



Figure 1: “Jesus I know, and Paul I know about, but who are you?” (Acts 19:15). The author has completed the highschool with a gold medal, the master degree at the University of Tartu with Cum Laude, has published in top academic journals, including Physical Review, has been lecturer at the university. The first part of his CV can be found in <http://www.etis.ee>.

Division of Faith and Reason is consequence of unjust Methods of Science

Dmitri Martila¹

Former researcher at Institute of Physics, Tartu University, Estonia

Abstract

The Science tells us, that there is the chance, that Bible is true. But let us assume, that Y-Chromosomal Adam lived 600 years before the Mitochondrial Eve was born (according to references in Wikipedia, there is a chance, that Y-Chromosomal Adam lived same time as Mitochondrial Eve). But the female ancestor of that Eve lived also 600 years before the Mitochondrial Eve: latter has grand-grand-grand-mother called also “Eve”. Enough grand, that this grand-grand-grand-Eve lived the same time with Y-Chromosomal Adam. The future Eve was in the genus of those who lived with Adam. Therefore, one can say that Adam lived at the same time as Eve. This is argued in this paper. In addition, I use the opportunity for a discourse about the methodology of science, proposing a change of methodology.

Indeed, if the Mitochondrial Eve Valentina was born by Victoria, Victoria was born by Susy, and Susy was born by Eve, then Valentina, Victoria, Susy, and the original Eve are all our common ancestors. However, the original Eve is the most ancient common ancestor.

¹eestidima@gmail.com

Due to alternative formulas [1], Adam and Eve lived about 7500 years ago. But even such a progressive article does not contain my result. Apostasy says that the most recent common ancestors might not even have been married. But my result is that the most ancient ancestors were indeed married.

In addition, I prove that the most ancient common ancestors are at the same time the most recent common ancestors, proposing a past-directed evolution: “In the beginning God” (Genesis 1:1). However, the attempt to divorce the couple and, therefore, to cut the source of the existence of humankind is a clear sign for a war against and existing God, a self-destructive nihilism, satanism and mental sickness, a wrong methodology, censorship, division, and malicious ignorance of science. Therefore, I argue for a change of methodology.

Trolling: “your posts are illogical, incoherent.” Surely, after the Second Coming this paper will be published in a good journal. I am in God’s right. Atheists are not. So, their tyranny time will soon pass “with a roar” (2. Peter 3:10). “Put everything under Him, so that God may be all in all.” (1. Corinthians 15:28).

1 Most ancient common ancestors of contemporary humankind is the original married couple

If Y-Chromosomal Adam lived many centuries before the Mitochondrial Eve, he still knew the female Eve from whom the Mitochondrial Eve came. This female Eve can be, then, called the common ancestor of the contemporary female humankind. And the observation does not exclude Adam’s and Eve’s marriage. I quote from Wikipedia 2018: “As of 2013, estimates for the age Y-MRCA are subject to substantial uncertainty, with a wide range of times from 180,000 to 580,000 years ago (with an estimated age of between 120,000 and 156,000 years ago, roughly consistent with the estimate for mt-MRCA).”

Suppose the moment of History called “ACA” has happened at 5500 BC. [13] Then at this year 5500 BC lived, suppose 20000 Adams, it means, that any single human in our time (2018 AD) can trace own origin to one (or more) of the Adams [for example, man Bob – female Jane – man Igor – - man John - Adam number 1700]. But due to the direct male descendants line of Y-Chromosomal Adam (and line of females of Mitochondrial Eve) is present also at 5500 BC, then ACA point must be more ancient, than time when M-Eve and Y-Adam were born. It means, that mt-MRCA must be not 200 000 years old, but under 10 000 years old.

Therefore, Adam lived at the same time with the original Eve. Suppose that the family of Adam lived in the same city together with 10 families, and this was the complete population of the planet. Every woman of our time (year 2018 A.C.) can trace her line back to one of these families. Then the probability that they all came from the family of Adam is $P = (1/10)^N$, where $N = 3500000000$ is the number of females in 2018 A.C. The probability that at least one female (of the contemporary female humankind) has not come from the family of Adam is then $p = 100\% - P \rightarrow 100\%$. But since the researches say that ABSOLUTELY ALL WOMEN in our days came from the family of Adam, the number of families is not 10, but 1.

1.1 Alternative derivation of the original couple

Look, from the Mitochondrial Eve (she is known to Science, the Science in Wikipedia talks about her: she is the real person) at least 3 500 000 000 female lines follow into the future: these lines connect every women in our 2018 year with Mitochondrial Eve by blood (all females in 2018 are blood-relatives, all are “sisters in Eve”). But from Mitochondrial Eve only single

female line follows into the past. And if the Y-Chromosomal Adam lived 600 years before Mitochondrial Eve was born, then he was walking on the planet, with the female blood relative(s) of Mitochondrial Eve. Moreover, from Y-Chromosomal Adam the single male line could follow into the past. However, due to human-monkey population becomes more and more small in numbers (while our mind motion into past), is expected, that past-directed Y-line and past directed M-line are converging to just one couple: original couple of Adam and Eve. Think about them, are they looking in your imagination as monkeys, alien biorobots, or a simple one-cell organisms? Oh my dear! What are your problems with the Absolute Truth?! [2]

1.2 What if the female common ancestor was a monkey or was created from aliens?

Assuming that close to the 5 human families in the city of Adam there was a forest with the 5 most developed monkeys, who later have produced some female lines of the humankind. Then the probability that a modern female traces her line back not to the city of Adam but to the monkey forest is much less than simply $d := 1/10$. Therefore, the result is that the probability of “all females in 2018 have a common female ancestor” tends to zero: $d^N \rightarrow 0$. But it has happened, so its probability was not the zero, but 100%, because there was no monkey forest, just the city of Adam with only one family: the one of Adam.

1.3 Conclusion

The Y-Chromosomal Adam is married with the female common ancestor, and all previous common male ancestors are married with female common ancestors. Therefore, the probability that the most recent male ancestor is the most ancient male ancestor tends to 100%. In other words, the Y-Chromosomal Adam is the original Adam. And because a contemporary woman must have equal human rights as a contemporary man, one can be sure that the most recent female ancestor is the most ancient female ancestor. In other words, the Mitochondrial Eve is the original Eve.

1.4 Should the evolution be directed into the past?

Axiom: *If the vector of degradation was not realized when there was more ability of minds, it will never be realized because without miracles, degradation of minds is irreversible.*

The embittered and damaged ones grow more and more in numbers, it is like the growth of Entropy (chaos) in Physics [3]. Therefore, is expected that Adam and Eve (Fig.2) were not *Untermenschen*, not animals, but fully evolved humans: the arrow of evolution is past-directed [4].

2 Does peer-review inslave the editors, so they can't have their own opinion and desire?

Dear Editors, thank you if you would sent my paper to the (anonymous) referees. But. And this is big but: Jesus is not yet returned. Therefore, the referees are sinners. And as being sinners, they can troll and block my paper just because I am an extremely active believer (check



Figure 2: The Holy Icon of Adam and Eve. We can be absolutely sure that in Eastern Orthodox Christianity Adam and Eve are fully respected as original saints. This is the past-directed evolution.

my name in Google), and because I am not a PhD, and because the results are great (so they stimulate the sin called “envy”). Therefore, I am asking you: if all reports would be total negativism, without any logical reasoning at all, would you still protect me and publish the breakthrough paper?

I have given my papers in the Journal Theology to graduated persons, but they were not ready “to fight devils”. I lost my academic employment in 2011. It seems like that to ensure that the scientific path does not lead people to the God of Absolute Truth, the “fathers” of science introduced a lot of absurdity into the Methods of Science. A crucial method of research is given by the reports in the Journals. A top journal can raise the rate of acceptance and respect (towards the submitters) after the return of Jesus Christ. So, the change in Methods will come with Lord. A new methodology is applied to marry Adam and Eve in Love.

It is not a secret that until the works of Darwin there was no massive loss of fear for the punishing agency called “Heaven”. Accordingly, in the renewed methodology, the theology is present. An example for the fight of the author against pseudo-scientific rudeness and disrespect is found in the “Discussion”. Live cannot be infinitely extended to the past. As infinities do not exist in nature, there is a very first living being with the esteemed name of “God”.² He must be source of all Life, because He is the first, the Alpha and the Omega. “Do you know Him? – That’s My King” [5].

A knowledge is what is known by a living being. Therefore, the very first living being is the source of all knowledge. Therefore, knowledge of a human is the knowledge of God’s mind which proves God’s existence (objectively). Anyone who without reason disagrees with the proof (or publicly doubts it; whatever proof, like in mathematics) is the liar. Our God cannot sin, because the holiness is defined as being true to God. We know God’s True objective opinions through the conscience. The latter is owned by anyone (also by atheists), as the God of Absolute Truth tells that e.g. $2 + 2 = 4$. A spiritual entity (like the love) is what God measures, and God is who measures the spiritual entities. A material entity (or nature) is what physical instruments measure, and instruments are what measure material entities. The measure of God (and the instruments) has to be unchangeable in goodness. This tells the dogma of theology. God can do only good by the definition of goodness. For instance, the police might execute a criminal, but is not guilty before God, even though a policeman who had no right to execute a criminal named Bob has lost the right to be called a policeman any more. As a second example, the government can make only true laws, as sinful laws are not laws but mistakes and sin. The satan is the damned source of evil and sin. The evil has no right to exist, because rights and existence come from God. Sin is a mental sickness, but it becomes extremely malicious, if the sinner accepts from satan the false “right” to sin. Until he became the first murderer (in the garden of Eden, cf. Genesis 3:14) was ill, but he was not damned to hell. Still, the first “human” murderer Kain was damned to hell in Genesis 4:11.

Because Science has taken its origin from monasteries, and because the only final goal of science was the study of God, science is now in schism with the atheism as basis of the methodology, justifying and praising ignorance, doubt, bullying, trolling and uncertainty – which is non-knowledge and non-truth. See for instance Mr. Ra’s bullying against theist Kent Hovind. Mr. Ra is convinced that this is OK [6]. Doubt, uncertainty and ignorance constitute the official policy [7]. They even ignore their own life and existence, just as they ignore the God of Existence [8].

We do not debate with sick people, but we cite the recognition of “scientific rights” posted by the Flat Earth Society [9] and the recognition of “scientific rights” of atheism [10]. Debates with sick people is the first move towards the “Overton Window” [11]. Why? The only enemy of the

²God is not idol, because an idol (satan) is what has stolen His Holy Name.

God of Absolute Truth is the idol of deception, the satan. That is why the crazy methodology of science will be changed only after the Second Coming. And the separation of Church and State with its “freedom of religions” is actually a Church schism (which led to the acceptance of the false “church of satan” in the USA), because the original form of rulership is God’s blessed theocracy: “they have rejected me as their king” (1. Samuel 8:7).

2.1 Overton Window for Atheism

Humankind has gone through all the stages of perversion in such a way that it no longer remembers the happy time where lies and godlessness were the most terrible accusations. Nowadays, there exists a natural, indisputable godless “right” of human, which exists “always” and “will” exist even in the Paradise after the Judgment Day. Isn’t that wild madness?! Who does remember, when the debate of believers and atheists began? The fact is that “right doctors” do not argue with sick patients; but patients are being treated. God is so obvious, that even a proof is not required (this “God does not require proof” is common sense to the humankind). God is proven first of all by His Son, Jesus Christ. And when they begin to debate with atheists, they unwillingly recognize satanic “right” to godlessness and torment in the hell [12].

To revert the Overton Window motion one needs to get used to use such words in everyday communication like godless lie, godless abnormality, godless persecution, godless perversion, godless deception, godless terror, godless hate, godless evil, godless monstrosity, etc; to any negativity one has to add the word “godless”.

2.2 How many Gods?

How the variety of Gods is reflected in Politics

In the religious thought of mankind there are two main non-overlapping options: Theism and atheism (and in mathematics about $2 + 2$ are two opinions: 4, or not 4). Therefore, there are two according Gods: the God of Truth and the idol of godless lies. Indeed, if five Gods were in charge of the theism, God “Bob” would not be in charge of atheism and part of the theism. But there is nothing in common between atheism and theism. Therefore, the number of Gods in theism is unity. We cite the known riddle: “What is common to a crow and a desk?” As example, the fact that the crow is not an apple and the table is not an apple; although the raven is not a table. Theism is not atheism, but is there something in common between Theism and atheism? Nothing at all (cf. 2. Corinthians 6:14-18 and 1. Corinthians 15:28). Since there is nothing in common, the atheist, mentioning the holy name of God, speaks not about the real God, but about his/her own idol, the non-existent god. The gulf between Being and Death is great: “between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence.” (Luke 16:26)

All variety of Gods are reducible to just two: the God of Truth and the idol of atheism. Therefore, there are two alternative Sciences (Young Earth Creation Science and Darwinism), two alternative morals (historically, there where left and right politician wings before the right wing got mixed with left ideology, fanaticism, hereticism, indifference towards religions, and confusion), and two alternative definitions of faith [15] (cf. 2018 year’s Wikipedia: “In the context of religion, one can define faith as confidence or trust in a particular system of religious belief, within which faith may equate to confidence based on some perceived degree of warrant, in contrast to a definition of faith as being belief without evidence). One can shorten this definition: Faith is Faithful-ness to Knowledge.


The left and right wings in politics were predicted: “He will put the sheep on his right and the goats on his left.” (Matthew 25:33) With the time the right wing became more and more

left: “the sons of God saw that the daughters of humans were beautiful, and they married any of them they chose.” (Genesis 6:2); “Nevertheless, I have a few things against you: There are some among you who hold to the teaching of Balaam, who taught Balak to entice the Israelites to sin so that they ate food sacrificed to idols and committed sexual immorality.” (Revelation 2:14)

2.3 Cleansing the Definition of Science

The usual definition of Science is the following: “Science is a systematic enterprise that builds and organizes knowledge in the form of testable explanations and predictions about the universe”. This simply says that Popper’s scientific criterion is the scientific method to extract knowledge. Therefore, basically, Science is defined to be the process of extraction by using Scientific methods. However, this definition can be greatly shortened: “Science is knowledge extraction.” Usually after a term definition a description of it follows: “Science is composed of main sections, such as: Methodology, Metrology, and Disciplines (Physics, Mathematics, Chemistry, Art, History, Philosophy, Psychology, Theology).”

The words “Science is a system of knowledge obtained by scientific methods” is a tautology. After all, scientific methods are the “methodology” section of science. In Theology, one of the methods is the reading of the Bible and the prayer (cleansing the mind).



The methodology in physics has not changed for a long time and is completely “dusty”. Are we living in a perfect world? If yes, do you like terrorism? No. My suggestions:

2.4 Scientific theory is always confirmable

Common belief: “A scientific theory is true (with its confirmation) and scientific (with its falsifiability). That’s all. If the theory is not confirmed, it can not be true and will be rejected by this criterion.”

But these are just our “romantic” fantasies. And what does Popper’s official wording say? There are no words “Truth”, “confirmability”. Well, indeed, the criterion of Popper (believer, by the way!) sounds like this: a scientific theory is scientific when it can be refuted. That is, to prove that it is a lie and falsehood. Therefore, lies and untruths entered science. And in order for the unchangeable Dogmatic Knowledge of the Church to be included in Science, it is necessary to rewrite the criterion in this way: “scientific theory is confirmable.” If a theory test disproves scientific theory, then it is no longer scientific. The aim of a test is not to disprove a scientific theory but to confirm it. If it sadly happens that a theory becomes disproven,

the theory is not scientific anymore (NB! Read my wording: usually a test is meant not to prove but to confirm). Otherwise, the vector is directed towards idiocy, not towards evolution: scientists and journal referees are called to lie for Science to be refutable. If someone refutes a scientific theory, then the latter is no longer scientific and, therefore, not confirmable. But it stays forever refutable, if once refuted.³ The Flat Earth theory is refuted, so this theory is scientific, because it is forever refutable. Please consider how love, respect and trust are lost in them [19]. Popper's destructive ideology is incompatible to the dogmatic knowledge, to the Absolute Truth. Latter can not be refuted. That is why there is a conflict between religion and technical science. The small word "confirmable" makes the difference between the hell on earth and the happy life. The theist Immanuel Kant has destroyed Thomas Aquinas's five proofs of God by using the wishfull thinking only: Kant wished (according to Popper's definition of science) to destroy, wished to refute. Better is to wish to confirm, to built, to love the theorem authors, to respect their work.

Not to destruct things, Love, and Life as shame-less-ly sinned the nihilist Adolf Hitler. God damned Adolf Hitler burning in hell. Nihilism is not true, because it denies the Absolute Truth. The absence of truth is lie.

2.5 The burden of proof is the presumption of non-existence

The modern Methodology supposes that if the article was not refuted by the reviewer, but he did not understand this article, the journal must reject the article. This is known under name "burden of proof". Science is based on methods. But has science proved own methods in strictly scientific way? Or are they "proven" only by practice? But how unfair could become this practice? I suspect that often a reviewer understood everything, but lied that he did not understand to stop the author. The burden of proof is not suitable for the methods of science, because it does not fight the unjust activity.

The burden of proof should not become the presumption of the guilt, that "if something has not been proven, it does not exist." Instead, the presumption of innocence has to be used: "as long as something is not refuted, it exists." As you have noticed, such principles allow theology to rank with technical science [20].

The presumption of existence is not the factual existence and not the assumption of existence. But my God is proven to exist. The trolls use the presumption of non-existence: "If something is not proven, it is like if it does not exist". This is the "burden of proof". But I use the presumption of existence, the presumption of innocence and the presumption of righteousness, the latter expressed as "until one would become disproven, the person is treated as if he is in right".

If somebody called John tells you that a demon is in your room and is going to murder you, would you believe that this demon in the room exists? DISPROOF number 1: the demons do not exist because it does not come from the Source of Existence (the God of Existence). DISPROOF number 2: demons exist only as problem. They have no right to exist. But John might be a god-less atheist, so he is not God, so John cannot see that an enemy is in your room. Thus, John has lied and, therefore, is not trustworthy. Moreover, you and John can come to a common ground by agreeing that a demonic problem might be in the room but also might not be.

³The "Hawking temperature" of the black hole is explained differently in the two abstracts of Refs. [16]. However, it has to coincide, because it is Hawking's most famous discovery. Has the World gone with the true one? Another example: all scientists used (and are still using (cf. e.g. Laura [17]) the solution of a dust collapse almost for a century, but this was wrong [18]. Some of the peer-review "mistakes" are uncovered in Rudolf Peierls, "Surprises in Theoretical Physics" (1979) and "More Surprises in Theoretical Physics" (1991).

The degradation has reached the groundless assertion of “what can be asserted without evidence can be rejected without evidence” (ATHEIST Hitchen’s razor). Such a razor deals with an author in the following cruel way: first, the editor of the journal posts doubt that there is no proof in the article. The author responds that there is a proof, since the author thinks so, and asks not to be rude but rather check the proof for correctness. But the editor was “brought up” by the god-less Hitchen which means that the author’s latter sentence is not in itself a strict refutation of the editor’s statement, so the article is not accepted for consideration with the argument of having no proof. Hitchen’s razor justifies any tyranny and highhandedness.

A typical editorial office etazhi-lit.ru/edition reports that their journal

- does not take payments and does not pay the royalty for the publication of manuscripts;
- does not enter into correspondence with the authors, does not notify the author whose manuscript was rejected, and also does not explain the reasons for the refusal;
- does not review and does not give advice on the text of the manuscript;
- can not share the opinion of the author.

The cancellation of royalties at the end of the XX century does not mean anything good for “plebs”, i.e. independent researches. The independent and free-thinking science has lost support and financial means. The love is dying [21].

If a journal may not share the opinion of its own journal article, all articles in the journal are self-justifications of the authors, so they are not objective despite the peer-review. By saying that “the journal does not trust its own papers”, the peer-review system becomes nihilated. What is the point then about the journal? If the editors of scientific journals do not review the submitted material, they can be self-justifying tyrants. And if all such journals are tyrants, they do not respect the truth. “The truth is born in the argument” (popular aphorism), but editors deny disputes. And if so, their journal is like a junk yard.

The degradation of the meaning of the printed word became obvious in the developments related to Fermat’s last theorem. In plain language, journal decided that letters from plebs go to the trash unopened. This is really mean: “Proving the Fermat theorem among mathematics lovers was so popular that in 1972 the Kvant magazine, publishing an article about the Fermat theorem, accompanied it with the following postscript: “The editors of Quant, for its part, consider it necessary (!!!) to inform readers that letters with the “proofs” of the Fermat theorem will not be considered (and returned)” [22].

2.6 About publishing in scientific archives

Your suggestion: “You can publish science papers in the arXiv.org e-Print archive, I think.”

Me: “No, I can’t. Just like for the Nobel Prize nomination, where a programmed bot looks for most cited scientist, they have blocks to prevent a pleb from publishing. These blocks are 1. endorsement and 2. moderation.”

You: “What would you do if you were sent tons of manure, promising that there is a gold nugget in each heap, but after having shoveled a few heaps you haven’t found it? Would you continue to dig? Have you never read the bead that “manuscripts are not reviewed and are not returned”, and that the “editorial opinion may not coincide with the opinion of the author”? It is worth respecting the disclaimers. You have received the answer, but the meanness you have not seen.”

Me: “That way you “can” justify Adolf Hitler. You can justify any idiot, if you really want. Therefore, it is necessary to change the methodology.”

You: “And immediately after this, the idiots and the false scientists will flood the science. The present methodology is correct because it works.”

Me: “The new methodology makes the journals use their brains to screen out articles.”

You: “They just do not have the opportunity to do it.”

Me: “Why wouldn’t they say honestly: “Pleb, do not write to us.” Dr. Michio Kaku, a quite popular physicist on YouTube insincerely says: “If you find out what Dark Matter is, let me first know”, or “the Nobel Prize is waiting for someone who understands why there is so few antimatter in the Universe”. As the “plebs” do not have a direct channel of communication with the elite. Can’t they organize a fees for talking to elites like Kaku?”

2.7 Discussion

If two competing things, if two competing theories (A and B), if two competing Theologies are possible, then it can be a subject for investigation: the set $S = (A, B)$ is refuted, however A and B are not yet. You should recall my meaning of presumption. It is not assumption. Presumption of innocence means that the author is being treated as if he is in right, as if he is not criminal nor crazy, until the opposite would be proven. Presumption deals more with KINDNESS and RESPECT and LOVE and CULTURE, than with technical truth. We are not robots! Without this there is no knowledge, because all is in doubt. But the latter sentence is the knowledge. The existence of God has arguments, such as those given by Thomas Aquinas. Therefore, God is glorified in the new methodology as being proven. The new methodology will make us happy [23]. But nowadays such lovable principles are being laughed at, so an “opponent” might act like a disrespectful troll:

Opponent: “Sorry, where’s the “proof” that the mitochondrial Eve is the wife of Adam?”

Me: “Please open the paper. Do not lie that it is not a proof. A proof can be wrong, but it is still a proof, if the author tells you. Please demonstrate that proof is wrong.”

Opponent: “It is idiotic nonsense. Why do you give this nonsense any credibility at all? The paper is not about the Science.”

Me: “You do lie. I am not stupid. The paper IS about science. But in case it is not, then I am a nothing. Am I? What are your problems then?”

Opponent: “We should be sorry, but we are guilty before God of Truth and Love. We are satanic liars. We give no valid reasons, but we’re rejecting your paper. The text is weird and confusing. It is read as if the author had got a paper rejected by a journal, and this event has triggered a mental breakdown. The internet is full of stuff like that. What are we supposed to do with this? The author has a confusing understanding of genetics/genealogy, considerable bitterness towards the scientific world, and ... What? What’s the point?”

Me: “It is a problem not of me, but of you, the receiver. Prove you right. Be specific. It is not enough to say that “truth is stupidity.””

Opponent: “Be specific about what? The author’s evident belief that the Y-chromosome Adam is some special ancestor whom we can take to be the Adam of the Bible? We have lots of common male ancestors, most of them much more recent than the Y-chromosome Adam.”

Me: “You can not disprove the proof in my paper just quoting textbooks. I know textbooks, and have gone further than these.”

Opponent: “Here’s a claim: an undetectable 7-headed dragon is going to eat you unless you stop posting on this forum. I’ll go ahead and assume that you can’t prove this to be incorrect. So I trust; which means that you assume that this dragon exists until he can be disproven. Better stop posting then. If you continue posting, I will know that you don’t actually believe any of the nonsense you write down in here in baby English.

Me: “I will give you several disproofs:

- DISPROOF number 1: The monster was made up by this atheist. Thus, it does not exist. Why? A: things made up do not exist, B. the claimer is atheist, so he fights the God of Truth. Like the Flying Spaghetti Monster does not exist, because it is made up, and made up by atheists. Unbelievers know things, but they do not believe in them. They never trust a thing, but are making practical assumptions.
- DISPROOF number 2: Who has seen, that the unseen dragon is a dragon? Who has seen its colour, flames, and form? Only God. But the claimer is god-less. So we came to a contradiction, and the monster does not exist.
- DISPROOF number 3: “And there appeared another wonder in heaven; and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads . . . for to devour her child as soon as it was born . . . And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world . . . for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night.” (Revelation 12) But the satan exists only as a problem: he is the Absolute Nothing, because sin does not originate from the God of Existence.

Opponent: “According to the people following a different religion, your god is the idol.”

Me: “My God cannot be an idol, because He is not disproven. A human is like a swimmer in the ocean of lies and truth. One needs to use the own brain to come to the True Religion and to God. And you have no God’s right to be a troll, just because somebody is trolling. A human can become his own idol, see the fake omniscience: “you will be like God, knowing good and evil.” (Genesis 3:5) People, do not pay attention to atheistic trolling. Atheism is not proven. Theism is proven. There are no nations which are without religion. Therefore, the humankind “votes” for theism. Atheists say that the absence of God is not proven, and the presence of God is not proven. But this is not possible, because it denies the origin of knowledge. We know at least that $2+2$ is 4. Therefore, atheists MUST BE WRONG. If atheism is WRONG, then theism is RIGHT. Any proof is the knowledge of God’s mind. There, God is proven.

What if atheists were absolutely honest? Then instead of “God is dead”, they would tell you that “nihilists are saying that God is dead. But nihilism is a lie because it denies the existence of Absolute Truth.” Instead of “There is no God”, they would tell you that “atheists are saying that there is no God. But this Nihilism can not be proven, as they admit, and they do not want to find God while hiding behind the burden of proof.” Instead of “there is no evidence for God”, they would tell you that “there are proofs of God and evidences, and testimonies, and wonders. But atheists say that any single evidence theists showed to them is disproven. But the proofs of God are not disproven for theists: theists know their God.”

3 New Thoughts

The reading of the Bible, and the reading the the interpretations by the Church Fathers cures people, it can heal their atheistic disorders.⁴ Why? Historians, Archeologists, Theologians, Physicists (e.g., their understanding of the beginning of time and space), and Philosophers, are all confirming the authority of the Bible. Atheists, please be just a bit more open-minded if you read the Bible: it is known that in mental cases the mind-vision becomes very narrow, very

⁴For instance: Why perfectly right and healthy people are going to be burn in Hell? No, they won’t. Why would maliciously sick ones go to hell? God made a worldwide flood; God has burned Sodom and Homorra. All can be found in the Bible.

tunnel-like [24]. A first sign of recovery would be the realization that you are sick. Because a person who has thought about his mistakes is no longer that bad (2. Timothy 3:12).

The methods of Theology include the methods of technical sciences⁵ and much more. The methods of Theology include: the reading of the Holy Scripture, following the divine wisdom of Church Fathers; the sacraments of the church and the prayer to clean the mind. Theology uses the technical sciences, and the latter uses the “technical” methodology. Conclusion: Theology uses the technical methodology [25].

Atheism is the official method of apostasy science. The method is that a scientist, while he is in scientific circles (and not alone at home or in the temple), is obliged to forget about God under the threat of dismissal [26]. Judging according to the articles of the most strictly moderated online magazine arXiv.org of the elite (search for the words God, faith, omniscience, omnipresence, satan, and others), even in scientific circles it is welcomed to talk about God only in a blasphemic and heretic way. Thus, the apostasy science is the schism of the Church.

First, atheism talks about gods⁶, and second, atheism is unscientific⁷. Therefore, atheism is a pseudo-religion. Atheism and theism have nothing in common. Therefore, they are not options of choice. The choice can only be free. But the choice in favor of the hell is not a choice, but the harmful craziness. And the atheist knows that God exists. Can a false and feigned choice be a real choice?

Because the Omniscient God must know about his own existence, God exists [27]. Look for God in different rooms (there are many places, times and rooms out there), then in one of these rooms you will find Him, because the probability to find God is non-zero. Believers have found God. Pray and you will feel Him if He wants [28]. But because God is omnipresent, He exists in every room. To avoid this, atheists give a probability of absolutely zero to find God in a room: atheism is groundless denial of theism. That is why the methodological naturalism in “apostasy science” has led the christian civilization to the absolute solipsism [29].

God is fighting the injustice and tyranny. So, not all ideas of human have to be protected by the law of “freedom of thought”. For instance, fascism has to be oppressed. The freedom of thought is simply the own patience, hope, and suffering,⁸ which is the Church’s blessed love to the “mental patients”. God is the Sovereign King, but not a tyrant. Tyranny, by definition, is satans “reign” with the goal of homicide: “So they came out and went into the pigs, and the whole herd rushed down the steep bank into the lake and died in the water.” (Matthew 8:32)

A fallen human becomes a believer not by his choice. If you have become mentally ill, then only a physician can fundamentally change your essence: your soul is based on the idol of godlessness (the idol of lies and hatred), or on the God of Love and Truth. It’s a miracle. Therefore, you cannot “choose” to become holy: “No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draws them, and I will raise them up at the last day.” (John 6:44) “Who then can be saved? Jesus looked at them and said, “With man this is impossible, but with God all things are possible.”” (Matthew 19:25–26) “They answered Him, “We are Abraham’s descendants and have never been slaves of anyone. How can you say that we shall be set free?” Jesus replied, “Very truly I tell you, everyone who sins is a slave to sin. Now a slave has no permanent place in the family, but a son belongs to it forever.” (John 8:33–35, Galatians 5:13)

The God of Existence did not create atheists. Therefore, they are deprived of the gift of

⁵However, technical sciences are contained in a critical revision, see the current paper. The scientists have investigated the famous Church Wonders, which are happening in our days.

⁶the word “god” is being used by atheists

⁷because all areas of human knowledge with God being definition of latter, cry out loud for His glorious return; e.g., there is still “God of the gaps” and the gaps (wonders) are proven to be not removable

⁸“For that righteous man, living among them day after day, was tormented in his righteous soul by the lawless deeds he saw and heard” (2 Peter 2:8)

existence (John 8:44). How are they able to make a choice then?! God intervenes: it is great MIRACLE. Where is then the conscious choice?! (cf. Revelation 3:20; John 4:48). And the most wonderful miracle happens in the soul (Luke 16:31). How will an atheist ask God, about whom he is 100% sure that He does not exist? Before he could ask, God did his job, because the Church (with its angels and saints in Heaven) prays for the whole world (Matthew 9:2). God works with the soul before its baptism (John 15: 5, Romans 5:8). “And now you will be silent and not able to speak until the day this happens, because you did not believe my words, which will come true at their appointed time.” (Luke 1:20)

3.1 Technical Science has cut itself by Occam’s Razor

The cat is looking through the glass.
The emptiness approaches us.
It quiets any sound of pain.
The roof is hit by acid rain.
But don’t you worry,
Dear mom,
I am your cat till Trumpet sound.

Is the loss of God an involution, a degeneration, or an evolution?

Involution (from the latin *Involutio* = coagulation) is the reduction or loss in the process of evolution of individual organs, simplifying their organization and functions, the reverse development of an organ. See for instance the involution of the uterine after childbirth; the atrophy of organs during the natural aging. Involution is sometimes used as a synonym for invagination, for example, when cells are moved from the germ surface inward. Degeneration is the process of simplifying an organization, associated with the disappearance of organs and functions, as well as entire organ systems.

But this is not surprising. Such a vector of simplifications was set by the method of apostasy science called Occam’s Razor. Even in everyday life, people talk about texts longer than a page in a degenerate tone: “it is too long; I didn’t read.” The simplest explanation for the most complex phenomena are: “massive hallucination, juggling, falsification, error and deception.” Occam’s razor brought science to break away from the Mother Church, to complete solipsism [30].

Occam’s razor makes the work of a scientist⁹ completely ungrateful and not funded. After all, Occam’s razor and atheism-naturalism¹⁰ are official methods of apostasy science which will not last after the Last Judgment - the noisy end of the era of godless tyrants, because it’s promised (2. Peter 3:10). Why? Man has two kidneys, not one: God does not follow Occam’s razor and does not follow Popper’s Criterion, because they are moving the scientists towards godless untruths and lies. The process of degradation and destruction is also called as form of DEVELOPMENT, evolution. Why? After all, then Darwinism can be considered as the theory of death and fascism.

The Church schism of faith and knowledge division is schizophrenia, which is convincingly shown in the Russian video “Faith and Knowledge. Religion and Science” [31]. Indeed, the

⁹Work on science which is too complicate, to study angels and God, and even to introduce technical complications giving a mass to neutrinos, Dark Matter, and the needed vacuum energy.

¹⁰This is the simplest philosophy, namely the philosophy of death and emptiness: “before the Big Bang there was nothing and there was no Creator, but from nothing the nothing comes, and therefore we are a hallucinating mold on the planet, a disease of the planet that imagines self-consciousness, Religion and soul”

“death-moan of human reason” really sounds louder and louder: “we do not know what is around us. Nature somehow works, but we cannot understand how. Science has a nervous breakdown, equations make no sense and we can not do anything about it. So, something is fundamentally wrong. Is this schizophrenia?” [32].

In the video of Fr. Serafim Rose, “Man against God” [33], it is shown convincingly that we live in a non-intellectual era of monstrous simplifiers (and the most terrible of them is the coming Antichrist). Do not believe? And what does the lawlessness of Joseph Stalin “no human – no problem” means, if not simplification? The overpopulation hoax has led to horrible population control programs. The United Nations Population Fund has helped governments deny women the right to choose [34].

3.2 Sir Michael Atiyah’s proof of Riemann’s hypothesis

In 2018, Sir Michael Atiyah presented a proof of Riemann’s hypothesis [35]. But in the same month came the command from satan through the sub-conscious not to check the proof. This means that the proof was not refuted, but scientists are way too sceptical to look for a refutation, because (1) the author has previously made mistakes in his articles, and (2) the proof looks too simple. It is a shame for the un-human methodology of science that the proofs and dis-proofs of Riemann Conjecture are constantly coming, but are going into trash unopened [36].

4 Conclusion

Well, how could we all have gone in the wrong direction? The wrong direction started from Ancient Greece, when the methodology of mistrust began to form. This direction was developed by the Christians: Popper, Occam, Darwin. It sounds like the Church Schism. Today, Dr. Kaku “teaches” that reality does not exist: [30] and that the Science got it all wrong: [32].

I wanna peace on Earth, without conflicts. The Science tells, that there is a chance, that Bible is true. Why not then close and de-fund the alternative “ways”?

References

- [1] Carl Wieland, “A shrinking date for ‘Eve’”, Journal of Creation 12(1): 1–3, April 1998, <https://creation.com/a-shrinking-date-for-eve>
- [2] “Erasure - Ship of Fools” <https://youtu.be/i7KY0LTbk2U>
- [3] Dmitri Martila, “What I’ve got new in Science”, in print, the drafts are available from <https://my.mail.ru/community/fysika/22CBFF5BBE0B227E.html>
- [4] “And if you lost your way, look back for yesterday, remembering this way” (from a song in the movie “Casper” (1995))
- [5] “Do you know Him? – That’s My king” <https://youtu.be/sChJUaU5W9I>
- [6] “Debate: Hovind vs. Ra” <https://youtu.be/du0xy3omB-4> Jesus Christ was murdered by Roman Authorities. Is Jesus a criminal? If you reply with “yes”, then Kent Hovind is also not criminal, because you dare to accuse God. A christian never sins. The moment a christian has sinned, he is no longer Christian, until he confesses his/her sin in the church.

- [7] Stuart Firestein, “Ignorance – the critical driver for science”
<https://youtu.be/44eTY5pYCTQ>
- [8] “The Universe Shouldn’t Exist, Physicists Questioning Reality”
<https://youtu.be/bu-pu0wkVd8>
- [9] “SCIENTISTS DISCOVER Flat Earthers Know REAL SCIENCE!”
<https://youtu.be/L9WouDyfHa0>
- [10] “Epic Debate Over God’s Existence” <https://youtu.be/aUKIVV48L0k>
- [11] “Overton Window” <https://youtu.be/gaKDcAAEdo0>
- [12] “We didnt start the fire, it was always burning, since the world’s been turning; no, we didn’t light it, but we tried to fight it.” <https://youtu.be/BKfaKdFsFds>
- [13] In genetic genealogy, the identical ancestors point (IAP) or all common ancestors (ACA) point is the most recent point in a given population’s past where each individual then alive turned out to either be the ancestor of every individual alive now or has no currently living descendants. Another words: the ACA is the time when everyone around was either an ancestor of everyone currently living or has no descendants at all. This point lies further in the past than the population’s most recent common ancestor (MRCA). The identical ancestors point for Homo sapiens has been the subject of debate. In 2004, Rohde, Olson and Chang showed through simulations that the Identical Ancestors Point for all humans is surprisingly recent, on the order of 5,000–10,000 years ago. Ralph and Coop, considering the European population and working from genetics, came to similar conclusions for the recent common ancestry of Europeans. [?]
- [14] Wikipedia 2018 has following references: D.L. Rohde, S. Olson, J.T. Chang, “Modelling the recent common ancestry of all living humans”, *Nature* 431(7008), 562–566 (2004); Peter Ralph, Graham Coop, “The Geography of Recent Genetic Ancestry across Europe”, *PLOS Biology*, May 7, 2013; D.L. Rohde, “On the common ancestors of all living humans”, Submitted to *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* (2003).
- [15] Alvin Plantinga, “Warranted Christian Belief,” USA: Oxford University Press (January 27, 2000). pp. 169–199;
 Kenneth Boa. “Faith Has Its Reasons: Integrative Approaches to Defending the Christian Faith.” USA: IVP Books (March 1, 2006) pp. 251–255
- [16] Steven W. Hawking “Particle Creation by Black Holes,” *Comm. Math. Phys.* **43** (1975) 199–220; Steven W. Hawking “Black hole explosions?” *Nature* **248** (1974) 30–31
- [17] “We use the matching of metrics at the surface of the star, illustrated in Section 2.2 for the OS model,” in Laura Mersini-Houghton, “Backreaction of Hawking Radiation on a Gravitationally Collapsing Star I: Black Holes?” *Phys. Lett.* **B738** (2014) 61–67; arXiv:1406.1525; arXiv:1409.1837; <https://youtu.be/gSh-bzz4z58>; <https://youtu.be/qBfo4SNZq7I>.
- [18] “At this point OS made a fatal error by choosing an ...” in Trevor W. Marshall, Max K. Wallis, *Journal of Cosmology* **6** (2010) 1473-1484. Available from <http://journalofcosmology.com/MarshallWallis.pdf>
- [19] “The best flat earth song ever!!” <https://youtu.be/Zfuma1Ahhrrw>

- [20] “Jesus Takes My Burdens Away” <https://youtu.be/vJCJiHxuyd4>
- [21] “OneRepublic, “Love Runs Out” <https://youtu.be/00Wj0CiM8WU>
- [22] Y. Gastev, M. Smolyansky, “A few words about the Great Fermat Theorem,” *Kvant.* **8** (1972) 23–25
- [23] “Little Big Town – Happy People” <https://youtu.be/DDcJiamY9N8>
- [24] <https://www.postoj.sk/uploads/10985/conversions/square.jpg>
- [25] “Pope Francis meets Stephen Hawking” <https://youtu.be/6HvqcQUwyQw>
- [26] “Neil deGrasse Tyson on Science, Religion” <https://youtu.be/xRx6f81v6qc>
- [27] Jesse Hoey, “God exists with probability $1/(H + 1)$,” arXiv:1206.6752 [physics.hist-ph]
- [28] Madonna, “Like A Prayer” <https://youtu.be/79fzeNUqQbQ>
- [29] Michio Kaku, ”We Should Not Be Able To Exist!” <https://youtu.be/ftYS2yYtYZk>
- [30] Michio Kaku, “The universe should not exist, because in any case we should not be here. It is so frustrating that we are ready to tear our hair out”
<https://youtu.be/esPXpagkVwY>
- [31] Lecture by Archpriest G. Fast on <https://youtu.be/yqoXKjEE0pE>
- [32] “Science vs. God: It’s The Collapse Of Physics As We Know It”
<http://www.dailymotion.com/video/x2jbd7x>
- [33] Fr. Serafim Rose, “Man against God” <https://youtu.be/TwQaCbdsPX4>
- [34] “Overpopulation Hoax” <https://youtu.be/hWNSOXfQiQQ>
- [35] “Sir Michael Atiyah Riemann Hypothesis Proof” <https://youtu.be/UBVy0o0YczQ>
- [36] <https://preview.tinyurl.com/y754ckml>