

Presentations of Weeks 1 and 2

SUMMARY

1. I sing the almighty power of God,
That made the mountains rise,
That spread the flowing seas abroad,
And built the lofty skies.
I sing the wisdom that ordained
The sun to rule the day;
The moon shines full at His command,
And all the stars obey.

2. I sing the goodness of the Lord,
That filled the earth with food;
He formed the creatures with His Word,
And then pronounced them good.
Lord! How Thy wonders are displayed
Where'er I turn mine eye!
If I survey the ground I tread,
Or gaze upon the sky!

3. There's not a plant or flower below
But makes Thy glories known;
And clouds arise and tempests blow,
By order from Thy throne.
Creatures that borrow life from Thee
Are subject to Thy care;
There's not a place where we can flee,
But God is present there.

Lyrics: Isaac Watts (1674 – 1748)

Williamsburg-James City County school system explains why
physicists
(& selected other scientists)
will no longer be assigned to schoolyard playground duty.



↑
This is not
Ken but another
physicist of local
prominence.

Clarke asked: What do you tell your children?

I tell them to watch out for “materialists” of which there are two types:
atheistic and theistic materialists.

Here is a short letter on this idea to my son.

December 27th, 2012

“That which is born of flesh is flesh, and that which is born of spirit is spirit/soul.” (Jesus)
“While we look not for the things which are seen, but the things which are unseen.” (Paul)

Dear Scott,

You have been reading stories now for some time to Nathan, Amy, and Anna. Such is of foundational importance to what it is to be human.

Let’s begin with a clip from David Lopez’s story of *Crow and Weasel*, two young men, Native Americans, who set out on a journey to travel further north than any of their tribe had ever traveled.

The three of them [Crow, Weasel, and Mouse] remained silent for a while.

“It is very difficult to lead a good life,” said Crow, finally. “What you have set out to do,” he said, turning to Mouse, “is hard. But our older people tell us that without a dream you do not know what to do with your life. So it is a good thing, I think, what you do, what your people believe.”

“Yes. **To be a good hunter,**” said Mouse, “**to be a good family man, to be truthful instead of clever with people, to live in a community** where there is much wisdom—that is what all of us want.”

“I would ask you to remember only this one thing,” said Badger. “The **stories** people tell have a way of taking care of them. If stories come to you, care for them. And learn to give them away where they are needed. **Sometimes a person needs a story more than food to stay alive.** That is why we put these stories in each other’s memory. This is how people care for themselves. One day you will be good storytellers. Never forget these obligations.”



The problem is, Scott, that externally, undirected physics and chemistry of the material world as the theory, or “**story**,” of life is impotent. That is, materialistic evolution is a story incapable of producing and sustaining life (as we see in Albert Camus in the Myth of Sisyphus and Jean Paul Sartre in Being and Nothingness.) Why is evolution **a bad story**?

Because the commitment to externally, undirected evolution of life is based on the epistemological and ontological presupposition that the universe is constructed of atoms, of “dust.” This is untrue. The correct affirmation is that the **"universe is constructed of stories, not atoms"** as understood by Muriel Rukeyser in her poem *The Speed of Darkness* (1937).

Rukeyser’s dictum is the sustaining truth within the human community. People like Dawkins, Dennett, Harris, etc. lament the finding that so many Americans do not believe in their atomistic (“dustistic”) understanding and articulation, that is, their story, of human life. They consider such people a combination of ignorant, superstitious, and thoughtless. What really is the case is that all people intuitively/instinctively/subliminally understand the reality of story and the need for story, and they intuitively/instinctively/subliminally know when a story is unworthy of nourishing and sustaining individual and tribal/communal life. As David Lopez writes,

“Sometimes a person needs a story more than food to stay alive.” Here is the problem: **evolution is a sterile story.** It does not produce life, real life. When you couple the sterility of the evolution story with the fact that the large-brained scientists of the academy are not uncommonly among the most boring of genre in the universe¹, it is no wonder evolution is overwhelmingly rejected by those immersed in real life in a real world, those immersed in the “contextistential” world. The story in Genesis 1-3, however lacking, is much more interesting and much more informative and much less boring than the story of Dawkins, Dennett, and friends. Where is the materialistic evolutionist “epic” to compare with the Iliad, the Odyssey, The Book of Job, Paradise Lost, Hamlet, King Lear, The Pilgrim’s Progress, Moby Dick, War and Peace, Great Expectations, George and Martha, Rachmaninoff’s Second piano concerto, Handel’s Messiah, and on and on? Great story informs regarding **love, vision, dreams, journey, courage, friendship, community, family, loyalty, commitment, beauty, hope, charity, justice, goodness, trust, fidelity, self-sacrifice, wisdom** – add your own descriptors.

Atomistic/”dustistic” evolution informs as to “nothingness” as Sartre might put it, or “absurdity” as Camus might put it, or “the firm foundation of unyielding despair” as Russell has put it. A story without some collection of these virtues, aspirations, and challenges is not a story, and thus, it does not sustain life. The aimless and purposeless evolutionary paradigm therefore will never be embraced because it presumes atoms as the building blocks whereas **the universe is made of and sustained by stories—evolution as a story** will never be embraced except by those inflated brains of the academy, who are the prima facie evidence of the Western Enlightenment/Age of Reason mind run amok.

All this, Scott, is **not because evolution is atomistically wrong—it may well be materially correct**, but because evolution is holistically and soulistically irrelevant, if not destructive, as a philosophy of life, a worldview, to what it means to be human, to be “soul” and not “dust.”

Blessings on you,

The Old Dad

Acknowledgement:

Gratitude to Carey for many challenging discussions on the composition of the universe and all things therein.

Notes:

Footnote 1. From *The Double Helix* by James D. Watson (Nobel Prize 1962 in Physiology/Medicine):

“One could not be a successful scientist without realizing that, in contrast to the popular conception supported by newspapers and mothers of scientists, a goodly number of scientists are not only narrow-minded and dull, but also just stupid.”

Footnote 2. I assume that I don't have to convince of the importance of story to Christians. Story permeates orthodox Christianity and my fundamentalism. For example:

1. I love to tell the story
of **unseen things** above,
of Jesus and his glory,
of Jesus and his love.
I love to tell the story,
because I know 'tis true;
it satisfies my longings
as nothing else can do.

I love to tell the story,
'twill be my theme in glory,
to tell the old, old story
of Jesus and his love.

Footnote 3. Eugene Peterson has the word “story” some 150 times in his rendering of the Bible.