

# THE GOD PROOF

A new statement of the Cosmological and Ontological Arguments  
for the reality of God

PETER HARRIS



## What some early readers have said:

Great to see the arguments finally written down on paper after mulling these weighty matters since 1990... 'thirty years - has it been that long?' \*

A seductively logical, admirably aphoristic and succinct work of great allure and charm... opens up an infinite Realm of Divine Beauty, Sublimity and Nobility locked away since Voltaire et al. - PJH ☺

And seriously - your feedback solicited - 'we're on a Mission from God! '\*\* At least a Quest... And would like to inspire others to join this Quest, and join in a Renaissance of the reason-based values which made our culture as great as it (still) is.

\* The Doc in *Back to the Future*

\*\* *The Blues Brothers*



Copyright Peter Harris © July 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2019

Published by:



Eutopia Press, 61 Carnarvon St  
Gisborne  
New Zealand  
wizardofeutopia@gmail.com

**Printing history**  
FIRST draft print 16.7.19



*'...Inconceivable!'*

'That word you keep using – I don't think it means what you think it means.'

-

- *The Princess Bride.*



*Platonist Exiting Plato's Cave P.J.H 2019*

Dedicated to  
C. S. Lewis  
Who opened the Wardrobe Door  
And My Brother and Patron, the Blue Knight  
John Evan Harris,  
Who, not having seen, has believed.





## Preface

I acknowledge you, Reader whom I hope to seduce into an awesomely exciting, romantic and mind-blowing mental journey into the Concept of God!

*Affairs are now soul-size.  
The enterprise  
Is exploration into God*

Christopher Fry, *A Sleep of Prisoners*

Did I just say *mind-blowing*? Yes – as Plotinus said, the rational mind can take us to the very top of the conceptual mountain, to the very edge of the thinkable and sayable, but only the meditative Mind can make the leap into the divine sky which lies beyond. As Ludwig Wittgenstein said in the *Tractatus Logico-philosophicus*, ‘There *is* the Mystical.’ But, having traced the boundaries of the sayable, he closed with Proposition number seven:

*Whereof we cannot speak we must pass over in silence.*

I think that was poetic license on his part, driven by his distaste for the ‘profanation of metaphysics’, the reduction of the ineffable Mystery to dry philosophical metaphors and dubious definitions... I sympathize with this reverence. Still, I think we can see and say something about the transcendental, from the top of the conceptual mountain, using the telescope of logic.

But how can I call this journey through the cramped lens of the logical telescope romantic? Perhaps I should change the metaphor. Think of rational thinking as a remote 3D probe, allowing us to see, zoom in on and explore some of what lies in that infinite Beyond, ‘That than which Nothing Greater can be Conceived’, the Absolute, the Is, the All-Father, the All-Mother, the Ground of Being, the First Cause....

Or even better, think of it as a computer which can calculate and portray in ever-finer detail the infinite fractal outlines of the Mandelbrot set. The concept ‘God’, I submit, is like the formula for the Mandelbrot set, writable in three letters, or to be more accurate, a few concept words, mapping out the most fantastic, infinite Pattern of all, a pattern so vast that it can appear in many regions to be no pattern, or worse, an anti-pattern, a work of horrible chaos...

So, I admit, it isn’t all tea and crumpets, this exploration into God... we come up against monsters and devils as well as butterflies and angels.

The shadows are deep indeed, the deserts very wide. There arises sooner or later – usually sooner - in our theological explorations the spectre of Evil (or Pain), from which issues the implacable Argument from Evil which seems to make the existence of God inconceivable. It is like the paradox of the irresistible force meeting an immovable object – which can win?

I believe that inexorable logic of the God Proof can and should win against the the mountain of suffering which is in this world, not by denying it but by establishing a prior claim, that of necessary existence. When the impossible is eliminated, what remains, however improbable, is the truth. If I can persuade you by reason that it is impossible, or at least inconceivable, that God should not exist, then we must agree to accept the improbable conclusion that such evil and suffering must somehow - we may never understand fully how – be compatible with His existence.

Hopefully by then you be glad to have been so persuaded, having seen that the existence of God does not entail the doleful things we have grown up assuming that it does, but is in fact the most hopeful fact in this or any conceivable Universe.

Peter Harris, Auckland July 11th, 2019

## Introduction

### Personal Background

At the age of 35 with four children and a long-suffering wife I finally turned to face head-on the knot of life-crippling uncertainties in my mind over the meaning of 'Life, the Universe, and Everything'. I had become agnostic after completing a BA in classical Greek and Biblical Hebrew, started a photo frame making business to try and support a growing family, became insolvent, then in the nick of time saved the business by reading and applying *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance*. We left our now much more *Zen* workshop to our two loyal staff. They were to make good frames which I would then wholesale from a rented back yard in Auckland, while I studied philosophy at the University.

I found a philosophy department divided between the dry, brittle 'Western analytic' tradition of 'piecemeal analysis' (the majority) and the murky minority of the Continental tradition of relativism, historicism and deconstruction (or something like that).

Because I already had a degree in classical Greek and had studied Plato, I was able to skip to metaphysics stage three. The lecturer, a specialist in the philosophy of Science and an atheist, set us an exciting first essay, on the nature of 'a priori' knowledge and whether it is possible. I argued passionately that it was and quoted Plato. It turns out it wasn't. Indeed, the very term 'Platonism' was meaningless, he informed me. He wrote a lot of stern comments and warnings in red throughout and gave me a D minus (equivalent to about an 'F' in American terms). I appealed to the Head of Department, my Philosophy of Religion lecturer, an amiable gay Englishman who attempted to keep the peace by advising me that while the essay was indeed to his mind 'grossly undermarked', I should just continue with the course and everything would be alright in the end.

It wasn't, of course, and I became more and more isolated and embattled as I did my best to pursue, alone, the noble and original Western Philosophical quest for a systematic theory of... well, 'Life, The Universe, and Everything.' I beachcombed through the Philosophy section of the University library, finding here and there a shell of unusual beauty and nobility in the form of books either of systematic philosophy or of the theory of systematic theory-building. The latter were often dealing with the philosophy of Science, which of course is at bottom very holistic and systematic.

Why then did that philosophy of Science lecturer react so violently against my systematic quest in philosophy, which was the quest to be scientific as possible in forming more and more general and all-

encompassing theories of Everything, in the style of Popper in his *Conjectures and Refutations*? Part of his outrage at me was his belief that students were there to *study* (approved analytic) philosophers, not to practice *being* philosophers (let alone system-builders!), not until they had read everything there was to read on all the topics they wished to cover – an impossibility in the case of systematic philosophy: you would never get to the end and if you did you would be so full of the endless piecemeal disputations that any original thoughts would be buried forever).

But the main outrage for him was that I was bringing up from its unquiet grave the scandal of physicalism (/atheism/naturalism), the Faultline, the paradox buried so deep and for so many decades that it was passed over in silence as the atheist scientists and philosophers had their cake (atheism) and ate it too (mathematics and science). That logical scandal in fact, when unearthed and analysed, yields a complete refutation or *reductio ad absurdum* of the physicalist position.

This refutation is also the first stage of an ‘ontological’ God Proof, which of course is the greatest heresy and intellectual anathema to the atheist – and to the agnostic empiricist. I was therefore standing on very dangerous ground if I wanted to earn an MA in what they called ‘philosophy’ but was really Western Analytic - physics-envying academics bickering in the journals like lawyers over the deconstructed fragments of great systems, dissected footnotes to footnotes to the dialogues of Plato (IMHO\*).

So, what is this Faultline running between the rock-bottom assumptions (and presuppositions) of the physicalist scientific tradition (or ‘paradigm’ as the philosopher of science Thomas Kuhn called it)? I am not, of course, the first to call attention to the paradox of physicalism. My go-to location for a refutation of physicalism, or Naturalism, is C. S. Lewis’s *Miracles*, Chapter 3, ‘The Cardinal Difficulty of Naturalism.’

Again, what is the *logical* problem with physicalism, Naturalism or Atheism? If you are happy to find out straight away, before reading my attempt to remove the cardinal *psychological* difficulties Physicalists have with the idea of a God, go straight to Part One. But I would love to prepare the ground psychologically - ‘soften you up’ if you will - by taking you on a healing journey through the array of poisonous prejudices, ancient and modern, about what belief in a God actually entails...

\* In My Humble Opinion

## **Some of the Prejudices about God and belief in God.**

1 That 'HE' is angry, warlike and judgmental, devoid of feminine qualities; or else pale and anemic, meek and mild, and calls on us to become martyrs and doormats.

2 That He is a Person who goes about poking His nose Everywhere and spoiling all the fun.

3 That God is scary, capricious; that He could be unjust, say, but mostly chooses not to be... That to know God and to know justice or love or beauty or truth, are two separate things, and one day God could demand of us something totally shocking, as He did of Abraham when He ordered him to sacrifice (kill) Isaac his only son.

4 That He wants us to be self-sacrificing, unhappy and poor.

5 That He wants us to be aloof from the world and all its beauties.

6 That He is against sex, and all the pleasures of the flesh

7 that he is against learning, science, creativity and curiosity

8 That He wants us to be simpleminded and cannot abide cleverness

9 That He hates art, storytelling, fantasy, romance of all kinds.

10 That He demands we become perfect or He will punish us in this life and send us to hell when we die.

11 that He sides with the priests, the authorities and institutions and is on the side of the status quo even when it crushes all joy out of us.

12 That if we believe in God we will be laughed at, scorned, shunned and even persecuted.

13 That belief in a God is a slippery slope and soon we will have to convert to the God of our fathers and their dogmatic religion.

14 That belief in God entails giving away of our money and becoming a holy pauper and living in grinding poverty until we die.

15 That our partners will hate us for converting and leave us; or God will demand that we leave them if they will not convert.

16 That the reality of evils in the world and in our own lives and the lives of our family and friends will make a mockery of any faith or belief – it would seem better to 'curse God and die' as suffering Job's wife urged him to do...

Any of the above assumptions about what belief in a God would entail could be psychologically overwhelming as we look at any argument for the reality of God. If we are seeking clarity, to make sense of this existence, this 'terrible privilege' of life and consciousness and intelligence, we must wrestle with our feelings, bracket them, understand that they are not the truth but conditioned by our 'human, all too human' culture and history, which we have good reason to distrust.

For me the reality of evil, of suffering and death woven into the fabric of life on this planet, was and still is the hardest psychologically to bracket. There is an argument for it – this suffering does seem incompatible with the existence of a God – unless that God was indifferent or even cruel. There are some defenses, such as the freewill defense which mitigate the problem, to some people completely, but for me there is left a huge problem when I think of the seemingly unnecessary ‘collateral damage’ of freewill – the suffering of the apparently completely innocent – babies and animals, for example. But, just as we do not understand all the workings of the physical universe, we can remind ourselves that even if we can see with our reasoning minds that there must be a Creator, we may never in this life understand all the workings of the moral universe. There may be a function of pain, seemingly mindless pointless pain, which will one day be revealed to suffering souls when they finally evolve beyond this ‘vale of tears’. At least, if we have become convinced intellectually of the reality of God – the Is, the Source – we will not be faced with that final affront to reason, the bleak and hellish vision of a mindless world of pointless and random pain, anguish and death which is atheism.

So, let’s stoically bracket all that fear and loathing, all the seething emotions that can arise when our accustomed ‘sense of life’ is challenged, and calmly inquire what reason may discover in the matter of the deepest structure of reality, the question of what is the ultimate Reality.

My account of this reasoning is brief, and I don’t try to answer all emotionally charged objections, reasonable or unreasonable, that people might raise along the way. Describing and grappling with these objections could make the line of reasoning seem convoluted. Really it is quite straightforward. The greatest difficulty is in the emotional bracketing.

One final thought on why a ‘softening up’ is necessary before a modern western mind will even open a chink to the possibility of an argument for the reality of God: there is a prejudice we all share, that empirical evidence, by which we mean evidence presented to the five senses, is the only real evidence for the reality of anything. The eminent logician, set theorist and Platonist philosopher Kurt Gödel argued that the mind is also an organ of perception, but of non-physical, intelligible realities. And there is actually strong evidence that our mental ‘sense’ is at least as reliable as the five physical senses: mathematics applied to engineering builds bridges very reliably – more so than purely physical observation, trial and error. So, why do we think of real science as based on purely physical observation, and of philosophy and mathematics as dubious and speculative, or else abstract, an invention of the mind, a set of arbitrary constructs? Pure prejudice...

## Part One

### The Refutation of Physicalism: The *reductio ad absurdum* Argument from Reason

For physicalism to be true, there can be nothing that is not physical. But atoms and fields and space cannot be true or false; they just are. At least, it would appear to be a ‘category mistake’ to even try to argue that they are of the same ‘kind’ as statements of truth. To claim they are capable of this dual nature does violence to the distinctions we cannot coherently do without. It is smuggling into the physical something which the physical does not and (surely?) cannot claim – the mental or conceptual qualities of truth and meaning). Therefore there is something that is not physical, namely truth, and the physicalist appeals to it when he says in effect ‘physicalism is true’.\*

Also, atoms cannot be numbers, only *represent* numbers if grouped deliberately to a mental concept of number...So there is something else that is not physical, namely numbers.

The same argument applies to ethics – we can ‘see’ that something is right or wrong, that it should be a certain way, but no amount of what *is* can get us a single *should* without reference to a concept of right and wrong, independent of what is.

Physicalists in fact are making a self-contradictory statement when they say ‘physicalism is true’ – they have no logical right to say anything is true or false, if they are right and there is nothing but physical stuff.

Perhaps they can say ‘I feel there is nothing but matter and energy’ – but this has no more validity as a statement about reality outside of their feelings than a statement about their digestion. So, any statement that physicalism is true is logically absurd.

**So, there is a reality that is not physical. And it is intelligible to the reasoning mind.**

\* This is to me the greatest improbability, if not absurdity, in the atheist’s, and the Pantheist’s, rebuttal of the Cosmological Argument for the existence of God. The second greatest improbability is in their claiming that it is more probable that matter, and the Universe, is self-existent and self-causing than that God is self-existent and made the Universe. See the chapter below on the Cosmological Argument.

## **Part Two**

### **The eternal necessity of the non-physical**

If there is truth, number, and right and wrong (and possibly Beauty, Love, and many other things perceived by the mind but not intrinsic to matter – consciousness perhaps too), what can we say about the nature of these things? The first and most obvious property they have is changelessness – they cannot be one minute and not be the next. The second is they cannot be conceived to not be – to understand truth is to see that it must be so, in all times places and worlds. ‘One plus one is two’ can’t be true today and not tomorrow or true on Earth but not on Mars.

**So, this non-physical reality is eternal, changeless and logically necessary.**



## Part Three

### The Concept of God and the non-physical Reality

Now we come to the most critical term in the argument about God: the concept 'God'. Here we need to put aside all mental images of a physical being. We are not trying to prove (or disprove) the existence of such a being. God, we see by examination of the concept, cannot be physical, otherwise that being would be limited, trapped in space and time, not, as the concept demands, eternal and outside of, independent of, the physical. (the Greek gods and goddesses could be real, live on Mt Olympus and be very swift wise and powerful, but would still not be God – not even close. The word God refers to Something eternal, timeless, and indeed *necessary* which created or at least is independent of this physical universe.

Now, it may be too much for the modern, materialistically trained mind to make the same leap as we made to the reality of number, truth and right and wrong, and say that this concept of a Necessary Being – God - did not come from or rely on the existence of atoms and energy so logically it describes a non-physical Reality, the supreme one – the eternal, uncreated, necessary ground of all lesser being, such as the physical. That is the essence of the 'ontological argument'.

So, let's take the more modest step of comparing the idea of God with the ideas we have already established as referring to non-physical realities – truth, number, right and wrong. Are these concepts not part of the definition of God? They are eternal as God must be, by definition. They are good, positive, beautiful, as God is by definition. They are necessary in all possible times places and worlds, as God must be, by definition.

So we find ourselves committed to believing in the reality of at least some of the necessary attributes of God. If we have the tail of an elephant, is it not reasonably to conclude that we have hold also of the elephant? That is of course an analogy, but consider: what further attributes of God do we need to we need to find to have found all the essential attributes, the minimum set of attributes we would need in order to believe in the full reality of God?

The final essential attribute, I suggest, is the property of being the Cause or Ground of the physical reality. We only have two

candidates for this entity: the physical universe itself, or the non-physical. Now, it is perfectly possible to imagine any particular rock, tree, galaxy or universe not existing – there is no obvious absurdity to that thought. But we have already seen that it is impossible to imagine one and one not equalling two, or right being the same as wrong, or a simple statement being both true and false at the same time.

So, it would seem overwhelmingly more reasonable to conclude that the non-physical came ‘first’ – is the Necessary reality – and the physical came ‘second’ – is the contingent or dependent reality - in other words, was created by the non-physical reality.

So, it seems inescapable that the non-physical reality, or a part thereof, was/is the source of all that we see. Is, in fact, the Creator of it. And, if the Creator also the sustainer and also physically omnipotent and omnipresent. (Truth is omnipresent, so is right and wrong, etc).

So we have come to believe in a set of attributes that are necessary and sufficient for a God to exist – eternity, self-existence, (necessary reality), goodness, beauty, creatorhood, omnipotence and omnipresence. And of course, infinitude – number is infinite; the set of truths is infinite.

Therefore it is logical to conclude that God is real. (This is not a belief that God ‘exists’ as a tree or rock or person exists; as we have established, we are not talking about an Olympian-style ‘mighty being’ within the physical world, but a transcendent reality, beyond it but as it were penetrating it or enfolding or subsuming it.)

**QED.**

## **A second Argument for the Existence of God: The Cosmological Argument**

As a backing argument to the above Ontological Argument, which is almost as purely *a priori* as any argument can be, I will run through the Cosmological Argument, which relies on a principle or axiom which can be questioned by a very determined atheist, though not, I think, with much credibility. That axiom is the Principle of Sufficient Reason, which is that for any physical phenomenon to exist (including the whole physical Universe) there must be some prior cause, and there cannot be an infinite regress of physical causes, but eventually there must be a 'First Cause' – which must be self-existent. (It doesn't help to propose that there really IS an infinite chain of causes – the argument applies to that whole infinite set of causes – making an unexplained physical phenomenon infinite in extent whether in time or space or both, doesn't make it any more probable – if possible, it makes it even less probable – or, to the unbiassed mind, absurd.)

It seems absurd to say that the first state of this universe of matter and energy could be self-existent, self generating out of nothing, uncaused by anything else prior to it. The Big Bang helps not at all – it just pushes the question one big leap back, into the cosmic singularity from which it all exploded out.

So, the only candidate for such an uncaused Cause must be non-physical. And there are plenty of realities which we can see to be non-physical (as pointed out above – truth, logic, number, right and wrong), eternal, uncreated. Therefore, some Sum of all these realities seems to be the only plausible candidate for the Cause of the physical Universe. We might as well call this prior Reality and cause of our whole existence by its common name – God.

To return to the question raised in my *reductio ad absurdum* of physicalism: is it coherent, let alone probable, that matter and energy can be of a dual nature, both physical and mental/meaningful? I think not, but even if it was a reasonable picture, we have really only smuggled God into our physical Universe as some kind of permeating entity or quality, and we have in fact become Pantheists, with all the logical difficulties that entails. We have certainly ceased to be Physicalists or Atheists.

The main difficulty with Pantheism, apart from the oil-and-water dualism involved in combining atoms and ideas, is moral - that we then have to say that everything that goes on in this universe is part of God – including all the evil and suffering we see in it. Or that it is somehow an ‘illusion’. But pain is not made one bit less painful by calling it illusory – we are only adding the pain of a monstrous denial of our common sense and sense of truth.

No, it seems much more logical and intellectually honest to admit that if there is a divine or transcendental Reality, it is independent and logically prior to the physical Universe, causing it, sustaining it, and presumably caring for it, despite the evil it is infected with, despite the evil choices humans, and for all we know many other life-forms, make.

## EPILOGUE

After becoming convinced intellectually, we are faced with the real challenge – to live into the beauty and nobility of the vision which opens up, in this very world we find ourselves in. Love, acceptance, courage, freedom – all these take on new colours as we continue this great Adventure, Pilgrimage, Experiment – as we revise even these metaphors we use to describe to ourselves what life is. I like the idea of the poem quoted in the beginning of this little book, that life can be an exploration into God – not the limiting merely personal God but the limitless Ground of Being, the infinite mathematics behind the evolving geometry of the flower, the galaxies, the human body and mind, masculine and feminine. Yet, as C. S. Lewis points out, it is to be expected that God will have, as it were, His own ideas about what's what and will challenge us, no, command us in the name of all those qualities which He embodies, to act in accordance with them and not continue, as is so easy, in self-deception about ourselves and how we behave in the world.

We are social creatures, too, and the problem of who to explore and obey God *with* naturally arises. In fact it may be the first thing He may lead us to sort out. Do we join a church? A philosophy group? Start a Mere Theists group? ☺ Go to university and seek likeminded souls there? (yeah... been there!) Alas, I don't have any easy answers. My own pilgrimage has been long, winding and mostly lonely and frustrating.

It would have been so much easier if I had become convinced of the religion of my fathers – Christianity. But this didn't happen – or rather, I became unconvinced. However, there are many Christian churches that welcome the unconvinced, and indeed are led by the semi-unconvinced... So, maybe I and my family could have found some kind of spiritual and social home in one of them.

But the artist, the philosopher and the idealist finds it hard not to get frustrated by such stuffy compromises. They want to get out into the fresh air, to 'sing outside the walls', seeking a rarer and truer kind of fellowship, or else go it alone, or with one other person, a kindred spirit or two, or one true love. Or start a new and better 'church' or intentional community of some kind. That has been my frustrating path, so far fragmentary and expensive to myself and those around me. But it is more important, as C. S. Lewis said, that heaven should exist than that

we should get to it – at least in this life! We live, many of us, in our ideals and dreams as much as or more than in the concrete reality around us.

And, as I reflect on the path as I have found it, there is a mystic fellowship of all who love, who love truth, who want to live meaningful and good lives. There are divine synchronicities and encouragements along the way, chance meetings that restore our faith in the living Meaning behind mere existence, beneath the surface of the daily struggle. So, I often feel content in the awareness that I am part of a mystic fellowship of humans who are somewhat alive to this deeper Reality and Meaning, whether further along than me or only just beginning to get an inkling of Something More... And I know I am part of a whole great stream of humanity which has for generations been looking to this higher reality to guide them towards a great vision – the Western civilisation, the Western Dream.

My version of the Western Dream (which I like to call the *True West* to distinguish it from the actual performance by Western nations and empires which it is the current fashion to slander and decry) which I treasure as a great inheritance, dearly won and defended, is one that honours Love, Beauty, Truth and Freedom. I have composed a ‘Declaration of the True West’ to be found at my blog on the topic [www.thetruewest.wordpress.com](http://www.thetruewest.wordpress.com)

I have a theory of how those four work together as dynamic phases in the evolution of any idea, system, project, society or culture. It is a process theory (totally compatible with the conviction of the reality of an eternal Transcendent Reality as argued for above) and perhaps one day it will help me and/or others to evolve and create a better society, in an intentional microcosm at least. See [www.4phase.wordpress.com](http://www.4phase.wordpress.com) for a little about it.

And there are many other movements and experiments which can give us hope that the world can move closer to the ideals available in the infinite world of potential manifestation we call God. We are fragmented, but we are all humans, and there is only one God, and through reason, art, and love we may grow to be more worthy of that Reality and to manifest it here.

*With every mistake we must surely be learning*

- *While my guitar gently weeps...*
- George Harrison

Finally, it must be said: there is no such thing as a moral free lunch. If we believe in a good God, we find ourselves logically obliged to stop being evil; to in fact attempt to be good, in thought, word and deed. The obligation can feel onerous to our ‘fallen’ nature, even if we do not buy into a religious codification of all our moral duties – a Bible or other holy book – or belong to any church which can put huge social-moral pressure on the conscientious theist...

C. S. Lewis claims in *Surprised by Joy* that when one becomes a theist and makes a serious effort to become good, one soon runs out of moral resources, fails miserably and must pray for and eventually, like him, pray for and accept God’s transforming grace through belief in Jesus. Although this sounds good to a weary moral pilgrim, I have not found it to be automatically successful. And I have tried, for about seven years in the (fundamentalist) faith before the questions became more numerous than answers. Virtue, it seems to me, is not a gift to be received by an instant spiritual rebirth, but a habit to be cultivated by understanding, insight and practice – probably in close association with others of like mind. This, of course, is difficult to find outside of some religion...

For more on this and other questions, read my next little book, *Mere Theism*. Some of the burning questions to be addressed are:

Is romanticism safe with Theism, or is it incompatible?

Is there room for ‘magic’ in a theistic universe – synchronicity, mind, intention and emotion affecting the unfolding of the world process? If the supernatural is not present in a pantheistic sense, does it impinge and interpenetrate the world in a theistic context, or is the physical universe pretty much as the Newton saw it – just physical cause and effect, deterministic – just with the addition of quantum fuzziness – with a completely separate spiritual realm or level where God is?

Do we ‘have’, are we partly, eternal souls/spirits? Or are we intelligent sparks from God, destined to burn out in a few decades?

If eternal or at least able to survive in some form after physical death, is the reincarnation? Punishment or karma in a Hell and Reward in Heaven?

What are the outlines of the possible map of Natural Theology, ie theory of God and the universe based purely on observation and reason, not on ‘revelation’, ie doctrines not reachable by reason and

regular observation, but delivered by chosen prophets and teachers sent from God?

How can we tap into the collective experience of all theists past and present, and the wisdom traditions based on theism, to live more wisely happily productively and successfully than we ever could if we had to sit down and work it all out for ourselves? Without getting bogged down in conflicting doctrines commands taboos etc?

What forms of solitary and community prayer, meditation, and worship are desirable and available?

Join me in this exploration in Mere Theism – soon (present writing 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2019) to be available on the [www.meretheism.wordpress.com](http://www.meretheism.wordpress.com) website. Also soon as an ebook Amazon and other platforms.



## Footnotes, sources

The Ontological Argument: Anselm, Descartes, Gödel, Plantinga

Arguments against physicalism/Naturalism: C. S. Lewis, Miracles, Chs III and V.

Platonism, Realism, philosophical ‘Rationalism’ (not to be confused with atheist’s ‘rationalism’): many sources. Plato of course; Plotinus; All of C. S. Lewis; C. S. Peirce, who though known as the father of Pragmatism and a radical process thinker was also a firm believer in the underlying Reality of the Intelligible Order – he divided Everything into three ‘universes’: the Possiverse, the Activerse, and the Necessiverse – the latter – the absolute Infinite containing all truths of mathematics and logic and ethics - being the infinite source and ground of the finite universe, or Theatre of Reactions, of all actual things; and the infinite ‘continuum of Possibility’ into which the Activerse evolves.

Aristotle, though much more ‘empiricist’ than Plato, did have a firm belief in the rationality of the Cosmos, based ultimately on a ‘First Cause’ and ‘Unmoved Mover’.

Now, contact the Author (that’s an order!)  
[wizardofeutopia@gmail.com](mailto:wizardofeutopia@gmail.com) (A name I somehow got when building Café Eutopia. NOT a magicky spellcasting wizard – more like a seeker of wisdom, believer in the Magic underlying this world process, and general Fighter for a Higher Vision for the world, as per Gandalf. Apologies to my Christian relatives who feel it is akin to necromancy and witchcraft. Not at all; there are black wizards and white wizards, as in every walk of life. I do not and never have believed in or joined any organisation of, the dark arts. I don’t even like Harry Potter. ☺) If you (like my sister in law) still cannot email me using this address, there is my Dreamhaven one:  
[dreamhavensales@gmail.com](mailto:dreamhavensales@gmail.com) .)

Peter Harris is currently living (God willing, at 65!) in Gisborne, New Zealand.

His works are various. The ebooks, ranging from Fantasy to self-improvement to (now) metaphysics, can be found on Amazon, Smashwords Apple and Kobo and others. Some are free, all are reasonable... Search under Wizard of Eutopia, Peter Harris.

His place of work and self-inflicted ongoing Eutopian dream, is Dreamspace Gallery and Workshops, 61 Carnarvon St., Gisborne 4010, New Zealand. [www.dreamspace.nz](http://www.dreamspace.nz). He has a round table there for practising creative discussion and inquiry, and phasetimer clocks to keep them on time... see [www.4phase.wordpress.com](http://www.4phase.wordpress.com).

His current projects include Dreamhaven, the building of romantic cabins of carved ferrocement, wood, forged steel and light earth. See [www.dreamhaven.nz](http://www.dreamhaven.nz).

Stop press: I (Peter Harris) have just begun (another!) blog in which to talk more on this matter, and warmly invite you to follow the blog and get notifications by email when there is a new post:

[www.meretheism.wordpress.com](http://www.meretheism.wordpress.com)

This draft will be available there as a PDF. Please share it freely! In LOVE, BEAUTY, TRUTH AND FREEDOM,

Peter Harris