

Questions and Answers

Is there perhaps a summary of your views?

It is found in the New Testament. Just read it.

A practical message that could apply to today's world, may be this: A solution is vital, but it may not be the answer. Peace on earth may be the most ideal goal possible, but it is not a long term solution for life here. The rest you can find in your soul or in the Bible.

How about a summary of the views here regarding women.

If the world continues down a path of promoting a lopsided reverse inequality of female fascism and female use and abuse and lack of respect of/for males, to replace a prior supposedly male-dominated world, at one point the particularly sane males will wake up and take notice of what has occurred, and there will be a lot of estrogen-rich blood flowing down the streets of the world.

If you care about women, then the world's current insane extremist feminist path is not the one you want.

Stated differently: Today's version of so-called "gender equality", is wholly unrelated to the definition of that term. Put a male and female lion in an enclosed area, and a form of equality will exist- but it is natural equality. What exists today is something fundamentally faulty. Women are given a license to take the helm as though they are males, with males demanded to smile in blind submission to the new artificial forced standard, while the females themselves are fully conscious of gender, and view it as a form of victory over males. That is purely warped. It is unrelated to any notion of equality.

Someone along the way may have had good intentions by promoting such faulty versions of equality. But as they say, "the road to hell is paved with good intentions".

Why are you so strongly against women? Where is this "lopsided reverse inequality" you speak of? Today's world is wonderful!

I'm not necessarily against women per se. But there is a significant problem in the world today in the realm of gender (along with a host of other things).

To illustrate the point, three of my grandparents were born in the USA, and one immigrated to this country as a young man. The latter one, after arriving, put himself through university, became a patent attorney, then a judge. The man could read, write, and speak fluently about 10 languages, and at one point built a fully functional yacht in his backyard with his own hands, which would be used at sea on occasion. He also served in the U.S. Navy.

In my estimation, I inherited his genes on the side of intelligence and talent, but unlike him, I can barely read and write English properly, and thus far have not done remotely what he did. My current ability is limited to ranting, if that. Why? Because the world I was born into was not the world he was born into. In the world I entered, if a boy does anything except to finish his broccoli, he is being a bad boy.

Why not just leave America and give up on it? Europe may be a better focus.

Europe may look down on the USA, and there certainly are things they do better, such as regulating standards, mandating a focus on privacy, production of top quality goods, and the like. But it cannot be denied that the "mediocre" America has been the source of most major pillars of modern society. From electricity (Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Edison) and the telephone (Alexander Graham Bell), to airplanes (Wright brothers) and motor vehicles (Henry Ford), to conventional and quantum physics (Einstein and others), to democracy (U.S. Constitution), to the internet and iPhone and Tesla cars. Etc.

They have also been a vital force for preserving relevance of religion in human life. Many would consider that to be more like an illness, but I feel it to be very important for the survival and progress of humankind.

I am not of the opinion that America is a type of god, and that it needs to remain forever the sole world superpower. But neither can I simply dismiss it as something irrelevant.

Wouldn't devotion to a God would be senseless, and even seem to be narcissistic of whatever God for Him to demand such a thing?

It could be important to realize that He *created* you and everything here in the first place. Obviously He desired to create something, not to be some selfish being sitting up there. Devotion to Him isn't about a selfish wish of His, but is an expression of the true nature that already exists. All He is doing is trying to teach His creation that He loves, about things beyond a simple physical animal existence.

The lessons He teaches may not always seem clear, because they are not grade-school math. They may seem painful at times as well, because they are not minor surgery. These things can be better understood if you realize that He created humans to be in His image. You are being formed into the image of God.

Why cause trouble? Society is mostly fine.

If you don't like all these discussions, I think unfortunately you will face a lot of homemade nooses and hangings taking place at random, as soon as some event disrupts civil order and social structures.

It is advisable to face and address these issues while there exists a somewhat coherent society, rather than to face the alternative.

Finding solutions now may seem uncomfortable, but if you're hanging from a noose you may wish the effort was invested at a prior point.

Society has invested too heavily in very faulty solutions to this life. If better and more relevant solutions aren't found, a change to the most primitive of human conditions will be the obvious natural result. Would you like to put your neurons to work, or would you prefer facing a bunch of angry cavemen with clubs? The cavemen won't go for a Liberal agenda, but they will gladly embrace a true solution that makes sense.

Noose or Truth. Take your pick.

Why push Christianity on people? You are infringing on long-held traditions and cultures. It is a violation of their dignity and human rights.

I think it is important to realize, that Christianity is not about trying to convert other people to a belief system. Rather, it claims to represent a Truth that is and was the source of all humans and of all life on earth. It is therefore claiming to be more of a reminder, or a help to "backsliding" populations that have left the True God a very long time ago.

Such an explanation can obviously sound like the ultimate of arrogance. Unless the individual actually does believe what they are asserting.

Why try to reform the Christian Church, rather than just promote Islam?

I believe that the religion of Islam itself does not require others to convert to its religion in order to be right with God. What it demands is a proper worship and walk with God, regardless of what religion one is affiliated with.

Such a view is backed by the Qur'an, and I think that an honest Muslim will acknowledge this fact.

Why so much mention of Adolf Hitler, Nazism, White Supremacy, etc.?

Because unfortunately, many factions in today's society are attempting to resurrect all of those. And a cancer is best dealt with in a direct manner, before it blossoms into something fatal. Although, with a cancer, often the best approach is preventative measures, which may involve improvement to diet and limit of exposure to certain toxins, etc. And likewise in this case, the solution is probably to address core causes to the growth of such movements, and attempt at developing healthier environments where such ideas would seem irrelevant. Which is one of the reasons that I find topics like correct versions of masculinity, racial preservation, true religion, and the like, to be

vitality important. Those topics are not merely "distractions", but are more like cures and medicine, or like a healthy diet.

I guess such things can sometimes be like a stupid but catchy tune that pops into your head at times, although you dislike it. Logic and morality have proved them to be non-starters. But when society faces problems and tensions, such erroneous quick fix ideas can come back, regardless of how nonsensical they may be.

Practically speaking, I suppose such things are like the Devil: they may be a dead-end and have no substance or ultimate sense to them, but they will hang around in one form or another until the very Last Day.

Why do you try to connect masculinity with religion?

Because I think the only hope for true masculinity to survive, thrive, and take its rightful place, or at least to demand a truly equal position in life, is found in religion only. All other attempts to prop up true masculinity have failed, and will fail. They may temporarily succeed like streaks of lightning, but lightning comes and goes within a matter of seconds.

What's your gripe with the modern fields of Philosophy and Science?

The modern field of Philosophy has apparently discovered enough to cause potential for a serious wrench to be placed in the gears, but they haven't discovered enough to make a better machine.

And the modern field of Science oddly seems to confuse apples and oranges, not realizing that by its very nature- probing the physical universe- it cannot provide sense to this life.

The sum total is that society is taught a giant lie in the name of structures that have significant power and influence on daily human life. The lie is that such structures can provide sense and meaning to life, when by their very nature or in their current form they cannot do so. In my view, that is something very tragic.

If the fields of science and philosophy and the like were under the Church, as you have suggested should be the case, wouldn't that both stifle progress and also give the Church way too much power?

My view is coming from the opposite direction. A person knows they need to go to work, to earn money to pay for their food and shelter. They venture out to an unpredictable and dangerous world, because that is what must be done.

I think that the split of those fields from the Church, has produced very bad results for society. I don't think creativity or innovation would at all suffer from returning those to

their former positions. And if there were to exist a central single Church, I think by this point in history, religious people would be unlikely to abuse their positions regarding such things. Too much of the inner nature of humanity is already in the spotlight, and an average person would be very hesitant to take advantage of a position of authority over those fields for exploitative purposes.

Why not leave those fields as is? Because those claiming to represent those fields are harming society in the most significant and detrimental ways possible. They are like zombie minions of the Devil, who is enjoying himself immensely at how they are dragging society to hell. They have erroneously convinced most of humanity that science either has all the answers to life already, or will have the answers. And none of those are remotely true. If you take off the training wheels of a bike before the person can ride properly, that will probably have disastrous consequences. People are led to believe that they can live a nihilistic life of chaos, and that the god of science has their back. But that is a terrible error, and will lead to a very bad place. Etc.

(In my view, I think it also happens to be, that those fields would not exist if not for the Church. Humans traditionally did not believe in an objective reality in the style that science today takes for granted as its driving force for discovery and innovation. They had a large array of beliefs, but the idea of focusing on this universe in a manner that inspects it as a real and independent entity, was not on their radar. And oddly, the fields that the Church created, have become its greatest nemesis.)

If religion is true, then what is the primary cause for its decline in human society?

Let's try to articulate and define one major error that is prevalent in modern society.

It is entirely invalid to use doubts or a torrent of questions, as an entity on their own, as "proof" for the validity of questioning the existence of a God or questioning the authenticity of religion.

If you have specific questions, those should possibly be discussed or evaluated. But a natural law is that volume can never decide something on its own. A levee is built to regulate it, and maybe channels can be designed to allow relevant distribution.

In plain language: You have questions about life or religious type things? Address each one. It is faulty math to declare that a vague collection of such questions add up to form a legitimate conclusion merely on its own.

So you are urging religious people to accept queer movements?

My view on the topic may be as follows.

Regarding rebuking sin: First actually care about the sinner. And you know what? Leave it at that. Try to teach them about Christ, God's love, biblical Truths, etc. Because if you yourself are truly religious in an authentic style, then if you truly care about the other

person, eventually the desired goal will come about one way or another. If the goal truly has a basis.

When the Bible urges rebuke of sin, it is usually referring to helping a fellow Christian to correct a clearly erroneous behavior, as a sort of favor to the other.

I don't support Gay Pride movements. I also don't support those who oppose Gay Pride movements. I think the focus in society needs to shift to something more of a religious type nature.

Sometimes, the only solution is to look elsewhere, and I think that is the case with this topic. I disagree with both sides. Queer identities and sexual relationships are a dead-end. But so are so-called "straight" gender identities and sexual relationships. In a way, all people need to become monks and nuns, even if married or in romantic relationships. That, in my opinion, is the closest to a real solution on the topic.

It may be true that a Christian will go to Heaven, and an unbeliever may go to Hell. But it is important to realize, that for you to be a real Christian you must truly care, in your heart, about the one that is going to Hell. If you do not care about them, then you are not a Christian, and you will end up in the same place that they are going.

I am just trying to accurately define what a Christian is. This point is very clear from the words of Jesus and others in the New Testament.

That said, there simultaneously needs to be a contrary view included as well. Namely, that God's Will and His plan is not within the grasp of an individual human being. And that therefore, if someone cannot be "saved", then that is in God's hands, not your own. The sense to such things is not for the Christian to understand. The duty of the Christian is merely to know that this concept exists, and that it is true, and to commit to it as God's Will.

Why the focus on Christianity? What is so unique about it?

I think the other two major monotheistic religions of the world are found within a correct version of Christianity. Therefore, it can be an ideal representative of those. I would tend to believe that monotheism is the only path forward for human life. And therefore, my focus is on Christianity.

On a lighter note, seriously- who is like Christians? A real Christian (who follows Jesus's teaching of "love your enemies") is someone who a person may talk about in this way: "With enemies like this, who needs friends?".

I still don't get why you insist on Christianity. It overcomplicates things. Just be a good person, and enjoy life. Doesn't that seem better?

Well, if life is about enjoyment, then why work, why travel, why put effort into anything, why eat, etc.? All those things don't contradict enjoyment of life (- ideally), but are vital to allow the enjoyment that is desired.

I would say that Christianity is similar. The basic idea is love of God and love of another person. But quite a lot may be helpful towards achieving such things in an ideal manner. For example, if God puts a person into what seems like a horrible situation, it may be helpful to gain some idea on why He puts people into such predicaments sometimes. The Bible, and Christian teachers throughout history, can help to explain such things. And maybe you will find methods of living life where a form of inner joy can always be present, regardless of circumstance.

(An objection may say that such ideas are all coping mechanisms or self-deception. But if you have already concluded that a God exists, and that the Bible is true, then such an interpretation would not make sense. Back to the example mentioned above- would it make sense to claim that the person going to work, traveling, eating, etc., is doing things that are self-deception? Probably not. Because it has already been concluded what the nature of those things is about.)

Still, I don't see Bible sources for your ideas or views.

If you are a Christian, you probably can find the sources yourself, if you tried. My goal with this website was/is to provide somewhat direct and clear points for those who may not be actively part of the Church. Although I have provided sources on occasion.

Additionally, I very much prefer if you evaluate each topic on your own, and disagree as needed. I'm not "preaching to the choir" here. I won't deny that at times I am providing my own views or opinions. Though that may not contradict the principles of the Bible, as Saint Paul does that sometimes, and Jesus implied something along such lines, for example "judge correctly" in John 7:24 (meaning, He did not tell them not to judge or use their minds to evaluate, but to judge according to correct standards).

Your words are often sharp and hurtful.

I'm living in the real world of today, with a human life of my own, and can be subject to personal reactions that I may view as being less than ideal. I apologize if any points mentioned have been rough around the edges in some way.

Are you aware that there are many groups that already represent and advocate for a lot of points you mention? Why try to reinvent the wheel?

I am certainly aware that there are many groups representing individual points I have mentioned. But there is only One individual Who represents all the mentioned points, and more like those, in their ideal manner, which would be Jesus Christ Himself.

I would be open to conversation with any groups that support specific ideas I have listed, but they will need to realize that most outlines listed are inextricably connected with the others. For example, I am very much against destruction of the human male, but I think that Christianity, or religion in general, is the only key to define a version of a male that has potential to survive and thrive. Likewise, I am strongly against female fascism, and the extremist feminist tendencies of today's world, but I am not against all females per se, nor do I support misogynistic mentalities or the like.

Why not simply find a way for all religions and races to live in peace, exactly as they are?

Because in my view, such a solution will not work in the long term. There are too many protruding elements that cannot be compatible with other such elements. I believe that quite a lot can be left as is, but certain central things need to be changed.

Additionally, most truly religious people do not view religion as a social convenience or as some pleasant myth, but as something very real. And there is a limit to how long there can coexist in this world the various opposing religions, together with secular populations that display patronizing but merely pretend respect of their beliefs.

Why won't you acknowledge superiority of the White Nordic race over other races?

Because I don't believe it in fact is superior to all others. Specifically, an honest northern European will admit that while they will ideally fight to the death to defend their core culture, it is however in no way an answer to all of life.

You may look at history, and find evidence of this. At a point when Germanic tribes toppled the Roman Empire, after many prior unsuccessful attempts, it was the Greco-Roman philosophies, the Christian religion, and the Roman ruling classes, that were required for the territories to survive. And many of those elements spread up north.

Northern Europe certainly had its own cultures, but they were not of a form that could match the comprehensive nature of what was found down south.

What is required is what may be a difficult surgery to differentiate between defense of culture and racial preservation, and assertion of superiority. In my view, Adolf Hitler and his Nazi party made a mess in that area, which still lingers in its damage.

It may be a nice dream to imagine everyone living in peace, but immigrants and minorities are destroying many countries of today.

It may help if there were more of an understanding of what is involved.

When a minority population or group attempt to survive amidst a majority population, their efforts to push for equality can often appear to the others as some form of a violation of order, and as an attempt to bring everything down to destruction. The minority population doesn't see things that way at all. They feel like they are simply fighting to have the same basic starting point in life that the majority or the ones in power take for granted. Those in power, or the majority, in turn, cannot understand what the others are doing, and can't see any explanation to their behavior except as some form of an agenda to sabotage the life and order of society.

In other words, there exists a deep misunderstanding, and each side has extremely legitimate complaints against its counterpart.

The solution, I suppose, is like most other such misunderstandings: each side must try to better see the viewpoint of the opposite side.

(I'm obviously referring to those on either side who have sincere intentions. There are certainly some on either side who do not have noble goals, and I'm not referring to those.)

Well, there certainly seem to be differences in I.Q. between races. You can't really deny that.

A discussion on the differences in I.Q. between human races, is like trying to argue that apple juice is better than orange juice- it is an irrelevant and nonsensical argument that has no purpose or conclusion.

Why? Firstly, the very nature of I.Q. and its place as something intrinsically interwoven with other aspects of life and society, makes it questionable whether it can ever truly be measured by a lab-grade standard in a way that clearly correlates to race as an isolated statistic. Secondly, in a world of races that need to interact and exchange with each other, with increasing dependence on such interactions and exchanges, there may be no point to any conclusions on the topic of I.Q. as it relates to races. Much as a person doesn't decide that since it is too cumbersome to eat and drink daily, maybe they should just stop doing such things. Namely, some topics genuinely are irrelevant for practical reasons.

Someone may assert that the topic is not elusive- it is clear that some races have higher I.Q.s than others. If you claim that, then you aren't aware of the details necessary for true scientific-grade studies. Statistics do exist, but those don't prove anything. There are many details to such a research project that would make it highly unlikely to ever be possible to produce a reliable conclusion.

Another may assert that one day their race will eradicate all inferior races. I won't argue with such a person. But I think that is unlikely to ever occur. And if it does occur, then the remaining humans will be so deeply of the seed of the Devil that their end will be inevitable.

"Who says a Devil exists? Who says there is such a thing as Good and Evil? Etc."

I'm talking practical. It is not relevant to this topic whether or not such things exist in a conventional idea of them.

"I've seen your arguments in many forms before. Nothing new here."

Great. So now you have seen the same arguments again.

Do you have any other comments on race?

White people today often don't seem to realize that the White culture they value is actually in many ways based on standing on the bones of peoples their ancestors have trampled on. It is not merely an innocent identity that should simply be respected as it is. A relaxed breath of that identity, is breathing in the smell of spilled blood from long ago, whether the person is aware of it or not.

Black people who view "gangsta rap" and the like as their cultural identity, are not merely enjoying a cultural identity like a tribe in the Amazon. Such supposed culture is inextricably based on aggression towards the societies they live in, and is a strange attempt to give a license to a force of destruction. All people should have a right to feel a form of a comfortable identity. But the version promoted today among Black people, in my view is definitely not the correct one. It is not pride but a defective stench that shouts pity. And it hurts everyone involved.

I'm not advocating that anyone hate themselves. But somehow a very delicate surgery needs to be made to extract a legitimate form of culture, identity, and pride, while leaving the defective parts behind.

Although in no way should it be belittled the harm caused to people throughout history, it may also be important to realize that what was done was also simultaneously vitally important to bring humanity to today's day. Practically speaking, somehow those whose ancestors have hurt other races or peoples need to both fully remove and eliminate the remnants of whatever the cause was for such behaviors, in no uncertain terms, but all must also recognize that sometimes life cannot be understood in a purely linear manner. "It was fully wrong, and was fully necessary".

(Since that idea can potentially elicit a notion as though I am proposing that a form of nihilism is the only answer, or that I don't believe that Evil is in fact evil, I would like to make it clear that what I have in mind is not that at all. It is more like humble submission to God's Will and Plan, or general humility that some things are not for a person to fully

grasp in a linear manner from a given vantage point. In human English: when I say it was wrong, I mean it was wrong. When I say that it was necessary, I mean that apparently somehow those things were important, even if it cannot be understood in what way. Jesus Christ always demanded that a person disavow their sins and leave their sinful life, and He also then fully forgave them, giving them a clean slate. If there is no Evil present in the life of a descendant of those who had behaved unjustly, the person need not pull out their hair over a historical past that cannot be changed. Repent, and you are forgiven. And if you are forgiven by God, no human can hold a grudge against you. In more practical language: An English Briton who does not approve of behaviors of their ancestors towards the Irish or Celts, and truly has no racial biases towards them, should not be urged to feel permanently guilty for something they did not do. A German who disavows any affiliation or support with/for what took place during World War 2, and has no unjust racial discrimination in their worldview, should not be labeled as someone that should be permanently ostracized from civilized human society due to what others did nearly 100 years ago. A White American who holds no racially hateful views, should not feel permanently ashamed for what was done to Black Africans in America during the times of slavery in the country. Etc. Evil must be purged, but forgiveness must be a more than willing partner. And regarding those whose supposed culture has developed in an unhealthy manner, like with stereotypical African American rap and hip-hop culture, or Jewish extremist feminism or other unacceptable mentalities, a correction is needed to something more healthy. In the case of African Americans, there should be a focus on the dignity they had in their own lands before being taken to America. In the case of Jews, I suppose the only answer may be of a religious nature- they need to embody what their religion truly teaches, which in my view can only find fulfillment if they turn to Christ and Christianity. And similar would apply with all minority races that have developed unhealthy "culture" that is harmful to themselves and to others- there needs to be an adjustment to something healthy and reasonable. However, as I have outlined on the website, I believe that some form of solution is needed in order to ease people's minds in the area of race. You may wish for peace to come about today, and for everyone to become true saints overnight, but it may take a bit longer than that. If each race/religion/culture feels that they are not threatened, due to recognition of a land of their own, then a path forward may be a bit easier.)

If your ideas on a restructuring of religion do come to fruition, how would you suggest religious people view one another and communicate with each other, since there would still remain significant divisions and many types of groups?

Probably along the following lines:

If you claim to believe in true Truth, then by default you must allow another to make an ultimate decision for themselves to determine what Truth is in their own life, or for a given circumstance. You may have a very strong opinion on what they should choose, but Truth with a capital "T" implies that every vantage point, merely on its own, is by default incapable of deciding something for another vantage point. Rather, all sides are bound and united by the Truth they are committed to.

In other words, you may be 99.999...% sure that your view is correct, but you cannot be 100% sure. And no matter how in sync you are with another person, or how understanding you may be, you are not the other person. It is for reasons like this, that one who claims to be subservient to Truth, must respect that the last mile is not in their own hands. That the ultimate sense to things, and the real Truth, can only be submitted to, not known or understood. And that another person must have the final choice to decide on such things according to their own position.

Phrased differently:

I believe that sincerity and decorum are like rays and windows that lead to a single Truth.

I don't care if there are fierce disagreements, but if they are based on sincere and correct motives, and the arguments are done with respect to the other parties, then inevitably all sides will end up at the same destination. Although the actual destination may not be what any of the sides had in mind.

(This could sound like the idea of peacemaking, and in a way I suppose it is related. But the idea mentioned is less of a practical nature than a general concept. Namely, I am not suggesting that each party compromise until there is a single agreed-upon conclusion. Rather, I'm saying the if the motives and methods are in order, then the end result will be a single Truth, one way or another.)

Let me provide an example of the idea I have in mind, for illustrative purposes. It may sound controversial, but try to see the point.

I fully support an Islamic terrorist, if their motivation is principles they truly believe in, and their framework in life is truly a dedicated submission and discipline to a truth they believe to be correct. In other words, someone truly serving God and their own conscience to the best of their ability.

However, I would also fully support a governing authority or military force to fight against such Islamic attacks, and to defend their citizens to the absolute best of their abilities, provided their motives are based on some form of a principle that has substance to it.

In effect, I would fully support both sides to use all their abilities and to put in their full efforts to succeed in their goals, provided that their motives are proactively as they should be.

The solution, then, will not be about one side winning, but will be about each side realizing that they are both serving the same God. It will be about a light turning on, where they realize that they are on the same side- provided in fact they are on the same side, rather than fighting for motives polluted by faulty elements.

(Is this hopeless and naive idealism? I cannot say. But to me it seems to be the only viable solution, and the only viewpoint that can hold out against all challenges to it.)

The views mentioned are incoherent and unclear. You need to make up your mind which side you are on. You cannot be on all sides or on no sides.

I don't think this reality would agree with you. The real answers to this life are not polarized in that way.

I'm not suggesting to register for a retirement home and spend your time reading books from the past few thousand years, until you are simultaneously somewhat more enlightened, but also far more confused. (No offense intended to those in retirement homes- enjoy yourselves!) Rather, I'm pointing out that the real answers and solutions to this life are not the types of things that can be solved through a barking match.

In simple language, what do you think is wrong with today's society?

If you try to cure an illness that doesn't exist, you will end up in a very bad situation. Because you will never find the right cure, but you will cause quite a lot of problems.

That is today's society.

Previous generations were not stupid, and knew that progress was the goal. In fact, they were the ones to bring us to today. Meaning, they were well-aware that not everything was perfect in their societies. But the path humanity has taken recently has been badly faulty, and has been out of step with the goals that were taken for granted for all of known human history.

It's like someone running a long marathon, and when reaching the last mile catching some form of dementia, and deciding that their legs seem to be a nuisance, and cutting them off.

For example, I believe that if the social order in America that existed at the time of the first moon landing, had remained intact, that humans would long ago have been to Mars.

I'm not saying that we should have gone there, or that it even is vital that we do go there in actuality. And I think that the detour to an insane world of chaos may have produced many positive results. But the core fact would remain: if the coherent social order that existed back then had remained, in my view, there would have been quite farther leaps for humankind than are found in its condition as it is today.

Are you against culture in general?

No. I think culture has been an important tool for society, but it is merely a tool.

I'm not advocating a chaotic anarchist anti-culture mentality. But I think it is important to keep in mind the correct place that culture has in the scheme of things.

A proof for this view can be found relatively simply. In small countries or areas with an intense focus on culture, while there may be an improved lifestyle and many benefits, often there you will also find a lower creativity level that is truly original in its nature, than in locations that are larger or with less of a focus on culture. As a not great example, it is sort of like eating too much ice cream- it may be very enjoyable, but you will probably get a belly ache. (Though sometimes binge eating of a comfort food can have its place, regardless of the negative after effects.)

You are definitely being a male chauvinist or misogynistic. You don't believe that girls should be able to be independent people?

When a girl sees a boy behaving in a feminine manner, often she will be irritated. The views I have expressed are simply the reverse of that- females trying to compete with males by being extra arrogant or selfish or the like, is unrelated to independence. Let males be males, and females can be females. The two genders are not the same. They function differently, and not just regarding periods or hormones. The solution to life is found in higher things, such as religion and enlightened pursuits. It is not found by outdoing someone else. In this case, it is a faulty easy way out for a female to think that the solution to her life is to embody the male style of independence. That is a recipe to drag the world directly to hell.

I would note, that by and large, I do not blame females for today's problems in such areas. I think males made some stupid errors in previous generations. Although certainly females are not entirely without blame on the issue, and it is they who must choose to change their direction.

But Christ died for the sins of the world, and committing one's life to Him, and getting baptized, is a simple but highly effective solution to a very complex problem. Because He will then send the Holy Spirit to dwell with the person, and the Spirit is omniscient and omnipotent (=knows everything and is all-powerful). If that Spirit directs your life, you are in good hands. You may still face hardships in life, but it will have meaning, and there will be someone standing by your side.

Your words and views can hurt women raised in environments where they know nothing but the "reverse inequality" you mention. They cannot merely adjust to something drastically different from what they are accustomed to. It will cause them to respond with either doomed aggression or tears. Likewise, males that grew up in such environments would be clueless at how to live any other way than the one they are accustomed to.

I don't know of an answer to that. The blame would be on their ancestors who made some wrong choices, or who otherwise messed up in some way. I guess empathy, and baby steps, would be the only way to address such things. And no one has to become like someone else. For example, there is no real need for someone on the west coast of

the USA to be the same as someone on the east coast of the country. But certain core elements need to be in order. And I think those in fact can change.

In more plain language, practically speaking- and no offense intended, a woman on the west coast could be told by a male she is trying to boss around or is being condescending towards, "Would you like to be my mop? Would you like to drop on your knees and worship your male lords as their maid and slave? If not, then stop your behavior. Now. If you give, you get. If you pay, you buy. You get nothing for free. I am not hurting you. At a minimum, I expect you to respect me at the level you expect me to respect you."

The problem with such a mentality is that naturally males and females are *not* actually equal in many spheres of life. So although the mentioned statement could sound reasonable, the woman can still walk away crying, after attempting to be burning mad. But if society truly established equal rights for women, then maybe she no longer has an excuse to pull the "damsel in distress" style card. Life itself would still be unfair in the sense that the male gets the upper hand in such a setup. But by this point in the train of thought the topic inevitably must turn to religion and the like. Inequality is inbuilt to this reality. Why is that?

As part of the treatment for the hypnosis that society has gotten into, maybe it could be good to explain to males that there exists no such thing as "no one is in charge- we're all equal". Such an idea is a lie that is used in order for others to take the helm.

There certainly can exist equality and fairness, and (I think) that is a great goal for society. But those things are very different than entirely removing the idea of some form of a dominant force or position in life.

Sheep with a shepherd of Jesus Christ, are in great hands. Sheep that have no shepherd, are in a very bad position. The world has seemingly been deceived to enter a fog where they roam as sheep without a shepherd, and that can't end well.

So are you genuinely advocating that society rewind to a time when women were only housewives?

I wouldn't necessarily micromanage the solution in that way.

It appears there are three levels, so to speak, of gender dynamics. One is the most basic, as is found by animals. Both genders are truly equal in their independence, and readily will assert themselves as needed. The second is the style found in human society over the past long while- roles are set, responsibilities are designated in a heavily polarized manner, etc. Such a setup improves efficiency in an increasingly complex world. Many animals do have a similar social setup, but not nearly at the level that humans embodied. Then there may be a speculative hypothetical third level, where society has been built up to a decent enough level to allow a form of return to the first level, while retaining all the positives that were gained along the way. What you end up

with is a far more ideal version of gender independence than existed previously. Whereas at the first level, the independent female can merely scream or the like when attacked by a much more physically powerful male, and may employ various other similar methods of breaking away, and may or may not succeed at the attempt to escape, in the developed society there are police, and there are many other threats she can use against the physically stronger male. Likewise, in the first level, the male may lack the ability to truly relax without a female nearby to provide some extra comfort or assistance, but at the advanced third level, the male can easily relax very comfortably without need for the female. Yet the genders can still benefit each other. But at that higher level, the relationships are far more optional and fluid than at prior levels.

Many today may feel that they are in fact living in that third type of setup, but I think some things need to be clarified.

I am proposing that there exist in human society either level one, or two, or three. But not a faulty mix and match between them. You want to be free as an animal? You will be treated like an animal. Alternatively, the woman can adopt the role of housewife, and the man can adopt the role of provider, as long as the roles are genuinely the given role, rather than an attempt to get away with something that shouldn't fly. And yet another option: If you want to be a free bird in a modern society, make sure that you aren't behaving like an animal, and aren't trying to exploit another gender to a confined role that isn't part of the life you yourself are embodying. Etc.

It is a natural tendency for a person to want to "have their cake and eat it too". I do think that should happen, but it can't be in a way that harms or exploits others.

Ok, so you just like hanging out with the guys. No need to be bitter towards women.

How can I explain this. It is not about preference.

I am not on the feminine side, since purely on their own, they are a train to death. And their version of "equality", involves something very unrelated to that word.

I am on the masculine side, while not actually being on that side. Because that side allows such a concept- it allows the possibility of the existence of an "other", without requiring that it either conform or be destroyed.

(What I mentioned could easily be stated in reverse as well, but I think the reverse version is deficient.)

Maybe the following can shed some more light on the topic.

Healthy equality:

It is a punishable crime of animal cruelty to harm a chimpanzee, but chimpanzees are viewed as chimpanzees.

Unhealthy equality:

All chimpanzees are given automatic machine guns, and taught how to use them- since after all, don't the U.S. Navy Seals get to use machine guns?

With human gender, each has its strengths and weaknesses. And ultimately, each has its own fit position in life. To try and claim or encourage something else, is not equality but a rhyming word- "insanity". And will only destroy life on this planet.

Let males truly be males. And then maybe females will be able to truly be females. But if you destroy and crush the ability for a male to be male, then females fade to oblivion the following day.

In case you disagree with such views, talk to a plumber or electrician, and ask them about gender terms for fittings and connectors. Their natures are quite clear. To ignore such things will only cause a big mess. (Reversing the setup certainly can be done! But it would require a lot of extra effort, and added parts and/or epoxies and/or wirings and the like. No plumber or electrician will choose such an option unless it is truly necessary.)

All that said, I definitely do not think that society should be stuck in some primitive age. Social progress is great, and often is vital. But there is a difference between adjusting a rod, and bending it to an extreme until it breaks.

So you think that all men are perfect on their own?

No sir. No sir. Not at all. But there is a healthy and legitimate version of right and wrong, and then there is a mass deception masquerading as "right and wrong" in the name of subterfuge. That latter version of "morality" is what I am against.

Men did not build society, physically and intellectually, in order to hand it over to women, and then to head to the grave. As Jesus said "a worker deserves his wages".

Women traditionally cooked food, cleaned and took care of the house, bore children and cared for them, supported their husbands in their work and endeavors, etc., and therefore should surely have a stake in the product that men produced. But it is not an either/or scenario. No one in their right mind would work for thousands of years merely to hand over the end result to someone who will selfishly swallow it with no purpose.

Is sharing easy? No. Any kid knows that. But often it is mandatory.

Again, I believe that some form of religion is the only real solution in this realm, precisely because ultimately two entities- no matter how different or similar they may be- are innately incompatible with each other. (Meaning, two entities must in the end either merge and die, or destroy each other. There can be a temporary existence where each somehow gives life to the other, but that cannot last indefinitely. The only possibility for a long term or endless existence, may be found if sense is discovered to an apparently

imperfect condition. (There certainly exists a side of society that would claim ownership of this idea, in a style of "our differences are what make us strong", or the like. But that solution is likewise faulty, as it merely embodies the same problem but in another form.))

So you believe that the dominant force, and the vantage point for all of life, should be men only?

No. I believe that there are various sides to life, much as Jesus said to respect the secular government, or the Chinese Yin and Yang, etc. Similar concepts can be found in many religions and cultures. But within the respective domains and spheres of life, there needs to be a coherent functionality. Mixing and matching, in this case, will not be a great idea.

I would add, that the human male as an individual, is merely more inclined to be able to represent the masculine side of life, but certainly does not own it or represent it permanently by default. As Jesus taught- often you must die in order to live. True strength often is found by exercising forms of weakness. Etc.

Likewise in the case of the feminine side of life. By no means do women own it or represent it by default. They often can navigate it better than males, but as in the case of males, they only can stand on that side if they are representing something legitimate.

Bluntly stated: if either gender is representing selfish motives or clear evil, while claiming otherwise, then they are not representing the given gender in the broader sense.

Is there a simple summary of the problem facing males today?

It may be this: A man is expected to be a baby boy, subject to the supposed moral police of women, all his life.

Preservation of youth can be a great goal. But there is a correct version, and a very incorrect version. A young boy is in a temporary condition where he can benefit from some assistance. He is not a pet, or permanently a dependent baby. Etc.

Ok, I still don't see how you can claim to have the best interest of women in mind. You sound very sexist.

To clarify why it is that my views on women aren't actually against them:

Today's world, with its warped version of "equality", tries to force women to use men as footstools, much as women were supposedly previously used by males. A truly independent woman, is one that has the same natural gender regulation of males to females, as females to males. A nun is an independent woman. A modern extremist

feminist is one of the most imprisoned people possible, as her entire tower will crash to pieces if all males suddenly disappeared.

It may help to note that there certainly can exist a third form of female independence, which is the more primitive style that many animals live by- the version of a local female pet dog, or of chimpanzees, etc. But an enlightened and advanced human version of gender does require extensive potential regulation between genders, and it is needed in both directions.

And I will add that all these things are required only in potential. A male need not actually correct a female, and a female need not actually correct a male. But the potential must be very real. Each must realize that if the carrot is not followed, a stick may be hanging around. Etc.

Are you seriously advocating for there to be a world full of pre-pubescent children, and no adults?

To a cat, there would be little difference between a world full of adult humans, or humans that have not gone through puberty.

I don't think the concept is as shocking as it may sound.

It sounds like you may just be against Millennials and Gen Zers.

I'm against Gen Alpha, Gen Z, Millennials, Gen Y, Gen X, Baby Boomers, Silent Generation, G.I. Generation, and any other such categories. Although it is not people that I am against, but the whole idea of the related perspective. The same reality that existed 100 years ago, 200 years ago, and 2,000 years ago, is what exists today. Reality is what needs to be solved. Those modern generational labels and stereotypes, with demands for conformity to a respective division/mentality, are part of a neutered lala land that leads to a dead-end or far worse.

Ever try over-polishing something that didn't require polishing in the first place? You will likely badly damage the item. Those labels lead exactly nowhere, except to a giant black hole. Next comes Gen B, C, etc. Christ is what is needed, not those labels.

You're living in a bubble regarding gender. Are you aware that today, in modern societies, the concept of "women's rights" is mostly nonexistent? Because they are not only equal, but often they are the dominant gender. You speak of what rights should be given to females, but males no longer have the luxury to think about or to choose such things.

I would say that I'm not so much living in a bubble as living in a well-fortified tower. I am well-aware of the realities of modern society. I am challenging those realities. It is no small task to try and gather the worms back into the can, or to get the cat back into the

bag, so to speak. But along such lines is my goal. The worms should be let loose, but not in the wrong place or in the wrong way. Same with the cat.

Would you like to clarify the idea on a solution to homelessness in the USA or elsewhere?

I don't think specific details are even needed. What is needed is a will for it to be solved. If a territory in a modern country suddenly realized that their water supply was under threat, it will be solved yesterday. But for some reason people don't realize that the homeless people are real human beings. This isn't about a guilt trip, but while you are enjoying a warm bath, after an outing at a fancy restaurant, reflecting on your various relationships, someone is shivering out there wishing they could buy a piece of bread so that they don't die.

I suppose the solution can include a few levels, along the following lines.

One, address a condition where someone is close to eviction or foreclosure. Do not allow that to happen. Provide what is needed for several months, then several months more if needed. And provide services to help the person back to a steady source of income. If after a certain period they still have no income source, and it would appear that they have the ability to find a source of income through employment or otherwise and have not done so, then the monetary assistance will end.

Two, a homeless person gets housing immediately, period. For a minimum of one year, no questions asked. The following two year period will need to include clear efforts on the part of the individual to find employment or some form of income. The following three year period will only pay for half of their housing costs. Unless a clear excuse for lack of income can be provided, the seventh year will no longer be under the program.

Three, if someone had been through both of those prior programs, and faces homelessness nonetheless, they can be provided with a "tiny house", or a room, that provides the bare minimum of housing, indefinitely. The incentive for them to graduate from that, would be the fact that it is very small, and provides only the most basics of shelter.

All these would obviously apply only to someone who did not consciously choose to be homeless, and does not wish to be in that condition. A "drifter" who specifically chooses such a life, can be acceptable, provided they do not disturb society and social order. Such a person should not be scorned or mocked or looked down upon, if they are not disturbing the peace. (You may view such a person as an eye sore and disturbance merely by their homeless condition. But I would assume that the number of homeless people who want to be homeless, is very low. And with time, such a person will probably want to change their position by their own choice.)

Such programs may be expensive, but if taxing the ultra wealthy at a similar level as everyone else, it should be no problem. Additionally, a solution to this problem is

probably not optional. The problem will grow and grow exponentially, until it is so severe that entire cities and counties and even countries, will be dragged to their knees. And it will affect everyone- it could end up being your brother, son, daughter, cousin, best friend, etc., or you yourself.

But perhaps in ways more important than all of those solutions, would be a focus on addressing the causes of such problems in the first place. I happen to believe that the core problem is a rejection of religion, and the notion that the default starting point for all people is basically an atheist position. Why do I believe that to be the case?

1. If true religion was the pillar of society, then care about people in those types of positions would be automatic. There would be help available for them, as an obvious obligation.
2. Those people themselves would feel cared for, and would have the motivation to lift themselves up.
3. There would be meaning to life. In the first place, it would be less appealing for a person to let their life slide to nowhere.

All this may seem like Socialism or the like, but I think it is more like a form of Social Security. Society today has discovered that Capitalism- even within a democracy, on its own can't work. I suppose what is needed is an odd combination that is simultaneously fully Capitalism, fully Socialism, and fully Communism. Much like a decent parent gives the child independence, but corrects them as needed, and is always there for the child to fall on- provided it will actually be helpful for the child rather than harmful. (If you are a staunch supporter of freedom and perhaps Libertarianism, I am not opposed to your views. But I think that if your views are embodied in a society for a few hundred years, the mentioned conclusions would start to make more sense. Once a husband dies and leaves behind a crippled child that starves to death, you may realize that some form of Social Security is a good idea, etc.)

We know people like you. Lame people who claim to be supporters of the underdogs and minorities. What you really want is power, or an excuse to be lazy. Not falling for it. Money talks, all else walks.

Such an attitude can have its place, but you need to be very careful where it is used. The ideas I have mentioned regarding help to the homeless and the like, are vital to society and to human life.

If you respond in that way for no legitimate reason, I would have no answer to give you. That is called selfishness or evil or the like, and I would just have pity on you.

There certainly can be those who have ulterior motives for promoting empathy, but the core ideas remain intact and very important. Do not confuse a rejection of noble (and vital) human principles, with defense against a lazy person trying to get away with that lifestyle, or one looking for power while masking it under the guise of an enlightened value. If you suddenly found yourself on the other side of the game, your opinion on

such topics may drastically change. The threshold that triggers a cynical view of those advocating for more attention to be given to the most vulnerable in society, will be greatly modified.

You mentioned mental health services. Do you have any comments on that topic?

Yes. My opinion on the topic is like many others who feel that a change in the style of society is what is needed, not more and more medications.

For example, a teenager or young adult starting out in life, who gets into a brawl, and acts up against those trying to restrain them, may then be taken to jail or to a psychiatric hospital. But the kid is doing the best they know to do- they are not yet familiar with the way the world works. What you have just done is destroyed the kid's ability to figure things out in a coherent manner. If such a pattern repeats, it is likely that the individual will end up with repeated incarcerations or repeated admissions to those hospitals. And you may have just produced another prison inmate with a life sentence, or someone heavily drugged with psychotropic medications, with little hope for them to ever lead a healthy life.

All that could have been averted, if there were just a small amount more of a dose of empathy in the picture. The individual would be encouraged rather than fought against. And ideally would have been introduced to the world in a caring manner, rather than like a dog on a chain. Etc.

That is just one example.

I suppose a very limited amount of those types of medications can be used if truly warranted. Let's put it this way: whereas at this time it appears, based on the look of it, that the field of mental health views medications as 80% of the solution, and talk therapy or the like as 20%, maybe that can be reversed.

Humans aren't animals, so they should not be viewed and treated like animals. Sad? Talk with a good friend. Happy? Go for an outing. Don't let those things become so complicated that they require antidepressants or control for mania or the like.

(I'm well-aware that that can sound oversimplified. But the basic point should be clear. Aim to better see that it is a full human being that is the focus, not a broken doorknob. Etc.)

Universal Basic Income?

Yeah, you can search online for more about that idea. It is not new, and I think it is an inevitable eventuality.

The key challenge will be to simultaneously attempt to retain the positives of Capitalism, which includes individual innovation and originality and the like. I suppose that can be

achieved by limiting the monetary amount to something that is truly at or around a level that will only pay for basic necessities.

Are you aware that you are talking to a world that has largely thrown all religion into the trash? Who do you think will care about the ideas you are discussing?

I think that authentic religious concepts are timeless, and apply to all the ages. In my view, the only reason today's society has apparently successfully pushed religion from its consciousness, is due to an artificial fog. If that fog were ever lifted, there would be a world full of very naked people with nothing to turn to but true religion.

You mention 19th century philosophers a number of times. Would you have a summary on the topic?

Something like this: To address Mr. Nietzsche's view on God, maybe we could say that God needs some CPR, and a little help back up to His feet, and back onto His throne. Definitely not dead, however. Very far from it. An immortal being cannot die.

I don't view things this way, but alternatively, if you would like to view religion from an evolutionary type perspective, let's say that the "pattern" found within religions, and its place in this reality, needs to finish its cycle. That even if it is all myths, the myths are based on core truths found in this universe, which means that it has some legitimate place in the scheme of life on earth. And therefore, humanity must finish the "game" regarding such things, much as with any other part of evolution.

(But again- I believe that true religion is not a myth. And that the Bible is accurate at face value.)

Rephrased:

If Jesus Christ never existed, then let's invent Him, and aim for a perfected world in the image of that imaginary figure, and according to the moral standards that that fictional character insisted on.

In fact, if someone like Him never existed, then inventing Him may be the only real solution to a world that is not heading to a place of life.

But I happen to believe that He did exist, and was/is exactly Who and What He claimed to be.

I still don't see why you find philosophy to be important.

Firstly, I believe that such things are and have been silent fuel and ammunition for many very faulty directions that this world has taken.

And secondly, related to that: In my view, unless more accurate versions of religion and Good and Truth and the like, are better explained, those erroneous views will persist and grow and cause a lot of further destruction.

For example, if you claim that a Christian should be a helpless person, as though that is what defines devotion to Christ, then the ones with guns will come along, and push you as they desire, and mock you, etc., with no point or reason involved.

Obviously, Christ was treated that way, and was crucified. He also demanded of His followers to take up the cross daily. Etc. But also recall that He escaped mobs at various times, and otherwise often kept away from being harmed or killed. And the term is "whoever loses their life *for my sake* will save it" (Luke 9:25). He wasn't supporting mass suicide for no purpose.

Here are some more examples:

"I am sending you out like sheep among wolves. Therefore be as shrewd as snakes and as innocent as doves." (Matthew 10:16)

"But now if you have a purse, take it, and also a bag; and if you don't have a sword, sell your cloak and buy one." (Luke 22:36) Although He put that into perspective: "The disciples said, 'See, Lord, here are two swords.' 'That's enough!' he replied." (Verse 38)

When He demanded sacrifice, it relates to sacrifice for a cause. It is not a demand for His followers to be used and abused as anyone desires, with no point involved whatsoever.

When He taught to "turn the other cheek", He was teaching a general concept- to appreciate that there is benefit and blessing included even in seemingly harmful things. Often He used "hyperbole", meaning that He gave extreme examples in order to illustrate a point.

More clearly stated: It is fine- and maybe even desirable, to value weakness. And it is correct to believe that there is somehow meaning to pain and suffering. But in a way it is far more of a devotion to Christ or to a God, to claim that even at your strongest and best position, you are submitted to your Creator as though you were nothing at all.

This is just an example of what I have in mind. If you adopt erroneous versions of religious ideals, it can potentially badly backfire. I think it is best to address such things directly, rather than to face the alternative, such as a demented Hitler, or what is developing in the world today.

If you define kindness as being distinct from weakness, you may make it more difficult for Dark forces to invade human life. Etc.

I am not against Christianity of today. And if not for the countless Christian martyrs throughout history, there probably wouldn't exist a Christianity today. But I think it could use some significant repairs or renovations.

You claim to be against the modern secular fields of science and philosophy, but then you talk about things like A.I. and 19th century philosophers, and the like. Can you explain the apparent contradiction?

I am against faulty science and philosophy being promoted as though it is something that it is not. I think that those fields should be traveled through until their limit, but in the right way. And in my view, that cannot happen unless religion is included in the picture in a very central position. Otherwise, it's like saying "I would like to climb the ladder to the roof, but I don't want to climb the last step, or step off the ladder to the roof". That wouldn't make sense.

All of science ends where philosophy begins. All of philosophy ends where religion begins. You cannot pick and choose about such things.

Some may claim that actual organized religion is not the answer, and that something more generic in its nature is called for. But the basic idea would remain. That "trinity" cannot survive as merely a "duo" or as a "lone ranger". Religion is the "father" of the three, if it behaves properly. Etc. (But God and the real Trinity, those are not dependent on such things. Which is another topic.)

It sounds like you may just like paradoxes.

I don't. I actually really do not like paradoxes. But often what seems like an impossibly elusive paradox from one perspective, is a simple starting point from another perspective.

For example, if you never met a human being before, and it were explained to you that they have a head, a heart, legs, arms, thoughts, emotions, voice, hearing, sight, hair, blood, muscles, nerves, etc., you may find it extremely difficult if not impossible to imagine how all that can coexist as one single entity or being, let alone imagine that the being can identify itself as a single simple "I". Yet from the perspective of a person, at least in a core way, there isn't really such a problem.

Isn't religion for weak people, and minorities, and the like? Why don't you occupy yourself with real life? Seriously- humanity has moved beyond such things.

I don't believe there is a contradiction between being occupied with progressing life on earth in the realm of science and technology and other such things, and being occupied with or attempting to assist in the realm of religion. Both are vital to life.

In the Bible, God did command for humankind to conquer and subdue the world, and I suppose technological and other human development may be a part of such an endeavor. In a way, I suppose this reality expects and desires that humans do that to their full ability- provided it is in a correct manner and with the right intentions. The Christian Church often has claimed that efforts in science are part of marveling at and appreciating the wonders of our Creator.

It is well known that some of the most sad people ever to live, are also some of the most wealthy. Without meaning and sense to life, the rest is not necessarily an asset, and can even be a cause for great distress. In my view, similar would apply to all other aspects of this physical world. Water without a cup is pretty difficult to use, and a cup without water is just a pretty object. I think that the religious and secular sides of life should ideally be complementary.

That said, although a police officer and a private citizen are technically equal, the officer has the right to issue commands to the citizen, and those must be obeyed. Likewise, I think that ultimately, authentic religion is not remotely on the same level as other things in this life. Such a position certainly has potential to be abused, but if evaluating on an intellectual level, I don't think you can compare development of an iPhone with the New Creation that God is due to accomplish at the right time.

I suppose the secular and technological developments in this world, although often helpful for the time being, in the scheme of things may be more for a purpose of a form of exercise or the like.

I would like to address a potential objection, which would assert that organized religion is not needed, and that society today is enlightened in a manner that is beyond such things. My response would be that the idea may be correct- organized religion in its current form should not exist forever. But I think that it is still vital for now. Trying to discard it now, is like getting off the bus at the wrong stop, in a dangerous neighborhood. What is needed is for True religion to reach its destination and full maturity. At that point the same Creator that created this universe, can transform life to a different level.

And just so this is clear, I would add that I do not support disrespect for the field of science and research, or for any occupation or framework in secular society that is helpful for people. But for their own sakes, my prayer and hope is that those involved with such occupations realize more clearly just where their endeavors fit into the bigger picture. If all the lights went off, where will you be if your worldview was too heavily on a tangent line away from the true nature of this reality?

Why are so confident that a God even exists? I mean, who knows what anything is about?

There would be almost countless responses to such a question, but here is something simple:

A child very easily believes in a God, and it can seem almost natural for them.

Is it due to their naivety, and they simply don't know better? Or is it due to the fact that they aren't yet bogged down by mountains of unfinished human activities and works-in-progress, allowing them to see more clearly than an adult?

I would tend to suspect more relevance to the latter interpretation. The child knows very well that it came from somewhere else, and hasn't always existed. It also knows that it is limited and dependent. An adult has often largely forgotten such truths. The adult is swimming deep in a somewhat artificial pile of trash, and is mostly concerned with survival within that predicament. The child mostly doesn't have that problem.

Ok, but there are many religions and many spiritual type paths.

This topic would need serious evaluation, but I'll note the general idea:

It can be very tempting to view something like Buddhism, or life as an innocent child without any artificially defined beliefs, as being a better path for life of an individual, and for humanity, versus the major religions of the world. But there are two significant problems with such an idea.

1. In theory, such views do not contradict the major religions, but are found within them. For example, Jesus seemed to be all about similar views.
2. A question must be asked as to whether there can be actual hope for humanity if it attempts to pursue a path other than the major religions. I think it may be highly unlikely that humanity will survive long enough to find out the answer to that question, if such a path is chosen. Therefore, I am forced to wonder the logic to an idea that human life on this planet was doomed from the start. If looking at all the variables involved, including evidence that stories in the Bible actually took place, I would tend to lean in a direction of viewing the major religions as being the only true hope for human life.

Or another way of viewing this topic, may be as follows.

See, this reality in general, if divorced from a God, can certainly exhibit some form of very real consciousness. It can teach, correct, encourage, enlighten, joke, etc. But ultimately it's like going on a wild goose chase, because there isn't actually anything it can teach.

Paths like Buddhism and Hinduism and the like, can try to navigate such things, and they seem to do it pretty effectively. But I think that in the end all such religions or paths lead to a dead-end. Because the God and Creator of the universe is merely allowing them to play with His hands, as though the hands are toy objects- as a parent may do for an infant, and that is all. There never will be any destination with such an endeavor.

Do I actually believe this? I'm not sure. But in my estimation, if a God is removed from the picture, in fact all paths lead to a dead-end. And you will end up interacting with random spirits, some good, some neutral, and some bad. But none that can lead you anywhere truly desirable on their own.

You mention that A.I. will only be useful if the human side of life is developed as well. Would you care to elaborate?

I suggest that the conversation among humans shift to something along the lines of a form of practical philosophy of a religious type nature.

Numerous examples were given already, but maybe the following scenario can shed more light on the idea:

Most people have at one time or another faced a situation where another person was seemingly behaving unjustly or even evil, but it was virtually impossible to protest against the behavior. It was like a catch-22 directly from Hell itself. For example, if you label the person as behaving in an evil manner, since you can never be fully certain about what is behind their intentions with their behavior, in effect you yourself may very well turn out to be in the wrong. And if you are in the wrong, then even if in some way they were in fact behaving in an evil manner, you have just given justification to their behavior. Etc.

Therefore, shall we say that right and wrong, good and evil, etc., are concepts that can never be fully solved within this human vantage point? Or do we say that after a certain limit, once it is highly probable that the other person in fact is behaving in a wrong manner, that you can go ahead and label the behavior as bad or evil or the like?

Dissect what is involved in such a scenario, and try to find a pattern as it relates to other areas of life.

Do such a thing with many other concepts, until the framework of viewing life has shifted to a new understanding. Etc.

Interesting ideas. But Christianity just demands love. I don't see how you can call yourself Christian.

This website is very much not related to me as a person. I believe these ideas are important to publish. Additionally, God's plan isn't always clear according to an individual's own version of right and wrong.

If you are a Christian and are offended by the ideas mentioned here, then I suggest you simply follow your religious path, if it is genuine and sincere. I would fully support that choice. My main audience would probably be others.

But I suspect that my views or this endeavor aren't/isn't necessarily against Christianity. For example, there was a venerable and accomplished Dutch Christian theologian in his own right, named Abraham Kuyper, who was actually prime minister of the Netherlands at the turn of the 20th century. Politics and concern for this world, don't necessarily contradict devotion to Christ. In my view, such topics are often up to a person to decide, and they should be honest with their own conscience on such matters. Recall that "Christ died for sinners". While a Christian should be "in this world, but not of this world", recall that Christ prayed that his disciples be protected, not taken from the world.

Is there anything else you would like to add about religion or the like?

If you think that you're on the side of Good, it is likely that you are not.

If you are on the side of God, and submitted to Him, then there is a chance that in fact you are representing the side of Good.

I'm not Christian. I find your views to be offensive.

I'm apologize if you feel that way. But if you read this website from beginning to end, you may realize that I am not against you. I am certainly unabashedly promoting Christianity, but not a version that can possibly harm someone in an unjust manner.

Nobody talks your language these days. Have you looked outside your window?

I hope people will learn that language again, because the world is heading to a bad place.

It's pretty arrogant of you to say all these things.

I'm sorry if you feel that way. But please ask yourself this: Is it Evil for a bird to eat a seed, swallowing it into its own selfish stomach? If I convinced the bird that it was behaving in an Evil manner by eating the seeds, I would probably be the one behaving wrongly, not the bird.

I believe that while humanity has in a way purged itself of many major Evils, it has also crushed everything in an unhealthy manner. There is nothing intrinsically Evil about being male, or female, or speaking, or thinking, or believing, or taking action on a belief, evaluation, being original, disagreeing with something, having an opinion, inventing, etc.

What happens when you push for an extreme that is faulty, is that either something breaks, or you face the monsters slowly growing today, or both.

A simple example is Eve in the Bible: she added to God's words, saying that God commanded something that He did not command, and the Serpent easily exploited that error. (God told the humans not to eat of the Tree of Knowledge, and she told the

Serpent that God had commanded that they not eat *or touch* the Tree. As soon as she stepped into her own translation of God's words, the Serpent- who many Bible commentators believe was the Devil- jumped on it, and easily deceived her.) I believe that God has a purpose for everything, even things that seem faulty or wrong. But nonetheless there needs to be a correction. In plain language: it is not inherently or innately Evil to exist, speak, think, etc. Despite what others may have convinced you. What is Evil is existing in the wrong way.

And if you still believe that I'm wrong, I agree. According to the Bible, this entire reality will be re-created into something else.

Dude/Dudette: Do you realize what you're fighting against?

You may say that I'm being crazy to fight against the flow, and that it is inevitably a losing battle. But didn't Jesus Christ very much fight against the norms around Him, as did most major figures in human history. Of course they killed Jesus, but looking at the world 2,000 years later, it would seem that His efforts definitely did pay off.

So, yes- there certainly are risks involved. But if I feel the battle to be important, then it may be worth the risks.

Is there anything you would like to add?

It is a dead-end for a person's worldview to be about a polarized "me vs. you" outlook. Even if it includes a lot of fancy explanations and tall towers. This seems to be something the world has increasingly realized to some extent, until relatively recently. And I don't know how the world today has apparently gotten amnesia about this fact.

On the flip side, today's world is like living in a chimpanzee society: if you merely try to begin to behave or to live as a human being, you will be locked in the chimpanzee psychiatric facilities for appearing to be purely psycho beyond hope.

If every major innovator in human history had been subject to today's world standards, most would probably be locked in an insane asylum. And effectively humanity would never have been able to reach this point in the first place.

Is there anything uplifting you have to say?

Yes. Since I believe that the Bible is true, and that God is Love, therefore I think that one way or another the end result of this reality will be an unimaginable bliss. (And technically it already exists through all of time, albeit not always clearly within one's awareness.)

The challenge is crossing the river safely, holding on to the Faith.

Do you genuinely believe that the real Jesus Christ will be returning according to the style mentioned in the New Testament?

Yes, I do.

How can I contact you?

That will not be an option at this time.