses as people do from the clue given that people are made in the image of God

7) this does remove ambiguity, but it is itself an ambiguous solution because the Bible also claims, with various showings of evidence throughout, that God is not the same as us in ALL ways, which is highlighted by the statement that His ways are higher than ours (see Isaiah 55:8-9), and is above us to the point of being imperceivable (see 1 Timothy 6:16, Exodus 33:20)

8) furthermore, the previous claim (7) is all consistent with claims 1 and 2

9) so, this ambiguous solution is what has led to the unsolved case of the mystery of iniquity in biblical doctrine, suggesting that God left this unclear for personal reasons, argued to be consistent with the fact that he speaks in parables (see Mathew 13:10-17), talks as if he lacks foreknowledge and omnipresence (see Genesis 3:9)¹ and uses symbolic expression in His divinely inspired

(see 2 Timothy 3:1) scripture, as exemplified in the book of Revelations

10) none of claim 9 needs to be argued, because there exists the cutting-edge solution established through the CTMU, by which claims 3-4 cannot be overlooked

11) in addressing claims 3-4 based on the logic of the CTMU, the only remaining clue that can then be considered a lead is the collection of all implicit and explicit descriptions of the righteousness of God's character throughout scripture, which must somehow allow for the coexistence of sin

12) one can then deduce that for God's character to stay consistent and so stay static, he cannot choose as people choose

13) therefore, God can only choose when the concept of choice is defined by the numerical specification of seeing only one option as viable at a time, or one option left

14) as established, having one option left is the same as having none left, which equates to Fate

15) now, one can see that only God has aptitude for this Fated sense of choice, which somehow must work with people and heavenly beings being able to choose in the intuitive sense we are accustomed to

16) this works together in the sense that God's inability to choose means that he had no choice in creating people or heavenly beings

17) this entails that God also had no choice in making us with free will

18) so, in this way, predestination exists in the sense that a person is Fated to be born or not, not that a person is Fated to be born again or not

So, God is Fate, and, altogether, choice is bad and Fate is good, meaning for a Universe without life in it, there were only good things to be found.

Now, while the incredibly complex system of Fated creation may be very well impossible for any man to describe in totality, it can be generally grasped through the recognition of God's primary tasks, as expressed in the following:

- 1) God must sift through of an uncountable number of events and possibilities from the past, present, and future constantly
- 2) God must narrow the set of all possible choice down to one for every atom in the Universe in every moment of eternity
- 3) God effortlessly makes the choice that will keep things running as smoothly as possible

These are the building blocks of the raw, overarching process used for all of God's creations, and they also go along with the fact that the word fate itself is from the Latin "fatum," meaning "that which has been spoken."² So, God speaks everything into Existence, maybe at times only in Spirit, but I see no reason to believe God could not and did not at least speak in the times Bible says he did: I see no reason to believe that he didn't say, "Let there be light" and I see no reason to believe that he didn't create light in that very moment.

1 A possible reason for God's manner of expression is that because God is so smart, he must talk down to us so that we understand. While I do believe there is truth in this, in that this is aligned with scriptures talking about the mysterious genius of God's thought processes, I think there is another reason too. God has shown a strong sense of irony in scripture when dealing with people, as he gave people like the shepherd David, born into low status and of humble heart great status and wealth, even kingship. It is as the Bible says, "the first shall be last and the last shall be first," and "God chose what is foolish in the world to shame the wise; God chose what is weak in the world to shame the strong" (1 Corinthians 1:27) and "whatever measure you use will be used against you." In this, God knew how people would interpret Him choosing to do things in the Bible, and that the true interpretation- hidden in plain sight for centuries- would only be revealed in this current postmodernist period of pseudo-enlightened, aimless atheistic reasoning and indignant smugness.

2 The word study of Fate was done and presented to me by my father in my first pitch of Fated Existence.

Same-Difference

It was then upon the utterance of light into existence that Reality awakened as the only possibility capable of appearing and so appearing Real, so that nothing else was or could be Real outside of it. It is here that I want to look closer at this reasoning and acknowledge the thought of Reality being duplicated or having an exact copy- where all its traits are the same without exemption:

1) in taking this into consideration, a second Reality, or in theological terms, a God like Adonai, must have also already been Real

2) therefore, Reality is incapable of having a duplicate, as any concept of a second Reality would be externally created by the self-created original

3) so, it is impossible for another Reality to have awakened at the same time as or before the original, only sometime after

In other words, all possibilities for reality can only be actualized if already a possibility in the first awakened Reality.

However, while Reality is Itself a concept with no possibility for replicability, the Universe contained within It is. This possibility would equate to there being a multiverse in physics terms, an idea which has taken several different forms across time which I'm aware of, summarized below.

First, the inflationary multiverse theory rests on the idea that the Universe is constantly expanding, allowing bubble Universes to pop up amid this expansion. Some of these universes may have different matter makeup, physical laws and different numbers of dimensions. There is nothing that contradicts this possibility by the logic of Reality's origins, including the idea that the Universe is expanding, because, as previously established, while the Universe is inseparable from Reality, it is has physical definition, and so is not a metaphysical

concept which can neither expand nor downsize like Reality is. This is not the only viable theory, though.

Another viable multiverse theory is the many-worlds interpretation: an idea of quantum mechanics (which deals with the behavior of the smallest known things, like neutrons and other subatomic particles) where multiple quantum states (for example, a decaying particle vs. non-decaying particle) occur at the same time as different branches of history.

Additionally, string theory leaves room for many vacuum states, where each one is their own universe with their own physical laws.

Lastly here, the mathematical universe hypothesis from Max Tegmark figures there are four levels of the multiverse as is allowed by equating physical Reality to mathematics.

Now, these three theories are all possible interpretations of how God may deal with different Universes in Reality, but

even with a future discovery of which theory is Reality, there will still be the unanswered question of how God deals with what lives in the Universe.

Fated-Created

It is correlated with the facts that:

- 1) God cannot have a duplicate entity
- 2) God brought light into the midst of dark matter
- 3) subatomic behavior could allow for extra dimensional possibilities
- 4) the atoms inclined to form elements of carbon, hydrogen and oxygen exist
- 5) the worlds of Heaven and Earth and other distinct beings within them inevitably joined Existence sometime after Reality's awakening

Furthermore, it is also correlated with the facts that:

- 1) God has the collective traits of eternal omnipresence, omniscience and foreknowledge
- 2) God knew all other being would have minds of their own¹
- 3) God knew the goodness of things would change with the minds of Heavenly beings and man
- 4) God has both all unstoppable forces and all immovable objects in his nature, but it is because they are in his nature that it is these qualities God cannot remove
- 5) God can't remove what is irremovable from His nature because He cannot unsee himself, which is the only way for the energy making up all nature to truly be removed or "destroyed" or take the form of nothingness

6) all other changes of form are simply rearrangements of something-ness

So, in all this, God couldn't stop the arrangement of energy leading to brains which have minds, even though in God's omniscient mind He could imagine doing so (and who knows what else could be in the possibility of God's imagination). I say He could imagine doing so because in God's foreknowledge He instantly foreknew every thought, every feeling, and every state of mind another being could have, has had, and will ever have upon His own awakening.

1 Also keeping in mind here that He knew He couldn't have had duplicates and so couldn't have been omniscient, as they couldn't keep track of all atoms in the universe like He could.

Think-Act

In this fated view, an attempt by God to act on the thought of stopping creation would've been impossible because what could be described as His physical Brain- that is all energy and matter and their connected forces of nature- is incapable of stopping His disembodied Mind- that is the metaphysical object in control of all this in His Brain- from perceiving It, and His Mind is useless without His Brain that makes things which are perceivable. Another way to understand this is by thinking about energy and matter acted on by forces like gravity as the thoughts of a single optimized neural pathway. This pathway, being another way to describe Fate, allows God's mind to act on a thought as it occurs, where as we as people always have a delay in-between, even for unconscious bodily movements like blinking, which is said to have a delay for mental preparation of around 100 milliseconds (see National Institutes of

Health) between the thought and action of it. What all this means in essence is that God cannot act on a thought which is against His nature: He cannot make salt-water that doesn't contain salt, and he cannot remove the atoms from the universe which make carbon or oxygen or hydrogen. He could not remove whatever angels were made of in the mysterious heavenly dimension, He could not stop the creation of a man's body from carbon dust, and He could not stop the chemical reactions and electrical signals making a man's brain function in a mysterious way that makes a man's mind have thoughts and feelings.

So, in this unstoppable Fated creation:

- 1) light enters and some darkness exits upon God's utterance
- 2) Heaven and Earth form, possibly at separate points in space and or time

3) in them everything and everyone else forms: from Heaven, Heavenly beings like angels, including Satan, naturally form and from Earth, animals and then people naturally form

Also, it is entailed by God's established trait of having no duplicate that all these beings must be inferior to, that is, dumber than, Him; they cannot constantly keep track of and know the nature of absolutely everything, including His Mind.

Lower-Higher

This inferiority of all beings in comparison to God is shown at varying levels in nature. Some animals like the chimpanzee (which share 99% of human DNA), bonobos, dolphins, whales and elephants demonstrate self or social awareness like that of people. African gray parrots can talk. Crows and ravens use retrieval tools to get food. Dogs can read social clues and are comparable to a two-year old human child in mental and emotional capacity (International Animal Health Journal). People, on the other hand, while having a smaller, lighter prefrontal cortex than that of an animal like an elephant, have a prefrontal cortex more densely packed with neurons than any other animal, including elephants and chimpanzees (National Institutes of Health). This density allows for self-awareness, social awareness, and building capabilities to such an extent that humanity together has

manufactured weapons with the capacity to end all life on Earth. This intellect groups people- including you, me and them- with Heavenly beings, and this grouping of inferior beings is Biblical too, with man being made:

1) in the image of God, unlike all other animals and possibly even angels (Genesis 1:26-27)

2) lower and dumber (think Satan as the genius fallen angel) than the angels (Psalm 8:5, Hebrews 2:7, 2 Samuel 14:20, John 16:11), despite also being the judge of angels in heaven (1 Corinthians 6:3), and angels being of mysterious substance (1 Corinthians 15:40)

Self-Other

It is also in this angel and man category of awareness that arrogance can manifest. This is in comparison to animals like primates, dogs, and corvids which display jealousy over food or affection like people do and exert dominance in mating rituals, but only we have the minds which can project arrogance onto these behaviors.

So, our group is uniquely susceptible to pride, not authentic pride, synonymously humility, where credit is only given as it is due, but hubristic pride (and along with this, an abstraction of pride that is self-condemnation) apart from God's will. This is specifically in the ugly delusion of having keen self and social awareness but not being able to perfectly reason with the concept of self.¹ This hubristic feeling of pride only becomes uglier when considering the meaninglessness of all self-created purpose that makes the goodness God's selfless love ever so plain in nature (see Romans 1:19-20

in relation to this). However, there is compassion to be had for the arrogant- though that is easier said than done- in that none can calculate the true depth of hurt being arrogant causes like God calculates in his omniscient foreknowledge.

In the same way, nobody aside from God can calculate the opportunities lost from being in a state of self-condemnation, synonymously self-absorption in guilt: a complication of authentic pride that is more noticeably internally painful and allows for credit given only when it comes to the bad and not the good, which is logic that breaks down immediately when applied to another person.²

So, all-in-all, in God's omniscience of all the various traps of thoughts and feelings, He can only be unshakably fair, thus He can neither be arrogant (having no pride of hubris) nor self-loathing. Instead, He can only be humble, which is His glory; His authentic pride of unselfish love (see Isaiah 48:11).

1 This includes people with intellectual disabilities, although in this case these people are not to be held accountable for these things (See Romans 2:12, 1:20, Luke 12:48).

2 This is made to look especially unfair when considering that man cannot know all the inner-workings of another man's mind down to the last thought and nuanced feeling (1 Corinthians 2:11).

Create-Change-Destroy

So, it is in God's fairness and unshakable nature that- upon the arrival of people in history- He could not all of a sudden change His natural law of the conservation of energy¹ just because people are of a form of energy which breeds corruptible minds.

In this rule, God can create and destroy the "building," but not the "building blocks," meaning God could kill all inferior beings if he willed it, but he could not destroy the atoms and subatomic particles of the universe themselves from which inferior beings are created. So, even if He did kill off everyone at once, inferior beings would eventually come back around again from life-giving elements reforming from atoms. Therefore, inferior beings can exist as long as God exists, in one form or another. So, because God is eternal, inferior beings, though not named individuals, are eternal by nature, without any need for reincarnation or

repopulation, and in this all beings are included: animals (where species go extinct or adapt but animals in general will always be), people, angels, and any other Heavenly beings. However, just because all inferior beings are eternal that doesn't mean God has a desire to keep it this way.

1 That is: energy cannot be created or destroyed but can only change forms.

Face-To-Face

In this, I argue that if God had a choice in keeping all other beings around or not, people and angels especially, then he wouldn't. I argue this because when one looks at the creation account of Genesis, it is readable from the account that God saw that things were good until Satan and man fell in sin, thereby substantiating the concept of morality which God foresaw.

It was in this time that God first came face-to-face with good and evil, which He has been in a staring contest with ever since. In this, while God won't ever bat an eye in the face of evil, even for the 100 milliseconds it takes to blink, it does bring into question why God wouldn't just keep the good and get rid of the bad. So, why does God keep everyone around if he can just stop evil by always eliminating most or any sign of life as soon as they join and then rejoin Existence? Full sending with this

would keep all things all good in nature, and no rebellion could send itself in return.

This is not so simply countered by saying that He Exists in a choice-less state when addressing the fact that He killed a lot of people in the genocide of Noah's time but spared one family, so all I can think of is that it must be for the sake of balancing His own feelings in His omniscient Mind. This seems like the same problem from the start, as God doing things for the sake of personal feelings seemed to be the reason why He allowed evil, and so He is marked as not truly all-mighty and not truly all-good. However, it cannot truthfully be perceived as the same issue when God's aptitude for predictive analysis is considered. So, unless God wanted evil for some reason, and there is nothing in scripture that tells me he does, God must need evil to Exist logically.

Affirmation-Negation

While the concept of the logical balance of God's providential good requisitely negated through evil in free will has already been presented more comprehensively by Chris Langan in his CTMU, it can be woven seamlessly into the concept of God as Fate, and in reflecting upon this integration I have considered the following:

- 1) God cannot suppress any atomic structures; this misses the point of God being incapable of stopping the forces of nature acting on them
- 2) it is unknown how God could kill off an angel or Heavenly being in general, given their mysterious substance
- 3) in any case, there is no point in God repeatedly killing off people or Heavenly beings, let alone seeing it happen repeatedly,

because this is like when an unstoppable force meets an immovable object: The meeting never ends, so, there is no end to be met

4) as God promised to never mass genocide people again after the legendary Noah's flood, one might assume that he foresaw lesser evils in the future by doing so

5) this would've spared God coming face-to-face with future possibilities of grief from the savage sin of Noah's time, assuming He can feel in the sense that we do

6) it is in this consideration of the possibility of God feeling that I come to a turning point

Regret-Grief

I take the idea that God gets the mental sensation of feelings, like how we as people do, as inferable from the Bible. This is evidenced by Genesis 6:6, in the time of Noah's flood,¹ when God is said to have regretted the creation of man and grieved it. This verse in the original Hebrew uses the word *vayyinnāḥem* to mean regretted, and here it expresses a sorrow felt by God, not a change of mind about His nature.

Additionally, the specific verb form of the word used for grieved, *vayyit'asṣēb*, expresses a heaviness or deep emotional pain.²

So, unlike the concept of choice, this concept of feeling can be inferred as the sensation we are familiar with and not just assumed to be implied. This is because Genesis makes the point that we are made in the image of God (in one way or another) and there is nothing in the logical structure of Fate that says God can't feel as we do.

However, in this case being true, I would assume that the depth of feeling God has access to and the nuances he deciphers in His massive intellect and giant heart is beyond our comprehension at extremes, and only understandable in the middle section, in which God must feel all the feelings of every individual in history and remain emotionally stable enough to not affect His decision-making. In this sense, even though God keeps His self-control when He expresses a deep emotional pain in Genesis 6:6, we cannot know just how deep that pain goes. This also brings up the uncertainty of how exactly God can remain composed in the face of immeasurable pain. It seems it might take a psychopath to do this, or maybe a genocidal sociopath who can bottle it up at times.

1 Note that I do not necessarily believe in a global flood. The only true belief I hold about this story at this point is that it served as a reset for humanity, and by some means leaving only Noah and his family behind.

2 This is taken from the Interlinear Blue Letter Bible and ESV Biblical translation.

Psycho-Social

In addressing this uncertainty of God's emotional stability, I argue that God is not a psychopath or inversely a sociopath in the sense that there is something off with His Brain, as God could not possibly have a person's brain allowing for these traits.

Looking into this, psychopathy is said to be a genetic abnormality in the integrity of the white matter connecting the gray matter that is the amygdala processing emotions to the gray matter that is the prefrontal cortex processing logic.¹ However, God's theoretically physical Brain, while running as an electrochemical machine as people's brains do, cannot be this small, wrinkly container of white and gray matter made of cells. Instead, His Brain is the expanse of the Universe containing and running on the building blocks of all matter, with the connected mind of interacting thoughts Existing as Space-Time Itself. In this, God's Mind does not require the life-

giving carbonic cells and so requires no physical neurons in His Brain stemming from these cells. Instead, from what is known about quantum mechanics, He may only have atoms (the base for molecules making cells) and subatomic particles as a base for His Being, although it could be from the mysterious subatomic realm or possibly from the Randall-Sundrum dimension² in which an equivalent of the cells and neurons of God's Mind can be found. Regardless though, God cannot have the physical disconnect causing apathy about social or moral issues as a psychopath does and looking at the inverse condition of sociopathy in this view, I argue that God cannot have the sociopathic effect on His Brain either.

While sociopathy is said to result from traumatic environmental conditions affecting emotional stability instead of genetics, He still cannot have the sociopathic Brain capable of showing consistent amygdala activation during an

outburst or an aggressive act, as this also operates on the carbon-based cells, allowing for the impulses of neurons which trigger chemical imbalance. I will say though, under the assumption that this were physically possible in the mysterious matter of God's Brain, God might be the biggest sociopath of them all, because if anybody has a traumatic backstory to get messed up by its God, who has literally seen it all. If this is the case though, God shows tremendous restraint as a sociopath, given He hasn't gone back on His word and ended all bloodlines with the sheer amount of sin- unquantifiable to us- He's seen since Noah's flood.

So, God either has a brain with perfect emotional regulation or no emotion at all, and at this point I am inclined to favor the former. The latter take could be right though, but only under the condition that God's feelings are not actual feelings. This, however, would still not make God a psychopath, as psychopaths still have feeling in some manner, but instead would make

God an emotionless machine in our view: a calculator perpetually solving mathematical equations held together by inverse operations maintaining balance in the world.

1 Note that this information, as well as any further research done on neuroscience and psychology, is taken from the National Institutes of Health webpages.

2 Physicists use information taken from particle colliders to search for the Kaluza-Klein particles or microscopic black holes that could mean the existence of warped dimensions like that of the Randall-Sundrum Model (See CERN).

Affection-Affliction

Regardless of how God's feelings are interpreted though, it is the case that not all God's feelings mentioned in the Bible are written as if God expressed them in the same way as He did in Noah's day. In this, the way God most meaningfully expresses His feelings to us is through merciful action. John 3:16 is the greatest and most famous example of this in combination with the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ Himself. In the first part of this verse (which I have sectioned off as), "For God so loved the world," the word love in Greek is agape, meaning a self-sacrificing, unending, merciful love. This word for God's love is not affection as we know it, although, again, this does not necessarily prove God is more machine than man in terms of feeling. In any case though, we know love from action and in the reflective times of our inaction, while God's love is known perpetually from action and in action. This action is God's

continuous self-sacrifice of holding our secrets, our wretchedness and our humiliations. It is not a specific, subjective, romanticized feeling but instead an always self-fulfilling objective. John 3:16 stands as the ultimate symbol of God's love for people. It is showing what God had and has really been doing all along- carrying the burden of all the pointless feelings of our pride and self-indulgence. In this, there is no greater love than laying down one's life for a friend, and there is no disservice done to the world by loving your enemy. It is in this that God- if only by quantity alone- gave the greatest love nobody could top: laying down His life for all people, even those who had made themselves His enemies. In this action, He expressed His overwhelming love for people, a love greater than any one person can have for another. In this action, those faithful to God in the Old Testament were redeemed by the symbol of Jesus' blood and broken body and restoration even after death, while those who still lived could be

redeemed in their belief of the event and its redemptive power. In this action, all future generations were permitted to be redeemed as well, and I feel that this is an event that must be meant to stand the test of time by God's Fated will.

Better-than-Nothing

Now, upon understanding this bit about God's feelings (if only barely in terms of depth and nuance), it can be established that God must also work to spare Himself as much grief as possible (or as much imbalance as possible) as part of His Mind's calculations. In this, God has no use in seeing eternal suffering from evil but also has no use for spending His time killing off bloodlines continually for no reason to keep the world sinless (especially given that he is not a psychopath or sociopath). So, God, if only for the sake of His own conscious, instead must seek to do the best with what he can that is allowed by His nature, and this involves God having a generous, positive outlook on life:

- 1) God knows that life is temporary, and through His insight into people's minds He also knows that nothing is too much to bear

if one lives out His word and trusts in Him
(2 Corinthians 1:8-9, 1 Peter 5:7)

2) so, God seems to deem life better lived than not (see also Deuteronomy 30:19, John 10:10, Ecclesiastes on human suffering and perseverance)

3) therefore, God allows life, and (enigmatically) cherishes every individual's precious time on Earth, if for no other reason in his calculations than because He might as well be invested in what He cannot avoid allowing

4) this selfless care may make God happy too, as it does for people with giving hearts (Proverbs 11:25)

5) this selflessness may also be key in Him maintaining emotional stability, along with being jealous for people's sake (Exodus 20:5, Deuteronomy 4:24) but taking joy in

people's goodheartedness (Psalm 149:4, 1 Chronicles 29:17)

6) while being selfless may comfort God, doing the greatest good is also an unconditional love from Him in the sense that He is not required to do it

7) this quality also aligns with the scripture that while everything is permissible, not everything is beneficial (1 Corinthians 10:23)

Salvation-Above-All

So, in His calculations, God must also consider what is most beneficial or what is fair for every person individually and collectively. This, in concept, makes up the when, where, why, who, what, and how of His actions on Earth, and entails the following:

- 1) God never solicits, but instead only acts separately from the actions of people
- 2) this is in hand with the fact that God cannot stop the base function of any part of His nature, and so cannot prevent choice which is inherent to people's nature
- 3) God is so smart about this that it seems like He is soliciting, but He isn't
- 4) to say God does not solicit, or interfere, may seem to go against the Biblical notion that God is a proactive God, but it doesn't

5) this is because, in his omnipresence, God's Hand is in everything; God is in the means of production and the production of life itself, but only in this latter stage if we give him permission to be

This is a general outline for God's calculations, but one can delve further into how God handles this operation conditionally through reflecting on how He must deal with the means of life's production itself, which is outlined in the following:

- 1) God's hand is in genetics, making predestination present only up until the point of birth
- 2) if this were not the case, then people would have no ability to choose in life
- 3) however, if predestination were present even in the production that is life, then it seems to me that all of us would be

4) Christians because God is smart enough to direct us to His will and convince us of His Being if He has His hand in everything

5) there'd also be no reason to even be a Christian on Earth preaching the Gospel in this case, and we would be in a Heavenly paradise, which we aren't

6) so, I argue God operates through genetics, most impactfully in the sense that he makes people with some combination of predisposed personality traits, which aligns with research in modern psychobiology

7) these varying combinations of personality traits, said to primarily manifest in five OCEAN or synonymously CANOE categories in all people, which are

Openness to experience
Conscientiousness

Extroversion or Introversion

Agreeableness

Neuroticism aka emotional stability

and secondarily under contradictory exceptions, such as when a person is agreeable in one circumstance and not in another, make everyone inclined to commit a certain kind of sin, but forces or permits nobody to sin

8) for example, a person who is less open to experience but more introverted, conscientious, agreeable and neurotic is inclined towards fear causing them to lie, and lying is a sin causing many issues, even that which is unknown by perception alone (See Proverbs 26:18-19)

9) now, it is also intuitively evident that God mixes and matches all sorts of different kinds of people in this, allowing His glory to be shown through Christians who preach more logically or emotionally and to people

who listen more to reason or more to raw, emotional expression.

10) God also can mix and match by assigning specific people to be born in a particular country or region all over the world, and to people of certain occupations, so His glory might be understood in all spheres of influence

11) also, it seems to me that God would only allow people to be born from the genetic lottery of the gene pool who would best show His glory, especially because He knows even the best will always come short in life

12) this also means that God knew there would be the worst of the worst (brace yourself here): guys like Adolf Hitler, Jeffrey Dahmer and in general sex traffickers and rapists, but He could only grieve their crimes, knowing He had dealt the best hand He could for them¹

13) in this notion of God doing the best that He can, the highest priority for God is always that people find salvation, as He knows there is no greater good than what His omniscient Mind can come up with, and this is not hubris, but compassion

1 I wonder how many more people would be like this
or how much more severe the crimes would be if
God's hand was not in this.

Time-to-Kill

Now, in this conditional operation of the world, there is still the unresolved case of why God lets a person such as Hitler be born (other than just saying, “He did the best he could for them), or why He lets a person be born whose mental processing capabilities get impaired from a brain injury in their youth, making them a serial killer or otherwise making them prone to delinquent behavior later in life.

Upon reflecting on this, my initial view here is that God cannot allow able minded killers and schemers like Hitler to exist simply so He can, through them, vicariously get back at an individual who mocked Him or Jewish people who have turned their backs on Him. God can also not have a standalone reason like letting the killers clear space on Earth for His purposes, or otherwise that these killers were just mistakes on His part. This is because all these reasons, while containing partial truth,

as evident from God's genocide of most all people on Earth in the time of Noah, don't tell the whole truth. Instead, they miss the truth found in the reasoning that God, if only for the sake of His own sanity and a clean conscious in His omniscient Mind, must do what is most beneficial for mankind because He knows exactly how to do it.

So, again, a serial killer is born with God knowing He has done His best (to make all the optimal arrangements) to prevent their sin before their birth, but also in knowing He can only do so much for them (who do have free will) to let their sinful thoughts become salient to the point of manifesting murder. It is also a fair assumption in this to say that he prevented them from killing even more people as an indirect effect of selecting the birth-time, birthplace, and genes of others in the killer's lifetime.¹ In this, God works circumstantially, and always for the grand purpose of maximizing the count of saved souls as the primary focus of His operations.

For example, if the killer killed one or more unbelievers, then the victim must have been beyond reach of being redeemed by Christ. It is this and-or that the victim had been helping the Devil make too many people irredeemable blasphemers of God along with them. Concurrently, if the killer killed one or more believers, then they went to a better place anyways, but God only would allow this to teach a lesson powerful enough about the depressing nature of life lived and thoughts thought apart from His will to cause people to turn to Him. However, this would not be an upside if the killer professed to be Christian, unless it was obvious enough that the killer represented a cult more than true Christianity.² Furthermore, as for the killer or delinquent (including the other worst of the worst, like pedophiles) themselves, they could commit the worst and most amount of sin compared to anyone before, but they still might be saved later if they truly repent, no matter how unlikely this would be. This is because

God has no works-based threshold for being saved, only an intention-based threshold (1 Corinthians 4:5, see also 1 Samuel 16:7), meaning you are either in a blasphemous (always meaning lucidly, wholeheartedly blasphemous) state or not, and which of these two states you die in is the state which you are judged in (see Mark 3:28-29). In this, all are judged by their last seconds spent processing life, marked either by a change of heart, meaning values and worldview, not mere belief or attitude, or a firmness of heart, that is, a conviction in values and worldview. Now, this does bring into question whether certain actions like Hitler's holocaust or sex-trafficking of minors require a perpetrator of a blasphemous, forever irredeemable heart to carry them out, and in answering this, I believe this is currently unknowable for us. I believe this because knowing that much requires being certain of:

1) the perpetrator's intensity of disbelief meeting the threshold for blaspheme (see 1 Kings 8:39 and 1 Chronicles 28:9 in line with this)

2) This blasphemous emotion being definable by neuroscience, which it isn't³

3) that this blaspheme is not only publicly communicated but privately sustained within the person's heart, even in the moments of their death, which is currently unknowable, and may never be

So, under the assumption that the worst of the worst could be redeemed, even if they later became a preacher of the gospel, I doubt this ex-con's preaching would affect people negatively enough to the point where they couldn't be saved for the rest of their lives. In this, God knows that bystanders and onlookers are either or altogether: smarter, more apathetic, more impressionable and

more easily distracted by other things in their own stories than that.

Now, in looking at this viewpoint from another angle, one can see that who the victim is as a person must also be taken into consideration according to God's conditional operation, although I will say that it matters not if these victims were unbelievers or believers in the sense that God allows either to be killed. In this view, He allows both cases because He knows the impact that the unbelievers and believers would've made if they lived. From this He deemed their passing away a solemn, worthy sacrifice for humanity's sake, and this itself is a claim that can only be provocative if one cannot reason with the idea that it is not apathetic or cruel on God's part, as:

- 1) in this, God spares all these victims future physical and emotional pain on Earth
- 2) God knows the Christian's impact on unsaved people so well that I'd think it must

be in a quantifiable sense to Him like seconds passed are to us

3) so, He knows that more people would be saved in the future through them dying at that specific moment in time than if they had lived, keeping in mind God's awareness of all possible branches of a root event

4) if this were not true, then salvation itself cannot be the highest priority, which contradicts the crux of the Biblical worldview

5) in this, God does not play favorites; He understands and treasures the uniqueness of every individual

6) the Christian gets to go to a painless paradise anyways

7) if their family is Christian and loving, the blow of their loss will be softened, if only in

the knowledge that the deceased family member had been saved before death

8) if their family is not Christian, then their grief- though it may not come from the approval of their faith- may be comparatively just as strong if not appearing emotionally stronger than the Christian family's regarding the death itself, but more brutal in the long run

9) God knows if a nonbeliever was irredeemable in this case, under the assumption that they didn't repent in their final moments and that the killer gave them a slow enough death to do so

10) if this nonbeliever's family was Christian, then grief would be felt both in the mourning of the life and for the uncertainty of their salvation

11) if their family was non-Christian, grief would be felt in the loss of life all the same,

but it would only matter if it pushed them further away from God if their hearts were not blasphemous (immovably defiant towards God) already but instead of humble posture (open to God's possibility)

12) in the case where they keep a humble heart, God foreknows more opportunity for their salvation

13) the case where their hearts become irredeemable would only be allowed to play out if the event sparked some revival in other people, making for an overall positive outcome in terms of people saved

In this, God also knows specifically how many people all those victims would have preached the gospel to and successfully helped converted, and by this there is no being taken too early (see Isaiah 57:1-2) in the sense that potential good was left on the table, as any wasted potential was already recycled by God in the early death. If God

were to have let these people live, it would've been a sin compared to the action of God letting them die as He did. This is because for all that I can say about Fate, God finds the best amid the worse. For example, the deceased could've become best friends with a lost soul, but because they didn't live, that lost soul instead became best friends with a passionate, genuine believer and got saved in the process. Also, if God were to have let the deceased person live, then, the rest of their life might only amount to living and learning but never finding truth; losing and gaining thoughts and feelings everyday but only knowing illusion.⁴

1 This reasoning of maximizing good and so implicitly preventing the greatest evil can be applied evenly to the modern-day Israel-Palestine conflict. In this, God likely allowed for Ishmael, who is the ascendant of modern-day Palestinians, to be born, because he knew Him being born would prevent a less destructive future conflict between modern-day Israel and a nation there instead of Palestine.

2 For example, a case where a person says that God told them to kill a person, though it is a command of the Bible, "thou shalt not kill." (KJV Bible translation)

3 I also find it highly unlikely that these criminals would take the time to volunteer for neuroscience lab testing research even if blasphemous intent could be tested.

4 "I've looked at life that way, from Both Sides Now..." -Joni Mitchell

Victim-Perpetrator

Now, speaking of illusion, I here come to a point where I intend to clear up any misconception of how God allows a different, compromised breed of criminal: the two-faced handicapped killer; the victim-perpetrator.

In taking a stab at this¹, violent behavior of people with reported head injuries in youth must be affected by some other factors as well, as not everyone who sustains a head injury becomes a serial killer.

These factors are shown by psychological research to be:

- 1) trauma from environment through infliction by guardian or other means
- 2) predisposed inclinations increasing the chances of violent behavior in life

In this, it should be noted that while the Bible offers God's help in any extreme, unbearable situation like this, for God to maintain fair character, he must judge these victim-perpetrators based on the interactivity and overall effect of more specific causes that vary on a case-by-case basis, aside from considering the chances and effects of salvation of all parties. These specific causes are considered in the following:

- 1) the total amount of information, true or conflicting, the killer hears about Him
- 2) if that information was known before or after the brain damage was there
- 3) the severity of effects from the brain damage on logical thinking and emotional regulation, and possibly memory
- 4) the degree to which they are predisposed to neuroticism, which is currently, comparatively measured by percentile in

neuroscience (see National Institutes of Health articles)

These causes can then be integrated with God's responses to the initially elaborated on case of the killer with no physical brain trauma. This allows for the following judgments to be made:

1) in cases where the killer gets insignificant or no exposure to the Bible or no clarity about God's presence before the damage, and the brain damage was severe as opposed to mild, it is Biblical to infer that God would judge this person as if they were a naive child

2) this is because it was in their childhood (again, this is only regarding serial killers afflicted in their youth), specifically before 18 (the solid age of accountability or consent we have in the US), that their mind was stunted and stopped functioning naturally

3) also, foundational development of the mind is permanently stunted if the injury occurred at age five or younger

4) examples of brain damage cases include Richard Ramirez who suffered temporal lobe epilepsy in childhood, and Fred West who sustained a fractured skull at age 17 (again, see National Institutes of Health for all psychobiological claims)

5) in the case where a killer is raised Christian before experiencing trauma, that person will have either less leeway in God's eyes or the same amount as the former case, depending on if it was a high-impact case with lasting consequence (like the skull being fractured causing permanent issues, in which case God would look at the heart underneath all the damage) or if it was a low impact case, like where a concussion occurred, only mildly or temporarily impairing reasoning skills²

6) in the low-impact case, the theological issue of if a Christian can commit this sort of sin or if the person was never really Christian comes up (see Hebrews 6:4-6 vs. Romans 8:38-39 and John 10:27-28)

7) this uncertainty brings back the issues of never knowing the heart of a person and how to perceive (or even define) the minimum threshold met for the genuine salvation of another person

8) so, the best judgment I can make on this low-impact case right now is that the killer's attitude towards their past religious affiliations can be determined to some degree through modern interrogation methods, under the assumption that the person isn't clinically insane, in which case this judgment is left to God³

9) now, re-centering here, the general case of being Christian-raised would also depend on religious issues, such as fear of exposure to secular education provided in childhood, the continual presence of psychological growth-stunters like false doctrine, continual neglect and social isolation, and being raised on unnaturally restrictive rules

10) Ed Gein is one such case, as he was raised Christian, with reported head beatings from his father, but mostly being a product of an overly strict religious upbringing emphasizing a degraded view of women from his mother

11) in terms, this caused him to suppress his feelings and biological drive to the point where they overflowed, leading to psychosexual perversion and violence⁴

These are all judgment calls that God must make regarding what to allow and what not to allow in the case of the victim-

perpetrator in life, and while God still has the same amount of control over situations like this as the preceding circumstances and any other, in these situations He can only prevent so much abuse amid all the grief.

Now, it is here, regarding this limit of God's preventative power, that I argue that God really only causes half of all life's occurrences (occurrences being thoughts, feelings, words and actions) through geographical placement and genetic selection, but the other half of all occurrences- that is, the production of life itself- I cannot give God full credit for.

1 (a cheeky, on the nose transition, but a transition no less)

2 Sources: Concussion Alliance and Harvard Medical School

3 I do intend to find a better answer for this eventually. This will require further psychological research, serial killer case studies, and developing a system for determining degrees of conviction in feeling and thought in relation to a person's known life experiences.

4 Ed Gein was declared clinically schizophrenic following his arrest (see Radford University serial killer database for more on his case).

Ask-Receive

In this, the production of life is constantly fluctuating in terms of who has the most control over it- demons, man, or God- but the extent to and the rate at which it fluctuates can be determined by man only, except in extremes where man would kill themselves off or become too wicked in sin, grieving God. This is where God can act: when man gives Him the opportunity to.

Now, the unrefined, salvation-above-all set of guidelines does allow for some understanding of God's mind, but it does not deal with some practical matters or miracles which help in understanding. This includes what exactly something like praying does, if God favors certain teams in sports events, how God views church denominations, if a person living in sin should be allowed to minister, what Old Testament laws should still be followed, if God sees playing video games as a waste of time, or if God grants a wish of getting married to a named spouse

or a wish to get rich. This also includes how people can get healed in this, or how Elijah was given the power to outrun a chariot, or how Paul was made immune to snake venom, or how God did any other miraculous sign in the Bible. In this, God breaks the pretense of any notion that he can only work through genetics or geographical placement to get involved. Here, this pretense is broken with the addition of a new condition which circumvents any issue of equating "joining in on the action" to predestination and amounts to a solution in line with the traditional doctrine of God's providence, except more refined. In this, the uncertainty of if a thing perceived as good has happened because of God arranging it (providence) or if it is just good luck has left the issue of what is from God and what is man forcing the issue. Essentially, it only gives God control over life when we say it does.

So, to fix this issue, I reassert what the balancing, unbiased, undemonized,

perpetual force of Fate all entails. This view takes no prisoners. It leaves no pastor an excuse to live in self-indulgence and avarice off tithe. It leaves no room for a woke gospel, no room for a (white) hippie Jesus and no room for an abusive God.

In this, the 'contract' of Fate, in terms, must have the clause that God can lend a hand- not solicit- in the production of life under the condition that man was asking for it. Man asking for it is done both indirectly by not acting according to God's will, or directly by praying. This means man is in fact always "asking for it" to some degree, which means that God does in fact have a hand in every occurrence in life. Essentially, while God cannot act against the nature of choice and so cannot control a person's mind, He can act on the constant flow of opportunity a chooser grants Him from choice. These actions, along with the constant passive influence of God's presence in and on the Earth itself, then interacts with a person's thoughts and feelings, but these

alone cannot cause an unsaved person to be saved. This is because God cannot access the lowest depth of the soul determining salvation if it is sealed shut in the cocoon of accumulated pride. In this instance, the accumulated pride could not have been cumulated in ignorance of the gospel, but only in defiance towards it, as previously established. This includes a lack of the ignorance associated with false doctrine or misunderstanding the Bible, leaving no excuse to stay unsaved.

So, God must take all opportunity given to him, and this opportunistic, "asking for it," give-and-take type system is exemplified both with negative and positive connotations in the following:

- 1) in the time of Noah, man was asking for it by sinking so low into sin, only Noah and his family were found favorable enough to be spared

2) in the time of Moses, the pharaoh was asking for it by keeping God's people the Israelites enslaved, the people made mighty from humble origins so God's truth may show arrogant fools what authentic pride is

3) David was asking for it in a positive way as he lived chasing after God's own heart and became God's ambassador as king

4) with these Biblical examples aside, in modern times one "asks for it" in the negative sense by being an advocate for the Devil in an information age and with the qualifying intellect to know better, as established previously

5) inversely, in the positive sense, all "asking for it" entails has stayed the same over time: this is to pray for God's will to be done.

6) one does not even have to be saved to do this, as a person can pray to find it in

themselves to believe in Jesus's sacrifice and resurrection

7) in line with this, simply praying the traditional prayer from Matthew 6:9-13 gives God the opportunity to rearrange all the moving parts for an improved outcome

8) essentially, every time we pray this prayer, we (in God's eyes) contribute to the effect of a more peaceful world aligned with God's will

9) however, out of desire, one may utter or think prayers into existence without the greater good in mind

10) for example, a guy may ask God to land a woman with a certain kind of look or might simply be asking for financial success

11) in this, God keeps in mind that the main goal of any moment is to maximize the

count of saved souls while drawing those saved as close to Him as possible

12) so, God grants a wish of a marriage, even if it is superficial, but only if there wasn't a more positive domino effect on overall salvation counts if the guy had stayed single

13) in the same way, God grants financial success to a person only if the person will have a closer walk with Him and be a brighter light to others as a result

14) this is different from when a prayer is left unsaid, because though God knows the heart's every intent, when there is no request, He cannot answer the request

Now, in cases of asking and receiving like this one does run into a person claiming that God has blessed them because they were given exactly what they requested, which can be met with doubt (I

know I have doubted any claim like this).

For example, a person invested their time and money into a business and prayed that if it was the Lord's will, it would be successful. Over the course of a year or so it meets the person's expectations for success, and the person proclaims that the Lord has blessed them. In the traditional view of God's providence, this can be written off as the person living for themselves and getting financial success from it. However, in the Fated view, this successful business cannot need to be viewed as them falsely accrediting God when it was them forcing the issue. This is because in the unrelenting, hand-on approach of God in the Fated view God did grant their request, though it may not have been what He had planned for them originally. Instead, God adjusted to the person's prayer, changing their life's trajectory. This is because He knew their heart being in it would make it the most impactful way for them personally to minister.

Additionally, and in the same way, if a basketball player prays for victory in a championship game, wins, and gives credit to God for that blessing and opportunity, this victory being God's favor does not need to be doubted. This is because while it doesn't seem fair for any Christians on the losing team and it seems like God is above choosing sides in this anyway, He still granted the wish of that player because it fit best in His grand calculations. Now, God may also have given favor in this event (according to His calculations) regardless of if any of the players prayed, although the odds are more even if they don't care enough to ask. If this were not the case, then there'd be no reason to pray, because it would have no effect. One does not even have to do it out loud, because prayer is supposed to be self-reflection and alignment with God's will anyways.

In this, God adjusts according to what we're willing to conform to, and a prayer request, even in thought, is the

telltale sign of the acknowledgment of our own wills, even if our own wills are not aligned with God as much as they could be.

Perfect-Imperfection

Furthermore, this give-and-take reasoning can also be applied to the scenario where a pastor must step down because he is caught living in sin and needs to change before influencing others in such a way. The Bible aligns with this being proper procedure as it talks about being above reproach (1 Timothy 3:2), and it also follows that if one is going to preach a lifestyle then one must know how to live it. This, of course, is impossible to the extent of becoming perfect. However, it is possible to the extent of practicing consistent Bible reading, talking with God, confessing sinful thoughts to God in humility before they lead to action, confessing habitual sin but knowing when confession itself is becoming a crutch, and forgiving others as well as oneself.¹ This is what God requires for us to be free in spirit, pure and humble of heart, and mentally strong in the perpetual spiritual

warfare that is life, and more prayer can never hurt either.

It is in the act of prayer that God is granted the opportunity to pave the way for what an individual values, and a person living blamelessly grants God the opportunity to pave the way for what He values for this individual. It is my intuition to believe that few live out this lifestyle, so few that in the last century, only Billy Graham as an example can be used for it off the top of my head, and, going back to the early church age, Paul comes to mind.

In the case of Paul, he had been freed from the bondage of his previous sin and was so in touch with God's presence that in one instance, the Holy Spirit made him immune to snake venom (Acts 28:1-6).

When this level of involvement happens, it means one has gone a step beyond the territory of prayer and battling the demons of self into the territory of wearing the armor of God as a prayer warrior to help others conquer their demons.

This is physically walking with the Holy Spirit of God as one's forcefield. This is not preachy Christianity nor is it weak Christianity. Instead, this allows the Holy Spirit to speak and act for you, the same Holy Spirit who is the set of the physical forces of nature acting on energy in the universe, even down to the subatomic level. He is as intangible as the mind itself, and as tangible as what the mind deems possible. He is the gravity which keeps us physically grounded, and the comforter who keeps us spiritually grounded.

It was only with the presence of the Holy Spirit blanketing him (in terms) that Elijah could outrun a chariot (1 Kings 18:46), and it was only through the power of the forces of the Holy Spirit that Jesus could raise Lazarus from the dead (John 1:38-44). These extraordinary feats may have happened through the mysterious inner-workings of the subatomic realm, but the belief in the miracle itself requires no such conjecture. Instead, the Spirit draws every

person on Earth to Him automatically even as we pull away.

This entails a viewpoint which sees the self in concept as an armored vessel for God to steer forward and carry His cargo, that is the fruits of the Spirit, in. This viewpoint is one of compassion and self-control. In this, one lives with purpose because one lives according to God's priorities, and with priorities in view, even if one were to run into the issues associated with, say, orthodox Jewish tradition in practice, or a Baptist who doesn't believe in the ministerial gifts of the Holy Spirit, the Holy-Spirit filled Christian (and for the latter case, particularly one who operates in the gifts) can look at these people and say that while the Baptist is missing out, more focus should be put on helping the orthodox Jew go Messianic.² The Holy-Spirit filled Christian in this scenario also knows the old laws of Judaism need not stay, although they still may fast in reverence to God's humble ways, and honor the Sabbath as a day of rest

(though even this day is in commemoration of a time preceding the times of the Old Testament laws). This Christian is made new daily with a heart of worship towards God, not social constructs of righteousness based on appearance and works.

1 This is a practice described wonderfully in the book, "the Practice of the Presence of God" from brother Lawrence.

2 Orthodox Jews are still a part of God's blessed people, even if unsaved. Jews, Orthodox or Messianic, have stayed notoriously smart, talented and financially successful throughout the years. This remains a sign that the original Abrahamic blessing has not gone away, though the Orthodox Jews continue to reject the spiritual blessing of Christ's redemption (See Romans 11).

Body-Mind-Spirit

It is with this untethered heart of worship that this Christian dismantles a plethora of schemes and rebukes all temptations of the Devil and his allies. After this, the Devil flees from him and, in terms, goes back to his drawing board. However, the Devil still does not flee from the one who cannot yet bear the weight of God's armor, even by Fate. So, the fallen angels and (possibly the undead Nephilim) demons are granted access to those who leave themselves vulnerable.

The Bible says we do not wrestle with flesh and blood but with demons and principalities (Ephesians 6:12, where the principalities are possibly fallen angels governing territories instead of demons assigned to specific people). So, when we think, act, and pray, we are really fighting these and these only: those which are the invisible constructs of the Devil. However,

this also means we fight him with the Holy Spirit in us and angelic spirits on our side.

The physical world, then, is only the effect of the cause that is the invisible, substantial, supernatural (or extra-physical) world. The instigating demonic spirits here are found all over where there is partaking of the infamous seven deadly sins: pride, greed, lust, envy, gluttony, wrath (unrighteous anger) and sloth (idleness), and all other branches from these roots.¹ However, God places restrictions on the Devil in all this.

One restriction is that He will not let the Devil- who is the chief demon- or his band of demons harass people to the point where people do not have at least one way to escape the harassment. In connection with this, Satan cannot read minds (only God knows the mind) but instead must see the contents of the mind manifested through actions and words.

God also mostly only lets demons harass or possess anyone if that person chooses to leave themselves ignorant and vulnerable by not knowing the Bible, although there is the exception of demonic forces being present in childhood as with a case like in Mark 9:14-29, which entailed a child being harassed with a mute spirit. When God does allow this exception, though, it is still only for the greater good in some way or another, whether that be through the eventual casting out of the demon possessing the child (for healing and for testimonial purposes) or the child dying young and being sent to Heaven to spare him from future grief (in which case the demons would find another host; see Luke 11:24-26).

Now, one or more spirits can externally harass- that is, attach to a Christian- at a time in the unseen extra-physical realm, but not actually possess a Christian, as a Christian soul is automatically sealed off by God's Holy

Spirit, so the Devil cannot do a Christian harm like this (1 John 5:18).

A non-Christian, on the other hand, can be both externally harassed and internally possessed as shown by Jesus casting out demons in his ministry, although it makes sense to think that the Devil has no need to send demons on or into a person who is already a tried-and-true blasphemer. In this, the Devil works based on intent.

1 Strongman's His Name...What's His Game? An Authoritative Approach to Spiritual Warfare points out sixteen types of associated evil spirits from scripture.

Inside-Out

Intent determines what the Devil can use against you and what the Devil leaves alone. He judges intent based on one's behaviors with perfect precision. This is so he can predict our next move, trap us in sin, and ultimately let us destroy ourselves in it.

Our intent is also the sole reference point from which God judges one's sin, and this is described in three levels in the Bible:

- 1) sin not necessarily having selfish intent could be called "chatah", which is the Biblical Hebrew word for "missing the mark," meaning not aligned with God's will
- 2) sin that is done out of desire and leads to guilt in the Bible is called "avon," which means "punishment" or "guilt" and is also called iniquity
- 3) sin that is done out of defiance in the Bible is called "pesha" which means

"transgression" or "rebellion" and represents betrayal, a breaking of covenant with God or breaking of trust in a relationship by unjust treatment

In this, God never claims that any one of these three degrees of sins is completely our fault. Instead, in the cyclical process of sin, it is always half the Devil's fault for doing the tempting based on our heart's desire and half one or more people's fault for acting on it. God has no share in this portioning, as, again, He can neither do wrong nor impede on man's choice to do wrong. However, going back to man controlling the fluctuation of power in choice, if one doesn't act on it but instead fights it with one's thoughts aligned with God's word, then the Devil is left with all the fault of provoking that person's heart.¹

This portioning of fault for sin also brings up the uncertainty of if man would have sinned at all if not for the Devil there to tempt them. In this uncertainty, I believe we

would have stayed sinless, as we would have been like sheltered, completely isolated children in awe of their parent. We would have been with no peer pressure to corrupt the belief that what God says, goes, and without question. In this logic, the severity of pride and rebellion that Satan has, even when compared to man, is further illuminated.

Now, more specifically in God's- in terms- judicial process, if more than one person is involved in a sin, God adjusts the people's half regarding percentage of fault in line with the following:

- 1) the degree of intent they all had individually
- 2) their individual contribution in action
- 3) previous relevant context

In a case like this, Satan still takes half the fall, but the main trespasser

(perpetrator) may get something like 27% of the rest while another person involved gets 23%, but before this is calculated God also considers:

1) the number of people that would be affected by the sin that the trespasser had predicted beforehand

2) the sin's depth of influence in those people that the trespasser predicted beforehand

In this, if any number of people is predicted to be negatively affected by the sin, it is marked by the third level of intent: defiance. Also, in this, the level of intent does not matter if the trespasser has not reached the age of accountability or maturity in God's telepathy and all-seeing eyes. These factors affect percentage of fault in correlation to the person's intelligence, and this factor of intelligence is also tied to a person's chances for salvation, but only for a

child-like mind, which means only children, sheltered teenagers² and, as previously established, people with intellectual disabilities. Beyond this threshold, it becomes about what one chooses to consume, affecting what one produces, and what one chooses to produce from their thinking afterwards, affecting what they consume.

It is also noticeable in all this sin that there is always the consequence of pain in the short term and the possibility for torment in the long term.

1 This is also for people who have intrusive thoughts, possibly due to an obsessive-compulsive disorder. In this case God will certainly not put fault on this person for fighting off sinful thoughts they can't control, but I will say that one does have the right to pray for the disorder to leave them. If it does not leave them, God may have this stay in a person's mind for a reason I have not figured out yet.

2 (See also Matthew 18:6, Mark 9:42, Luke 17:2) This is to say nothing about the age of consent or sexual conduct which acts as a safety net in society. This is simply coming from the perspective of God knowing when a teenager's brain and thinking is developed like an adult. This we never know entirely, but that does not debunk the science and reasoning of general brain and bodily development times of teenagers, let alone preteens and younger kids. It is better to cover the majority for this than to change laws for a select few smart, more adult-looking teenagers (who still have a lot of room to grow as well).

Arrival-Departure

So, the consequence for sin is always pain, regardless of if one is living in denial of it. This pain is only suppressed by coping mechanisms or superficial pleasures but is always there, deep down, through all the highs, lows, and mind-numbing experiences of life, until we die.

It is then believed by the non-Christian that there will be no more of this consequence of sensation in death, but it remains true for everyone that life's consequence is at least the antecedent to death's consequence, whether one can feel it or not.

Now, one might take the view that a life lived in accordance with God's word is what Heaven is, and that dying in this state is the truest peace one can obtain, but also that there is no afterlife in an extra-dimensional realm. Instead, peace felt through the highs and lows of life becomes the reward- the purpose- of life itself. The

opposite of peace, then, is a life lived defying Reality's design which brings the tormenting parasite of pride to oneself. In this, we are convinced that we are living gallantly or free or happy but are just suppressing our true feelings. This is what Hell is, and breathing your last like this is to die in an empty, hopeless, meaningless state: the final form of Hell.

In this cognitive approach, after we die, we go back to the same state we are in before we are conceived, and the only thing giving our life meaning is the memory of our convictions in the minds of the next generation.

This is a take I have heard that I've found interesting, and true in its social commentary. However, I find it false in its view of the afterlife.

One reason is that because if the sun dies in five and a half billion years, as is predicted by scientists, and we die without space-travel or time-travel technology to have avoided it, life will have nobody to

remember and so have no meaning. If this is the case, God might as well have killed us off in the first place, then at least we could've avoided all the pain of this temporary sequence of sensations we call living. Also, even if we did come up with the technology to steer clear of a sun-blast and continue on, there'd still be no purpose to life as far as I'm concerned. Instead, we would continue in sin regardless of any technological progression. Artificial intelligence could not stop human sin without killing us off, and any technological or medical advancement making us immortal would either:

1) make us unfeeling enough to avoid sin, in which case it brings to question why we didn't stay human if we couldn't feel the same pleasures as we did

2) assuming we can still reproduce, immortalize sin on Earth, worsening the 3)

effect of sinful patterns through
overpopulation

4) assuming we can't reproduce in something like a synthetic body, immortalize sin but lose the weightiness and bitter-sweet sentiment of a temporary life and body

Essentially, we can't outsmart sinful desires, and for this reason I don't think God will allow mind transference into immortal robot bodies. I also know from previously established reasoning that God doesn't want people to die as part of his, in terms, nonrefundable investment into keeping His conscious clean, and therefore He will not let artificial intelligence outsmart people to the point of causing human extinction.

So, for the sake of keeping in line with God giving meaning to life, I think there is an extra-dimensional realm invisible to us outside of this, as well as a waiting place for divine judgment, although in most

general terms any place associated with an afterlife is either Heaven or Hell.

In this extra-dimensional view, the Bible talks about a new Heaven and new Earth being created in the end of times, after all are judged.¹ The Bible also describes a waiting room type of place called Sheol, the place of the dead, depicted like how it is before we are born, with no sensation or consciousness. This Old Testament Sheol has been translated as the Greek word Hades in the New Testament times, seemingly with the added effect of being perceivable post Jesus' resurrection, and, from Luke 16:19-31, it is inferable that it is made up of two spaces: a place of comfort for Christians and a separate place of torment for non-Christians, with both Christians and non-Christians awaiting final judgment.² After Jesus' death, however, it is said that Christians will skip the waiting place altogether and go straight to Heaven, as this is what Jesus seemed to be saying to the man who repented on the cross when He

said, "today, you will be with me in Paradise." I don't believe it is necessary to think this though, as to God (whom Jesus could've been speaking for here), one day is a thousand years and a thousand years is one day. So, it could just as easily be taken to mean that when the time is right, the convict will go directly to Hades, feel as if he's spent a few hours there, then- after facing the place of final judgment for what feels like up to another few hours- go to the warped time zone of Heaven.

In this, the place of final judgment itself will be before a glorious throne, and all alive and previously dead will either go to Heaven if their name is found in the Book of Life, or be tossed with the Devil the fallen angels, allied spirits, and non-Christians into the eternal lake of fire replacing Hades, separated from the new Paradise. This judgment marks the end of Revelations so, after this, who knows what will happen? Some speculate that all will eventually end up in Paradise until they learn their lesson in

torment (in theological interpretation, this is the universal reconciliation view, or the Christian universalism view), and others think that the final judgment is really that all not aligned with God's truth will simply die with no afterlife. I personally am inclined to believe the former view, because it doesn't matter when one becomes a Christian in this life, so what does it matter in the afterlife? This lake of fire is said to be eternal, but that doesn't mean the people in it have to be there eternally (this is also taking into account a universalist interpretation of Luke 16:26 and the etymology of the word, "eternal" itself used throughout English translations of scripture, which does not entail "forever" but simply a more symbolic concept of an "age" or a "lifetime"). Now, if one is worried about a person getting the same reward for less work in this, for one thing this logic does not apply to salvation according to Jesus Himself (See Mathew 20:1-16), and for another, works will also be rewarded separately to people who walked

the walk in life (This is the "bema" seat; see 2 Corinthians 5:10).³

Regardless of what one thinks about what Heaven or Hell really is though, it does not change that sin is a pain of free will that must be dealt with on Earth no matter what and no matter what pain there is, one must choose to be tormented it or find peace through it. However, there can only be a purpose to this choice if the mind does not die with the body, and with this purpose comes objective morality.

1 As for when the end of times will happen, I currently consider this a research topic for another time, but here I will say that based on my limited eschatological knowledge I lean toward the belief that it will not happen in this century, 21st AD century. Though there are theories that it will, which are based on Israel becoming a state in 1948, I argue against these simply off the feeling that God still is able to salvage enough lost souls in this time to justify keeping us around.

2 According to scripture, there is also Tartarus, the place of judgment for the fallen angels, as described in 2 Peter 2:4.

3 Even if souls are given a third chance to be redeemed in the afterlife, God would know the difference between pretending to be sorry just to get out of the punishment versus an actual change of heart. So, again, I say this is fair for all prior Christians.

Objective-Subjective

In this purposeful Existence, if pain must always be felt in sin, then by pain the philosophical concept of morality, that is, good and evil, can be most generally defined, and then objectively defined with Heaven and Hell involved.

In this, morality is objectively defined with evil being pain from opposing God which extends to the afterlife, and good being the overcoming of pain through God's guidance leading to its complete blotting out in the afterlife.

From this foundation, the world is transformable, and an objective purpose is made: to stay on the good side of God's moral spectrum.

It is by fulfilling this objective purpose that postmodernist confusion can be cleared up. However, not all people divided- both on a personal and social level- can be reunited, and even complete unification of everyone cannot remain if the Devil finds

that it is drawing them closer to God. In such a case, the Devil would play on the desire to feel special and meaningful as an individual, leading to the degradation of community in one's view. So, division will come and go until the day of judgment. In less words, to become united is to then become prideful, and to become prideful is to then become divided.

Divided-United

Going back to the days of Genesis, the Tower of Babel stood to exemplify the unification of pride. The Tower was built from when the Earth had one joined people, and each individual had agreed to contribute to the common goal of building the tower. In this commonality, it seemed they would have a glorious brotherhood that could never be divided. However, God could not let them see their pride eventually destroy them as they discovered they were still empty in their glory. Instead, I do believe that in His omniscience, He had to know that dividing the brotherhood was the most efficient way to show men that there was no purpose, no achievement to be had without Him, and that this created purpose would only lead to a messier fallout from the division of their insatiable hearts. God knows the optimal purpose in life, and it is not building a tower of pride. Instead, true purpose is marked by obedience to God rather than ambition of

man and honoring God's covenant rather than man's covetousness.

Now, this same reasoning of division, pride, and unification can be exemplified further by the concept of marriage in general. In scripture, for those who want a relationship, marriage preceded by abstinence is the only way. This way is the covenant between God, one man and one wife, the intent being to keep a couple physically and spiritually pure and reasonable, because all outside of it has the numbing effect akin to prostitution that erodes the body, heart and mind. In this, marriage is a unification of interests that only fights the interests of pride when God is included as the primary interest. If God is an afterthought before and through trials, the marriage will result in the giving in to pretentious pride and the associated prideful interests, such as unforgiveness between fighting and melancholy between misunderstandings. If one then leaves the relationship due to prideful interests like

these but not for reasons including adultery or a felony committed by the spouse, it cannot be said truthfully that God was of primary interest for both individuals. However, if one can, through the trials, look to God's presence, to pray for peace and to find time to- if only for a single minute in each of these turbulent days- read the Bible for application rather than obligation, then the cyclical, ordered process of unification, pride, and division cannot break the bond marriage as it would for the compromising Christian and the unsaved. This devotion is the practice of God's Presence exemplified, a passing through of the only loophole to this demonic circle of pride inevitably cycling its way to death, this circle that is sustained by the Devil's pride itself.

Blind-Sighted

It is without the Devil's circle of death that that the world is without unification to pride or division out of pride, and so no pride to be felt, as was temporarily the case in the beginning of human history in the Garden of Eden. ¹

It was the Garden of Eden where Adam roamed, blissfully ignorant and having no reason to be any other way. God saw that even in Adam's ignorance it was not good for him to be alone, and so Eve was created. ²

It was then sometime later and by some means (possibly from his allied fallen and by himself), Satan had come to know about the pair, and that they had the ability to speak and communicate with God as he could. ³ It was in these discoveries that he saw the opportunity to wreak havoc; that they could see themselves like he saw himself. He disguised himself as a serpent at some point, found a place to set a trap for

them,⁴ made his way past to what he would've recognized as lower life forms and came to a tree in the garden which contained the fruits of good and evil. Now, the way I think about this tree is that it was a regular tree with no supernatural power, but its power was that it represented a deal between God and man. Not eating from this tree was one half of the deal and not eating from the tree of everlasting life was the other half of the deal. So, Satan's trap was to play on people's naivety and impressionable character to convince them they were being cheated in the deal. It wouldn't have mattered which tree he could get Adam and Eve to eat from first in this scheme, but my guess is that he chose the tree of morality because it was made more accessible to man by some means.⁵ So, Satan may have slithered his way to the tree of morality or possibly had found his home there already when Adam and Eve were nearby. It was in the ensuing moments Satan carried out his plan. He played on their curiosity with an

authoritative pride and divisive intent, the temptation a forbidden apple and the tempter a forbidden snake. He successfully convinced them to eat that bad apple, and their eyes were opened to the natural pride that had previously stayed dormant in their mind.⁶

It was then that the temporary peace of the trance-like ignorance of man had been eaten-away and replaced with the sudden realization of pride circulating in the mind. Their natural nakedness then appeared like the apple in their eye and went to take cover, away from the serpent, but further away from God.

It was then that God had seen that the circle of death had been drawn and the circle of life erased, but He had known it was the only way: He had known it mattered not if He had prevented it, as Adam was no more unique than any other man that could've formed from the dust, no wiser to Satan's schemes than the next man up. It is because of this that man stays punished for

the original sin: man cannot stop sinning as long as Satan cannot stop sinning.⁷

1 The Devil can at any time choose to let go of his pride and realign with God's "circle of life" in antonymous terms, but he will never have reason to, just like all other blasphemers.

2 In view of Fate, why does God create Eve if He knew she would convince Adam to sin? Here I point to the logic of God preventing the greatest evil, again, if only for maintaining perfect logical and emotional balance. If God said it was not good for Adam to be alone, then He did this not just so Adam could have company, but He foreknew a worse outcome from him being alone. Who knows, maybe God saw Adam eating from both trees out of idleness and curiosity and immortalizing sin. In this, it was just as the Tower of Babel incident was God wanted togetherness but not that which leads to division.

3 This finding goes under the inference that Satan did not have God's foreknowledge, if only shown by his initial lapse in judgment and arrogance beyond reason. Satan may be the most genius deceiver, but the fact he is compelled to deceive alone makes him dumber than God. Not only this, but he would have some power zapped away from him in his fall, if only because he does not have God on his side. It seems intuitive to think that Satan lacked omnipresence before the fall and has continued to lack it after the fall but at least found coverage in numbers with his band of demons- starting out as the original fallen- on Earth. It also makes sense to think that Satan's original Heavenly immortality converted to Earthly

immortality, but this is nothing new, along with the possibility that he and his band of demons could reproduce in their fallen state, leading to the Nephilim living and then dying to become demons—the literal spawn of Satan. Also, his fellow fallen I imagine became powerful demons answering to him, with the same leeway to tempt people given by God for all demonic choosers in His grand calculations.

4 It is not important to say whether the disguise of the serpent was symbolic or literal, but I see no reason to think Satan couldn't have this shape-shifting capability, which is similar to how God appears in the form of Jesus, or how the Angel Gabriel appeared to Mary in the physical world.

5 This is keeping in mind God's omniscience and foreknowledge and considering what would happen if man got to the tree of everlasting life first.

6 In this, it seems logical that a talking snake would've been a shock enough for the pair to put them on guard, as I would imagine that all other animals in the Garden made sounds like one is accustomed to animals making. It seems that maybe upon hearing words of their own language from an animal they would get the hint that this was no ordinary animal, but I am also not too surprised as, again, they would have the minds of innocent little children at this point.

7 It is in this that I also argue that man would not have sinned if not for Satan tempting them, and in this Satan will always be different from man: He needs no tempter other than himself to sin. It is in this Satan and man are like apples and oranges, one's sin cannot be compared to the other.

Kill-Steal-Destroy

Now, the stubbornness of the Devil to resist God and remain the accuser and deceiver of men does explain the continuous, repeated cycle of sin throughout time and from generation to generation, but it does bring to question why God doesn't just stop him or banish him to his eternal lake of fire now.

In handling this doubt, one must reconsider what God deems fair to allow for choosers. If Satan cannot be allowed to tempt, then God can also not allow man to be tempted, but this cannot happen as God cannot destroy their minds with free will. It has been established that God spares himself both the uneasiness of killing these choosers repeatedly for all time¹ and the tormenting effect of not participating in life on Earth at all, so instead God acts reactively while foreknowing how to do the greatest amount of good in every moment until the end of time. By this reasoning, the response to why

Satan still tempts on Earth is that the greatest amount of good, measured in souls saved, cannot be seen through if Satan is banished from doing so now. This lines up with the end times being described as a great falling away with blasphemers taking joy in their Godless lives. This is because the threshold of potential salvation that allows Satan's reign to continue cannot be met if the remainder of all evil is attractive enough to forcibly turn everyone undecided into blasphemers.

This point of saving people is also emphasized if, in the time after final judgment, people can move to Heaven at any point in their otherwise endless torment by having a change of heart. This possibility emphasizes one of God's Biblically implied goals: to make all blasphemers less certain about their denial of Him, even if they can't be saved in this life because then they at least have better chances to escape eternal torment in the afterlife.

Now, as for if Satan could have a change of heart in this last possibility, I say no, although I do so hesitantly, because I think Satan's pride could only barely edge out the unbearable torment.

1 In this, I also argue that if Satan and all other fallen angels had been wiped from Existence before their falls, then other angels materializing into existence later would have.

Guilty-Innocent

So, with Satan's pride inseparable, we must continue living in an unreconciled world, regardless of whether we like it or not. We must live in our state of sinfulness, and in reconciliation of all sinfulness, we must accept that to fight it, to overcome it, is a part of God's grand design.

It is in this state that the Heavenly beings, in their Heaven, and people, on our Earth, survive; it is in this state that we try to live apart from Him- to choose against Him- though He could never choose at all; and it is in this state that any blame- any fault assigned for the evils of the world- goes to Satan, his demons and man only.

First

In The Beginning, God Said, "Let
There Be Light," And There Was Light, And
God Saw That It Was Good.

Afterword: Future

This book is meant to stand alone but also serves as an intro to other works and a conglomerate project which integrates them. See davidpaskell.github.io/fatetheory/ for updates.

