

Conclusions

Volume I

by

Arthur O. R. Thormann

Specfab Industries Ltd.

Edmonton, Alberta

2012

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Thormann, Arthur O. R. (Arthur Otto Rudolf), 1934-
Conclusions / by Arthur O.R. Thormann.

Essays.

ISBN 978-0-9685198-9-9 (v. 1)

I. Title.

PS8589.H54945C66 2012 c814' .54 c2012-901087-1

Copyright © Arthur O.R. Thormann, 2012

Publisher: Specfab Industries Ltd.
13559 - 123A Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
T5L 2Z1
Telephone: 780-454-6396

Printer: PageMaster Publication Services Inc.
10180 - 105 Street
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
T5J 1E1
Telephone: 780-425-9303

Cover Designs: Front: *Hanayama* Handle-with-Care Cast Puzzle
Back: *Hanayama* Handle-with-Care Trapped Part

All rights reserved. Except for brief quotes, any use or reproduction
requires the written consent of the publisher or the author.

*I dedicate this book to
my grandchildren*

*Again, my gratitude goes to my wife, Renate,
to my daughter Nancy, and to my friend
Diana McLeod, for their valued advice.
All mistakes remaining are entirely mine.*

Preface

People like to reach conclusions, and sometimes they reach wrong conclusions. If someone tries, unsuccessfully for two hours, to free the trapped part of the metal puzzle on the front cover, he or she will probably conclude that it is impossible to remove it. Nevertheless, as you can see on the back cover, the successful puzzle solver has removed it. A drastic example of a wrong conclusion is the one Albert Einstein reached about the speed of light in a vacuum being the fastest speed in existence, and no physical object can travel faster. This has to be a perfect case of a positive but wrong conclusion! Einstein would have been very surprised to learn that neutrinos can travel faster than the speed of light.¹ However, Einstein himself said that future scientists would probably disprove his theories, just as he had disproved Sir Isaac Newton's theory.

Wrong conclusions, relative to more serious issues in life, have caused untold grief in human history. This book examines and criticizes the conclusions people reached, both in ancient and modern times. Take the conclusions of such doomsayers as Michael C. Ruppert, James Howard Kunstler, Nathan John Hagens, John Cronin, Hugo De Garis, and Robert Gleason in the recent show

¹ This, of course, brings into question Einstein's equation $E = mc^2$ in which c is the speed of light in a vacuum. Neutrinos travel right through matter and, perhaps, through gravitational fields, but matter reflects and gravity warps light; this may explain the speed difference.

Prophets of Doom on History Channel; they give us much to think about, but are they necessarily right? I will say more about this subject in Part III.

Nevertheless, the more I think about the title of this book the less I like it. When I first decided on the title, I was enthralled with it. It seemed to offer endless possibilities for an author. Now, I am less enchanted. What conclusions should we be looking for, reached by whom? This question is as difficult to answer as many other questions thrown at us. If I write about conclusions of others, how can I do so with any certainty when these others were, or should have been, uncertain of their conclusions? On the other hand, if I offer my readers conclusions I have reached about the activities of others, others must see me as nothing short of presumptuous. So, why did I not simply change the title of this book? Well, to be frank, I am still in love with it, probably because we are all in love with conclusions – if not the conclusions of others, then our own conclusions. Does this make sense to you? No? Well, in any case, I will try to be as factual as possible; perhaps offer you only some speculations on conclusions, so that you, the reader, can draw your own conclusions to your heart's delight.

One last comment: The reason I chose to add *Volume I* to the title is to give myself an opportunity to expand on the subject in the future. This is not a promise, but it gives me, and my readers, something to look forward to. After all, the subject is endless.

Arthur O.R. Thormann
Edmonton, February 2012

Contents

Part I: Earlier Conclusions

Introduction to Part I	3
The Existence of God, His Sons, and His Daughters..	3
Was God an Ancient Astronaut?	8
Luther’s Anti-Semitism	11
“The Great” of History	12

Part II: Contemporary Conclusions

Introduction to Part II	21
Presumption of Innocents	21
The Origin of Life	26
Homeopathy	29
Death of a Dictator	33
Mr. Papandreou’s Dilemma.....	37
Why European Debt Affects Our Stock Markets.....	40
Famous and Failed Secessions.....	45
Changing Warfare	52

Part III: Futuristic Conclusions

Introduction to Part III.....	61
Artificial Brainpower.....	62

Water Shortage	66
Air Pollution	68
Excessive Noise	69
Food Problems	71
Fuel Problems	74
The Brazilian Deforestation Problem.....	80
Life Expectancy	83
Is People’s Increased Tolerance Level Waning?	86
Will the Future be Better?.....	89

Appendix: Fanatic Focus

Introduction to Appendix.....	95
Our Games	95
Our Habits.....	99
Our Beliefs.....	102
Our Certainties.....	104

Postscript: Re Volume II et al.	107
---	------------

About the Author.....	109
------------------------------	------------

Part I
Earlier Conclusions

Earlier Conclusions

≈

Introduction

In this part, I would like to explore some of the conclusions people reached in earlier times, and how these conclusions, right or wrong, still affect us today. Furthermore, if modern people's conclusions differ from those of earlier people, what caused the change of mind? Is it a question of "They were wrong, and we are right," or has a different *Zeitgeist* caused the change? If the latter, perhaps a new *Zeitgeist* will cause another change.

The Existence of God, His Sons, and His Daughters¹

Take people's belief or disbelief in the existence of God² or gods³ for example. Atheists believe God does not exist. Agnostics believe God is unknowable. Monotheists believe in only one God. Polytheists believe in many gods. Pantheists believe the whole

¹ Could God's sons and daughters have included the gods and goddesses of Roman and Greek mythology?

² See the author's letter to Richard Dawkins on page 5 for the author's opinion on the existence of God.

³ The plural gods is not just referring to Greek or Roman gods, it existed in the Bible as well: both the Old and New Testaments talk of gods. Take, for example, an assertion in The Acts (see 14:11): "The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men." Surely, this assertion raises a few questions.

Arthur O.R. Thormann

≈

universe and everything in it is God. Atheists⁴ could care less about the existence or nonexistence of God or gods. Many members of various religions believe in one God with human qualities. Members of other religions believe in many gods with different qualities, rather than just one God with human qualities. However, most Christians, although they say they believe in only one God, also believe their God consists of a God Trinity: God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. This poses another question: Why does the Trinity ignore all but one of God's sons? The Bible is unclear as to God's number of sons, but it tells us that Jesus Christ was not the only one.⁵ The Bible is completely silent, however, on God's daughters, if He had any. Presumably, if God had sons, He may have had daughters as well,⁶ and, perhaps, also a wife or wives, unless the children were illegitimate.

⁴ I have the distinct feeling that more and more Christians start leaning towards atheism, perhaps only subconsciously. Even folks who visit churches regularly seem to have lost certain interest in their religion, although they must still maintain appearances for some reason.

⁵ See Genesis 6:2. Perhaps the first Christians who created the concept of the Trinity thought that God's earlier sons perished in the Flood after they took human wives.

⁶ In actuality, Martin Luther's translation of Genesis 6:2 refers to "children" instead of "sons," which could have included God's daughters as well. However, if the true translation refers to God's "children," the King James Version translators probably felt that if God's children took human daughters as wives, they must have been God's sons (excluding lesbian relationships). Conversely, if the true translation refers to God's "sons," Martin Luther, in his translation, may have intended to limit the honor of being the Son of God in the Bible to Jesus Christ.

Earlier Conclusions

≈

All these different beliefs make one wonder: How can seven billion people on Planet Earth come up with so many varied and conflicting conclusions about God's existence or nonexistence? How, exactly, do all these believers reach their differing conclusions, and are their conclusions based on facts or fiction? If based on facts, how can they differ so widely?⁷

As already mentioned, the existence of God leads to various conclusions, and there seems to be no factual proof one way or another. Those who believe in the existence of God usually do so unshakably. The same applies to those who do not believe in the existence of God.

On April 22, 2011, I wrote a letter to Richard Dawkins (see below). In fairness, I only got through half of his book *The God Delusion* at the time, but my comments would not have changed after reading the entire book.

Dear Richard Dawkins:

I'm just reading your book *The God Delusion*, and I would like to offer you the following comments:

There is a set of laws in the Universe, which I shall call *The Supreme Existence* – some people prefer to call it *God*, for short.

⁷ One can also ask similar questions of many other conclusions people reach, especially regarding contemporary issues, supplied to us daily by the media.

Arthur O. R. Thormann

≈

If you remove this set of laws, in other words, remove the existence of God, you will also remove gravity and the orbits of the stars and their planets, right down to the orbits of electrons around the protons of their atoms! In other words, you remove the existence of everything, including yourself!

Sorry, Professor Dawkins, but I do not believe you can eliminate the existence of God!

Sincerely,

Arthur O. R. Thormann

Four weeks later, I sent an email to Richard Dawkins to enquire if he had received my letter. His PA, Rand Russell, replied that they received the letter on May 5, 2011. I sent a further email, this time to Rand Russell, asking him to get Richard Dawkins's viewpoint for me on my position. At first, he replied that he was not in a position to get Richard Dawkins's viewpoint on this, but his own opinion would be that *The God Delusion* is Richard Dawkins's viewpoint on my position. In a further email, he reported that contacting Richard Dawkins is possible through him, but what he could not guarantee, he was sorry to inform me, was an answer from Richard Dawkins. He also wished me all the best in my quest for truth. I took two messages from this exchange: First that it may be embarrassing

Earlier Conclusions

≈

for Richard Dawkins to express a viewpoint on my position; and, second, that his PA, Rand Russell, felt that I am not yet there (i.e., with my position) in my quest for truth. In addition, I think Rand Russell implied that Richard Dawkins has already found truth and no longer needs to concern himself with my kind of truth.⁸

I had taken my time reading Richard Dawkins's book *The God Delusion*. It is a very interesting book, but after reading it, I concluded that people who hide behind the appellation *atheist* offer no more proof for the nonexistence of God than Christians or Muslims or Judaists offer for the existence of God.⁹ Richard Dawkins addresses the various arguments that theists

⁸ It also reminded me of Ashleigh Brilliant's book *I Have Abandoned My Search for Truth, and Am Now Looking for a Good Fantasy*. In this book, he published a number of his "Pot-Shots" and, in his introduction, he cites the following example, which seems to offend some religious people: "IF YOU SEE GOD, TELL HIM I'M LOOKING FOR HIM." I suspect that Richard Dawkins would find it hard to object to this kind of truth.

⁹ It reminded me a little of Adolf Hitler's claims (in his book *My Struggle's* chapter, *Vienna's Learning and Suffering Years*) that the Jews were liars, and, by their support of Marxism, a danger to the world at large. Hitler never actually offered definitive examples of his claims. Instead, he asserted his belief, at the end of the chapter, to act in the Almighty Creator's interest: As Hitler fights against the Jews, he fights for the work of the Lord. Of special note is the time when he came to this conclusion, a few years before World War I. At that time he lived in Vienna, the capital of Austria, with two million inhabitants, including 200,000 Jews, he tells us in his book. Vienna abounded with anti-Semitic literature at this time, which Hitler read ardently. Hitler was probably also influenced by Martin Luther's treatise, *On the Jews and Their Lies*, which the Nazis later displayed during their Nuremberg rallies.

Arthur C.R. Thormann

≈

use for the existence of God, and tries to disprove them, often successfully, but his chapter on *Why There Almost Certainly Is No God* leaves us with a feeling of something missing: He offers no definitive proof that there is no God! In fact, if anything, Richard Dawkins's book supports the existence of God, simply by its various references to and criticisms of God!

“Can you do any better providing us with definitive proof of the existence or nonexistence of God?” you might ask. I think I can by starting with a definition (as expressed in my letter above to Richard Dawkins) based on irrefutable facts, such as a set of universal laws, and calling it *The Supreme Existence* – also allowing the synonym *God* for it. Thus, I am able to provide you with a *God* concept having irrefutable proof of its existence. Sure, it is a very simplistic approach, but, in the final analysis, all of our so-called complex concepts end up to be very simple. Besides, I challenge our esteemed philosophers out there to think of something that does not exist!

Was God an Ancient Astronaut?

Many people, including authors, reach speculative conclusions to the questions regarding the existence of God or gods. One such person and author is Erich von Däniken. One of the first books written by von Däniken, and published by Econ Publishing in 1968, he called *Memories of the Future*, which his British publisher, Souvenir Press, renamed in 1969 to

Earlier Conclusions

≈

Chariots of the Gods. He is firmly convinced that ancient aliens may have visited Earth, which could account for our beliefs in God or gods. Although he produces some speculative evidence for his theory, he does not give us definite facts of such visits. Such speculative conclusions can be useful to encourage more research, but we must accept them with caution. For example, von Däniken provides us, in over four pages of his book, with some details about Phobos and Deimos, the moons of Planet Mars, and his speculative conclusion that “It is also within the bounds of possibility that our neighbor Mars had its own civilization untold millennia ago.”

Von Däniken backs up his conclusion with quotes from other authors. He quotes Jonathan Swift’s precise data regarding the size and orbits of these moons from *A Voyage to Laputa and Japan*, which forms Part III of *Gulliver’s Travels*, and points out that Jonathan Swift gave us these descriptions 150 years before the American astronomer Asaph Hall officially discovered these moons on August 18, 1877. Von Däniken also quotes the Russian scientist I. S. Shklovskii and the renowned American astronomer Carl Sagan from their book *Intelligent Life in the Universe*, published in 1966. They accepted that the moon Phobos is an artificial satellite: von Däniken says, “As a result of a series of measurements, Sagan came to the conclusion that Phobos must be hollow and a hollow moon cannot be natural.” Shklovskii confirmed this after observing a peculiar, unnatural acceleration of Phobos, identical to the phenomenon

Arthur C.R. Thormann

≈

established in the case of our own artificial satellites. Sorry, Mr. von Däniken, but the pictures taken of Phobos by Viking 1 Orbiter in February 1977 do not at all look like an artificial satellite might look – they look more like an odd-shaped, oversized rock with a huge, six-mile wide crater in it.

So much for von Däniken's hope and speculative conclusion that Phobos might be artificial, because an artificial Phobos may have supported his theory of Martian visits to Earth – thus, the so-called gods that our ancestors described may have been no more than visiting Martians. That does not preclude, however, other speculations about ancient astronauts visiting Earth.

I bring these facts to my readers' attention to point out the follies of speculative conclusions. In the following pages, in addition to historical conclusions, I will outline for my readers some interesting contemporary conclusions, mainly reached by our politicians and business tycoons. Nevertheless, if I offer any conclusions of my own, they may also be speculative if sufficient evidence is lacking, and the reader must accept them with caution. The reader must also keep in mind that most of our conclusions are somewhat speculative; therefore, we must carefully examine all so-called supporting facts. For example, if we accept Carl Sagan and I. S. Shklovskii's hollow-moon theory at face value, without closely examining the pictorial evidence of Phobos by Viking 1 Orbiter, we might easily believe Phobos is an artificial satellite. Conclusions that have their basis in dreams,

Earlier Conclusions

≈

feelings, emotions, superstitions, and suspicions, rather than cold, provable facts, are especially doubtful – so much so, we should almost discard them as worthless. Be on the lookout for them!

Luther's Anti-Semitism

How far back does anti-Semitism go? Who knows? Of interest to us may be Martin Luther's attitude towards it, which he expressed in a treatise called *On the Jews and Their Lies*, published in 1543. When I heard of it, I was surprised, because Martin Luther is such a revered man in the Western world. His accomplishments are numerous. At age 22, he had already completed his master's examination at the University of Erfurt. Eventually, he translated the Bible into the German language, and initiated the reform of the Christian Church. Yet, his hateful anti-Semitic attitude defies his presumed intelligence. The same applies to other, less known, anti-Semites. For example, although the American tycoon Henry Ford was also an ardent anti-Semite, hardly anyone pays attention to this, or even knows or cares about it, anymore.

The big question is what filled Martin Luther with so much hate against the Jews? If he considered the Jewish people to be the enemies of the Christian people (which he could not reasonably support) should he not have practiced the love that Jesus Christ has demanded toward his enemies?

You have reached the end of this sample

Want to keep reading?

You can buy this book at **PageMasterPublishing.ca/Shop**

To find more books by Canadian authors or inquire about publishing your own book, contact PageMaster at:

PageMaster Publication Services Inc.

11340 - 120 Street, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, T5G 0W5

books@pagemaster.ca

780-425-9303