

# Adding reason to faith

[Home](#) [Subscribe](#)

[Main Page](#)

« [Previous 5 days](#) | [Next 5 days](#) »

Sunday, August 7

## Human Issues - Social: Welfare - Human Adversity

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on August 7, 2005 01:16AM (EDT)

### Welfare - Human Adversity

#### Question

**If the individual has no significant purpose for existence then just why do we exist?**

#### Introduction

*... Overcoming adversity is one of our great desires and one of our great sources of pride.... Nothing is to be earned, 'welfare esteem' is to be dispensed to ...People are to be mixed and matched by race and sex and whatever else the anointed want to take into account to present whatever kind of picture... This is a vision of human beings as livestock fed by the government and herded and tended by the anointed. ... The welfare state is not really about welfare on the masses. It is about the egos of the elites.... (Sowell, Thomas – senior fellow at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, Welfare state treats humans like livestock, April 2003, Detroit News Column.)*

#### Analysis

**The model of reality put forward by symbiotic panentheism completely agrees with the concept that humans are more than**

### Links

[Author's Current Work](#)

[Global Competition](#)

### Main Page

-  [Symbiotic Panentheism](#)
-  [Copyright](#)
-  [Response to:](#)
-  [Definitions](#)
-  [Good and evil](#)
-  [Graphics](#)
-  [Historical Wisdom](#)
-  [Human Issues](#)
-  [Q & A](#)
-  [Reflections](#)
-  [Simply Put](#)
-  [Understanding Reality](#)

### This Month

August 2005

Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
	<a href="#">1</a>	<a href="#">2</a>	<a href="#">3</a>	<a href="#">4</a>	<a href="#">5</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">7</a>	<a href="#">8</a>	<a href="#">9</a>	<a href="#">10</a>	<a href="#">11</a>	<a href="#">12</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">14</a>	<a href="#">15</a>	<a href="#">16</a>	<a href="#">17</a>	<a href="#">18</a>	<a href="#">19</a>	<a href="#">20</a>
<a href="#">21</a>	<a href="#">22</a>	<a href="#">23</a>	<a href="#">24</a>	<a href="#">25</a>	<a href="#">26</a>	<a href="#">27</a>
<a href="#">28</a>	<a href="#">29</a>	<a href="#">30</a>	<a href="#">31</a>			

### Month Archive

[September 2005](#)

[August 2005](#)

**cattle and should be treated as significant entities within reality. (Shepard, Daniel J, The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception, Vol. II, Tractate 12: Symbiotic Panentheism, Three ultimate paradoxes Global Academic Press, New York 2002.) Symbiotic panentheism rationalizes how it is that humans have significance to the overriding cosmic existence within which the physical universe itself is a part, and thus elevates each individual to a level above cattle.**

**The welfare state is one, which clearly degrades the individual rather than elevates the individual.**

**Concepts such as basic food, basic shelter, basic health care, and basic social protections against violence is not welfare but rather simply a recognition of the significance to the individual and acknowledgement of their purpose in reality as reinforced by Thomas Jefferson:**

**‘We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. To secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, ...’ (Jefferson, Thomas, Declaration of Independence.)**

**Life depends upon food, shelter, and medical treatment. The quality and quantity of the food, shelter, and medical treatment is defined by the word ‘basic’. The concept ‘basic’ acknowledges the pragmatic lesson of life, namely: Death is an absolute.**

**Society does not ‘owe’ any individual prime rib for dinner, a kidney transplant, air conditioning, trash pick-up, toys, beer, ...**

### **Remarks**

**Society does, on the other hand, ‘owe’ the individual the ‘basics’ and the term ‘basics’ is in turn defined by the unique society within which the individuals find themselves to exist.**

[July 2005](#)

[June 2005](#)

[May 2005](#)

## **Year Archive**

[2005](#)

## **Search**

Whatever society defines the term 'basic' to be, one thing basic cannot be is that which suppresses the individual sense of significance for their existence for all individuals have a reason for existing.

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

---

*Saturday, August 6*

## Human Issues - Religion: Singularity of God - Judaism

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on August 6, 2005 12:04AM (EDT)

### Singularity of God – Judaism

#### Question

If the furthest reaches of reality are composed of matter, energy, space, and time how is it ever possible for altruism to be of greater significance than materialism?

#### Introduction

*... the Lord is one. (Judah Halevi, [Kuzari](#), Part II)*

#### Analysis

**The rationality for such a concept lies within the 'symbiotic panentheistic' model wherein the physical universe composed of matter, energy, space, and time are contained 'within' the intangible, contained 'within a region lacking the universal fabric of matter, energy, space, and time. In short the physical universe is composed of the tangible whereas the whole is not composed of matter, energy space, and time, not composed of the tangible but rather is composed of the intangible within which the physical universe lies.**

**Although the physical universe, the tangible, is 'within' the whole, found 'within' the whole, found 'within' God'/ found within Oneness, God nevertheless is 'greater' in scope than the tangible and as such God, the intangible, cannot accurately be represented by tangible substances. The creation of a tangible form of God which would act as a representation of God would in essence lead to a misunderstanding as to God's existence of form and lead thinkers, theists – philosophers – academics – etc., away from understanding the whole of reality. This misunderstanding of the whole of reality would in turn lead to the emergence of the misunderstanding regarding the individual's function within the whole of reality.**

### **Remarks**

**Entities of knowing perceiving the physical to be the ultimate of existence would lead to an understanding that physical needs and physical desires are the ultimate goal of the individual and thus the perception that physical hedonism is the ultimate goal of existence. The emergence of physical hedonism would**

unquestionable be of great concern to an entity/God which depended upon devine sparks for the circumvention of 'eternal recurrence' as demonstrated by the model symbiotic panentheism. (Shepard, Daniel J, The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception, Vol. I, Tractate 6: The Error of Kant, Boredom and knowledge, Global Academic Publishing, Binghamton University SUNY, Binghamton, New York.)

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

---

*Friday, August 5*

## **Dialogue with a Neo-Buddhist: Understanding - Part II**

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on August 5, 2005 01:01AM (EDT)

**Dialogue: A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist**

**Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.**

**Understanding - Part II**

**[050717 cg] Let's simplify. I agree:**

- 1. G-d exists.**
- 2. G-d is that which does not depend on us or anything.**

**If you agree, I'm ready for your issues.**

**[050726 djs] As I stated 050716: 'I have some issues regarding the above but I will await your initiative.' So now I will say it: I have an issue with both the first and second statements.**

**Regarding: 'G-d exists.'** Although I personally agree with the first statement, I would suggest the statement cannot stand alone if it is to be anything other than a statement of personal belief, a personal religion.

**[Personal thoughts: Even Euclid began his establishment of Geometry with understanding that the very first statement of Geometry is based upon a 'common agreement', based upon a consensus if you will, is in fact a consensually agreed upon definition, namely: Definition 1: 'A point is that which has no part.'**

**It is from a willingness 'to agree' that mathematicians were then able to evolve an interesting and phenomenally useful train of thought which we call 'plane geometry'.**

**It is from the first statement of definition that Euclid's 13 books, Archimedes' 13 most notorious works of geometry, and Apollonius' three books addressing issues of conics all evolved. If mathematicians had not been willing to agree upon a first statement, no geometry would have evolved.**

**Having made the above observation, it would appear logical that to begin as Euclid began could potentially produce a broader understanding of reality. As such it would appear we should begin with a definition of 'G-d' upon which we can both agree.**

**Regarding: 'G-d is that which does not depend on us or anything.'** Why is it that humans make the assumption that God does not depend upon us or anything?

**The question is simply a rhetorical statement of wonderment.**

**My thinking leads me to the conclusion that we not forget the statement but rather that we address the statement after we 'define' 'G-d'.**

**Verbiage, verbiage, verbiage, I apologize for the verbiage.**

**Let me get back on track.]**

**Since this site is labeled as, Adding reason to faith', I have no choice but to ask:**

- 1. Regarding your statement, 'G-d exists.': What possible reason could you have for making such a statement?**
- 2. Regarding your statement, 'G-d exists.': What do you mean by 'G-d'? Define 'G-d'.**

**[050726 cg] Oh!**

**1. How can you ask this question and what point were you trying to make by asking it? The statement, "G-d exists," comes in the context of our dialogue. You wrote, "[050711 djs] What I am suggesting is that there are truths, absolute truths, universal truths which go beyond what it is we personally believe, which exist 'before' we enter and 'after' we depart this existence we call 'the physical'. Examples of such 'truths' which exist regardless of state of mind regarding their very existence: The Whole/G-d exists. The individual exists. The physical universe exists. These truths remain even 'if we do not'." (emphasis added) To which I responded, "[050712 cg] Perhaps, we can agree that there is the truth, 'G-d exists', that does not depend on us or any thing." You then parsed my statement and asked if I agreed.**

**2. How can you ask this question and what point were you trying to make by asking it? The statement, "G-d is that which does not depend on us or any thing," is a definition of G-d. It is not the only possible definition and it may not be one with which you agree, but it is a definition. We have also discussed other definitions such as "The Whole of Reality" (your term) which is all inclusive and would logically mean that G-d is not dependent on another thing for there is no thing that is not within G-d.**

**[050803 djs] Regarding: 1. How can you ask this question (Regarding your statement, 'G-d exists.': What possible reason could you have for making such a statement?) and what point**

**were you trying to make by asking it?, in light of the fact that I had previously clearly and emphatically stated: 'The Whole/G-d exists.'**

**You see, metaphysically speaking, it is not enough to simply state what one believes, nor it is enough for you and I to concur. The statement, to be considered a 'universal truth', must be supportable by all human perceptual tools.**

**If two billion Christians, one billion Muslims, and two and a half billion other theistically religious individuals concur, the statement is, even then, simply a 'religious' belief and not a metaphysical principle.**

**To become a metaphysical principle, a metaphysical truth, a statement must be supportable by all three human perceptual tools, namely: scientific measurement/observation and analysis, religious beliefs/doctrine and wisdom, and philosophical speculation/rational and reasonable dialectics.**

**Symbiotic panentheism is a metaphysical model of reality which emerges from the examination of what it is science, religion, and philosophy support in one form or another, be it deductive or inductive, direct or implied, rational or reasonable human analysis. Symbiotic panentheism clearly demonstrates that 'The Whole/G-d exists' is a fundamental, one of the three, first truths.**

**What I have just stated above not only supports my personal 'belief' in G-d but immerses my personal 'belief' 'within' a form of 'universal truth' which in turn strengthens my 'belief'.**

**Now I have given you my 'reasons' for 'believing' G-d exists. My belief is not only a 'belief' it is based upon scientific, philosophical, and religious analysis and thus what I 'believe' is more than just a 'personal belief'. So again I will ask:**

- 1. Regarding your statement, 'G-d exists.': What possible reason could you have for making such a statement?**

**Regarding my second question: 2. Regarding your statement, 'G-d exists.': What do you mean by 'G-d'? Define 'G-d'.**

**I would state simply, that G-d is the Whole. You state: **The statement, "G-d is that which does not depend on us or any thing," is a definition of G-d.** But you see that is your definition of G-d, not mine, not my neighbor's, not Universism's, not the Universal Universalists, not a scientific definition, not a philosophical definition, not a universal religious definition, rather it is your personal definition.**

**I would suggest to you that G-d is dependent upon us just as we are dependent upon G-d. I would suggest to you that G-d would not be G-d if you simply 'ceased to be' once you had emerged as you. I would suggest to you that G-d is affected by what is 'within' G-d and since you are 'within' G-d, G-d is affected by you and if G-d is affected by you than G-d is what G-d is because you have contributed to what G-d is.**

**But all this is irrelevant. You see, wwhat 'I would suggest to you' is not what this discussion is about, rather this discussion is about the 'truth' of G-d as opposed to what 'I believe'.**

**Having inundated you with all this verbiage let me attempt to state the initial definition of Reality:**

- 1. The whole is that which has no bounds.**

(Personal thought regarding 'G-d exists.'

To state 'G-d exists' carries with it too much baggage for science and philosophy to accept as a starting point, therefore, to include philosophy and science one needs to neutralize the term and begin with a term science and philosophy find acceptable. I would suggest the neutral term be 'the whole'. Religiously you and I would most likely agree 'the whole' is G-d.

Rational:

Science suggests the universe is limited, is expanding, and as such it is logical to suggest there is a 'greater' reality than the physical universe within with the physical universe lies or is expanding 'within', namely: G-d. As such we can define G-d as The Whole, the summation of the physical universe and what it is the physical universe expands 'within'.

Religion, for the most part, suggests there is an entity which is omnipresent, omniscient, and omnipotent. The three forms of 'omni' imply a Whole and as such imply G-d is The Whole.

Philosophy is filled with dialectics expounding upon the concept of 'first cause', expounding upon the concept of 'Being' versus 'being', expounding upon the concept of the existence of the intangible and as such embraces the set theory concept of a 'universal set', embraces the concept of The Whole.

(Russell's paradox regarding elements that are not members of sets is fully addressed by the concept of 'Separation through Inclusion' found within The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception, Tractate 9, at [www.panentheism.com](http://www.panentheism.com))

Lastly, Euclid began his examination of reality from a micro-observational point of view, namely, 'A point is that which has no parts', or in essence began the examination of reality from the smallest essence of reality and then worked outward.

To begin an examination of reality from the statement, 'The Whole is that which has no bounds', is to begin the examination of reality from a macro-observational point of view or in essence begins the examination of The Whole from the largest essence of reality and then works inward.)

**As for issue number two which you bring up, I suggest we work towards that concept once we have initiated definition**

one.

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

---

*Thursday, August 4*

## Dialogue with a Neo-Buddhist: Why build a model of reality: Part 1b

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on August 4, 2005 12:59AM (EDT)

### Dialogue: A Neo-Buddhist and a Symbiotic Panentheist

**Clyde G. is a respected thinker and Neo-Buddhist who has been acknowledged for his ability to ask questions going to the heart of issues regarding metaphysical models of reality.**

#### Why build a model of Reality: Part 1b

**[050722 cg] I understand that you believe consciousness is "the ultimate form of reality". If you would understand that your body is the manifestation of your consciousness, we would be in agreement. If you also understood that your consciousness is the function of your body, we would be in broader agreement. Finally, if you understood that the mental and physical are two aspects of Reality, that neither is preeminent, that they are co-dependent and co-extensive, we would be in complete agreement.**

**[050801 djs] Hmmmm, where should I begin. I guess it is best to begin by stating: 'The devil is in the details.'**

**Regarding: If you would understand that your body is the manifestation of your consciousness, we would be in agreement. But I do not agree. I 'believe', I 'see', I 'rationalize', I understand the existence of the body. I 'believe', I have 'seen', I find it totally reasonable, I understand that once my 'consciousness' leaves my body, my body remains and is observable by others, decays and recycles based upon the**

laws of nature and unaffected by any conscious thoughts I may have regarding my prior 'physical container'. Not only does this hold true for myself but almost everyone understands this concept.

In addition, I do not understand how it is you do not concur unless you 'believe' consciousness is nothing other than the only form existence.

Regarding: **If you also understood that your consciousness is the function of your body, we would be in broader agreement.** But I do not agree. Symbiotic panentheism clearly demonstrates that consciousness exists independent of the physical while simultaneously using the physical body as its means of experiencing the physical universe. The result of such a model is the understanding that consciousness is not the function of the body but rather consciousness uses the body as but one of many possible tools to expand its very knowing.

Again I say: I do understand how it is you would not concur with the above unless you perceive reality as simply a form of physical existence.

Regarding: **Finally, if you understood that the mental and physical are two aspects of Reality, ...** I absolutely do agree that consciousness and the physical are two aspects of Reality.

But let me be a little more specific, I view the mental (the brain) and the physical as one and 'one's awareness of one's awareness'/self-awareness/higher order consciousness/'the soul' as the second aspect of Reality.

Regarding: **... that neither [the physical and the mental] is preeminent, that they are co-dependent and co-extensive, we would be in complete agreement.** To suggest, **the mental and physical are two aspects of Reality,** is to suggest the two are distinct. If you are suggesting the two are distinct in nature then I agree.

**The model of Reality demonstrated by symbiotic panentheism**

is dualistic in nature and as such sp views the brain as simply a physical organ. When sp speaks of the dualistic nature of the individual it is referring to the physical and higher order consciousness as such sp would modify your statements: ... **that neither [the physical and the mental] is preeminent, that they are co-dependent and co-extensive, we would be in complete agreement, into being: ... that neither [the physical and consciousness] is preeminent, that they are co-dependent and co-extensive, we would be in complete agreement.** Having said this I can now say: I disagree yet agree. But how is it I can take both positions?

I agree in that sp would demonstrate the physical is a tool by which a 'virgin spirit' fills itself with experiencing of the physical. As such, the physical is critical to the 'virgin spirits' acquiring experiencing and knowing of concepts such as 'cause and effect', 'time', 'mortality', events physical in nature, the unique ability of the physical to 'affect' the intangible (love, jealousy, compassion, ...), ... In this sense we are 'dependent' upon the physical. Simultaneously, sp demonstrates that the physical is temporary, dependent upon time, while consciousness is eternal, not dependent upon time. As such consciousness goes on even after the collapse of the Big Bang, even after the universe dissipates, even after the physical 'burns' itself out.

In short, consciousness is preeminent in respect to the physical.

**Personal thought: When one understands the above and combines this understanding with the understanding that the physical emerges from nothingness, the understanding that the physical is simply an innate characteristic of nothingness, is simply a transformation of nothingness into one of its many possible alternate appearances, then one can begin to understand:**

**The statement, 'Nothing is lost', is a pun.**

- a. **Nothing is lost – Nothing literally is lost for it**

**is the only existence which arises and then simply ceases to be.**

**b. Nothing is lost – as in ‘nothing’ is the only form of existence which, once formed, is capable of ‘ceasing to be’ without transforming the truth of the statement, ‘Nothing is lost’, into a falsehood. Thus if the physical emerges from ‘nothingness’ then if the physical ‘ceases to be’, the statement ‘Nothing is lost’ remains a ‘truth’, for two reasons:**

**1. If the physical universe is simple a form of nothingness, then if the universe is lost, nothing is lost since the universe reduces to ‘nothingness’ itself.**

**2. If the physical universe is experienced by the intangible and as such becomes one with each unique entity of knowing and if the intangible entity of knowing is eternal then when the physical universe dissipates into its original form of ‘nothingness’ the knowing of time, space, experiencing within a ‘cause and effect’ reality remain eternally as elements of each entity of knowing and thus elements of The Whole’s knowing. Therefore it can be accurately said the physical is not lost when in fact the physical collapses in upon itself.**

**In short if the physical emerges from nothingness, the physical is a form of nothingness, and as such, if the physical ‘ceases to be’, ‘Nothing is lost’.**

[deleted materials ... ]

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

---

*Wednesday, August 3*

## Human Issues - Philosophy: Singularity of the Whole - The universal set

by [Daniel J. Shepard](#) on August 3, 2005 12:15AM (EDT)

### Singularity of the whole – The universal set

#### Question

**If there is a form of existence that lacks characteristics other than the tangible, the intangible, and/or ‘nothingness’, then just what distinctiveness characterizes such an existence?**

#### Introduction

*Universal: 1. of the universe: present or occurring everywhere 2. of, for, or including all or the whole: not limited, 3. entire: whole* (Webster’s New World Dictionary, Second Concise Edition, Simon and Schuster, 1982)

#### Analysis

**Religions take the position: God is not composed of parts. If such is the case than if God is not composed of parts what is the mathematical set described by the set whose elements are God and souls?**

**The individual lies ‘within’ the universe. The study of what lies ‘outside’ the universes, the study of what the universe lies ‘within’ (and thus what the individual ultimately lies ‘within’) is philosophically: metaphysics. The study of what God lies within is, in fact, a specialty field of metaphysics.**

**With the advent of the metaphysical system ‘symbiotic panentheism’ we can now understand the limits of cosmology, understand the limits of science. Cosmology is the study of the physical universe, the individual’s physical/tangible existence (the body and mind), and the relationship of the body and**

mind to 'nothingness'.

With the advent of the metaphysical system 'symbiotic panentheism' we can now understand the limits of ontology, understand the limits of religion. Ontology is the study of God, the individual's abstractual/intangible existence (the soul), and the relationship God and the soul to 'nothingness'.

With the advent of the metaphysical system 'symbiotic panentheism' we can now understand the limits of metaphysics, understand the limits of philosophy. Metaphysics is the study of God, the universe, the individual's physical/tangible existence, the individual's abstractual/intangible existence (the soul), and 'nothingness'.

With the advent of the metaphysical system of 'symbiotic panentheism' we can now understand three distinct subject areas of metaphysics:

1. Practical metaphysics – the study of metaphysics in terms of epistemology
2. Metaphysical Engineering – the application of metaphysics to social engineering
3. Theoretical Metaphysics – the study of what God, the universe, and the individual lie within.

Theoretical metaphysics is examined in The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception, Tractate 17: The Beginning.

In terms of the question: If God is not composed of parts then what is the mathematical set described by the set whose elements are God and souls? The essence of the question is: What is it that God lies 'within'? Since symbiotic panentheism accounts for the interrelationship of the tangible, the intangible, and 'nothingness' the answer to the question is: We do not know what God 'lies' 'within' for we as a specie have no comprehension of any existence comprised of 'something' other than the tangible, the intangible, and/or 'nothingness'.

## Remarks

**In short, since we as a specie have never conceived of any ‘thing’ other than the tangible, the intangible, and ‘nothingness’ we had not previously evolved to the point of discussing such a concept until the advent of ‘symbiotic panentheism’ and Tractate 17 (see [www.panentheism.com](http://www.panentheism.com), library, The War and Peace of a New Metaphysical Perception, Volume III)**

[Leave Comment](#) | [Permanent Link](#) | [Cosmos](#)

---