

Finding Life Video Series 1

Video 8: Finding the Designer

Hi and welcome back if you have watched any of the previous videos. My name is Tim Spiess and I am serving as a guide to the most important journey any human being can take...which is to find answers the most important questions of life.

Last time, we learned of a critical distinction when trying to identify and know the Designer that created the human race. We learned that the reason that the vast majority of human beings believe that a God or Designer of the human race exists is because it is reasonable! That is to say, that it is reasonable for people to deduce that complex beings like humans did not just arise by accident or randomly, which is what naturalistic evolution teaches. Or, said another way, the reason that over 90% of the humans on the planet believe that there is a Great Designer or God responsible for the existence of human beings is because it makes sense given their observations and experiences as reasoning beings...it passes the test of basic deductive reasoning using the minds we were given...complicated systems with inter-dependant components don't just happen without a Designer – this fact was explored in detail in videos 5 and 6.

In addition, it is self evident to those who are not closed to metaphysical possibilities, that a merely physical view of one's existence is inadequate to explain human nature, namely the ability to reason, to hold abstract thoughts, to intuitively know right behavior from wrong, to be touched or moved by beauty and acts of kindness, etc. These things cannot be reasonably explained using merely a physicalist view of physical matter such as atoms, molecules, proteins and electrical energy. We used an illustration about computers to conclude that just as it is not reasonable to believe that a computer's hardware somehow created or accounts for its operating system and

software, in like manner it is not reasonable to believe that the physical human body can somehow account for our mind, our ability to reason, our ability to know right from wrong, our sentience, etc.

In the last video, we defined two important concepts - God as well as religion - and we saw that they are related but clearly distinct. We learned that God, if he or she exists, is a being, not a concept or principle or belief. It is self evident that created things require a creative agent, for principles or philosophies or beliefs create nothing. Furthermore, we said that it is reasonable to believe that...

- A) the Designer designed beings that either reflect his or her nature or characteristics, and;
- B) That the Designer likes or values the basic characteristics or capabilities of the beings he or she created, and;
- C) The Designer has a purpose for that which she or he designed, for who designs something without a purpose for it, especially reasoning, sentient beings?

We also learned that *religion is the beliefs and practices people have about God or a cause for their existence – religion is not the same as any Designer that may exist, but rather religion is people’s speculations or opinions of what the Designer may be like and what she or he might want. In general, many religious beliefs or practices generally have no objective basis, nor even a set of reasonable facts from which to reason.* Please allow me to repeat that important point. Therefore, we learned that speculation about this great designer is the cause of most of the religions that people hold to.

We concluded that when people are speaking about their God, it is unlikely that it is an accurate, complete or full description of the actual Designer of the human race. Rather, religious people have a basic understanding that a Designer God exists, and then they do three things in trying to understand what that Designer or God must be like.

First, they assume that God must be like we humans, meaning that not only does God have

similar capabilities or a similar nature, but that he or she also acts or behaves as we do.

Second, they look to other people who claim to speak for the Designer, either in the present or in the past.

Third, they speculate or deduce from the first two things or from the Designer's creation itself.

There are serious and fatal flaws with the first two methods of trying to understand the Designer.

First, to assume God has the same or similar capabilities or a similar nature is unreasonable since the Designer may not be bound by the same constraints as we are. While it is reasonable to deduce that he or she can reason, know right and wrong, have a sentient aspect to his or her nature where emotions are associated with certain thoughts or experiences - that is all that is reasonable to deduce. To believe that the Designer has the same flaws and destructive tendencies as we human's do, has no factual support. As we have seen, we humans have a will; we have the capacity for both good and evil; and we have the capacity to know what those two important concepts – good and evil - mean. Again dear listener, do not make the mistake of failing to distinguish between capacities or capabilities of a being and the will with which to choose what we act upon. For example, we can use our ability to reason for good or evil. We can use our ability to know what is right and wrong for good or evil. We can even change what we associate our emotions with for good or evil. Our abilities or capacities are not the issue, rather the issue is our will and what we choose to do with our abilities. The human will is the deciding factor on all of those important decisions and the consequences of those decisions.

If the designer also has a free will, then why must the Designer use his or her will to choose evil? Just because human's regularly choose evil does not mean we have a reasonable basis to conclude that the Designer does. Human history shows we have the tendency to create god in our own image and likeness, oftentimes to justify our own faults or bad behavior. The second flawed method people use to try and understand the Designer is to look to other people to know what the

Designer is like or what he or she wants. This is the cause of most of human's religious history and beliefs.

While it is possible that some people might know the Designer better than others, there is no good way to validate if those people's beliefs about the Designer are factual, except one way. We will look at that one way in a future video. If claims about the Designer cannot be validated, then we are right back in the realm of pure speculation regarding what the Designer is like and what he or she wants.

Finally, IF the first two methods that people use to try and know the Designer and what his or her will is, are flawed, then the third method – deducing from the first two – will certainly be flawed. *Suffice it to say at this point, it is speculation about the Designer that causes most of the beliefs and associated practices of the major religions in the world.* Please let me repeat that important point. Religion, by its nature, does not use reason well to sort its claims out. That is the natural effect of not knowing much about the source...that is not knowing much about the Designer nor the realm in which he or she might exist. Since the Designer is not present in a way we can detect with our five senses, it is reasonable that people speculate. If we don't know much about something, then we are left with two options. Not thinking about it or speaking about it or addressing it - or speculating. To speculate means to guess without a reasonable base of knowledge or observations to deduce from.

As you can see by looking at the world's religions, the speculation method leads to many diverse results and conclusions about specifics, particularly a name for the Designer and what he or she wants of people! This speculation and the resultant beliefs leads to contradictions, confusion, disagreement, division, contention and sadly oftentimes violence in the name of the unknown Designer who is given a god-name by the various thousands of religious groups. Ironically, one

common belief of all religious groups is that their group has the right beliefs about the Designer, and that God favors them over others who don't have their correct beliefs! There has to be a more objective way to evaluate religion's claims, and fortunately there is.

Would it not make sense that the Designer of human beings would know what is best for human beings? Would it not make sense that the Designer of human beings would want what is best for the human race if the compassion of which humans are capable was modeled on his own nature? Would not the Designer and Maker and Creator of people want them to know what they need to experience a good and satisfying life while on the earth? If there was a way to continue one's existence after physical death, would not the Designer want his Designed to know of that way? Of course those questions imply a certain nature for the Designer...

So, for you, the individual viewer, you should be asking, 'if this designer exists, what is it/she/he like and what does he want of me?' That is a good and reasonable question that ALL people ought to ask.

The first consideration is does the Designer want to directly manifest him or herself to humans in order to communicate? It is possible that he or she does not. Is it possible that the Designer cannot communicate with us on a physical plane? Is it possible that in order for the Designer to communicate with us on some metaphysical plane, that we need to be in the right metaphysical condition or state in order to receive the communications? These are reasonable questions.

Have you ever heard the saying, "It is better to have loved and lost, than to have never loved at all."? I think there is truth in that saying, don't you? What about this saying, "It is better to have existed and then cease to exist than to have never existed at all"? That saying should make you a bit uncomfortable since losing one's existence should be very unsettling. How about this saying, "It is best to exist without ceasing to exist if we improve over time and can exist in a good state."?

For knowing, reasoning, sentient beings with the capacity to love and to remember - ceasing to exist is a rightfully frightful thing to contemplate. All the good things you ever experienced and knew...all the people you loved and cared about and those time shared...all the accomplishments you ever achieved...gone into the void of nothingness. This is the existential view that the so called elite of the world offer to the masses of people. But is this what the actual Designer and Creator of humans set up?

Perhaps one of the dominant thoughts of a created being should be gratitude towards one's Designer or Creator? As we have seen, it is obvious we have a Creator, therefore should we not be grateful for their creating us? Don't make the "but my parent's created me" error. Remember, your parents can't even explain your brain functions, let alone how you possess your ability to reason – and if they truly designed and created you, then they would have clear understanding of their design. All your parents did was bring the raw materials together and then the Designers magic took over to create you. As we have seen, we are not self-created beings – that is we did not create ourselves – we are not responsible for our existence. Nor are we necessary beings, which is to say that there is no force or principle of nature that says we need to exist.

Back to the communication issue - if the Designer wants to communicate with us, he or she has a few options. There are three basic methods the Designer could use. The Designer could communicate directly through some physical means. The Designer could communicate through a non-physical or metaphysical means that humans could perceive. Or the Designer could send a representative to speak for him or her. Of course these methods are not necessarily mutually exclusive, meaning he or she could use all or some combination of the methods.

Let us briefly consider the first method, which would mean some physical means of communication, like a cell phone or other such instrument. If the Designer exists in a different

dimension that we do, and if the designer does not have a physical body, but is rather a metaphysical being, then how would that gap be bridged? Who would create the phone, and if the Designer did, whom would he or she give it to? If the Designer created a physical artifact – like say the Mosaic ten commandment stones – then we could know some things about the Designer but we could not know him well. Written communication is impersonal and does not lend itself to getting to know a person well. If the Designer communicated directly to a person through some physical means – a voice from the sky for example – only certain people would hear it unless he or she did so all the time. The fact is this is not happening, so for some reason, direct physical communication is not a method the Designer uses.

What about communication through a metaphysical means? This is possible, but perhaps it is so different than people are used to, it would not be very effective. As beings that have a physical component, we pretty much want things that affect us to be physical in nature because that is what we know, can validate and thus are comfortable with. We have a trust problem. If the Designer can communicate via some metaphysical means, perhaps we have to have the ability to receive that communication, and perhaps our ability to receive that communication is dependent upon a metaphysical or spiritual state we must have or be in in order to enable that ability? This is entirely possible and cannot be ruled out.

OK, what about the last method, where the Designer would send a representative to his created race. This method has the following benefits. First, if the representative was like us, we would not be afraid. We as humans are easily afraid of things that are different than our normal experiences. Thus, if someone very different were to approach us, our natural reaction is fear, caution and lack of trust. If the Designer is a non-physical or metaphysical being, then his or her trying to approach us would no doubt cause fear in us. Therefore sending a person would be a very good way to communicate with us. Furthermore, sending a representative would minimize the chance of error

in communications, since the representative is personal and could fully explain things and answer questions.

The good news is the Designer did send a messenger to mankind. This messenger is not a religion or a philosophy or a made up fantasy. This messenger was a person, much like you or I. Next time, we will introduce the messenger.

Until next time, be real - get past the shallowness and pretentiousness of typical American life and look deeper to find what you truly need.