

*The Fall
of Man
Parts 1,
2 and 3*

*David
Young*

© David Young. 2004

This work is copyright. Apart from fair dealing for the purpose of criticism or review as permitted by the Copyright Act 1968, it is against the law to reproduce any part of it by any means whatsoever without the written permission of the author.

National Library of Australia Cataloguing-in-Publication entry: Young. (David John). 1943- .

The Fall of Man, Parts One, Two and Three

Bibliography

ISBN 0-9756059-1-7

Spirituality. 2. Spiritual life. 3. Philosophy and religion. 4. Psychology. 5. History. 6. Meaning of Life. 1. Title.

Cover Art. A photograph of a young Adolf Hitler. Origin Unknown

THE FALL OF MAN,
PARTS ONE, TWO AND
THREE

(A “ What If ” Book)

David Young

Who Are We?
How Did We Get Here?
Why Are We Here?

THE FALL OF MAN, PARTS ONE TWO AND THREE

INTRODUCTION.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
THE FALL OF MAN PART ONE	
INTRODUCTION.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 1 The Garden of Eden	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 2 And in the Beginning	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 3 Now God Gets Really Clever.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 4. The Fall	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 5. Snake	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 6. The Souls and the Ego.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Chapter 7. What If This Is True?.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
PART TWO	
CHAPTER 1. The Problem	8
The Reverse Hiroshima Principle.	9
Between a Rock and a Hard Place	10
CHAPTER 2. The Answer?	14

PART TWO FROM A DIFFERENT ANGLE	
CHAPTER 1. One for the Nerds	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 2. An Operating System Called Judgment.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 3. Designing a New Operating System.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 4. Getting Back on the Net	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 5. How the Net Could Work.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Chapter 6. Douglas and the Hitchhiker.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
PART THREE.....	
INTRODUCTION.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 1. Who Is This God Person Anyway?	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 2. And In the Beginning	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 3. The World's Biggest Foul-up	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 4. The World's Second Biggest Foul-up	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 5. And another foul-up	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 6. The End of Days.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
PART FOUR	
INTRODUCTION.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 1. The Inner World.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 2. Reality Thinking.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 3. Recognizing and Avoiding Snake	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 4. The Mobile Reality.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 5. All Knowledge is Useless.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

CHAPTER 6. Do We Have Choices? **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

CHAPTER 7. War and Peace..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

PART TWO

CHAPTER 1. The Problem

The Hiroshima Principle.

The Hiroshima Principle: judging the negative to be true because we cannot prove the positive.

We can never know if a new technology will have detrimental side effects because, until the technology is introduced, the detrimental side effects do not exist. It is impossible to prove the existence of something that does not yet exist.

Scientists tell us that there is no proof of any harm associated with the introduction of genetic engineering, therefore genetic engineering is safe. That there is no proof of harm is true. There is no proof of harm because until genetic engineering is introduced, the harm will not exist.

I call it the “Hiroshima Principle,” because before Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the scientists who invented the atom bomb thought there would be a big bang and it would be over. They had no idea radiation sickness, acid rain or any of the other side effects of

nuclear weapons would occur, because before Hiroshima and Nagasaki, these things did not exist.

The scientists were actually split three ways. Some thought nothing would happen, some said there would be a big bang, and others thought that it would set off a chain reaction that would destroy the world. None of the scientists predicted radiation sickness and acid rain, any more than anyone can predict the fallout from genetic engineering.

The Reverse Hiroshima Principle.

The Reverse Hiroshima Principle: judging the positive to be true because we cannot prove the negative.

Someone robs a bank. They are caught, tried, found guilty and thrown into jail. I see no problem with that. But using the Reverse Hiroshima Principle, we are found guilty and thrown into jail because someone said we were thinking about robbing a bank. It's up to you to prove you weren't thinking about robbing a bank.

If someone says that something exists, it is impossible to prove that it does not exist if it does not exist. The less truth there is in what is said, the harder it is to prove that it is not true.

If I want to prove something is true or false, I must have something physical to prove true or false. A clever argument may sound like a proof, but it may be no more than a clever argument. I need physical evidence to prove true or false in a physical world. Anything less than that is only judgment.

But without physical proof, it is impossible to say that something does not exist. If it does not exist, I have no way of proving it does not exist.

It is impossible to prove that the first man and woman did not grow from the seeds dropped by the Great Pumpkin. We could be forgiven for judging that this was improbable, but we cannot prove that Charlie Brown isn't right.

Between a Rock and a Hard Place

The Hiroshima Principle and the Reverse Hiroshima Principle leave the human race between a rock and a hard place, because the effect of these two principles combine to produce a no-win situation.

At some point in our evolution (or creation), we moved from an externally conscious entity to an internally conscious entity. At this point three questions were invented. Who am I? How did I get here? And why am I here?

Before the advent of internal consciousness, these three questions did not exist because there was not an entity capable of thinking these questions. They require a concept of a self to be thought, and without internal consciousness there is no concept of self.

These questions have no ultimate answer. All three questions are totally beyond our comprehension. But without an answer to these, we have no context to work with. Without a framework our human brain is comatose. We must have a framework to think within, but the first three questions we ask are formless.

So we invent a framework to work within. We invent religion, philosophy, psychology, nationality, race and a barrow load of other nonsense frameworks that we judge to be true.

And, of course, the Reverse Hiroshima Principle means that it is impossible to refute any of these frameworks once they have been invented.

All consciousness requires a duality, so the frameworks we invent are different so that we can define who we think we are supposed to be by what we are not.

It is all those damn foreigners that make me British. It is the Palestinians that make Jews, Jews. It is the Jews that make Palestinians, Palestinians. The fact that none of these exist doesn't stop us from making up groups so that we have something we can claim to be.

Our judgment-based concept of self relies on a duality between totally nonsense frameworks that have no reality, but cannot be shown to have no reality. So they can be held to be true by their followers. We need the conflict of nothing against nothing to give ourselves some concept of who we think we are supposed to be. This concept of self is nothing, but we think it is something. Take it away and we will know that who we think we are is nothing.

So we are between a rock and a hard place. If we do not invent a context to work with, we are comatose. If we invent a context based on judgment, it is nothing and we condemn ourselves to creating conflict over nothing so that we can prove we are nothing even if we think we are something.

The paradox is that it is when things are going well and our problems are disappearing, we have the biggest problem of all. We need conflict to give ourselves a false sense of self, and when conflict disappears, our false sense of self disappears with it.

Peace and happiness are okay in short bursts. Peace and happiness provide a duality with conflict for a short time. Whilst we can retain the memory of conflict, peace and happiness are acceptable. But when they become “normal,” there is no duality and we must destroy peace to recreate duality.

We have set up a major problem. The way we have set up duality provides us with the conflict we need to have a context to work with. We have set up conflict to

define who we are by fighting who we are not. We may say that we are against war, but if all war ceased, we are nothing.

Unless the human race can come up with a new context to work with, we are condemned to conflict as a way of attempting to define ourselves by defining who we are not. The probable ultimate result is that we will destroy ourselves proving we are who we think we are supposed to be. And we will do just that by being nothing.

Even if we do not destroy ourselves physically, it seems inevitable that as individuals, we will destroy everything in our lives that brings us peace and happiness, since peace and happiness does not produce the conflict that gives us a concept of who we think we are supposed to be.

Houston, we have a problem.

CHAPTER 2. The Answer?

If we are going to invent a framework to work with that is valid, it needs to be based on reality. Such a framework needs to be free of judgment, because judgment produces a framework that cannot be proved to be true, but also cannot be proved to be untrue, and has nothing to do with reality.

Can we avoid the Hiroshima Principle and the Reverse Hiroshima Principle? We can if we accept them. They are real because they can be demonstrated in the physical. Both are highlighted by the recent Iraqi war. The Americans have all sorts of unforeseen problems resulting from the “liberation” of a people who are showing opposition to being liberated, is an example of the Hiroshima Principle.

The Reverse Hiroshima Principle is highlighted by the way weapons’ inspectors could not prove that weapons of mass destruction did not exist, only that they could not find any. This was the correct position to take because it was the reality of the situation. But once the “proof” was presented by the Bush administration, it was impossible to disprove, because it was without foundation, and we went from reality to insanity.

I have no idea who I am, how I got here or why I am here. But it does appear that I am here (I think, therefore I exist?). Not only that, it also appears that there are other

people here too. Also the trees, birds and a multitude of other entities and things also seem to exist.

I will accept that as reality because if I do not, I bump into things.

I have no idea why I am here, and I have no idea why the other entities are here either, so I have no way of deciding any hierarchy of importance. With the lack of ability to decide importance, it would seem the way to proceed would be to treat myself and all other entities as being equal.

We may not be equal; I have no way of knowing that. I have no way of establishing a hierarchy of importance without resorting to judgment. And if I do judge an order of importance, I have no idea what nastiness the Hiroshima Principle might throw up. If I do invent an order of importance, it will be impossible to dismantle it if I don't like the result. The Reverse Hiroshima Principle ensures that I will not be able to prove that once invented, it is untrue.

So it would seem that the way to work within what can pass as reality, that I know nothing, would be to treat all people and everything that exists as being equal.

Since I cannot judge who is important and who is not, I have no idea of the ultimate importance of anyone. This other person that I see in front of me may be of supreme importance or may have no importance whatsoever. Since I have no idea, then it


might be as well not to hinder this person in whatever it is they need to do. If I do harm to this person, the Hiroshima Principle makes it impossible to predict the outcome.


So, initially the new context becomes “treat everyone and everything as equal, and cause no harm.”

This does not come from any niceness or morality, but from the understanding that since I know nothing, I have not the slightest idea what the outcome of inequality or causing harm will be. If I do not know, then I should do nothing to upset whatever it is I know nothing about.

But, what of self? Who am I? I may have a framework, but who is the person who will use this framework?

I want things which may or may not be material. I think, therefore I exist. I want, therefore there is a person to want. As Jesus said, “By your actions you are known.” If we create what we want without judgment, who we are becomes visible. And if we create what we want without judgment, we will create without harm because without judgment, we won’t harm.

What we want can be with judgment or without judgment. If we want with judgment, we only create what we think we are supposed to want. What do I want? That is a question that can be answered only by who I am. If we want, we  can call this entity

the soul, but  we don't have to. We can give whatever name we like to the ghost in the machine.

So who are we? If we create whatever we want with equality and without causing harm, the person we are becomes visible. Who we are moves from being an esoteric concept into a living, breathing person. Who we are becomes reality.

This is different than a concept of self arising from judgment. A concept of self arising from judgment is just that, a concept. We think we are who we think we are supposed to be. That cannot be experienced. All we can experience is the pain resulting from the conflict we have created.

Do we really want to be nothing more than the pain we have created for ourselves?

We need a duality for internal conscious. That duality is an internal duality. We need the internal duality that allows us to see ourselves as an individual. But there is no need to take this too far and export it to the external world. Once we experience ourselves as being an individual, there is no need to take that extra step and define who we are by who we are not.

There is no need for me to experience pain to understand pleasure. I, the person, am capable of experiencing what I want to experience without having to experience what

I don't want to experience to understand it. If we experience what we want, do we need the duality of knowing what we don't want? Only if we want to create judgment.

Once we know we are, we can experience who we are. We "know" in the head. We understand through experience (with the heart?). We cannot experience who we are through duality, we can only experience the pain of not being who we think we are supposed to be.

That still does not answer the question of how we got here, but I can live with that for now.