

First Published On

→The Human Conspiracy Blog: <http://www.jaygaskill.com/blog1>

→The Policy Think Site: <http://www.jaygaskill.com>

All contents, unless otherwise indicated are

Copyright © 2005, 2006 and 2007 by Jay B. Gaskill

Permission to copy; publish; distribute or print all or part of this article is needed.

Please contact: Jay B. Gaskill, attorney at law, via e mail:

law@jaygaskill.com

LINKS:

Profile: <http://www.jaygaskill.com/Profile.htm>

Archive: <http://www.jaygaskill.com/BLOGARCHIVE.htm>

Articles: <http://jaygaskill.com/GaskillLinks.pdf>

IS THERE A DEEPER WORLD VIEW THAT UNDERLIES THE TRADITIONAL WORLD RELIGIONS?

Let's not Forget Our Species' Core Human Discovery

By

Jay B. Gaskill

Why Ask the Question?

The moral order does not automatically self-perpetuate itself. If you doubt this, I invite you to reread the bloody history of the 20th century during which otherwise morally intelligent populations in Europe and Asia succumbed to three mass bloody movements that ran on quasi-religious, but profoundly warped ideologies (Nazi, Stalinist and Maoist totalitarianism). During this terrible period, thousands of religious leaders were imprisoned and millions of ordinary people murdered, while other intelligent and well meaning people stood by stupefied. I am reminded by Dostoevsky, speaking through his character Ivan Karamazov, that “without God, everything is permitted”. More accurately, *without a well supported moral order, things quickly go to hell.*

As the 21st century dawns, we still rely on the intergenerational transmission belt to maintain the moral order. That belt is broken in many places in urban America, and the “broken belt” problem is growing among our comfortable intelligentsia among whom all religions tend to be disparaged as retrograde fundamentalism or as mindlessly anti-scientific, or both.

The means by which we preserve and transmit our species' collective moral memory constitutes the social capital of the moral order. That social capital is made up of a core underlying belief system and a cadre of adults who are committed to its perpetuation in the culture.

All parents are at least minimally responsible to prepare their children for the challenges of the world. As part of that preparation, the parent generation needs to impart a robust moral code to those who follow. That crucial intergenerational moral transfer is not taking place in the post-modern family setting because of the decline of religious observance among our most educated populations. These are the people who otherwise would be our cultural, political and commercial leaders. I am not making an apology for any particular religion or pattern of observance. I am issuing an invitation for the intelligent, but spiritually disconnected among us to look deeper.

There is a deeper metaphysical model that underlies the great religious traditions. I call it the Core Human Discovery. It is not my goal to simplify this world view in order to make it directly accessible to children. That task has already been accomplished in large part by the orthodox religions, many of which have incorporated its main elements or been grown and nurtured on its broad *morphological features*, without always understanding that they are standing on deep inter-religious common ground.

When I say the orthodox religions are built on the Core Human Discovery and that its common morphological features are visible, say, in Christianity, Buddhism and Judaism, I mean “common morphology” in the following sense: Fish, dolphins and sea lions are different species that share a common morphology, a shared engineering solution to the problem of moving smoothly and efficiently while submerged in water. That streamlined, tear-shaped form and those tails and fins are close to the optimum transportation solution for each species, given its travel medium. Buddhists, Jews and Christians may not swim in the same sea, but they all swim somewhere in the larger ocean of humanity; and they all share a common spiritual-ethical morphology that includes similar models of exemplary moral behavior and several common moral prohibitions. In each tradition, we find the same injunctions against murder, theft and mendacity, and that these moral precepts are anchored on deeper terrain than the shifting sands of fashion. They are part of a “norm set” that is close to the optimum group survival solution for all who swim among other humans.

A Word about Civilization

Civilization is the critically necessary social technology by which the human species has managed to achieve planetary dominance (recalling that in the beginning we were weak and lived in constant fear of other predators); and civilization represents the sole social technology capable of sustaining our species over long spans of time. Civilization crucially depends on the widespread acceptance of and general adherence to a set of norms. This norm set constitutes the *normative architecture* of civilization.

To flourish, our children need to inherit a robust, liberty friendly creative civilization. Our legacy to them must include the inculcation of the essential values and operating principles upon which such a civilization depends, and to instill in them a willingness to fight for its preservation. This latter point takes us beyond mere utility; we need to access the deeper motivations.

The Utilitarian Premise and Its Limits

Part of any child's preparation for adulthood is the transmission, teaching or encouragement of the suite of faculties, skills and knowledge needed to function successfully in a then exchange milieu that constitutes modern life. But the child needs that which the civilization also requires: A moral anchor.

All the purely utilitarian arguments in favor of moral behavior can go only so far. This is not to disparage the wisdom of the utilitarian concerns, but it does suggest a caution for those who try to rely on utility alone. I am reminded of the British men and women who shed "blood, sweat and tears" against the Nazi onslaught. Clearly they were motivated by something more than the "greatest good for the greatest number". That ethos, brainchild of the British utilitarian moral philosopher, Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), rings hollow when heroic resistance is called for.

I'll return to this point soon, noting that a traditional anchor can prevent drift but it cannot drive a boat through troubled waters.

Any civilization worthy of the name requires modalities of social control aimed at restraining predators and otherwise supporting an expectation of rational predictability in all dealings. For this system to work at all (let alone well), the modalities of social control need to be linked to a *normative architecture* that is crafted to enable, support and protect the interactions of peaceful civil exchange.

For the modalities of social control to enjoy wide support within a civilization, the moral precepts and principles upon which they are based must be generally understood to have an objective authority, i.e., they need to be understood as more than mere tribal constructs, but as derived from the very fundamental normative underpinnings of the human enterprise itself. Ideally the moral structure of a civilization will be understood to represent the application of a few, well understood principles.

An Anchor that Moves the Boat; the Search for Relevant Transcendence

The successful intergenerational transmission of our species normative architecture over more than two or three generations requires an anchor outside social convention, secure from the whims and currents of fashion. But – and this is where my seagoing metaphor breaks down – the anchor (as it operates in each mind) must not only rectify, reassure and reveal the moral realm, *it must motivate us to act*. For reasons that should be evident as this discussion progresses, I believe we are necessarily talking about a *transcendental anchor*, located in effect beyond our immediate reach, but tethered to our deepest longings and motivations. To date, only the religions in some form or other have provided that transcendent moral anchor on a sufficiently large scale to be effective.

The decline of religious affiliation and adherence among the Western intelligentsia is a troublesome development for this very reason.

The post-modern condition has given rise to outbreaks of spiritual hedonism. These are part of the “crystals and aroma” New Age ethos that flourishes because it feeds the need for spiritual reassurance and comfort while it starves the equally strong need for connection to a robust and occasionally demanding moral order. We **enjoy** transcendence but we **need** morally relevant transcendence.

Relevant transcendence, in the sense used here, means an accessible non-mundane, non-transitory reality such that the transcendent connection exists and is potentially available to every thinking, potentially moral agent, and has at least these three properties:

- Immanence;
- Imminence;
- Relevance to the imperatives and demands of the moral life.

So, *moral* relevance is the key. To be relevant, any transcendent moral anchor must have *authority*. Its credibility must be internal as well as external.

Our species’ religions have succeeded in helping sustain civilization the last few millennia because they have provided a linkage (however imperfect) between one’s own internal evaluative/value-assigning faculty and that to which transcendence points: the *ultimate common source of all value*.

Relevant transcendence must continue to provide our primary *value-supporting* connection, one that opens up our access to a *universal repository of value*.

By necessary implication, this calls for or implies a relationship with *ultimate personality*. Whether ultimate personality is seen concretely, virtually, or symbolically, the ultimate relationship that is implied by moral transcendence leads us to a common center of *caring*. The capacity for *caring* is so central to personhood that, frankly, it is impossible to imagine *caring* as a disconnected, disembodied, impersonal force. I believe that this holds true even for Buddhism in the sense that there are really no impersonal *values*. We may from time to time be propelled by inertia, discipline, or external authority into obedience to a moral precept, but the underlying *values* that give that precept life are driven by *caring*. Put another way, the transcendent moral anchor is and must remain the primary authority for our “post-mortal caring”. Think about it carefully: The question, “Why should I care about the world or any part of it after I’m gone?” can be answered with real authority only via access to the experience of moral transcendence.

The Core Human Discovery in Outline

- (1) Transcendence is a common human experience, more often than not accompanied by a life altering moral insight.

- (2) There is a common moral realm, whether seen as universal conscience, natural moral law, or a core set of universal moral precepts derived from transcendent moral values.
- (3) Exemplary moral individuals arise (as a gift to us) who personify or incarnate (1) and (2), and whose lives generate, validate and give force to our ongoing moral traditions.
- (4) The moral Truths of the Core Human Discovery are Truths with a capital “T”; they transcend and stand over the mundane truths (with a lower case “t”) of day-to-day reality (including the theories and experimental outcomes of science).

Our species’ mainline orthodox religions have operated effectively in deploying the Core Human Discovery on four levels:

- (1) Top down literalism, something akin to the simple, but effective strategies of a good dog trainer;
- (2) Sophisticated allusion using metaphor and allegory;
- (3) Teaching by moral example;
- (4) Employing liturgy, ritual and the disciplines of meditation and prayer to facilitate individual reconnections with the Core Human Discovery

I believe that these four strategies have worked over the centuries because the Core Human Discovery is *actually true*, and because religions in general have been (and may remain) the single most effective means for the intergenerational transmission of the moral knowledge that we humans need to sustain our working civilizations.

The competing model is materialistic scientism. This model denies the possibility of transcendence altogether and by extension it denies the Core Human Discovery.

Emergent Purpose = Soft Teleology

Assume for the sake of this discussion that the eventual development of civilization is “programmed” into the sub-architecture that governs development paths in this universe. This is not a great stretch for science because most practicing scientists are willing to seriously entertain - even adopt as a working model - the general idea that this universe was so constructed that the eventual emergence of life was virtually assured. A plurality of working scientists would also concede that the emergence of intelligence within a robust ecology of living creatures is almost inevitable, given sufficient time for natural selection to operate, because of the competitive advantage reason confers.

The logic that leads us to expect the emergence of intelligence whenever local conditions in the universe permit also leads us to expect to foresee the self-organization of intelligent beings into social modalities that foster group survival. These modalities are forms of “civilization.”

The Core Human Discovery continues to integrate all these insights, including the many reported experiences of *transcendence* as discovery (as opposed to illusion). Through the

Core Human Discovery we humans have found and continue to find purpose in this universe instead of meaningless accident.

The Core Human Discovery therefore is *teleological* (because it tells us how the world is imbued with purpose and direction) but I hasten to add the recent implications drawn of chaos theory and quantum physics: The course of the world is not fully *pre-deterministic*. This is why I used the term virtually assured above.

Purpose and value make their appearance in the physical universe *gradually but almost inevitably* because they are inherent design features of the robust, fecund life-forms that emerge opportunistically through “natural” selection, but become dominant through “self assertion”.

Our starting point is the growing realization that the eventual development of civilization is virtually programmed into the sub-architecture of the natural world; that the rules, regularities and conditions that tend to govern development paths in this universe, combined with random chance and the passage of time, virtually assure civilization’s eventual appearance. Once that happens, creative intelligence (as it operates in the service of the life forms that gave it a platform) is amplified greatly within the interactive context of a *civilization*.

Think of civilization’s educational institutions, the communities of thinkers, the creative teams, the inventors at the head (or at the service) of supportive organizations, the dramatic creative synergies in Silicone Valley, and the creative surge in the arts in Renaissance Florence. Human intelligence becomes a creative force on its own when supported by civilization; it becomes a force that works much faster than the gradual evolutionary processes that, by giving an ecological venue for early humans, provided us with that “first chance”. Consider that it took mammals several million years through the slow mechanisms of natural selection to achieve the rudimentary technology of flight but that it took human civilization only a few thousand years to get human from treetops to the lunar surface using creative intelligence.

We can also allow ourselves to realize (as should by now be obvious) that several key norms are necessary for the emergence and continuity of civilizations because the social arrangements of civilization need to support peaceful exchange relationships among semi-autonomous intelligent actors. We can even expect that, over time, these norms would have become “soft-wired” via natural selection into the sub-architecture of volitional consciousness itself. Therefore we should not have been surprised by the recent findings that, within proto-intelligent animals capable of at least minimal social cooperation, there are early signs of the emergence of social norms. [Certain proto-ethical behaviors among the great apes have been detected. Whether and to what extent these are inherited weak tendencies combined with learned behaviors, or something more, is a pending issue.]

Life does benefit from intelligence and intelligence benefits from civilization; and the social technology of civilization actually *requires* a robust moral (or normative)

architecture. So here is the takeaway point: *Not all individuals are perfect; not all moral systems work perfectly; and not all civilizations are equally well constructed; but, over time, things gradually improve.* This is because both the so called “blind” evolutionary processes (I note that natural selection operates as if it were a proto-intelligence at work) and actual thinking beings (working both individually and collectively) *tend to learn from their mistakes*: The better planners and adapters in this universe enjoy a survival advantage. Therefore, there **is** a very long term tendency toward improvement. It is more clearly visible at a remove. It operates because intelligence and creative innovation, and yes, a moral context for these attributes, collectively confer a marginal survival advantage. Of course, success is never guaranteed.

Strict Materialism and its Limitations

Daniel Dennett and Richard Dawkins are members of the anti-religious, anti-transcendence intelligentsia. [See *Breaking the Spell: Religion as a Natural Phenomenon*, by Daniel C. Dennett (Penguin) and *The God Delusion*, by Richard Dawkins (Houghton Mifflin) and the review by Michael Novak referenced below.]

These and the other God-hostile intellectuals must necessarily work overtime to avoid the teleological implications of the general pro-life, pro-intelligence, pro-creative adaptation tendencies that nature has exhibited over the last several billion years. I suspect that teleology must be strongly denied by these authors because to admit that a pervasive purpose is at work in the universe implies that there is a meta-being somewhere in the mix with the capacity for purpose and a will to exercise it in favor of living creative moral beings.

The ultimate metaphysical ground upon which scientism rests is the doctrine of strict materialism, the strikingly arrogant claim that the primary subject of the physical sciences, the realm of matter and energy, represents *all that is and ever was real*. This view empowers the arch-materialists’ claims that *purpose* is nothing more than a human invention; that God cannot exist because there is no experimentally verifiable evidence for a deity having “caused” any event; and that everything is “explained” by purely physical/material processes. In other words, the scientific study of mere “stuff” - matter and energy in all its forms - provides our species with all the guidance it will ever need. Scientism claims to hold the sole explanation of Life, the Universe, and Everything.

The Core Human Discovery is durable for a reason. An embedded “soft” teleology is clearly at work in the universe. As we begin the 21st century, this is at the heart of the Core Human Discovery:

The tendency/soft teleology that has become increasingly evident in this universe is civilization-friendly. This simple fact strongly implies the central presence of deity as the core animating, organizing principle of development.

Why speak of a Caring Deity instead of some impersonal “force”?

- (1) Because consciousness and *conscience* cannot be separated in the real world;
- (2) Because conscience cannot be divorced from *caring*;
- (3) Because the tendencies for the emergence of consciousness and conscience are encoded in the warp and woof of the universe;
- (4) Because the Ur-source of consciousness and conscience cannot be adequately apprehended or described as a purely impersonal mechanism.

I propose that esthetics, empathy, ethics and the experience of transcendence are all deeply linked to each other in that they are aspects of a common faculty (or bundle of faculties) enjoyed by healthy conscious intelligence. They are part of a suite of special cognitive abilities that include our capacity to recognize other thinking, feeling beings as real persons, and to grasp in a meaningful way what is actually going on his or her “head and heart”.

The striking inability of Dr. Dennett to “explain” consciousness (“Consciousness Explained” Little, Brown & Co. 1991) except within the impoverished context of arch-materialism should have been a clue to the bankruptcy of scientism as the grand explanation of all significance.

Recently, I was struck by the revelation that the last century’s most famous atheist, Sigmund Freud (1836-1939), *hated music*. I wonder whether Dr. Dennett and the other materialist atheists might accept the description of Bach’s “B Minor Mass” or Beethoven’s “Eroica”, or Johnny Cash’s “Walk The Line”, or Dave Brubeck’s “Elementals”, or Duke Ellington’s “Take The A train” as fluctuations of air pressure that produce characteristic electrical activity in the brain? In a special sense, the exercise of rigorous materialism by those who profess the faux religion of scientism has a disturbing resemblance to the mindset of the *autistic*.

I am personally persuaded that the saints, bodhisattvas, seers, mavens and mystics who have been able to record their intimate and awesome experience of the Presence of an ultimate, caring Being (sometimes reported as a “beingness” or simply as an encounter with the numinous – a truly life-changing experience when not denied) were telling the Truth. And I am personally persuaded that they were employing the same suite of cognitive abilities that all healthy humans can potentially access. Through this suite of abilities we humans are gifted to be able to recognize, know and love each other and to enjoy and be moved by art, music and humor. In this sense what we sometimes call faith is nothing less than self-confidence in the veracity of our apperception of the *numinous*. The sense that a “great veil has been stripped away” to reveal that which is a wonder to behold” is so common in human history and has so often been coupled with great moral insight that to deny its reality and significance seems to me to hint of pathology. In this sense, the intense work of an intellectual, like Dr. Dennett who purports to “explain” (read “explain away”) consciousness, resembles the remarkable feats of memory and mathematical calculations of an autistic savant *who cannot stand to be touched*.

Of course Daniel Dennett is by all accounts a normal, civilized fellow. I suspect therefore that the strict materialism upon which most of his work is based is more of a rhetorical

construct than an operating life principle. Then there is the possibility that he is living in genteel denial. Like the other great doubters (I think of the billiard playing David Hume – 1711-1776), the comfortable, prosperous, well protected atheists of our era have taken the blessings of civilization for granted and seem to think that drawing room civility is an exportable product in its own right.

I want you to think of Dennett and Hume occupying an elegantly decorated, large elevator, equipped with the comforts of a study room at Oxford. Then consider the two “elevator thought experiments” first posed by Albert Einstein. Someone is isolated from the rest of the world and is set up in a pressurized elevator. In (a), the elevator is being towed in space at a steady acceleration of one gravity. In (b), the elevator is being allowed to fall from a great height. The observer in each is not able to tell the difference between: being situated safely on the earth (a) or being safely adrift near some earth satellite in orbit (b). Note that Einstein stops the story here to make his famous point about inertial frames of reference, *but each observer faces a possible disastrous reckoning*. In Hume’s and Dennett’s case, that reckoning is to be visited on a future generation.

Each atheistic “parent” who cannot communicate the elements of the Core Human Discovery has to rely on the power of *imitation without the power of renewal*. This kind of cultural transmission belt is subject to decay over time just as in the whispered message in a parlor game where a sentence is quietly told ear-to-ear around the table, only to end up garbled at the end.

I wrote about some of these issues in my early twenties. The following image (captured in old handwritten notes) seems to capture the plight of the “children” of the elevator people:

I see the falling away of the underpinnings of common morality as a result of the structural damage done by a pathological extension of skepticism. I imagine the whole body of human ethical principles, precepts and core beliefs as body of water held together by a bucket which represents the religious underpinnings of morality.

That is frame one.

In frame two, the bucket is removed, revealing the temporarily bucket-shaped glistening contents hanging in the air.

In frame three, without any support, the contents become a quivering blob. And in frame four, gravity takes over.

Our “modern” culture hovers between frames two and four....

The Universe That Needs To think: The Big Bang as Illumination.

The Core Human Discovery has developed in tandem with the scientific world view (as distinguished from scientism), and is not inherently hostile to science. I believe that the “CHD” can easily support a newly discovered core principle: *The self-organizing universe is also the proto-thinking universe*. A universe that exhibits a trend towards the emergence of thinking is a universe that wants to think and eventually (though us) will think.

Because we are the only self-aware thinking elements of the universe about which we have any direct knowledge, the follow-on question is ours alone to ask: *Why?*

That simple question: “Why are intelligence, purpose and conscience emerging within this universe?” is the one that we will be called on (in varying degrees of simplicity) to answer for our children. I propose (consistent with the “CHD”) an answer: The emergence of intelligence, purpose and conscience in the universe was foreordained by an Ur-intelligence that *cared for and therefore wished for that outcome*. A logical chain of reasoning and a well known bit of ancient scripture coincide here. “God said: Bear fruit and be many and fill the earth and subdue it!” Genesis 1:28 (Everett Fox, “The Five Books of Moses”)

Any strict materialist must also address the cosmological/physical issues surrounding the scientific trump card of the last century. The present universe began about 14-6 billion years ago from the **Big Bang**.

What came before the Big Bang?

An almost perfect consensus of physical scientists hold that all of space-time as we know it was once held compressed in a tiny entity *of such density and infinitesimal “size”* (a term that may not even apply) *that none of the physical laws with which science is familiar can describe it*.

It is called the pre-big Bang “Singularity”.

Was all the creative information, all the plans, designs, laws, forms that were later to emerge contained in this impossibly perfect “hard drive”? I’m tempted to think of infinite information storage in a point. Is this really plausible in a perfectly materialistic model of reality? Plato would have had no problem with the notion that form (and by extension information) occupies a different realm than the merely physical. But Plato has no standing among the arch-materialists. The fact that none of our physical laws and none of our mathematics can adequately describe what goes on “inside” the Pre-big bang Singularity is what people in my profession call a *clue*. Either all of the information that was later to emerge and define the contours, development principles and very space-time architecture of this universe were resident in the Pre Big Bang Singularity, *or they were resident elsewhere* (using the term “where” loosely, of course).

Any serious materialist must therefore consider and address:

- (1) The “regression-of-creative information problem” (running the big Bang movie backwards) – in effect asking, “Where did all the creative information go?” or conversely
- (2) The progressive “unfolding-of-creative information in space-time to the present problem” (running the big Bang movie on fast forward) – in effect asking, “Where did all this come from?”

And more to the point: “Where did we come from?”

The final nail in the coffin of the strict materialist world view of scientism is that the very architecture of space-time in this (or any universe) *is necessarily prefigured outside of that framework*.

I strongly suspect that in most of the academy, strict materialism is a pose adopted as a convenient platform - the pulpit of scientism - from which to attack the supposed evils of religious fundamentalism. But there is a crack in the materialist wall large enough to accommodate a creator that operates from the very beginning and in the present moment though the propagation of creative information as design.

I came away from this kind of exercise (and I’ve mercifully condensed a several years of thought and reflection here) with the notion that, information *qua information* (see my article links below) were precedent at the Beginning *as creative potential*. The question of “where” and “when” that creative potential resides is strictly “non sense”. After all, these are time and space questions about something outside time and space.

But there is a shorthand answer. I find it deeply explanatory and intellectually and personally satisfying. It encodes an entire metaphysical outlook. I believe it is the very essence of the Core Human Discovery. It is the only comprehensive reality model that has yet been posited that actually integrates all we really know about “Life, the Universe and Everything” without excluding our deeper selves from the universe.

The shorthand answer to where and when the potential for all space time and the resultant universes resides is this:

They reside in the God Mind.

JBG

LINK

A Critique of Dennett, Et Al. “Lonely Atheists of the Global Village” By Michael Novak (reviewing Dennett, Harris and Hawkins latest books:

http://www.aei.org/publications/filter.all,pubID.25770/pub_detail.asp

Note that Novak writes more sympathetically of atheists than Dennett, Harris & Hawkins do of theists:

“... in my own early work was centered upon the dialogue between believers and unbelievers, the intellectual horizon of the Absurd (as Camus, Sartre, and so many others called it) and that of Biblical faith — in such books as *Belief and Unbelief* and *The Experience of Nothingness*, for instance. For that reason, I really wanted to like these new books on atheism. I have learned a lot about atheists and believers from Jürgen Habermas, possibly the best-known atheist in Europe. Habermas writes of believers with respect and as equal partners in an important dialogue. A respectful regard for mutual dignity is, Habermas holds, essential to the practice of rationality among human beings. Recently, I had the honor of a long series of exchanges with a very smart American atheist, Heather Mac Donald, and these were a pleasure to conduct, with mutual regard, patience, and candor on both sides.

“Alas, it is extremely difficult to engage on the same level with Harris, Dennett, and Dawkins. All of them think that religion is so great a menace that they do not have much disposition for dialogue. The battle flags they put into the wind are Voltaire’s *Ecrasez l’infâme!* Meanwhile, all three pretend that atheists “question everything” and “submit to relentless, almost tedious, self-criticism.” Yet in these books there is not a shred of evidence that their authors have ever had any doubts whatever about the rightness of their own atheism. Self-questioning about their own scholarly indifference to their subject; about the horrific brutalities committed in the name of “scientific atheism” during the 20th century; about the restless and mercurial dissatisfactions in atheist and secular movements during the past hundred years; and about the demographic weaknesses thereof — all such questions are notable by their absence. Moreover, although an atheist zeitgeist dominates university campuses in America, it has not proved persuasive to huge numbers of students, who hold their noses and put up with it. Why does atheism persuade so few? Our authors never ask.”

LINKS TO SOME OF JBG’S ESSAYS AND ARTICLES

The Purpose of the Universe

<http://www.jaygaskill.com/generatropicuniverse.htm>

2Be or not: The Designs of Intelligence

<http://www.jaygaskill.com/Designofintelligence.htm>

The Matter of Reality

<http://www.jaygaskill.com/Critique.htm>

To See the Invisible

<http://www.jaygaskill.com/Toseetheinvisible.htm>

Reflections on the Stages of Awareness of Being

<http://www.jaygaskill.com/Awareness.htm>

The dialogic imperative

<http://www.jaygaskill.com/i2i.htm>

A Theology for the 21st Century

<http://www.jaygaskill.com/elements.htm>

More Articles on The Policy Think Site

<http://www.jaygaskill.com> and

The Human Conspiracy Blog

<http://www.jaygaskill.com/blog1>



Jay B. Gaskill

Is a Bay Area Attorney & Consultant

More about the Author

<http://www.jaygaskill.com/Profile.pdf>