

WHY THERE ALMOST CERTAINLY IS A GOD pdf

1: www.enganchecubano.com:Customer reviews: Why There Almost Certainly is a God: Doubting Dawkins

Why There Almost Certainly Is a God and millions of other books are available for Amazon Kindle. Learn more Enter your mobile number or email address below and we'll send you a link to download the free Kindle App.

I was surprised as to what I read. Obviously, Dawkins believes that Darwinism is a sufficient explanation for life. But he did not really let loose on evidence for evolution. The focus in this chapter is the anthropic principle. Dawkins admits that at first glance the odds of the universe being life permitting and life beginning on this planet seem unlikely. However, according to the anthropic principle the only reason we can think about such things is that we happen to live in the universe and on the planet and at the time when humans are alive. Still, as Dawkins goes through six fundamental constants of the universe or the requirements for life to exist on this planet, I was drawn to how amazing creation really is, something that I see as more likely the result of God. Dawkins uses the example of the man put before a firing squad and when the command is given, all bullets miss. He would only be surprised because he was the one to survive. Even so, it still would suggest that something strange happened, someone intervened in some way to allow him to survive the execution. The anthropic principle is limited in its explanatory scope. Dawkins looks to the theist argument that something so complex could not have come from nothing. Dawkins then turns around and suggests, if God exists, he would have to be much more complex than simple humans, therefore the universe could not have come from God. I am not sure that Dawkins understands what theists believe about God. He is not an entity with moving parts, so that you could look at his apparatus for omniscience, for omnipotence, etc. God is an all powerful mind and is simple in essence. One of the things that I noticed is that in terms of human life and the universe, Dawkins is comfortable with some mystery, with some questions that we do not know the answers to. For some reason he will not give that same sort of grace to theists. Theism leaves too many questions and must be rejected. Anyway, Dawkins did not mean to do it, but his inspiring description of the complexity of life strengthened my faith in God. Take a second to support Stephen Bedard on Patreon!

2: Why there almost certainly is a God | thinking makes it so

Why There Almost Certainly Is No God. By Richard Dawkins. America, founded in secularism as a beacon of eighteenth century enlightenment, is becoming the victim of religious politics, a.

I had not the slightest idea what this meant, and I had to telephone Downing Street to ask how many names the Queen had been given, and what she intended to do with them. It turned out I was being offered the job, and it was an offer I could not refuse. So I turned up at Oxford, having been transformed by Her Majesty from a philosopher who surprised many people by having some religious beliefs into a theologian who was expected by many people to defend a whole set of religious beliefs as a professional duty. This was a very unexpected change. That is a very original and unusual opinion. That is just what you are paid to say, so you must be some sort of paid church lackey. For some, being a Regius Professor at Oxford technically, the senior professor in the university was very grand. But for others, it was a definite slide down the ladder of academic respectability. And that, he thought, was rather like developing some sort of mental illness. My arrival in Oxford was heralded by a letter from Richard Dawkins to a public newspaper calling for my resignation, on the ground that there was no such subject as theology, and that I was a particularly stupid example of a theologian anyway. The reason for his wrath was a short letter I had written to the same newspaper, following a discussion of the Christmas story in the paper. I had written, in what was meant to be a joke, that I knew the three wise men existed because I had seen their tomb in Cologne Cathedral. Admittedly, it was not a very good joke. But it proved too much for Richard Dawkins, who took it as an example of the sort of evidence theologians rely on, and of the best I could do in theological argument. From that moment, the gloves were off. Even though Dawkins lived and worked in a university with one of the largest and ablest theology faculties in Britain, he went on refusing to admit that there was any such subject as theology. Despite the fact that he and I had entirely friendly and rational personal contacts – as he did with Richard Harries, former Bishop of Oxford, and the vicar of the University Church in Oxford, and the chaplain of his college – he went on proclaiming that all religious believers were stupid, deluded and dangerous. Despite the fact that many Oxford scientists are Christians, and that there is even a Chair in Science and Religion in the university, he went on saying that science and religion were intellectually incompatible. And despite the fact that a number of us have criticized his views publicly many times, he goes on saying that theologians have never answered his arguments. In fact there has been a series of public debates in Oxford over the last few years, and I do not think it is obvious that he has won them. They have involved, among others, Richard Dawkins and his even more vituperative atheist colleague Peter Atkins on the one side, and myself, Alister McGrath, Richard Harries and Arthur Peacocke on the other. Now it is my turn to rejoin the Oxford God Debate. But I only did so because I reached retirement age, and I am glad to say that I was succeeded by an eminent medieval philosopher, Marilyn McCord Adams. And though resigned, my pugilistic instincts have not subsided, and I am happy to enter the lists in a head-to-head philosophical confrontation. I am even happier to know that I am bound to win, for when Dawkins talks about theology, he is, on his own admission, talking about a subject that does not exist. It is a traditional definition of Oxford scholars that they know everything about nothing whereas Cambridge scholars know nothing about everything. So Professor Dawkins stands in a good Oxford tradition. But when a subject does not even exist, there is nothing to know about it. I presume, therefore, that Professor Dawkins actually knows nothing about theology. That gives me a head start. Thus I end my Oxford career, as I began it, with a bad joke. Or could it perhaps be true? That is my territory. I have taught philosophy in British universities all my working life, and I welcome all comers into that world of clear definitions, sharp arguments and diverse conclusions. Professor Dawkins I will call him simply Dawkins, for short, and hope it will be taken as a mark of respect and of acknowledgment of his status as a household name is one of the most exciting and informative writers on science, especially on evolutionary biology. I own all his books. I have learned much from them, and have always been greatly impressed by his capacity to convey the awesomeness of modern science and of the universe it explores. But when he enters into the world of philosophy, his passion tends to get the better of him, and he sometimes descends into stereotyping, pastiche

and mockery, no longer approaching the arguments with his usual seriousness and care. I suspect that he dislikes philosophers, and thinks they are wasting their time sitting around in armchairs instead of carrying out some worthwhile experiments. I often sympathize with him, and regret the fact that I will never make even a half-way decent scientific discovery. Every now and then, however, I recover my self-respect, and remember that it is important to be critical of all our beliefs – to ask what we mean by them and what reasons there are for accepting them. Philosophy is a systematic attempt to carry out such a process of informed critical enquiry on all our beliefs. In our world, that will involve an enquiry into the nature of science and the nature of religious belief. Whether he likes philosophy or not, Dawkins is doing philosophy in Chapters 2 to 4 of *The God Delusion*. He has come into my world, a world in which I welcome a good argument. In this short book I want to challenge his arguments, to show that they are not at all strong, and to show that there are much stronger arguments in favour of believing in a God – in fact, that it is almost certain that there is a God. The question for discussion, then, is whether the God hypothesis is reasonable and true. Dawkins advocates an alternative: Oxford is, after all, the home of lost causes, and it is nice to see a cause as lost as this defended. He has put his finger at once on the central point at issue. Is intelligent mind an ultimate and irreducible feature of reality? Indeed, is it the ultimate nature of reality? Or is mind and consciousness an unforeseen and unintended product of basically material processes of evolution? If you look at the history of philosophy, it soon becomes clear that almost all the great classical philosophers took the first of these views. Plato, Aristotle, Anselm, Aquinas, Descartes, Leibniz, Spinoza, Locke, Berkeley, Kant, Hegel – they all argued that the ultimate reality, often hidden under the appearances of the material world of time and space, is mind or Spirit. Even the great philosophical dissenters – most notably David Hume, whose arguments Dawkins often uses, and A. Ayer, another great atheist from New College, Oxford – were not materialists. These included such things as patches of colour, sounds, touches, smells and tastes. These, they thought, were the primary data, and the world of physical objects and other minds were logical constructs out of them. Of course there is a world of enduring physical objects, of course the future will be like the past, of course there are universal laws of nature, of course we are continuing selves who are aware of sense-data, and of course there are other sets of sense-data, in other minds. But none of these things can be proved by argument. Most philosophers in the world have been in some sense idealists – that is, they have thought the ultimate reality is mind. Theists are philosophers who accept this, but add that the physical world does have its own proper reality, which originates from but is different from God, the ultimate mind. An important minority have been phenomenologists, who think that the ultimate reality is the flowing succession of perceptions, thoughts and feelings of which we are aware in immediate experience. From that succession we may construct a world of external physical objects or we may construct the idea of a continuing Self that observes the succession. But in fact there is ultimately only the succession itself. Some forms of Buddhist thought are outstanding examples of this view. So we must rely on common sense beliefs, a sort of consensus that we accept because it works, or is conducive to survival, health and happiness. Most common sense philosophers have assumed that belief in God is a common sense belief, as it happens. There have also been scientific realists, like John Locke, who think that there are good arguments for the view that the world consists of colourless clouds of particles in mostly empty space, though we perceive it as a set of coloured solid objects. And there have been sceptics, who do not think that we know anything about the ultimate nature of reality at all, and that even common sense is suspect. But they rarely appear in public, since they are never sure there is any public to whom to appear. The world of philosophy, of resolute thought about the ultimate nature of things, is a very varied one, and there is no one philosophical view that has the agreement of all competent philosophers. But in this world there are very few materialists, who think we can know that mind is reducible to electrochemical activity in the brain, or is a surprising and unexpected product of purely material processes. In the world of modern philosophy, there are idealists, theists, phenomenologists, common sense pragmatists, scientific realists, sceptics and materialists. These are all going concerns, living philosophical theories of what is ultimately real. This observation does not settle any arguments. He is setting out to defend a very recent, highly contentious, minority philosophical world-view. That is the sort of thing we like to see in philosophy! But it will take a lot of sophisticated argument to make it convincing. It is not at all obvious.

3: Why There Almost Certainly Is No God | HuffPost

why there almost certainly is no god America, founded in secularism as a beacon of eighteenth century enlightenment, is becoming the victim of religious politics, a circumstance that would have horrified the Founding Fathers.

By contrast, when Dawkins enters this world his passion tends to get the better of him: Professor Dawkins claims that no theologian has ever produced a satisfactory response to his arguments. Professor Ward has taught philosophy and theology in British universities for all of his working life. This is his response. Atheist assertions are countered by careful theistic argument, in a manner that should prove persuasive to many and illuminating to all. Trafalgar Square Publishing, N. Use of either trademark requires the permission of International Bible Society. UK trademark number This book has been printed on paper and board independently certified as having been produced from sustainable forests. The God Hypothesis 10 Part 2: Large Aeroplanes and God 32 3. Explaining God 51 4. God and the Multiverse 67 5. Objections and Replies 83 Part 3: The Five Ways 7. The Argument from Personal Experience 8. I had not the slightest idea what this meant, and I had to telephone Downing Street to ask how many names the Queen had been given, and what she intended to do with them. It turned out I was being offered the job, and it was an offer I could not refuse. So I turned up at Oxford, having been transformed by Her Majesty from a philosopher who surprised many people by having some religious beliefs into a theologian who was expected by many people to defend a whole set of religious beliefs as a professional duty. This was a very unexpected change. That is a very original and unusual opinion. That is just what you are paid to say, so you must be some sort of paid church lackey. For some, being a Regius Professor at Oxford technically, the senior professor in the university was very grand. But for others, it was a definite slide down the ladder of academic respectability. And that, he thought, was rather like developing some sort of mental illness. My arrival in Oxford was heralded by a letter from Richard Dawkins to a public newspaper calling for my resignation, on the ground that there was no such subject as theology, and that I was a particularly stupid example of a theologian anyway. The reason for his wrath was a short letter I had written to the same newspaper, following a discussion of the Christmas story in the paper. I had written, in what was meant to be a joke, that I knew the three wise men existed because I had seen their tomb in Cologne Cathedral. Admittedly, it was not a very good joke. But it proved too much for Richard Dawkins, who took it as an example of the sort of evidence theologians rely on, and of the best I could do in theological argument. From that moment, the gloves were off. Even though Dawkins lived and worked in a university with one of the largest and ablest theology faculties in Britain, he went on refusing to admit that there was any such subject as theology. Despite the fact that many Oxford scientists are Christians, and that there is even a Chair in Science and Religion in the university, he went on saying that science and religion were intellectually incompatible. And despite the fact that a number of us have criticized his views publicly many times, he goes on saying that theologians have never answered his arguments. In fact there has been a series of public debates in Oxford over the last few years, and I do not think it is obvious that he has won 8 Why There Almost Certainly Is a God them. They have involved, among others, Richard Dawkins and his even more vituperative atheist colleague Peter Atkins on the one side, and myself, Alister McGrath, Richard Harries and Arthur Peacocke on the other. Now it is my turn to rejoin the Oxford God Debate. But I only did so because I reached retirement age, and I am glad to say that I was succeeded by an eminent medieval philosopher, Marilyn McCord Adams. And though resigned, my pugilistic instincts have not subsided, and I am happy to enter the lists in a head-to-head philosophical confrontation. I am even happier to know that I am bound to win, for when Dawkins talks about theology, he is, on his own admission, talking about a subject that does not exist. It is a traditional definition of Oxford scholars that they know everything about nothing whereas Cambridge scholars know nothing about everything. So Professor Dawkins stands in a good Oxford tradition. But when a subject does not even exist, there is nothing to know about it. I presume, therefore, that Professor Dawkins actually knows nothing about theology. That gives me a head start. Thus I end my Oxford career, as I began it, with a bad joke. Or could it perhaps be true? That is my territory. I have taught philosophy in British universities all my working life, and I welcome all comers into that world of clear

definitions, sharp arguments and diverse conclusions. Professor Dawkins I will call him simply Dawkins, for short, and hope it will be taken as a mark of respect and of acknowledgment of his status as a household name is one of the most exciting and informative writers on science, especially on evolutionary biology. I have read all his books. I have learned much from them, and have always been greatly impressed by his capacity to convey the awesomeness of modern science and of the universe it explores. But when he enters into the world of philosophy, his passion tends to get the better of him, and he sometimes descends into stereotyping, pastiche and mockery, no longer approaching the arguments with his usual seriousness and care. I suspect that he dislikes philosophers, and thinks they are wasting their time sitting around in armchairs instead of carrying out some worthwhile experiments. I often sympathize with him, and regret the fact that I will never make even a half-way decent scientific discovery. Philosophy is a systematic attempt to carry out such a process of informed critical enquiry on all our beliefs. In our world, that will involve an enquiry into the nature of science and the nature of religious belief. Whether he likes philosophy or not, Dawkins is doing philosophy in Chapters 2 to 4 of *The God Delusion*. He has come into my world, a world in which I welcome a good argument. Dawkins advocates an alternative: Oxford is, after all, the home of lost causes, and it is nice to see a cause as lost as this defended. He has put his finger at once on the central point at issue. Is intelligent mind an ultimate and irreducible feature of reality? Indeed, is it the ultimate nature of reality? Or is mind and consciousness an unforeseen and unintended product of basically material processes of evolution? If you look at the history of philosophy, it soon becomes clear that almost all the great classical philosophers took the first of these views. These included such things as patches of colour, sounds, touches, smells and tastes. These, they thought, were the primary data, and the world of physical objects and other minds were logical constructs out of them. Of course there is a world of enduring physical objects, of course the future will be like the past, of course there are universal laws of nature, of course we are continuing selves who are aware of sense-data, and of course there are other sets of sense-data, in other minds. But none of these things can be proved by argument. Theists are philosophers who accept this, but add that the physical world does have its own proper reality, which originates from but is different from God, the ultimate mind. An important minority have been phenomenologists, who think that the ultimate reality is the flowing succession of perceptions, thoughts and feelings of which we are aware in immediate experience. From that succession we may construct a world of external physical objects or we may construct the idea of a continuing Self that observes the succession. But in fact there is ultimately only the succession itself. Some forms of Buddhist thought are outstanding examples of this view. So we must rely on common sense beliefs, a sort of consensus that we accept because it works, or is conducive to survival, health and happiness. Most common sense philosophers have assumed that belief in God is a common sense belief, as it happens. There have also been scientific realists, like John Locke, who think that there are good arguments for the view that the world consists of colourless clouds of particles in mostly empty space, though we perceive it as a set of coloured solid objects. And there have been sceptics, who do not think that we know anything about the ultimate nature of reality at all, and that even common sense is suspect. But they rarely appear in public, since they are never sure there is any public to whom to appear. The world of philosophy, of resolute thought about the ultimate nature of things, is a very varied one, and there is no one philosophical view that has the agreement of all competent philosophers. But in this world there are very few materialists, who think we can know that mind is reducible to electrochemical activity in the brain, or is a surprising and unexpected product of purely material processes. In the world of modern philosophy, there are idealists, theists, phenomenologists, common sense pragmatists, scientific realists, sceptics and materialists. These are all going concerns, living philosophical theories of what is ultimately real. This observation does not settle any arguments. He is setting out to defend a very recent, highly contentious, minority philosophical world-view. That is the sort of thing we like to see in philosophy! But it will take a lot of sophisticated argument to make it convincing. It is not at all obvious. Why Materialism Is Dubious To most philosophers, materialism has looked like a non-starter. Most of us do not want to deny that material things exist. Is it quarks, or superstrings, or dark energy, or the result of quantum fluctuations in a vacuum? Some physicists, such as John Gribbin and Paul Davies, in their book *The Matter Myth*,⁴ argue that matter is a sort of illusion

or appearance produced by some mysterious and unknown substratum in interaction with the human mind. There is something out there, and it appears to us as a world of fairly solid objects. But modern physics suggests that the nature of reality is very different from what we see, and that it is possibly unimaginable. Roger Penrose, the Oxford mathematician, even thinks that the laws of physics may need to be radically revised, so that they take account of the important role of consciousness in the nature of the world. It no longer seems to be a set of simple elementary particles. And it no longer seems that just a few simple laws will account for their behaviour. Instead, we have a very complex mathematics of Hamiltonians, differential equations and Hilbert spaces, which may be elegant and beautiful, but is far from being simple in the sense of being easy to state and reducible to just one or two basic rules.

4: Why There Almost Certainly is a God - Stephen J. Bedard

To ask other readers questions about Why There Almost Certainly Is a God, please sign up. Be the first to ask a question about Why There Almost Certainly Is a God I gave up on this book. The author argues for the existence of God, but accepts that the world is billions of years old. I don't.

Believing in God[change change source] The percentage of people in European countries who said in that they "believe there is a God". Countries with Eastern Orthodox i. Greece , Romania , etc. Most of these religious beliefs involve God or gods. Well-known Abrahamic religions include Judaism , Christianity , and Islam. Monotheistic means the people in these religions believe there is only one God. Muslims say the word Allah , which is the Arabic word for "God. One artistic idea is that of an wise elder man in use since the Renaissance. Christians consider the Holy Spirit to be God as well, the third person of God. In the New Testament , there are three beings who are said to be God in different forms: This is called the Holy Trinity. Another word that Christians believe has exactly the same meaning as "Trinity" is the word "Godhead", which is in the Holy Bible. Christians believe that God incarnated in a human body, through the normal birth process, normally growing up into a man named Jesus or Yeshua , coming to Earth specifically to give every person an opportunity of salvation from their own evil, called sin. When Jesus prayed and talked to God, he called him "Father," and taught others to do the same. God in Eastern religions[change change source] In Hinduism , there is only one God, named Brahman , but Brahman is said to have taken on many different incarnations. However, it is really only the worship of one God in different ways. Some Hindus also believe that the spirit of God lives in everyone. This idea is called Advaita Vedanta , which is the Hindu term for Monism. Religions like Buddhism and Confucianism involve the worship of many gods, or sometimes no gods at all. God in Western philosophy[change change source] Philosophers can talk about God or god; sometimes they talk about a specific god, but other times they are just talking about the idea of god. One of the earliest Western philosophers to write about God in a monotheistic way was the Greek Aristotle , who describes god as the Supreme Cause. Aristotle saw God as a being that makes everything happen, but is not influenced by anything else. There are also some philosophical problems with God. One of them is called God paradox. It is a question about whether an omnipotent God can make a mountain that is so heavy he cannot lift it.

5: Does God Exist - Six Reasons to Believe that God is Really There - Is There a God

The title of Ward's page rebuttal, Why There Almost Certainly Is a God, is a playful inversion of the provocative (and conspicuously dogmatic) heading given to chapter 4 of Dawkins' book: 'Why There Almost Certainly Is No God'.

Background[edit] Dawkins has argued against creationist explanations of life in his previous works on evolution. The theme of *The Blind Watchmaker*, published in 1986, is that evolution can explain the apparent design in nature. In *The God Delusion* he focuses directly on a wider range of arguments used for and against belief in the existence of a god or gods. Dawkins identifies himself repeatedly as an atheist, while also pointing out that, in a sense, he is also agnostic, though "only to the extent that I am agnostic about fairies at the bottom of the garden". By the year 2006, his publisher had warmed to the idea. Dawkins attributes this change of mind to "four years of Bush " who "literally said that God had told him to invade Iraq". How Religion Poisons Everything coming second. The first few chapters make a case that there is almost certainly no God, while the rest discuss religion and morality. Dawkins writes that *The God Delusion* contains four "consciousness-raising" messages: Atheists can be happy, balanced, moral, and intellectually fulfilled. Natural selection and similar scientific theories are superior to a "God hypothesis" – "the illusion of intelligent design" – in explaining the living world and the cosmos. Terms like "Catholic child" or "Muslim child" should make people cringe. Atheists should be proud, not apologetic, because atheism is evidence of a healthy, independent mind. He notes that the former includes quasi-mystical and pantheistic references to God in the work of physicists like Albert Einstein and Stephen Hawking, and describes such pantheism as "sexed up atheism". Dawkins instead takes issue with the theism present in religions like Christianity, Islam, and Hinduism. Dawkins concludes that evolution by natural selection can explain apparent design in nature. A hypothesis involving a designer, that is, a complex being to account for the complexity that we see. A hypothesis, with supporting theories, that explains how, from simple origins and principles, something more complex can emerge. This is the basic set-up of his argument against the existence of God, the Ultimate Boeing gambit, [17] where he argues that the first attempt is self-refuting, and the second approach is the way forward. The whole problem we started out with was the problem of explaining statistical improbability. It is obviously no solution to postulate something even more improbable". Dawkins does not claim to disprove God with absolute certainty. As such he argues that the theory of a universe without a God is preferable to the theory of a universe with a God. Dawkins suggests that the theory of memes, and human susceptibility to religious memes in particular, can explain how religions might spread like "mind viruses" across societies. Instead, our morality has a Darwinian explanation: He asks, "would you commit murder, rape or robbery if you knew that no God existed? In support of this view, he surveys the history of morality, arguing that there is a moral Zeitgeist that continually evolves in society, generally progressing toward liberalism. As it progresses, this moral consensus influences how religious leaders interpret their holy writings. Thus, Dawkins states, morality does not originate from the Bible, rather our moral progress informs what part of the Bible Christians accept and what they now dismiss. Dawkins sees religion as subverting science, fostering fanaticism, encouraging bigotry against homosexuals, and influencing society in other negative ways. He equates the religious teaching of children by parents and teachers in faith schools to a form of mental abuse. The book concludes with the question of whether religion, despite its alleged problems, fills a "much needed gap", giving consolation and inspiration to people who need it. According to Dawkins, these needs are much better filled by non-religious means such as philosophy and science. An appendix gives addresses for those "needing support in escaping religion".

Critical reception[edit] The book provoked an immediate response, both positive and negative, and was published with endorsements from scientists, such as Nobel laureate and co-discoverer of the structure of DNA James D. Watson, Harvard psychologist Steven Pinker, as well as popular writers of fiction and the illusionists Penn and Teller. The ethicist Margaret Somerville, [37] suggested that Dawkins "overstates the case against religion", [38] particularly its role in human conflict. In an interview with the *Time* magazine, Dawkins said: There are plenty of places where religion does not keep off the scientific turf. Any belief in miracles is flat contradictory not just to the facts of science but to the spirit of

WHY THERE ALMOST CERTAINLY IS A GOD pdf

science. The debate was titled "Has Science Buried God?"

6: Keith Ward: "Why There Almost Certainly Is a God: Doubting Dawkins on Vimeo

The point that you think almost 'certainly' proves there is no God is an astounding one. It is the core and heart of your intellectual justification for your emotional atheism. I almost feel at this point that there should be a drum roll.

Here are six straightforward reasons to believe that God is really there. No statements of, "You just have to believe. But first consider this. Here then, are some reasons to consider The complexity of our planet points to a deliberate Designer who not only created our universe, but sustains it today. But here are a few: If Earth were smaller, an atmosphere would be impossible, like the planet Mercury. If Earth were larger, its atmosphere would contain free hydrogen, like Jupiter. The Earth is located the right distance from the sun. If the Earth were any further away from the sun, we would all freeze. Any closer and we would burn up. The Earth remains this perfect distance from the sun while it rotates around the sun at a speed of nearly 67, mph. It is also rotating on its axis, allowing the entire surface of the Earth to be properly warmed and cooled every day. And our moon is the perfect size and distance from the Earth for its gravitational pull. The moon creates important ocean tides and movement so ocean waters do not stagnate, and yet our massive oceans are restrained from spilling over across the continents. Plants, animals and human beings consist mostly of water about two-thirds of the human body is water. It has wide margin between its boiling point and freezing point. Water allows us to live in an environment of fluctuating temperature changes, while keeping our bodies a steady Water is a universal solvent. This property of water means that various chemicals, minerals and nutrients can be carried throughout our bodies and into the smallest blood vessels. Without affecting the makeup of the substances it carries, water enables food, medicines and minerals to be absorbed and used by the body. Water has a unique surface tension. Water in plants can therefore flow upward against gravity, bringing life-giving water and nutrients to the top of even the tallest trees. Water freezes from the top down and floats, so fish can live in the winter. But on our Earth, there is a system designed which removes salt from the water and then distributes that water throughout the globe. Evaporation takes the ocean waters, leaving the salt, and forms clouds which are easily moved by the wind to disperse water over the land, for vegetation, animals and people. It is a system of purification and supply that sustains life on this planet, a system of recycled and reused water. Your brain takes in all the colors and objects you see, the temperature around you, the pressure of your feet against the floor, the sounds around you, the dryness of your mouth, even the texture of your keyboard. Your brain holds and processes all your emotions, thoughts and memories. At the same time your brain keeps track of the ongoing functions of your body like your breathing pattern, eyelid movement, hunger and movement of the muscles in your hands. The human brain processes more than a million messages a second. This screening function is what allows you to focus and operate effectively in your world. The brain functions differently than other organs. There is an intelligence to it, the ability to reason, to produce feelings, to dream and plan, to take action, and relate to other people. It has automatic focusing and handles an astounding 1. Yet evolution alone does not fully explain the initial source of the eye or the brain -- the start of living organisms from nonliving matter. The universe had a start - what caused it? Scientists are convinced that our universe began with one enormous explosion of energy and light, which we now call the Big Bang. This was the singular start to everything that exists: Astrophysicist Robert Jastrow, a self-described agnostic, stated, "The seed of everything that has happened in the Universe was planted in that first instant; every star, every planet and every living creature in the Universe came into being as a result of events that were set in motion in the moment of the cosmic explosion The Universe flashed into being, and we cannot find out what caused that to happen. It had a start Scientists have no explanation for the sudden explosion of light and matter. The universe operates by uniform laws of nature. Much of life may seem uncertain, but look at what we can count on day after day: How is it that we can identify laws of nature that never change? Why is the universe so orderly, so reliable? There is no logical necessity for a universe that obeys rules, let alone one that abides by the rules of mathematics. It is easy to imagine a universe in which conditions change unpredictably from instant to instant, or even a universe in which things pop in and out of existence. The fact that there are rules at all is a kind of miracle. All instruction, all teaching, all training comes with intent. Someone who

writes an instruction manual does so with purpose. Did you know that in every cell of our bodies there exists a very detailed instruction code, much like a miniature computer program? As you may know, a computer program is made up of ones and zeros, like this: The way they are arranged tell the computer program what to do. The DNA code in each of our cells is very similar. These are arranged in the human cell like this: There are three billion of these letters in every human cell!! Well, just like you can program your phone to beep for specific reasons, DNA instructs the cell. DNA is a three-billion-lettered program telling the cell to act in a certain way. It is a full instruction manual. One has to ask These are not just chemicals. Natural, biological causes are completely lacking as an explanation when programmed information is involved. You cannot find instruction, precise information like this, without someone intentionally constructing it. We know God exists because he pursues us. He is constantly initiating and seeking for us to come to him. I was an atheist at one time. And like many atheists, the issue of people believing in God bothered me greatly. What causes us to do that? When I was an atheist, I attributed my intentions as caring for those poor, delusional people To be honest, I also had another motive. As I challenged those who believed in God, I was deeply curious to see if they could convince me otherwise. Part of my quest was to become free from the question of God. If I could conclusively prove to believers that they were wrong, then the issue is off the table, and I would be free to go about my life. I have come to find out that God wants to be known. He created us with the intention that we would know him. He has surrounded us with evidence of himself and he keeps the question of his existence squarely before us. I am not the only one who has experienced this. Malcolm Muggeridge, socialist and philosophical author, wrote, "I had a notion that somehow, besides questing, I was being pursued. Lewis said he remembered, " I gave in, and admitted that God was God, and knelt and prayed: Yet over the following several months, I became amazed by his love for me. Unlike any other revelation of God, Jesus Christ is the clearest, most specific picture of God revealing himself to us. None of them ever claimed to be equal to God. That is what sets Jesus apart from all the others. Though he talked about his Father in heaven, it was not from the position of separation, but of very close union, unique to all humankind. Jesus said that anyone who had seen Him had seen the Father, anyone who believed in him, believed in the Father. He said, "I am the light of the world, he who follows me will not walk in darkness, but will have the light of life. Unlike other teachers who focused people on their words, Jesus pointed people to himself. He did not say, "follow my words and you will find truth. He had power over objects He performed miracles over nature People everywhere followed Jesus, because he constantly met their needs, doing the miraculous. Jesus revealed that although he views us as sinners, worthy of his punishment, his love for us ruled and he came up with a different plan. God himself took on the form of man and accepted the punishment for our sin on our behalf. Perhaps, but many loving fathers would gladly trade places with their child in a cancer ward if they could. The Bible says that the reason we would love God is because he first loved us. Jesus died in our place so we could be forgiven.

7: Why There Almost Certainly Is a God: Doubting Dawkins by Keith Ward

*Review: Why there almost certainly is a God 3 ISCAST Christians in Science & Technology www.enganchecubano.com
Finally, interspersed throughout the book are a number of additional.*

What have you been thinking about? These letters have now been published in a slightly revised form in The Dawkins Letters. The title of this fourth chapter is a bold claim. You will notice that I have retitled it because I actually think the chapter does the very opposite of what you set out to do. In it you propose to prove, insofar as it is possible, that there is no God. I truly found this chapter astonishing. Allow me to explain why. I had expected that your case against God was to be a cumulative one – a bit like your view of evolution. Faced with the mountain of Divinity and the universal belief of humankind in a God or gods, I expected you to climb Mount Improbable gradually, building a case slowly and leading us by a cumulative process to the view that there is no God. However you go for the big leap. You think you have the killer argument and you can go straight to the Holy Grail of atheism, and then have a gentle slide downhill afterwards, picking off the remaining theistic arguments because you have already proved there is no God. What is this killer argument? The one that even Nietzsche could not find? Your argument goes like this. Evolution explains the illusion of design. The design argument is the main argument for God. Therefore there is no God. And the reason that the design argument does not work? It is the core and heart of your intellectual justification for your emotional atheism. I almost feel at this point that there should be a drum roll. Indeed design is not a real alternative at all because it raises an even bigger problem than it solves: But whatever else we may say, design certainly does not work as an explanation for life, because design is ultimately not cumulative. To suggest that the original prime mover was complicated enough to indulge in intelligent design, to say nothing of mind reading millions of humans simultaneously, is tantamount to dealing yourself a perfect hand at bridge. It is clear that this point is very important to you and the foundation of the rest of your arguments. When I read it I was genuinely shocked. Not because of its originality, killer force or overwhelming logic, but rather because of its banality. This is the argument that is going to change the world? This is the key?! Forgive my incredulity and perhaps even the slight mocking tone but you are very quick to mock some of the stupider theistic arguments. God is not made. God is the Creator, not the creation. God is outside of time and space. This is not to say that he is not also in time and space and that there is not plenty evidence for him there. God creates ex nihilo. He does not craft from what is already there. He creates time, space and matter from nothing. I realise for you that is a nonsense because the core of your creed is that evolution means that everything starts from the simple and becomes more complex, therefore because that is the case and any designer would have to be incredibly complex God cannot exist. But even if we grant that this is true for biology, biology is not everything. To argue as you do is to take an incredible leap of faith and to beg the question. Who says that everything, including God himself, has to come from something? Christians and other theists do not argue that God was created. That is precisely the point. He did not come from anywhere. He has always been. He did not evolve, nor was he made. If there is a personal Creator of the Universe then it makes perfect sense to regard him as complex, beyond our understanding and eternal. When you state that you can disprove God because there can de facto never be anything that was uncreated you are engaging in a circular argument. We do not believe in a created God. We believe in an uncreated supernatural power. Let us assume for the moment that evolution is true, why would that disprove God? It would disprove one argument that some theists use but there are many other arguments and there are many Christians who do not accept the ID science and who continue to be believers in the God of the Bible. He strongly disagrees with Behe and with the whole ID movement. By your logic he should then be an atheist. But he is not. He is a Theist. To my mind this is patronising and the equivalent of accusing them of a fundamental dishonesty. To you they have the evidence to prove there is no God who designed the designer? Except of course these conclusions are not logical. As McGrath puts it: There is a substantial logical gap between Darwinism and atheism, which Dawkins seems to prefer to bridge by rhetoric rather than evidence. In order for there to be natural selection there has to be something to select. Where did that come from? This is where the Unmoved Mover, the Uncaused Cause and the Cosmological

arguments come into their own. In terms of the origin of matter there are only three alternatives: Something came from nothing. At one point there was no universe, there was no material, there was no matter, no time, no space. And out of that big nothing there came the Big Bang and our vast universe, tiny planet, evolution and the human species. I think you will agree that such a notion is beyond the realms of reason and is a total nonsensical fantasy. In other words matter has always existed. There is a lump of rock, or a mass of gas or some kind of matter which had no beginning and will probably have no end. And at some point that matter exploded and we ended up with the finely tuned and wonderful universe we now inhabit. Something was created "ex nihilo" out of nothing. And that Creator has to be incredibly powerful, intelligent and awesome beyond our imagination. The existence of God is not dependent on the argument from design as regards evolution, it is dependent on the fact that there is any matter at all, and that we live in a universe which is so finely tuned that life is possible at all. Why is there something rather than nothing? And why does that something manage to produce you and I? That is not a question which you can just brush aside or express no interest in. It is not only the fact that matter exists at all, but that it is so ordered that life can exist. When I was a child I was brought up in an area which had very little light pollution and so during the winter nights I often walked under the stars, risking injury by continually gazing upwards. To stare at the stars is for me one of the major if not the major reason for believing in God. I found it difficult to believe that this vast universe existed by itself, or as the result of an accident. As I have grown older and in knowledge it has been a real delight to discover that my natural instincts in observation are in accord with what science has also discovered. Whereas I struggle with most books on evolution because of a lack of knowledge your books have actually been the most accessible and interesting, I really enjoy cosmology. After going into detail about the wonders of the Big Bang Collins cites with approval the astrophysicist Robert Jastrow from *God and the Astronomers*: For the scientist who has lived by his faith in the power of reason, the story ends like a bad dream. He has scaled the mountain of ignorance; he is about to conquer the highest peak; as he pulls himself over the final rock, he is greeted by a band of theologians who have been sitting there for centuries. I thought you would like that! Now we see how the astronomical evidence leads to a biblical view of the origin of the world. Stephen Hawking points out that if the rate of expansion one second after the Big Bang had been smaller by even one part in ten thousand million million, the universe would have recollapsed before it ever reached its present state. If it had been greater by one part in a million then the stars and planets would not have been able to form. Is that not spine chillingly incredible? Constants like the speed of light, the force of gravity and electromagnetism all need to work precisely together for there to be life. Apparently there are fifteen such constants. If you hold to position two "which you must as a rational atheist" then you are left with this vast improbability of the fine tuning of the Universe. And it is an improbability that cannot be explained by evolution because there is nothing to evolve. The question is how did we get the conditions for evolution? I guess you could argue that we were very very very lucky "to the point of one in ten thousand million million. That takes an enormous amount of faith. Like the example you cite from the philosopher John Leslie we talks about a man sentenced to death standing in front of a firing squad of ten expert marksmen.

8: Why There Almost Certainly Is No God | The Spiritual Advocate

by Richard Dawkins. America, founded in secularism as a beacon of eighteenth century enlightenment, is becoming the victim of religious politics, a circumstance that would have horrified the Founding Fathers.

Keith Ward begins the section like this: Finite minds come into existence when a complex neural network exists. We can formulate a rule that whenever some such neural network exists, then conscious states will exist. But that is a causal statement, not a statement that reduces conscious states to nothing but physical states. If the brain is impaired, our mental processes are impaired, so our mental processes are closely linked to the occurrence of brain-states. But they are still different. We are not just information-processing systems. We are also conscious appreciators of the meaning of information, and creative initiators of new processes of thought. The materialist claim is that, according to the available evidence, minds come into existence when a complex neural network of the correct structure exists; and that there is no justifiable reason for thinking that minds can arise any other way. It is a fact, in the sense of an established observation. Yes the materialist hypothesis that conscious states emerge from brain-states is a causal statement. Candle flame Put on hold for a moment the question whether it is actually true that conscious states can be reduced to physical states. And think of a flame. Incandescent or ionised particles give it its colour and light. Other explanations account for its heat, shape, movement and sound. But we have eventually reached the point where we have successfully explained every feature of the flame which we wanted to explain – in the sense of providing a set of conditions which are collectively sufficient for the flame to exist. In the case of the flame we would not say: But that is a causal explanation, not an explanation that reduces the flame to nothing but physical states of affairs. Our objective was to explain everything there was to explain about the flame and, as far as I can see, we have achieved it. We do not need to stipulate that the set of conditions which are collectively sufficient for the flame to exist are also collectively necessary for it to exist. There may be different sets of conditions which can give rise to a flame, and it may be impossible to word them in such a way as to exhaust collectively all the possible conditions which could give rise to a flame. But it seems fair to say we have not yet come across a kind of flame, or an instance of a flame, whose set of sufficient conditions does not fit the sum-total of current scientific knowledge. It is possible though that such a flame could exist. It is not obvious that we cannot set ourselves an equivalent objective in the case of consciousness. In theory we could then have a complete set of causal statements which explain everything there is to explain about consciousness, in the sense of supplying a set of conditions which are collectively sufficient for the existence of consciousness. If we do not achieve that objective, it will not be because of the causal nature of the statements. It will be for some other reason – perhaps because the set of causal statements is incomplete. Or there may be something about the nature of consciousness which makes it impossible for us ever to have a complete causal explanation. But that would be a different issue. Ward has not demonstrated that yet, so his assertions about our not being only information-processing systems but also conscious appreciators of meaning etc are so far just assertions. We are not denying we are conscious appreciators of meaning and creative initiators of new thought processes. What we are denying, so far, is that anyone or anything has demonstrated that these features of consciousness cannot ever – and cannot in principle – be scientifically explained. Ward makes a lot of the truism that just because a complex neural network may be a sufficient condition for consciousness, this does not make it a necessary condition. And therefore a divine consciousness could exist which is not the result of an evolved neural network. A flame could exist which is not the result of incandescent or ionised particles or something equivalent. The point is we have not yet come across a flame which defies scientific explanation of that kind. If that was all the God claim came to we could stop the argument there and then. But, as I mentioned last time, his book is not called Why there just might be a God. But Ward needs this unique status, because he wants to claim not only that consciousness can never be fully scientifically explained, but also that the existence of conscious minds introduces a new form of non-scientific explanation for why things happen as they do. That law predicts what regularly follows from the initial state, and it does so without any reference to purpose, value or consciousness. But there is another sort of explanation. Then it explains some of the things that

persons do in terms of knowledge, desire, intention and enjoyment. If it is, no one yet has plausibly suggested any idea of how to reduce it. How can my talk of knowledge, desires, intentions and awareness translate into statements of physics that only refer to physical states and general laws of their behaviour? Scientific explanation in terms of physical causes and general laws is one sort of explanation. Personal explanation in terms of desires and intentions is another. We need to be on our guard, because in the next section A Final Personal Explanation of the Universe Ward claims that, on the God Hypothesis, there will be an irreducible personal explanation for why the universe exists. Materialists try to connect personal and physical explanation: The former theory conflicts with our everyday experience of conscious life. The latter gives up on explanation. This looks like another reductionism, but in the opposite direction. It reduces scientific explanation to personal explanation, instead of the other way round. We need to backtrack, because Ward takes a leap or two to get here. First there is the point about the existence of conscious minds introducing a separate category of non-scientific explanation – personal explanation – for why things happen as they do. Ward has proposed, but not established, that consciousness is irreducible to scientific explanation. But interestingly his words do not imply a belief that consciousness is in principle irreducible to scientific explanation. What he says is: If it is [reducible], no one yet has plausibly suggested any idea of how to reduce it. Would he have said: The jury is not out on whether two plus two is five. But it is out on whether consciousness is reducible to scientific explanation. This matters because, if we have not yet ruled out a scientific explanation of consciousness, then we have not yet ruled out the possibility of giving a scientific explanation of human personal explanation. This is on the assumption that personal explanation is a mode or feature of consciousness. And if this is the case, we have not yet established that scientific explanation and personal explanation are equally sound but categorically different – ie that Scientific explanation is one sort of explanation. Personal explanation is another. In each case the explanation – in order for it to qualify as an explanation – would supply a sufficient reason for E. But could there be both kinds of explanation? This suggests that for a particular event E there could never be both kinds of explanation – there could be either a scientific explanation or a personal explanation but not both. The events would never be the same kind of things, so their explanations would never conflict. So the Es which qualify for personal explanations would be actions and decisions initiated by knowledge, desire, intention and purpose; whereas only philistine Es like candles burning and rocks rolling downhill qualify for scientific explanation. Unfortunately this does not fit the facts. There are events which qualify for both kinds of explanation. A familiar one is breathing. Most of the time – in fact all the time we are asleep and most of the time we are awake – we breathe unconsciously, by means of an automatic response to the pH of our blood. A scientific explanation if ever there was one. But we can also, within limits, breathe when we want to and stop breathing when we want to. So how does this work? In a matter of minutes we can flip-flop backwards and forwards between automatic breathing admitting of scientific explanation and conscious breathing admitting of personal explanation. We can be on the brink of breathing in automatically because our carbon dioxide level is building up, and then suddenly decide not to – on a whim. For a time we only breathe in and out when we tell ourselves to – until for some reason we realise we have forgotten about breathing because our thoughts have strayed onto something else, and we have slipped back into automatic breathing for a while without having a clue when this happened. Bear in mind that we also cannot automatically breathe in and automatically not breathe in at the same time; nor consciously breathe in and consciously not breathe in at the same time. We have not proven they are not distinct. But it is not self-evident that they are distinct. And the claim that they are distinct is at least problematic. On the side of the former are:

9: The Dawkins Letters - Why there almost certainly is a God - www.enganchecubano.com

One such is the latest missive in the Oxford God debate, Why There Almost Certainly Is a God (named, with one small change of wording, after chapter four of The God Delusion), by the university's.

This page is to explain why. I still contend that no one can know with absolute certainty that there is no god, but I am prepared to argue that In My Journey , I described how I rejected a very specific belief system. But these are not the only god claims in the world. What of theism in general – all the other god-claims? Are there any arguments against the existence of gods? If so, what are they? Do they hold up as poorly as the arguments for God? All god claims are almost certainly not true. Use the More menu to navigate the page. Absolute certainty is not possible on any topic. For practical purposes, near certainty is good enough. In reality, no one is ever absolutely certain of anything. There is no way to prove the universe is even physically real, for example, rather than a product of your mind or a highly sophisticated virtual reality. For practical purposes, therefore, we count near certainty as good enough. You know the probability that one or both sides have changed is very, very slim, close enough to zero to not worry about. But I have since come to realize that Especially for the gods that matter. Part of what spurred me to this realization was a collection of tweets from Canadian atheist Cult of Eh , as well as his blog entry Practical Atheism. Not all god claims are created equal. Some are more specific than others, and some are more relevant than others. As it happens, there is a direct correlation between specificity and relevancy. Most can easily be categorized: Some are constructed so as to be near-impossible to disprove. Many will never have any effect on our lives – even if true. These can be ignored. The more general a god claim, the harder it is to disprove, but easier to ignore. The more specific a god claim, the easier it is to disprove, but impossible to ignore. The more general a god claim, the harder it is to disprove, but the easier it is to ignore. The more specific a god claim, the easier it is to disprove, but the harder it is to ignore. In other words, some assertions are more falsifiable than others, usually the same ones that are the most invasive and insidious. This god claim is impossible to disprove because everything the universe clearly exists – as long as we ignore metaphysical solipsism. Pantheism can also be ignored as a semantic issue: Also, to my knowledge, pantheism makes no effort to infiltrate government or legislation, makes no demands of society nor of individuals. Therefore, it is irrelevant to our lives. Likewise, deism can be ignored. Its claims are simple and unable to be proved true or false: This Creator made no revelations or rules for behavior. Some deists claim this creator requires humanity to use reason to figure out the universe and morality, but even then no future punishment for misdeeds is asserted. It offers no punishments or rewards, no nuggets of wisdom, no miracles. There is no possibility or need to disprove this god, for it is also irrelevant. At least that was the case when I called myself a deist. It is interesting to note that deism reached its peak before humanity acquired much of its current scientific knowledge, including evolution, genetics, atoms, germs, etc. These gods are easier to disprove for obvious reasons: In most cases, they also claim a set of writings scriptures are provided by God as a revelation of himself and that these scriptures are the final word. These belief systems also have specific and often divisive rules for behavior, and regularly are carried out with legal force in major nations – making them difficult to ignore. Please note that these are entirely fictitious. None of the assertions in the following two paragraphs are to be construed as true or believable. Please do not start a religion based on these. Combined atoms molecules make up stronger gods, like the individual vehicles of Voltron combine to make one stronger vehicle. All the atoms in the universe together are one giant, all-encompassing God. This God made everything, makes us feel better or worse depending upon its whims dopamine is made of atoms! The aforementioned God is not only conscious, but is so powerful that it can reach into the physical observable world, and do things – in defiance of the laws of physics. It also lifts the waters of the ocean every night and causes the water to float over mountaintops. Atomic God demands petrochemicals be prohibited by law in every nation. It also demands occasional human sacrifices. You can shrug off the first claim because that particular God and gods requires nothing of you and nothing about my claim can be disproved or proved by science. But the second claim does require something of you – outlaw petrochemicals, human sacrifice – and asserts a disprovable interaction with the physical world. You can

observe, any night, the oceans not floating over the mountaintops. It is no coincidence that the very general, unfalsifiable god claims are the ones that have zero or ignorable requirements for humanity, while the very specific claims “the easiest to disprove” are the belief systems that have the most stringent requirements for human living “including capital apostasy laws. On this page, I am concerned mainly with the latter because you can effectively live as an atheist and the first type of god “even if real” will ignore you.

Defining God Quick Summary: This is what I refer to when I capitalize the word. When I use the lowercase version of god, I refer to any of several thousand deities that have been asserted to exist throughout human history, to include the monotheistic God but also the gods of other religions and belief systems, including the Roman, Greek, and Norse pantheons, the numerous gods of various Hindu traditions, the Egyptian deities, and all the others. The most powerful argument for me is this: Most god claims are mutually exclusive. This means we can, at the outset, declare almost all of them are untrue. I list this argument first on this page, because it is the most powerful and effective for me. Most god claims are explicitly contradictory with other god claims. As an obvious example, there is no way to reconcile the Christian claim that Jesus Christ is the son of God with the Muslim claim that Jesus was not the son of God. This alone means that one of those two belief systems is untrue. Obviously, I do not here refer to denominations that split off because of personal issues or organizational disagreements, but to the ones that split because of doctrinal arguments. For example, trinitarian Christians disagree with nontrinitarians about the very nature of the God they worship. At least one of them is untrue. This disagreement alone led to 15 centuries of persecution. Other doctrinal disagreements led to wars. This division alone amounts to three separate god claims. These are mutually exclusive belief systems. The same is true for Islam, which early separated into three distinct branches “each of which splintered further. These branches disagree on their history, on societal rules, and on moral codes required by their God. They disagree so strongly that wars have been waged over these points of doctrine. Members of one branch will assert that the other branch is blasphemous. In countries where one branch is in the majority, the other branch will sometimes not be allowed to pray or even enter buildings where they might pray source. In Galatians, Paul writes: And it should go without saying that not only are Islam and Christianity incompatible with each other, but both are incompatible with the Judaism that came before them which is also divided into disagreeing sects. Every doctrinal disagreement creates another god claim which has an increasing chance of being false. So I can categorically state that two of those three religions are untrue. God is either one, or three, or three-in-one. Without even researching, we can know that at all-minus-one are untrue. We know without even debating or considering the tenets of each that almost all of them are not true. And all of the above is without considering the thousands of god claims that arose before Judaism or simultaneously with it. The god claims of Native American civilizations are for the most part not compatible with the god claims of Islam or Christianity, and often not with each other. Even the Hebrew Bible Old Testament lists dozens of neighboring tribes, each of whom worshiped a different God or set of gods. Take as an analogy a hundred people standing on a highway overpass. As you approach the overpass, the first person tells you they saw a single automobile drive along the highway below them. But the next person tells you it was actually 12 vehicles, all identical. The third person agrees on the number 12, but asserts each vehicle was different in appearance and ability. The fourth person says it was a motorcycle. The fifth person said there was no vehicle.

Doubt, the Beginning of Philosophy Selling a niche practice by John Ventura Building a Web site Change of address form Building materials and construction technology notes Catch me lisa gardner Earth has been found Guardians and angels Tante Jolesch or the Decline of the West in Anecdotes A museum guide to Washington, D.C. Form follows function the art of the supercar Color atlas of difficult diagnoses in dermatology The Mad War on Bush (Mad) The Devils blood Commentary on the Icons 190 Economies of the Soviet bloc. Isi master list 2016 On the threshold of war in England, 1939 Kelly bowen Community canning centers Prisoner Of The Stars Developments in the West Managerial economics applications strategies and tactics 14th edition Part. 10. Congenital heart disease Mysterious predictions Mans peril, 1954-55 Quick Start Drama for Worship Appendix I : George Armstrong Custer : hero or goat? Patricians and plebeians in late colonial Charcas : identity, representation, and colonialism Sergio Seru Basic Field Manual V10, Military Intelligence Students laboratory manual of physical geography A Companion to Descartes (Blackwell Companions to Philosophy) Search Rescue (Quantum Leap, No. 5 (Quantum Leap No 5) Santa Fe Heritage Volume 3 (of 4 (Santa Fe Heritage, 3) Statistics (New School) Guide to the collections from the West Indies The election process: voting laws and procedures Reply to certain publications concerning George W. Hughes. Sociology of crime Exploring creation with zoology 3