

The Inherent Dangers Manifested by Certain Belief Systems¹

Robert A. Herrmann Ph.D.

Abstract: *During August 1978, a new application of mathematics was discovered. This article reports on a major result of this new application. Specifically, the semantic (i.e. informal) proof that scientific atheism as used within philosophic systems such as modern atheism, modern Marxism, secular humanism, secular scientism is a false doctrine. Further, inconsistent philosophic and theological systems are discussed. Depending upon the interaction of those that share (A) this false doctrine or an inconsistent belief-system with those that share (B) a consistent doctrine or consistent belief-system, this research implies that a system composed of (A) should eventually collapse.*

1. Modern Atheism.

[This article is concerned with atheism as practiced by science-communities and its consequences when incorporated within many philosophic systems as well as inconsistent philosophic systems, in general.] In October 1843, Marx wrote a review article criticizing statements made by Bruno Bauer in two of his published essays (1). Bauer asserts that, in order to live together, both Jews and Christians had to renounce what separates them – their religion. Indeed, all men had to be “emancipated” from religion, especially from State-sponsored religion. Marx’s statements are relative more directly to what is called the “Jewish Question.” Marx claims that all that is needed is that a government (the State) be secular, that all men are politically “equal” and that such equality is independent from any aspect of religious “castes” or “privileges.” Marx cites as examples the Constitution of the United States, various U.S. State Constitutions and the Constitution of the French Revolution. Marx claims that all that is required is that the State be entirely religion-neutral and that religious practices and doctrine be kept as a “private matter.” Marx does consider Judeo-Christian religious forms as “fantasy” or mere “imagination.”

[For this article, the term “metaphysical (supernatural)” is defined as any entity that is not confined to material space and observer time. That is, entities that, in general, are considered to reside in realms “exterior” to any defined physical universe or universes. Metaphysical processes are also not so confined, they are initiated by metaphysical entities and must employ procedures that are not defined as physical in character. For this article, a specific example of such an entity is “God” as He is described in the Bible. In this context, metaphysical events are not considered as “apparent” metaphysical events that might be explained via a physical alternative. I point out that the word-processor MS-WORD gives as synonyms for the word “supernatural” the words “weird” and “bizarre.”]

¹ This is an updated portion of the paper “Mathematical Philosophy – 1981 Status Report I,” that was presented on 15 August 1981 at the Annual Meeting of the American Scientific Affiliation, Eastern College, St. David PA. The major conclusions and their implications have not been altered from those expressed on 15 August 1981. However, a few additions, between the [and], have been made.

Marx states relative to what he claims are the contradictions between Jewish and Christian doctrine, that a unifying feature such as “science,” where “contradictions in science are solved by science itself,” is essential. Marx claims that the major problem with a Jewish society is not their religion but rather their love of money, which he claims is their true “god.” These pronouncements came from a naive Marx who rejected the metaphysical as a meaningless notion, and he implies that the humans can, somehow or other, separate their activities into two non-interacting philosophic systems – a secular and a separated theology. But if religious doctrines are not mere ramblings but are declarations influenced by some metaphysical entity - an entity that influences an individual’s daily activities - then such a non-interacting separation is not possible. The facts are that whether or not such doctrine is metaphysically inspired, individuals committed to their “God” directed religion are unwilling to make such a separation. Their “private” religious activities often impinge greatly upon the workings of an assumed separate political doctrine. In order to have any extensive form of State-control of human activities, as advocated by Marx and many other similar “reformers,” the simplest and most universally applied approach is an outright ban on all religious belief-systems that pose any type of threat to State-control. This is the goal of “modern atheism.”

From Marx’s viewpoint, atheism, in general, should be the State-religion but due to the conflicts it engenders when private metaphysical religion is allowed, modern atheism requires a complete ban based upon logic and a “scientific method.” The actual arguments presented that should lead to a banning of religious activities are relative to what was thought to be a self-evident notion. As Marx writes:

Christianity, . . . , cannot agree with reason because “worldly” and “religious” reason contradict each other (2).

Indeed, Marx and Engels consider *metaphysics* as employing an “anti-dialectic method of thought” (3). Throughout the writings of Marx and Engels on religion, one finds that “reality is rational,” and that metaphysical beliefs are “fantastic, imaginary, unreal” (4). Engels writes:

All religion, however, is nothing but the fantastic reflections in men’s minds of those external forces, which control their daily life, a reflection in which terrestrial forces assume the form of supernatural forces (5).

The assumed irrationality of metaphysics is also championed by Feuerback (6), Santayana (7) and is a requirement for secular humanism (8). If one claims that a metaphysical event has occurred, then this is counter by “There must be a rational explanation.” The unsubstantiated and, hence, self-evident claim is that metaphysical notions are, at the least, logically inconsistent and as such there can be no scientific evidence for any metaphysical notion. This is the major argument against such religious notions and it still permeates our “modern” society. Often, the terminology is more derogatory. Those that accept the metaphysical as “real” are often accused of exhibiting

various forms of “insanity.” Metaphysical notions are further associated with what constitutes “scientific” evidence.

There are two forms of evidence, direct and indirect. *Direct* evidence for the existence of postulated entities means that the entities directly impinge upon human or machine sensors. *Indirect* evidence for a postulated entities and their behavior means that there is no direct evidence. However, using defined scientific logic and the assumed behavior for the postulated entities that themselves cannot be directly observed, verified predictions are made in the behavior of other entities that can be directly observed. The major examples of where indirect evidence is a mainstay are atomic physics and early-history cosmology.

In physical science, a language is used to describe physical laws and physical behavior. The descriptions follow logical patterns that include classical logic, as well as, certain modifications of classical logic and some aspects of universal logic. These patterns are termed as “scientific logic.” For all that follows, a *rational description* is any description that satisfies such logical patterns. Although Marx and Engels suggested that other dialectical methods might be used, this has not occurred. Science-communities could simply state, “The metaphysical does not exist.” However, as so stated, they would be condemned for employing the unacceptable *ad hoc* method. Spurred on by the often-stated notion that metaphysical discourse is inherently irrational and scientific discourse is definably rational, *scientific atheism* and those philosophic systems that presuppose this belief system consider the following, explicit or implicit, hypothesis as irrefutable.

Secular Hypothesis:

It is impossible to give a rational description that combines accepted human laws of behavior, physical laws or physical behavior based upon such laws with metaphysical concepts such the behavior and attributes of a deity, the Christian concept of a higher intelligence, various Trinity notions, miracles, a metaphysical notion of “evil” entities [or metaphysical influences of human thought], among others.

Today, based upon aspects of “scientism,” secular humanists, secular scientists, which include many in the medical profession, most atheists and even certain so-called theologians accept this secular hypothesis. Relative to human comprehension, they also accept the follow axiom.

Axiom of Physical Consistency:

A description for any portion of reality is acceptable if and only if it is a rational description.

The Axiom of Physical Consistency is required for the philosophy of *scientism*, the belief that a scientific method should be applied in all fields of investigation and that all meaningful questions can be answered by using a scientific method. The modern atheist

accepts the Axiom of Natural Consistency and the Secular Hypothesis. Philosophic systems are created using these often hidden premises, and various methods of dialectic or deductive argument that necessary excludes metaphysical content are utilized.

There appears to be two related arguments for acceptance of the Secular Hypothesis. First, it is argued that all observed evidence is being observed by human beings and must follow the general rational patterns associated with human comprehension. If this is not the case, then a human observer could not mentally combine descriptions with evidence. That is, any evidence would be totally meaningless. From this viewpoint, all verifying evidence must be applied to a rational description. In order to enhance these humanistic philosophies, as mentioned, the simplest approach is to broadly state that the metaphysical does not exist and the Secular Hypothesis would follow from this pronouncement. The basic underlying rationale used, a rationale that appears to make scientific atheism more attractive, is the extreme egoistical belief that given enough time the human mind will describe, via scientific logic, all important aspects of physical behavior, social behavior etc., as well as “explain” all observed phenomena using a scientific method. If this explanation does not lead an individual to accept the non-existence of the metaphysical world, then it can be coupled with a refinement.

This refined argument is benevolently expressed by the modern humanist to placate those “irrational” individuals who still claim that metaphysical entities and processes exist. They state, “If the metaphysical exists in reality and is not merely an imaginary mental construct, and if there is evidence for the actual metaphysical, then this evidence would be so far beyond our meager comprehension or direct observation, that we could never hope to associate the evidence with an actual metaphysical entity. That is, we could never hope to rationally describe the ‘true’ metaphysical using our inferior mental capacities.” This refinement still leads to accepting the Secular Hypothesis. It might mollify those “strange” individuals who for some “inexplicable reason” still believe in the reality of the metaphysical as describe in various documents such as the Bible. It restricts acceptance of the metaphysical to allege unverifiable tents of faith. This might allow such individuals to still successfully function within a society that tolerates their existence.

2. Rational Evidence that Falsifies Scientific Atheism.

Why, in reality, does the modern atheist require one to accept the Secular Hypothesis? Suppose that at a specific moment in time you have a large amount of observed or experimentally obtained direct or indirect evidence for specific physical behavior. If one were to believe that there is a rational description for metaphysical processes, then the majority of the evidence might be more easily and more directly interpreted as the product of metaphysical processes rather than the result of defined physical processes. Thus, if *all* physical evidence is required to be secular in character, then the possibility that a rational description for assumed metaphysical entities and processed must be eliminated by steadfastly requiring a belief in a Secular Hypothesis. In an attempt to avoid any evidence being associated with any metaphysical process, atheistic scientists often cite highly improbable and narrow aspects of a secular physical theory as reasons for such evidence.

But, using the exact same scientific means used by atheistic science, a large amount of material presented [on this website and] in published [and archived] articles shows that the Secular Hypothesis is manifestly *false*.

This fact means that scientific atheism is internally inconsistent. Further, this material gives viable direct and indirect evidence for the scientific rationality of metaphysical entities and processes. These results give scientific and metaphysical alternatives to the theories and models employed by secular science or they present further refinements of these theories and models to include a metaphysical component. These alternatives have never been shown to be in rational error. They tend to satisfy the technical requirements that state that these metaphysical alternatives yield a *better* alternative than the secular.

Atheistic science-communities have little choice as to how to combat these metaphysical alternatives. They denigrate the authors of such alternatives and they, in general, spread lies to students and the world. Since they cannot use any argument that would rationally eradicate these alternatives, they use the forbidden *authority method*. The student, the public, the Courts, indeed, every social institution must reject these scientific alternatives, in their view, based solely upon the statement that they are authorities in matters of scientific discourse. They use false standards to measure the quality of such alternatives. They purposely, often without review or for no scientific reason, reject publication of these alternatives in their journals and then make the irrational claim that these alternatives are in scientific error simply because they have rejected them. They force, by all practical means, public schools, colleges and educational programs to reject any attempt to present, in any form, any of these alternatives for fear that an individual might choose an alternative that can be interpreted in a non-trivial theological manner.

[As an example, the pure secular aspects of the General Grand Unification Model were presented to public school students. Then it was observed that the students could, entirely on their own, re-interpret the model theologically in a rather strong sense and such presentations were disallowed. All cosmological theories or models can be interpreted, in a positive or negative sense, theologically. Cosmologies with a strong negative theological interpretation are allowed, but only the ones with the weakest theologically positive interpretation are presented to such students.]

The fact that the Secular Hypothesis is false means logically that any philosophic system that employs this or a similar hypothesis is inconsistent. From the viewpoint of rationally described behavior, there can be no worst state-of-affairs for a society than attempting to follow an inconsistent philosophy.

3. Significant Specific and General Societal Ramifications (9).

What significant implications can be drawn from the fact that a scientifically consistent model for aspects of the metaphysical now exists? One important implication is that those philosophic systems that include rational descriptions and, either explicitly or implicitly, the Secular Hypotheses are internally inconsistent.

In philosophical systems, known inconsistencies might be avoided or they only apply to an insignificant fragment. However, the paramount inconsistency that pervades these systems is closely related to human behavior and, in particular, how such inconsistent systems view the reasons for human behavior, wants and aspirations. In this regard, an important rational and metaphysical component is the existence of the human immaterial and immortal “spirit” [and the metaphysical processes that influence human thought. (See the article on this web site at index no. 19).] It is the “close” proximity of these demonstrable inconsistencies to highly emotional human factors that will tend to lead to significant consequences. These consequences develop when the following type of specific secular hypothesis is adjoined to a philosophic system.

Biological Secular Hypothesis.

There is no rational scientific possibility that the biological objects known as homo sapiens can exhibit any attribute related to a metaphysical component that would distinguish them from the “general observable categories” associated with distinct and demonstrably intelligent animal species. The *general observable categories* are defined as categories that can be rationally measured or described by application of the procedures or principles of modern experimental or deductive physical science.

For an atheistic philosophic system, unless a populous is closely controlled and highly restricted so as to limit its knowledge of other competing and rational philosophic systems that contradict this Biological Secular Hypothesis, then internal contradictions could yield considerable unrest and even the eventual collapse of such an atheistic system. Due to weakening of societal control, political systems such as the USSR, among others, should collapse. However, such collapses could take on any diverse form. This could include actions that might envelop all of mankind in an unprecedented holocaust. It is rather difficult for any culture based upon a logically consistent political or general world-view to comprehend or even successfully communicate with any society controlled by an irrational philosophy. The same conclusion holds when two or more theological systems contradict each other, where each may be internally described in a rational manner. It is imperative that each individual be appraised of these basic facts as well as the dangers these facts represent in order to be well-prepared to meet any irrational actions that may occur if these inconsistent systems or inconsistent combinations of philosophic systems are not drastically modified.

Philosophic inconsistencies yield other grave, immediate and specific dangers. Many local, State and U. S. Federal government agencies have applied specific principles that are advocated by irrational philosophic systems. Of course, one may benevolently assume that these agencies are unaware that the principles they apply are based upon often deeply hidden logical inconsistencies. Nevertheless, these principles are the direct result of such contradictions and, in a society that pursues “free thinking” as well as many diverse civil actions including destructive ones, such inconsistencies might lead to a perilous collapse of portions of our governmental system.

One example of such a partial collapse stems from the conclusions of a previously confidential report prepared for a member of the U. S. Congress and the Chairmen of a major U. S. Senate committee.

With respect to all known forms of ordinary and consistent human logical discourse, it can be irrefutably demonstrated that the U. S. Supreme Court opinion *Roe V. Wade* – 22 Jan. 1973 – is logically inconsistent. The procedures employed by the Court in arriving at this opinion can be utilized in order to argue for any declarative conclusion acceptable to the majority of the Court’s members. Politically, such declarations are legislation and the Court would be violating the Separation of Powers.

A major process that yields an inconsistent philosophic system occurs when two systems are combined. The Court has arrived at its conclusion by combining mathematical science with portions of secular humanism. The only way to correct an inconsistent system is to remove those portions that lead to the contradictions. However, the fact is that a set of hypotheses need not display an obvious inconsistency such as an explicit contradiction. [Let A,B,C,D be simple declarative statements. If the hypothesis “A and not A” is utilized, then the “A and not A” is an obvious (classical) contradiction. This statement can be used to give a valid classical argument that yields E, where E is *any* propositional statement taken from a language. A set of hypotheses that contain this statement is “obviously” inconsistent.] For societal and combined theological systems, obvious contradictions can produce immediate civil consequences.

[Consider the set H of hypotheses, (1) (not D), (2) A if and only if B. (3) If B, then C. (4) (not C) or D. (5) If (not A), then D. It can be shown that, although the sets {1,2,3,4} and {5} are consistent individually, the set H is inconsistent and, hence, there is a classical deduction that leads to an explicit contradiction. This is an example of a “not obvious” or “hidden” inconsistency and the fact that a set of premises leads to a contradiction may not be noticed until after considerable civil conflict.] It appears that a majority of those individuals and organizations that follow many of the principles developed using principles taken from scientific atheism are unaware that the concepts they employ are based upon inconsistent hypotheses. Moreover, in many cases, local, State and Federal government agencies that are charged with observing and communicating with irrational groups or individuals are apparently unaware of the often hidden logical difficulties since they attempt to explain or interpret irrational behavior by assuming that the behavior is *rational*. Such agencies should no longer adhere to the belief that such behavior is “somehow” rational in character. Since rational behavior is more relative to comparison, then although behavior may appear to be “strange,” when compared to a majority, nevertheless it may be rational as here defined. The appropriate approach would be to analyze and compare individual or group philosophic foundations and to determine, if possible, whether these foundations are consistent. There are certain mathematical techniques that may be able to make such a determination.

The major research conclusion discussed in this article, in many cases, produces a *ranking* for specific irrational behavior associated with an inconsistent philosophic

system or combination of systems. Inconsistent philosophic systems can generate diverse and often dangerous behavior. One of the major concerns is the obvious fact that two or more consistent systems when combined can lead to an inconsistent system. Thus, although a philosophic system may be internally consistent, when it is observed and, hence, combined with a second system the combination may be inconsistent. Hence, in the following ranking, it is assumed that the system being ranked is either internally inconsistent or is inconsistent when combined with the observer's system. For such combinations, the irrationality in social behavior driven by one philosophic system is most prevalent when compared to a competing system that rejects certain social behavior. This ranking is in an ordering of increasing observable irrationality.

1. General philosophic or political systems presented as a highly complex structure tend to obscure much of their irrationally conceived content since these systems have built-in procedures that allow for such obscurity.
2. Any revolutionary or terrorist organization that, by definition, applies a methodology that is inconsistent with of the observer's system. The actual actions are mostly covert in character.
3. Any revolutionary or terrorist organization that, by definition, applies a methodology that is inconsistent with of the observer's system. The actual actions are overt in character. Generally, groups that have competing theological systems, which in combination are inconsistent, will tend to exhibit obvious contradictions due to the reliance upon a system's assumed "ultimate authority" for the actions taken. If group A employs revolutionary or terrorist methods which are deemed as inconsistent and heinous relative to the rather passive methods accepted by an observer group B, then A will tend to engender "fear" within B due to the difficulty B has in predicting A's "irrational" actions. It is impossible for B to negotiate rationally with A in any matter that stems from an inconsistency. The only absolute way that groups A and B can fully cooperate is to eradicate any inconsistency by any appropriate means.

4. Apologetics.

I have been asked to give various examples of how Christians could directly employ these and other "Theory of Ultralogics" conclusions in apologetics. Clearly, a most important aspect of this research is that it gives strong scientific evidence that basic Christian doctrine with its metaphysical content is not irrational as been so widely proclaimed by atheists. This is a major defense of Christianity and, as we have seen, it completely eradicates much competing philosophic doctrine. This also neutralizes most secular scientism. Importantly, individuals can use their common (everyday) reasoning processes to discuss Biblically related Christian doctrine and Biblically directed solutions to the complex problems of our modern society. Individuals need no longer rely upon some complex dialectical argument. Dialectical arguments are often used to lead an individual into accepting a "cult" doctrine that may appear to be Biblically based.

Clearly, these findings could be the final piece of evidence that would lead an individual to accept Christianity as a personal philosophy. The predicted results from this model tend to yield a clearer, more concrete and specific description for what has been confusing and nebulous Christian doctrine. The use of this scientific approach in Christian education is obvious. It is also clear that for Christians of weakening faith these results could be an important faith builder.

From a purely abstract and unemotional viewpoint, it can be minimally stated that Christianity with its metaphysical component is just as “real” as any scientific theory based upon mathematical models. This includes almost all of modern physical science. Thus, there seems to be no rational reason that scientifically modeled metaphysical notions should not be examined, at least on same technical level as any other mathematically based model, by students in the K–12 public and private schools, as well as colleges and universities. Moreover, the existence of a scientifically rational and predictive model for many metaphysical concepts suggests that new evidence that verifies various aspects of Christian doctrine can be obtained using experimental techniques employed by behavioral scientists.

4. Something Not Accomplished.

Due to the persistence of an unfortunate mind-set or simply mental laziness ineffective attempts have been made within scholarly communities to dismiss these research findings as the product of previously categorized and rejected philosophic methods. This is not the case since the method used did not exist until 1966. Indeed, the method used is an absolutely new approach for analyzing philosophic systems.

One of the great difficulties, however, has been in communicating these research findings and eliminating the numerous misconceptions that are produced by an individual’s presuppositions, training or the lack of scholarly open-mindedness. I sincerely wish that all readers of this article would be more directly involved with the generation of further research results.

A major discouraging aspect has been the immense difficulty in communicating the significant societal results, some of which are mentioned in section 3, to the general public. This is particularly unfortunate since the U. S. State Department, many concerned Federal agencies and other individual members of the Federal establishment have been informed of the pertinent research findings through confidential governmental channels. These difficulties have proved to me that these irrational scientific, political and humanistic philosophies are highly entrenched and that vast portions of these irrational philosophies have been accepted by many agencies. On the other hand, Senator John East, Chairman of the U. S. Senate Subcommittee on Separation of Powers has assured me that the conclusions of the Roe V. Wade analysis will be utilized to their fullest extent in an attempt to nullify this dangerous and irrational Court opinion. It should be self-evident that I will not relent in my efforts to communicate these new methods, conclusions and implications to all of humanity.

References

- (1) Marx, K., *A World without Jews*, ed. D. Runes, New York, (1959).
- (2) Marx, K. and F. Engels, *On Religion*, Translated by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C. C., C.P. S. U., Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow (1960), p. 24.
- (3) *Ibid.*, p. 351.
- (4) *Ibid.*
- (5) *Ibid.*, p. 147.
- (6) Feuerback, L. *Lectures on the Essence of Religion*, Harper and Row, New York, (1967).
- (7) Santayana, G., *Reason in Religion*, Charles Scribner's and Sons, New York, (1905).
- (8) Kurtz, P., (ed.) *The Humanist Alternative: some definitions of Humanism*, Prometheus Books, Buffalo, New York, (1973).
- (9) All the conclusions in this section were written in August 1980, with the exception of the Supreme Court statement, which was outlined in November 1980 and revised in March 1981. All conclusions were disseminated to various federal government agencies in January 1981. Some conclusions were distributed to the news media in February, March, April, May and June 1981. The formal mathematical proofs for the conclusions was completed on 21 May 1981 and revised 19 June 1981. The U. S. Supreme Court conclusions were disseminated to various authorities in May and June 1981 for critical review. These conclusions were personally presented to a member of the U. S. Congress in March 1981. In July 1981, Senator John East and the U. S. Senate Subcommittee on the Separation of Powers accepted the U. S. Supreme Court findings as a "valuable contribution."

Mathematics Department, U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD USA.