

DOWNLOAD PDF THE CHILD, QUESTIONS HIS PURPOSE IN THE COSMOS

Chapter 1 : What does the Bible say about fate / destiny?

rudra - creator of the cosmos In the union of energy and nature, of Shiva and Shakti, the primordial and dynamic energy is wedded to the transcendental. Shiva is the silent witness and Shakti is chitti or chidvilasa, the energy that plays and displays in infinite space.

This is a very complex issue, and we will start with what the Bible does not teach. Fate is usually thought of as a predetermined course of events beyond human control. Fatalism is a major premise of Islam, which demands total submission to the sovereignty of Allah. Their decisions could not be canceled or annulled, even by other gods. Again, fatalism is not a biblical concept. Fate and Destiny - Our Free Will The Bible teaches that Man was created with the ability to make moral choices and that he is responsible for those choices. On the contrary, Adam and his wife had the ability to choose obedience with its attendant blessing or disobedience with its consequent curse. They knew what the result of their decision would be, and they were held accountable Genesis 3. This theme of being held accountable for our choices continues throughout Scripture. We sin because we choose to. This is a very insightful verse. Scripture also teaches that we choose to have faith. The oft-repeated command in Scripture to believe implies that we do have a choice in the matter. Only God is sovereign. An all-wise, all-powerful God must have a plan, so it should be no surprise that the Bible speaks of a divine plan. The providence of God is working to bring about His original plan for creation. God speaks in Isaiah Fighting against the plan of God is pointless. This is why the Tower of Babel was never completed Genesis God uses even sinful men for His purposes. God worked in the hearts of the Egyptians Exodus As it is written: David also recognized that the Lord had a plan for him. Jesus obviously had a plan for Saul, and Saul had been painfully resisting it. Later, Jesus tells Saul that a man named Ananias would come to visit "and then Jesus tells Ananias verses ! Obviously, Jesus had a pre-arranged plan for Ananias as well. He could have been like Jonah and run the other way. Fortunately, Ananias obeyed verse In summary, the Bible teaches that God is in charge. At the same time, He has given us the freedom to obey or disobey Him, and there are some things that God does only in answer to prayer James 4: God blesses the obedient, and He is patient with those who disobey, even to the point of seeming laxity. He has a plan for our lives, which includes our joy and His glory both in this world and in the world to come.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE CHILD, QUESTIONS HIS PURPOSE IN THE COSMOS

Chapter 2 : Theogony - Wikipedia

The child, questions his purpose in the cosmos The small child was worried. He did not know what was he to do, who was he, and why was he in existence. Confused, he asked of Shiva as to the purpose of his birth.

For some more uncommon questions on Waldorf education, see here If you have a web site on Waldorf education, feel free to link to this page. What is Waldorf education? Waldorf education is a unique and distinctive approach to educating children that is practiced in Waldorf schools worldwide. Waldorf schools collectively form the largest, and quite possibly the fastest growing, group of non-profit, independent schools in the world. There is no centralized administrative structure governing all Waldorf schools; each is administratively independent, but there are established associations which provide resources, publish materials, sponsor conferences, and promote the movement. Return to list of questions 2. What is unique about Waldorf education? How is it different from other alternatives public schooling, Montessori, unschooling, etc. The best overall statement on what is unique about Waldorf education is to be found in the stated goals of the schooling: The aim of Waldorf schooling is to educate the whole child, "head, heart and hands". The curriculum is as broad as time will allow, and balances academics subjects with artistic and practical activities. Waldorf teachers are dedicated to creating a genuine love of learning within each child. By freely using arts and activities in the service of teaching academics, an internal motivation to learn is developed in the students, doing away with the need for competitive testing and grading. Some distinctive features of Waldorf education include the following: Academics are de-emphasized in the early years of schooling. There is no academic content in the Waldorf kindergarten experience although there is a good deal of cultivation of pre-academic skills , and minimal academics in first grade. Literacy readiness begins in kindergarten with formal reading instruction beginning in grade one. Most children are reading independently by the middle or end of second grade. During the elementary school years grades the students have a class or "main lesson" teacher, who stays with the class for a number of consecutive years. Many teachers stay with their class from first to eighth grade. However, in a number of schools, teachers are likely to stay with a class for a shorter period: Certain activities which are often considered "frills" at mainstream schools are central at Waldorf schools: In the younger grades, all subjects are introduced through artistic mediums, use the children respond better to this medium than to dry lecturing and rote learning. All children learn to play recorder and to knit. There are no "textbooks" as such in the first through fifth grades. All children have "main lesson books", which are their own workbooks which they fill in during the course of the year. In some schools upper grades may use textbooks to supplement skills development, especially in math and grammar. Learning in a Waldorf school is a noncompetitive activity. There are no grades given at the elementary level; the teacher writes a detailed evaluation of the child at the end of each school year. The use of electronic media, particularly television, by young children is strongly discouraged in Waldorf schools. Return to list of questions 3. What is the curriculum at a Waldorf school like? The relationship between student and teacher is, likewise, recognized to be both crucial and changing throughout the course of childhood and early adolescence. The main subjects, such as history, language arts, science and mathematics are, as mentioned, taught in main lesson blocks of two to three hours per day, with each block lasting from three to five weeks. The total Waldorf curriculum has been likened to an ascending spiral: A typical Lower School curriculum would likely look something like the following: Primary Grades 1 - 3 Pictorial introduction to the alphabet, writing, reading, spelling, poetry and drama. Folk and fairy tales, fables, legends, Old Testament stories. Numbers, basic mathematical processes of addition, subtraction, multiplication and division. Nature stories, house building and gardening. Middle Grades 4 - 6 Writing, reading, spelling, grammar, poetry and drama. Norse myths, history and stories of ancient civilizations. Review of the four mathematical processes, fractions, percentages, and geometry. Local and world geography, comparative zoology, botany and elementary physics. Upper Grades 7 - 8 Creative writing, reading, spelling, grammar, poetry and drama. Medieval history, Renaissance, world exploration,

DOWNLOAD PDF THE CHILD, QUESTIONS HIS PURPOSE IN THE COSMOS

American history and biography. Geography, physics, basic chemistry, astronomy, geology and physiology. Special subjects also taught include: Foreign Languages varies by school: Spanish, French, Japanese and German. Return to list of questions 4. How did Waldorf education get started? In , Rudolf Steiner, the Austrian philosopher, scientist and artist, was invited to give a series of lectures to the workers of the Waldorf-Astoria cigarette factory in Stuttgart, Germany. Steiner agreed to do so on four conditions: Molt agreed to the conditions and, after a training period for the prospective teachers, die Freie Waldorfschule the Free Waldorf School was opened September 7, Return to list of questions 5. How many Waldorf schools are there? Currently, there are about 1, Waldorf schools in 60 countries. Approximately Waldorf schools are currently operating in North America. Return to list of questions 6. What is the philosophy behind Waldorf education? He thought that schools should cater to the needs of children rather than the demands of the government or economic forces, so he developed schools that encourage creativity and free-thinking. Return to list of questions 7. Why should I send my child to a Waldorf school? The main reason is that Waldorf schools honor and protect the wonder of childhood. Every effort is expended to make Waldorf schools safe, secure and nurturing environments for the children, and to protect their childhood from harmful influences from the broader society. Secondly, Waldorf education has a consistent philosophy of child development underlying the curriculum. All subjects are introduced in age appropriate fashion. Finally, Waldorf schools produce graduates who are academically advantaged with respect to their public school counterparts, and who consistently gain admission to top universities. Return to list of questions 8. Who was Rudolf Steiner? He later came to incorporate his scientific investigations with his interest in spiritual development. He became a forerunner in the field of spiritual scientific investigation for the modern 20th century individual. His background in history and civilizations coupled with his observation in life gave the world the gift of Waldorf Education. It is a deeply insightful application of learning based on the Study of Humanity with developing consciousness of self and the surrounding world. Return to list of questions 9. How is reading taught in a Waldorf school? Why do Waldorf students wait until 2nd grade to begin learning to read? Waldorf education is deeply bound up with the oral tradition, typically beginning with the teacher telling the children fairy tales throughout kindergarten and first grade. The oral approach is used all through Waldorf education: Reading instruction, as such, is deferred. Instead, writing is taught first. Return to list of questions Why is so much emphasis put on festivals and ceremonies? Seasonal festivals serve to connect humanity with the rhythms of nature and of the cosmos. The festivals originated in ancient cultures, yet have been adapted over time. To join the seasonal moods of the year, in a festive way, benefits the inner life of the soul. Celebrating is an art. There is joy in the anticipation, the preparation, the celebration itself, and the memories. What are Michaelmas, St. The four seasonal festivals are Michaelmas fall , Christmas winter , Easter spring , and St. Michael is known as the conqueror of the dragon, the heavenly hero with his starry sword cosmic iron who gives strength to people. An ancient festival; celebrated when the sun sends the least power to the earth, as a festival which awakens in the human being an inkling of the very wellsprings of existence, of an eternal reality. It is a time when the soul withdraws into the innermost depths to experience within itself the inner spiritual light. Easter derives its name from pre-Christian goddess symbols of rebirth, fertility and spring. John - June 24 - Midsummer Day: Ancient peoples, watching the sun reach its high point at this time, lit bonfires to encourage it to shine and ripen their crops. It is a time when the cosmos brings the spiritual to man - a time when the spiritual, which animates and weaves through everything in nature, is revealed. Why do Waldorf Schools discourage TV watching?

DOWNLOAD PDF THE CHILD, QUESTIONS HIS PURPOSE IN THE COSMOS

Chapter 3 : Cosmos Quotes (quotes)

As a philosophical reply to his critics this is deeply flawed, because questions about the ultimate nature of reality are of crucial relevance to questions about personal meaning. Dawkins' focus on the ultimate fate of the cosmos overlooks the issue of cosmic purpose raised by Atkins.

One night he met Cosmos after his battle with the Baltan, and revived him using sunlight. Cosmos then left him a blue gem which gave Musashi the ability to summon the power of the hero. He was forced to watch as the Alien Invader destroyed everything in his path. Cosmos then fought Baltan and both of them were evenly matched until Baltan morphed into his Second form: The hero then used the Naybuster Ray and managed to knock the alien down. The alien realized what he had done as he just wanted to let his offspring to live on. It failed and he killed himself in grief. Just before he died, Cosmos turned back into Luna Mode and used the Luna Shootless on the alien invader as his body was recovered by the Child Baltans. The military tried to kill Cosmos with their missiles, but was stopped by Musashi and his father. After finishing his battle against Baltan, Cosmos left Musashi as the Earth was safe once again. He goes to Kapuya island to see Lidorias. As he saw that Lidorias was infected by an evil energy that were revealed to be Chaos Organisms , he goes to chase Lidorias that appeared in the city and Cosmos returned once again, joining forces with Musashi. Musashi himself transformed into Ultraman Cosmos and fought with Chaos Lidorias and managed to calm her down using the Luna Shootless. Much more tough opponents appeared when the Chaos Organism unleashed the Chaos Headers such as Iblis and Mebut to face him. Unable to face the Chaos Organism with Luna and Corona Modes, Cosmos with some help from Musashi and his friends, was able to awaken his third transformation: Eclipse form that achieved when Cosmos gained Courageous and he used 3 of his forms to face more dangerous monsters. Even worse, Chaos Header appears and terrorizes as Chaos Darkness. Cosmos appeared and fights the dark monster but Musashi orders Cosmos to stop, feeling that Chaos Header has their inner goodness somewhere in their heart but no avail as the giant paid no attention to Musashi. As Cosmos was on the brink of defeat, Musashi fuses with him again and thus with the help of Lidorias , Bolgils , and Mogrudon , Chaos Header finally purified, turning him into an angel and leaves. Cosmos thanked Musashi for defeating Chaos Header in a harmless way and leaves. It has been a year since Musashi retired from being a Team EYES member and now he has finally achieved his dream to become an astronaut. Musashi pilots his Planet 1 aka. However, much to his horror, the planet appeared to be a reddish and dusty wasteland. Suddenly, a flying monster burst out from the ground and fired a reddish energy ball. Cosmos destroyed the monster, causing a giant explosion and quickly rescued Musashi from the explosion. One of his friends, Tutomo, mocked him for believing in a mermaid but Mari objects to it, implied that Musashi might be talking the truth ever since his first encounter with Cosmos. As it starts to rain, Tutomo cowardly hides under the table with Mari mocking him, causing Tutomo to take a nearby soda and spraying it on Mari, starting a soda fight with his friend as they are watched again by the mermaid. The next day, when Musashi and Mari went snorkeling, they discover a portal underwater and at the same time are ambushed by a stingray kaiju. As Musashi was about to follow Mari, he was knocked down unconscious. Later, two figures approach him. The man decide to eliminate Musashi for interfering with them but the woman objects, but it was already too late as he already fired an energy blast at Musashi. He awakens at the hospital as his friends visits him but Mari was nowhere to be seen. Musashi was taken to their base and revealed that the monster he encountered earlier was Reija, who was detected undersea a year ago. Musashi recognizes him from earlier for turning Juran into a barren wasteland and killing Parastan. Once they were about to be killed, Team SEA fires a missile, bringing it away from the hospital. Reija appears and fought the monster but only to be overpowered by the menace. There, he witnesses the mermaid, now having human legs fuses with Reija, making the monster stronger but still, overpowered by Scorpiss. However, all he had foreseen was a dream and realise that Cosmos will never return. Scorpiss retreated for a while and the mermaid reveals her name as Shau while telling Musashi that

DOWNLOAD PDF THE CHILD, QUESTIONS HIS PURPOSE IN THE COSMOS

Mari is with her people. Once arrived, they were introduced to Alien Gyashi, where their leader, Jin, holds a dislike towards humans for being selfish. Musashi encounters him earlier in a dream where he got destroyed by Jin. Mari appears and leads them to their base where she revealed that Child Baltan from 10 years ago brought her to this place. Shau reveals that sometime ago, Sandros and his Scorpiss terrorized their planet and turned it into a wasteland. As the Alien Gyashi migrated, Scorpiss chased them and destroyed them. The being itself had been acknowledged as a God by their species. A swarm of Scorpiss arose and were on their journey to Earth in seven days. Three days before the Scorpiss invasion, SRC developed a force field used to defend the Earth from the monsters. Musashi receives a call from Mari to go to Space Zone. There he found Mari unconscious and Jin begins to attack Musashi for making Shau trust humanity. Developing a change of heart, Jin uses his power to complete the force field system, causing a giant shield to cover the Earth and protecting it from a swarm of Scorpiss. Though proven effective, a dark vortex empowered some Scorpiss as they were used to perform a kamikaze attack to destroy the shield and ease the invasion. Cosmos appears in Eclipse Mode where he demolishes the entire Scorpiss before Sandros appeared and overpower him. The Ultra knocked the monster to the side. As it recovered, he delivered some of his energy to the weakened warrior, allowing them both to take on the vile monster. As they did so, Sandros began to unleash its black cloud, blocking out the sun. In complete darkness the pair of heroes was attacked mercilessly by its energized blades. The foolish monster, however, eventually made a mistake. Charging up its fire ball exposed itself in the darkness, allowing both Cosmos and Justice to quickly fire off their Cosmium and Victorium Rays, annihilating the fiend and saving the Earth yet again. Ultraman Cosmos Vs Ultraman Justice: The Final Battle

Few years after Sandros was defeated. Musashi met Fubuki that he is ready to pilot and travel to planet Juran with some of the monsters on Monster Island to Juran. Suddenly, Gloker Pawn appear and attacks the base and aims to destroy the space capsule that will contain the monsters. Cosmos arrives at that time to stop the duo but ended up being defeated. Musashi used the Cosmo stone and merged with Cosmos and once again reached Eclipse Mode and paralyzes the two. But, Ultraman Justice appeared and revived the two Gloker and stopped Cosmos from making any movement. At the end, Musashi sacrificed his life with his color timer being hit so hard and died making Fubuki swear vengeance on Justice for a while. He arrived and transferred half of his energy to Justice and together destroyed Gloker Bishop. But, they still not give up and the two fuse to become Ultraman Legend and destroyed Giga Endra with the Legend Spark from inside and the two split. While Julie remained on Earth and replaced Musashi as its protector, Musashi and Cosmos travel to Juran and create the new habitat there. He received a message from an unknown person. After then, Alien Bat came and destroyed them because of their failure and warned Cosmos to not intervene with his plans. Musashi question Team U about another Ultra before him but they not answer him. Then, Taiga realized that Ultraman Dyna actually came to their Earth before them and ask where he is. Before sleep, Musashi tells the children about Juran, and the kids enjoyed hearing about the planet. In the morning, Alien attacked their base and showing that Dyna is now in a deceased state after being defeated by Giganto Zetton not long ago. Giganto Zetton sent a fireballs meteor and Musashi transforms into Ultraman Cosmos and protects them with all that he got. After realize that Team U is actually a fake team but they volunteer to save their fellow mekber. Taiga with his morale about faith on an Ultra restored together with Musashi ready to fight Giganto Zetton. Unfortunately, Giganto Zetton managed to paralyzed Cosmos and left him unconscious which left Ultraman Zero to fight it alone. After Dyna was revived, he restored Ultraman Cosmos and the trio successfully destroyed Giganto Zetton. Cosmos and Dyna managed to revert to their hosts but Zero died because of his injuries. Musashi and Asuka then told Taiga to never give up and trust in their faith and a miracle beyond what they can achieve would happen. Their bond revived their light and transformed them together into a new fusion Ultra, Ultraman Saga and destroyed Hyper Zetton with the Maximum Saga with help from Team U. Musashi as Cosmos then returned to his world and reunited with his family and lived happily there. Ultraman Ginga S Movie Showdown! When Cosmos attempted to defeat Eltergar, the wicked monster used a golden aura to force him into Luna Mode and seal him. Cosmos managed to separate from Musashi before being fully sealed by Alena. He reunited with

DOWNLOAD PDF THE CHILD, QUESTIONS HIS PURPOSE IN THE COSMOS

Ultraman Zero, However, Eltegar was defeated and forced to retreat and then Zero and Musashi have a chance to train them. He then fought Alena and destroyed the domain that sealed the Ultra and merged again with Cosmos. He and Ginga Victory left the other six Ultra to fight their old enemies that were made by Eltegar and together faced Eltegar themselves. Cosmos transformed into Eclipse Mode and had his rematch against Eltegar. He then with Ginga Victory managed to defeat Eltegar once and for all and restored Alena to her old self. Disputes between forces, the disputes are always going on and on and on. Musashi is known for his pacifistic personality as he never wants to solve things in an aggressive way. During the final fight against Chaos Header, Musashi finally defeats the evil entity by purifying him, something which even Ultraman Cosmos never thought to do. He is also trained in the usage of all their Mechs. Musashi is also a trained astronaut with at least two known extra-terrestrial missions in his career, documented in the overall series. A gift from Cosmos when Musashi was a child. The original purpose of the stone is to summon Ultraman Cosmos, providing a quick route to Earth wherever in the cosmos he may be.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE CHILD, QUESTIONS HIS PURPOSE IN THE COSMOS

Chapter 4 : Timaeus (dialogue) - Wikipedia

"I realized then that even though I was a tiny speck in an infinite cosmos, a blip on the timeline of eternity, I was not without purpose." — R.J. Anderson, Ultraviolet tags: cosmos, inspirational, purpose, r-j-anderson, ultraviolet.

It is the first known Greek mythical cosmogony. The initial state of the universe is chaos , a dark indefinite void considered a divine primordial condition from which everything else appeared. Theogonies are a part of Greek mythology which embodies the desire to articulate reality as a whole; this universalizing impulse was fundamental for the first later projects of speculative theorizing. Specifically, theogonies tend to affirm kingship as the natural embodiment of society. Further, in the "Kings and Singers" passage [3] Hesiod appropriates to himself the authority usually reserved to sacred kingship. The poet declares that it is he, where we might have expected some king instead, upon whom the Muses have bestowed the two gifts of a scepter and an authoritative voice Hesiod, Theogony 30–3 , which are the visible signs of kingship. It is not that this gesture is meant to make Hesiod a king. Rather, the point is that the authority of kingship now belongs to the poetic voice, the voice that is declaiming the Theogony. The nine muses on a Roman sarcophagus second century AD [4] Louvre , Paris Although it is often used as a sourcebook for Greek mythology , [4] the Theogony is both more and less than that. In formal terms it is a hymn invoking Zeus and the Muses: It is necessary to see the Theogony not as the definitive source of Greek mythology, but rather as a snapshot of a dynamic tradition that happened to crystallize when Hesiod formulated the myths he knew—and to remember that the traditions have continued evolving since that time. The written form of the Theogony was established in the 6th century BCE. Even some conservative editors have concluded that the Typhon episode [68] is an interpolation. Uranus produced many children with Gaia the Titans, the Cyclopes , and the Hecatoncheires , but hating them, [9] he hid them away somewhere inside Gaia. Only her son Cronus, the youngest Titan, was willing to do so. Uranus and Gaia prophesied to him that one of his children would overthrow him, so when he married Rhea, he made sure to swallow each of the children she birthed: So they sent Rhea to Crete to bear Zeus and Gaia took the newborn Zeus to raise, hiding him deep in a cave beneath the Aegean Mountains. Zeus then released his uncles the Cyclopes, who provided Zeus with his great weapons, the thunderbolts. Zeus cast the fury of his thunderbolts at the Titans, defeating them and throwing them into Tartarus. Zeus with his thunderbolts was quickly victorious, and Typhon was also imprisoned in Tartarus. And so Zeus managed to end the cycle of succession and secure his eternal rule over the cosmos.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE CHILD, QUESTIONS HIS PURPOSE IN THE COSMOS

Chapter 5 : What if the cosmos is all that there is? â€¢ www.nxgvision.com

History Ultraman Cosmos: The First Contact Meeting with Cosmos. Musashi Haruno was a fifth grader who dreamed of meeting Ultraman. One night he met Cosmos after his battle with the Baltan, and revived him using sunlight.

Cover Design and Cover Art: Pritvi Bharat All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or utdised in any form or by any means, electronics or mechanical including photocopying, recording or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers. This book is distributed with the condition that it should be lent, distributed and circulated to those in the journey to discover Shiva. It should not be resold. Use for non-profit purposes may be communicated. In gratitude to friends for creating magic and helping me - Rajendra Shirvekar, Dr. Shiva, Rudra, Cosmos, Vishnu, Brahma. December Published by: His Grace is boundless. He is the Saviour and Guru. He is the beloved of Uma. He is the Supreme Light that shines in your heart. Meditate on His Form. Then I wasted my time searching high and low. Finally I found you within, O Shiva! It is the ultimate atomic particle, the Natha. It is supreme Shiva, all-pervading. It is the ultimate jiva. It is Hamsa, the soul of Shakti. That which is not known, cannot be reasoned. Thereby, it cannot be wished away as irrational or superstition or mythology alone. That which is not known, has always been conveyed through a story, and usually with metaphors or aphorisms within these stories. For every ten scientists around the world who would scorn religion or the existence of God, nine of them would go home and beg the mercy of their own God. It is the one scientist who continues to question, without arrogance, who is correct. He who sees Shiva in the poor, in the weak, and in the diseased, really worships Shiva. And if he sees Shiva only in the image, his worship is but preliminary. He who has served and helped one poor man seeing Shiva in him, without thinking of his caste or creed or race or anything, with him Shiva is more pleased than with the man who sees Him only in temples. We are only receptacles of knowledge, and yet we do not know the vastness of understanding that we have. I ask you but not to believe, if you would not, but only to travel this journey, not with me, but with Shiva. For goodness to prevail, there needs to be evil, For destruction to prevail, there needs to be creation, And thus for suffering to prevail, there is none, For Shiva, he is within you, within you. For light to exist, there is darkness, For matter to exist, there is non-matter, And thus for distance to exist, there is none, For Shiva, he is within you, within you. For him who does not believe, there is arrogance, For him who does indeed believe, there is ignorance, And thus for prayers to be answered, there is none, For Shiva, he is within you, within you. He is the tall silvery-white mountain peak of the Himalayas. He is the tallest peak, clad in the clouds, around him, covering him. He stands tall, happy, with the clouds close to him, so close to him. I dream of Shiva, with his Naaga, around his neck. The Himalayan slopes twist and turn, below the peak, like a cobra. The slopes seem to go away, and yet they return upon themselves. They raise their head, and blessed they are, always, with Shiva. I dream of Shiva, with the crescent moon in his matted locks. He turns his head to show the crescent moon, and then hides it. I dream of Shiva, of the Himalayas, with the clouds touching him, Parvati, the goddess of the clouds, resplendent in the high peaks, She searches for Ganga and Chandra, not letting them through, For she alone, moves from his matted locks to his heart. I dream of Shiva, with the crescent moon hiding from the clouds, Seen beautiful and bashful, the moment the clouds pass away, Hiding and emerging, hiding and emerging, cautious. Waits for the clouds to move on, and shines high in the Himalayas. I dream of Shiva, him with the Ganges in his locks, Not allowing her to escape free, retaining her deep within. I dream of Shiva, he who resides in the tallest mountain peaks, For I feel that he smiles at us, and waits for us to seek him. He who is happy to stop the clouds and seek their rain upon him, And then sponges up the waters within him, and makes the rivers wait. I dream of Shiva, who fights the enormous strength of the waters, He knows that these waters of the Ganges are proud of their strength. He makes them tire themselves, and makes the waters drench his matted locks, To release the Ganges flow in such a manner that she stays with him, always. I dream of Shiva, he who sounds the damaru, dama-dama-dama-dama, Pinaka, the trishul, holds the damaru, lest it escape to tell another story. He who

DOWNLOAD PDF THE CHILD, QUESTIONS HIS PURPOSE IN THE COSMOS

applies the cremation ground ash on himself, and yet is handsome, He brings the clouds - his sweetheart, closer to him, in his love. I dream of Shiva, in the Himalayas. I call out to him. Om Shiva, the creator - an introduction Who came first? It is said that in this age of Kaliyuga, for one to listen to and understand the Shiv Puran, and to unravel the mysteries and marvels of Shiva, is to travel to the edge of the cosmos and back. This is an attempted interpretation of the concepts of creation as in the Shiv Puran, wherein it is as disclosed by the great Suta Romaharshana to the sages of the Naimisharanya forest, as told to him by his teacher, the great Maharishi Veda Vyasa, who learnt it from the divine Sage Narada, who learnt it from his father, Brahma. With the permission of the great Maharishi Sanatakumara, the story of the Shiv Puran was disclosed by Maharishi Veda Vyasa to his first five disciples. This interpretation is an attempt to convey an understanding of the concepts of creation as written in the Puranas and as unlike the common understanding from transcendental knowledge and the advances in science, especially astronomy, comparative religions and, quantum physics. The concepts of puranic times were in consonance with the extent of knowledge that was prevalent or available or the semantics in use at that time. We have, as human beings, evolved in our use of the metaphor, our assumed understanding of god, our knowledge of energy and outer space, and the learnings about matter and non-matter. Humans have failed over these many tens of thousands of years to achieve a comprehensive understanding of godliness and its innate existence in humanity. We search for God in the heavens, and we communicate through temples and rituals, and yet, we fail to travel through the magical distances of mind, matter, space and the cosmos. The Shiv Puran is comprised of about 24, slokas or verses within seven samhitas or chapters. When first composed, by Shiva, the Puran is said to have comprised more than a hundred thousand slokas or verses, in twelve samhitas or chapters, and included the 8 Vinayak Samhita, 9 Matri Samhita, 10 Ekadash-rudra Samhita, 11 Sahastra Koti Samhita and 12 Dharma Samhita. It is said that the Shiv Puran must be heard from the discourse of a Master, after an appropriate rendition to Shiva, and a prayer and offering to Ganesha. The listener is expected to be initiated in the magic of Shiva, and should earnestly want to learn. And during the significant argument and fight between Vishnu and Brahma, the story later introduces us to the awesome aspect of the Shiva Linga. The journey of Vishnu as a boar and Brahma as a swan, in their years of quest to search for the beginning and the end of the Shiva Linga is tremendously depicted in the story, and has splendid metaphorical paradigms. The perspective of the Shiva Linga as an ego-buster between Brahma and Vishnu boggles the mind. The aspect of Shiva, as the creator of the cosmos is dwelt upon in this book. The aspect of Brahma as the creator, of Vishnu as the preserver and that of Shiva as the destroyer much later to the events presented here. The manner in which Shiva would explain the difference between Shiva as the creator of the cosmos and that of Brahma as the creator after the cosmos has come into existence is the most significant of the puranas of this land of ours. There are several Creation stories, but this is certainly not any one of them. This is the very First of all. If Brahma is the Creator, then who created Brahma? If Vishnu created Brahma, then how come Brahma is the Creator? If Vishnu created Brahma, then who created Vishnu? Shiva is the creator? But, Shiva is the destroyer! So, how come the destroyer was the creator who created Vishnu, who in turn created the creator? Now, THAT is indeed a story. And it does come out from within another great story, - the great Shiv Puran. Brahma is said to have cast a wheel of light, plucking it from the sky, and thrown it upon the Planet Earth, and said, "Where this wheel would fall, assemble there, to hear the wonderful story of Rudra, of Creation". This wheel of light is supposed to have fallen at Prayag. Given to us by the greatest writer of all times, the great Maharishi Veda Vyasa, the Shiv Puran, is now known to us as a narrative by Suta Romaharshana, the great story-teller, one of the first disciples of the great Maharishi himself, when he presented his discourse to the sages assembled at the Naimisharanya forest, at Prayag, where the Ganges meets the Yamuna River. Upon being requested by the learned sage Shaunaka to disclose the story of Shiva, because so less was known about him at that time, the great Suta Romaharshana retold the Shiv Puran, as he had heard from his guru, the great Maharishi Veda Vyasa, who rudra - creator of the cosmos had heard it from the Sage Narada, who had heard it from his own father, Brahma. Thus, is the story told For us to understand creation, we would need to understand about that point of

DOWNLOAD PDF THE CHILD, QUESTIONS HIS PURPOSE IN THE COSMOS

time, just before creation. If the Cosmos exists, and the Universe exists, and the Solar System exists, then probably there was a moment in Time, when this did not exist. If it did not exist, then how did Matter, and so much of Matter that our mind cannot comprehend at all, how did this Matter get created? Did it take up considerable time to be created? At first there was nothing. Not even distance, time or energy. And, out there, deep in this void of NOTHING, from another dimension that we would never be able to comprehend, or understand, recognise or accept, there was a tremendously awesome burst of energy. This huge enormous vast ocean of energy that entered this void of NOTHING flowed through and through, covering tremendous trillion and millions more light years of distance. From this vast infinite ocean of energy came about the burst of a million stars and suns, each one brighter than the other, and along with them came the burst of energy that had the power to create. At present, our consciousness or schools of knowledge have not evolved to even recognise such a happening. Unable for us to comprehend at this moment of our collective understanding of science, religion or philosophies, this tremendous burst of creative energy converged within itself again and again, turning within itself, and concentrating its aspects within itself, layer by layer, to emerge, as SHIVA.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE CHILD, QUESTIONS HIS PURPOSE IN THE COSMOS

Chapter 6 : Philosophy of Religion (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Dr. Niels Henrik Gregersen (born) is a Danish theologian working on the critical interface between science and religion, especially in relation to theoretical biology and the sciences of complexity.

The Field and its Significance The philosophical exploration of religious beliefs and practices is evident in the earliest recorded philosophy, east and west. This intermingling of philosophical inquiry with religious themes and the broader enterprises of philosophy e. Only gradually do we find texts devoted exclusively to religious themes. Cudworth and his Cambridge University colleague Henry More produced philosophical work with a specific focus on religion and so, if one insisted on dating the beginning of philosophy of religion as a field, there are good reasons for claiming that it began gradually in the mid- 17th century see Taliaferro Today philosophy of religion is a robust, intensely active area of philosophy. Almost without exception, any introduction to philosophy text in the Anglophone world includes some philosophy of religion. The importance of philosophy of religion is chiefly due to its subject matter: A philosophical exploration of these topics involves fundamental questions about our place in the cosmos and about our relationship to what may transcend the cosmos. Such philosophical work requires an investigation into the nature and limit of human thought. Alongside these complex, ambitious projects, philosophy of religion has at least three factors that contribute to its importance for the overall enterprise of philosophy. Philosophy of religion addresses embedded social and personal practices. Philosophy of religion is therefore relevant to practical concerns; its subject matter is not all abstract theory. A chief point of reference in much philosophy of religion is the shape and content of living traditions. In this way, philosophy of religion may be informed by the other disciplines that study religious life. Another reason behind the importance of the field is its breadth. There are few areas of philosophy that are shorn of religious implications. Religious traditions are so comprehensive and all-encompassing in their claims that almost every domain of philosophy may be drawn upon in the philosophical investigation of their coherence, justification, and value. A third reason is historical. Most philosophers throughout the history of ideas, east and west, have addressed religious topics. One cannot undertake a credible history of philosophy without taking philosophy of religion seriously. While this field is vital for philosophy, philosophy of religion may also make a pivotal contribution to religious studies and theology. Religious studies often involve important methodological assumptions about history and about the nature and limits of religious experience. These invite philosophical assessment and debate. Theology may also benefit from philosophy of religion in at least two areas. Historically, theology has often drawn upon, or been influenced by, philosophy. Platonism and Aristotelianism have had a major influence on the articulation of classical Christian doctrine, and in the modern era theologians have often drawn on work by philosophers from Hegel to Heidegger and Derrida. The evaluation has at times been highly critical and dismissive, but there are abundant periods in the history of ideas when philosophy has positively contributed to the flourishing of religious life. This constructive interplay is not limited to the west. The role of philosophy in distinctive Buddhist views of knowledge and the self has been of great importance. At the beginning of the 21st century, a more general rationale for philosophy of religion should be cited: Philosophers of religion now often seek out common as well as distinguishing features of religious belief and practice. This study can enhance communication between traditions, and between religions and secular institutions.

The Meaningfulness of Religious Language A significant amount of work on the meaningfulness of religious language was carried out in the medieval period, with major contributions made by Maimonides “ , Thomas Aquinas “ , Duns Scotus “ , and William of Ockham “ In the modern era, the greatest concentration on religious language has taken place in response to logical positivism and to the latter work of Wittgenstein “ This section and the next highlights these two more recent movements. Logical positivism promoted an empiricist principle of meaning which was deemed lethal for religious belief. The following empiricist principle is representative: The stronger version of positivism is that claims about the world must be verifiable at least in principle. Both

the weaker view with its more open ended reference to evidence and the strict view in principle confirmation delimit meaningful discourse about the world. Ostensibly factual claims that have no implications for our empirical experience are empty of content. In line with this form of positivism, A. Ayer and others claimed that religious beliefs were meaningless. How might one empirically confirm that God is omnipresent or loving or that Krishna is an avatar of Vishnu? In an important debate in the 1950s and 60s, philosophical arguments about God were likened to debates about the existence and habits of an unobservable gardener, based on a parable by John Wisdom in 1956. The idea of a gardener who is not just invisible but who also cannot be detected by any sensory faculty seemed nonsense. It seemed like nonsense because they said there was no difference between an imperceptible gardener and no gardener at all. Using this garden analogy and others crafted with the same design, Antony Flew in his essay in Mitchell made the case that religious claims do not pass the empirical test of meaning. The field of philosophy of religion in the 1950s and 60s was largely an intellectual battlefield where the debates centered on whether religious beliefs were meaningful or conceptually absurd. Empirical verificationism is by no means dead. Some critics of the belief in an incorporeal God continue to advance the same critique as that of Flew and Ayer, albeit with further refinements. Michael Martin and Kai Nielsen are representatives of this approach. And yet despite these efforts, empiricist challenges to the meaningfulness of religious belief are now deemed less impressive than they once were. In the history of the debate over positivism, the most radical charge was that positivism is self-refuting. The empiricist criterion of meaning itself does not seem to be a statement that expresses the formal relation of ideas, nor does it appear to be empirically verifiable. How might one empirically verify the principle? At best, the principle of verification seems to be a recommendation as to how to describe those statements that positivists are prepared to accept as meaningful. But then, how might a dispute about which other statements are meaningful be settled in a non-arbitrary fashion? If the positivist principle is tightened up too far, it seems to threaten various propositions that at least appear to be highly respectable, such as scientific claims about physical processes and events that are not publicly observable. For example, what are we to think of states of the universe prior to all observation of physical strata of the cosmos that cannot be observed directly or indirectly but only inferred as part of an overriding scientific theory? Or what about the mental states of other persons, which may ordinarily be reliably judged, but which, some argue, are under-determined by external, public observation? Also worrisome was the wholesale rejection by positivists of ethics as a cognitive, normative practice. The dismissal of ethics as non-cognitive had some embarrassing ad hominem force against an empiricist like Ayer, who regarded ethical claims as lacking any truth value and yet at the same time he construed empirical knowledge in terms of having the right to certain beliefs. Can an ethics of belief be preserved if one dispenses with the normativity of ethics? The strict empiricist account of meaning was also charged as meaningless on the grounds that there is no coherent, clear, basic level of experience with which to test propositional claims. A mystic might well claim to experience the unity of a timeless spirit everywhere present. Ayer allowed that in principle mystical experience might give meaning to religious terms. Those who concede this appeared to be on a slippery slope leading from empirical verificationism to mystical verificationism. Alston A growing number of philosophers in the 1950s and 60s were led to conclude that the empiricist challenge was not decisive. Critical assessments of positivism can be found in work by, among others, Alvin Plantinga, Richard Swinburne, and John Foster. One of the most sustained lessons from the encounter between positivism and the philosophy of religion is the importance of assessing the meaning of individual beliefs in comprehensive terms. Carl Hempel developed the following critique of positivism, pointing the way to a more comprehensive analysis of the meaning of ostensible propositional claims. But no matter how one might reasonably delimit the class of sentences qualified to introduce empirically significant terms, this new approach [by the positivists] seems to me to lead to the realization that cognitive significance cannot well be construed as a characteristic of individual sentences, but only of more or less comprehensive systems of sentences corresponding roughly to scientific theories. A closer study of this point suggests strongly that the idea of cognitive significance, with its suggestion of a sharp distinction between

significant and non-significant sentences or systems of such, has lost its promise and fertility and that it had better be replaced by certain concepts which admit of differences in degree, such as the formal simplicity of a system; its explanatory and predictive power; and its degree of conformation relative to the available evidence. The analysis and theoretical reconstruction of these concepts seems to offer the most promising way of advancing further the clarification of the issues implicit in the idea of cognitive significance. Hempel, If Hempel is right, the project initiated by Ayer had to be qualified, taking into account larger theoretical frameworks. Religious claims could not be ruled out at the start but should be allowed a hearing with competing views of cognitive significance. Ayer himself later conceded that the positivist account of meaning was unsatisfactory. With the retreat of positivism in the 1950s, philosophers of religion re-introduced concepts of God, competing views of the sacred, and the like, which were backed by arguments that appealed not to narrow scientific confirmation but to broad considerations of coherence, breadth of explanation, simplicity, religious experience, and other factors. But before turning to this material, it is important to consider a debate within philosophy of religion that was largely inspired by the Austrian philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein. Religious Forms of Life and Practices Wittgenstein launched an attack on what has been called the picture theory of meaning, according to which statements may be judged true or false depending upon whether reality matches the picture represented by the belief. It gives rise to insoluble philosophical problems and it misses the whole point of having religious beliefs, which is that the meaning is to be found in the life in which they are employed. By shifting attention away from the referential meaning of words to their use, Wittgenstein promoted the idea that we should attend to what he called forms of life. As this move was applied to religious matters, a number of philosophers either denied or at least played down the extent to which religious forms of life involve metaphysical claims. Phillips have all promoted this approach to religion. It may be considered non-realist in the sense that it does not treat religious beliefs as straightforward metaphysical claims that can be adjudicated philosophically as either true or false concerning an objective reality. By their lights, the traditional metaphysics of theism got what it deserved when it came under attack in the mid-twentieth century by positivists. This Wittgensteinian challenge, then, appears to place in check much of the way philosophers in the west have approached religion. When, for example, Descartes, Locke, Leibniz, Berkeley, and Hume argued for and against the justification of belief in God, metaphysics was at the forefront. The same preoccupation with the truth or falsehood of religious belief is also central to ancient and medieval philosophical reflection about the Divine. At least two reasons may support recent non-realism. First, it has some credibility based on the sociology of religion. Religion seems pre-eminently to be focused upon how we live. A second reason that might be offered is that the classical and contemporary arguments for specific views of God have seemed unsuccessful to many philosophers though not to all, as observed in section 4. Non-realist views have their critics from the vantage point both of atheists such as Michael Martin and theists such as Roger Trigg. By way of a preliminary response it may be pointed out that even if a non-realist approach is adopted this would not mean altogether jettisoning the more traditional approach to religious beliefs. If one of the reasons advanced on behalf of non-realism is that the traditional project fails, then ongoing philosophy of religion will still require investigating to determine whether in fact the tradition does fail. As John Dewey once observed, philosophical ideas not only never die, they never fade away. A more substantial reply to Wittgensteinian non-realism has been the charge that it does not preserve but instead undermines the very intelligibility of religious practice. Let us concede that religious practice is antecedent to philosophical theories that justify the practice—a concession not shared by all.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE CHILD, QUESTIONS HIS PURPOSE IN THE COSMOS

Chapter 7 : Musashi Haruno | Ultraman Wiki | FANDOM powered by Wikia

Olson, who offers portraits of Mars, Saturn, Uranus, Pluto and Charon, Mercury, Venus and a violently erupting quasar, among others, admits his knowledge of the cosmos was somewhat limited at first.

The dialogue takes place the day after Socrates described his ideal state. Hermocrates wishes to oblige Socrates and mentions that Critias knows just the account 20b to do so. Critias believes that he is getting ahead of himself, and mentions that Timaeus will tell part of the account from the origin of the universe to man. Critias also cites the Egyptian priest in Sais about long term factors on the fate of mankind: Now this has the form of a myth, but really signifies a declination of the bodies moving in the heavens around the earth, and a great conflagration of things upon the earth, which recurs after long intervals. The main content of the dialogue, the exposition by Timaeus, follows. Timaeus begins with a distinction between the physical world, and the eternal world. The physical one is the world which changes and perishes: The eternal one never changes: The speeches about the two worlds are conditioned by the different nature of their objects. Indeed, "a description of what is changeless, fixed and clearly intelligible will be changeless and fixed," 29b , while a description of what changes and is likely, will also change and be just likely. Therefore, in a description of the physical world, one "should not look for anything more than a likely story" 29d. Timaeus suggests that since nothing "becomes or changes" without cause, then the cause of the universe must be a demiurge or a god, a figure Timaeus refers to as the father and maker of the universe. And since the universe is fair, the demiurge must have looked to the eternal model to make it, and not to the perishable one 29a. Hence, using the eternal and perfect world of " forms " or ideals as a template, he set about creating our world, which formerly only existed in a state of disorder. Purpose of the universe[edit] Timaeus continues with an explanation of the creation of the universe, which he ascribes to the handiwork of a divine craftsman. The demiurge, being good, wanted there to be as much good as was the world. The demiurge is said to bring order out of substance by imitating an unchanging and eternal model paradigm. Later Platonists clarified that the eternal model existed in the mind of the Demiurge. Properties of the universe[edit] Timaeus describes the substance as a lack of homogeneity or balance, in which the four elements earth , air , fire and water were shapeless, mixed and in constant motion. Considering that order is favourable over disorder, the essential act of the creator was to bring order and clarity to this substance. First of all, the world is a living creature. Since the unintelligent creatures are in their appearance less fair than intelligent creatures, and since intelligence needs to be settled in a soul, the demiurge "put intelligence in soul, and soul in body" in order to make a living and intelligent whole. Then, since the part is imperfect compared to the whole, the world had to be one and only. Therefore, the demiurge did not create several worlds, but a single unique world 31b. Additionally, because the demiurge wanted his creation to be a perfect imitation of the Eternal "One" the source of all other emanations , there was no need to create more than one world. The creator decided also to make the perceptible body of the universe by four elements, in order to render it proportioned. Indeed, in addition to fire and earth, which make bodies visible and solid, a third element was required as a mean: Moreover, since the world is not a surface but a solid, a fourth mean was needed to reach harmony: As for the figure, the demiurge created the world in the geometric form of a globe. Indeed, the round figure is the most perfect one, because it comprehends or averages all the other figures and it is the most omnimorphic of all figures: The creator assigned then to the world a rotatory or circular movement, which is the "most appropriate to mind and intelligence" on account of its being the most uniform 34a. Having thus been created as a perfect, self-sufficient and intelligent being, the world is a god 34b. The demiurge combined three elements: From this emerged three compound substances, intermediate or mixed Being, intermediate Sameness, and intermediate Difference. From this compound one final substance resulted, the World Soul. The demiurge imparted on them a circular movement on their axis: The demiurge gave the primacy to the motion of Sameness and left it undivided; but he divided the motion of Difference in six parts, to have seven unequal circles. He prescribed these circles to move in opposite

DOWNLOAD PDF THE CHILD, QUESTIONS HIS PURPOSE IN THE COSMOS

directions, three of them with equal speeds, the others with unequal speeds, but always in proportion. These circles are the orbits of the heavenly bodies: Then, the demiurge connected the body and the soul of the universe: The soul began to rotate and this was the beginning of its eternal and rational life 36e. Therefore, having been composed by Sameness, Difference and Existence their mean , and formed in right proportions, the soul declares the sameness or difference of every object it meets: The Elements[edit] Timaeus claims that the minute particle of each element had a special geometric shape:

DOWNLOAD PDF THE CHILD, QUESTIONS HIS PURPOSE IN THE COSMOS

Chapter 8 : Atheism and Child Abuse - www.nxgvision.com

biblical view of the world, God's purpose for the cosmos, His will for mankind, His plan of salvation, and the way we live our personal lives? In his comments on this subject, Dr. Del.

Preliminaries If ethics is widely regarded as the most accessible branch of philosophy, it is so because many of its presuppositions are self-evident or trivial truths: At least for secularists, the attainment of these overall aims is thought to be a condition or prerequisite for a good life. What we regard as a life worth living depends on the notion we have of our own nature and of the conditions of its fulfillment. This, in turn, is determined, at least in part, by the values and standards of the society we live in. The attainment of these ends can also depend at least in part on external factors, such as health, material prosperity, social status, and even on good looks or sheer luck. Although these presuppositions may appear to be self-evident, most of the time, human beings are aware of them only implicitly, because many individuals simply lead their lives in accordance with pre-established standards and values that are, under normal circumstances, not objects of reflection. The historical Socrates was, of course, not the first to question the Greek way of life. Nevertheless, Plato continued to present his investigations as dialogues between Socrates and some partner or partners. And Plato preserved the dialogical form even in those of his late works where Socrates is replaced by a stand-in and where the didactic nature of the presentations is hard to reconcile with the pretense of live discussion. But these didactic discourses continue to combine questions of ethical, political, social, or psychological importance with metaphysical, methodological and epistemological considerations, and it can be just as hard to assess the extent to which Plato agrees with the pronouncements of his speakers, as it is when the speaker is Socrates. Furthermore, the fact that a certain problem or its solution is not mentioned in a dialogue does not mean that Plato was unaware of it. There is, therefore, no certainty concerning the question: It stands to reason, however, that he started with the short dialogues that question traditional virtues – courage, justice, moderation, piety. It also stands to reason that Plato gradually widened the scope of his investigations, by reflecting not only on the social and political conditions of morality, but also on the logical, epistemological, and metaphysical presuppositions of a successful moral theory. These theoretical reflections often take on a life of their own. The *Parmenides*, the *Theaetetus*, and the *Sophist* deal primarily or exclusively with epistemological and metaphysical problems of a quite general nature. Nevertheless, as witnessed by the *Philebus*, the *Statesman*, the *Timaeus*, and the *Laws*, Plato never lost interest in the question of what conditions are necessary for a good human life. Socrates explores the individual virtues through a discussion with persons who are either representatives of, or claim to be experts on, that virtue. Xenophon *Memorabilia* I, 10; In the *Laches*, he discusses courage with two renowned generals of the Peloponnesian war, Laches and Nicias. Similarly, in the *Charmides* Socrates addresses – somewhat ironically – the nature of moderation with the two of the Thirty Tyrants, namely the then very young Charmides, an alleged model of modesty, and his guardian and intellectual mentor, Critias. And in the *Gorgias* Socrates discusses the nature of rhetoric and its relation to virtue with the most prominent teacher of rhetoric among the sophists. Finally, in the *Meno* the question how virtue is acquired is raised by Meno, a disciple of Gorgias, and an ambitious seeker of power, wealth, and fame. Nor is such confidence unreasonable. These flaws vary greatly in kind and gravity: Socrates shows that enumerations of examples are not sufficient to capture the nature of the thing in question. Definitions that consist in the replacement of a given concept with a synonym are open to the same objections as the original definition. Definitions may be hopelessly vague or miss the mark entirely, which is to say that they may be either too wide, and include unwanted characteristics or subsets, or too narrow, and exclude essential characteristics. Moreover, definitions may be incomplete because the object in question does not constitute a unitary phenomenon. Given that the focus in the early dialogues is almost entirely on the exposure of flaws and inconsistencies, one cannot help wondering whether Plato himself knew the answers to his queries, and had some cards up his sleeve that he chose not to play for the time being. This would presuppose that Plato

had not only a clear notion of the nature of the different virtues, but also a positive conception of the good life as such. Since Plato was neither a moral nihilist nor a sceptic, he cannot have regarded moral perplexity aporia as the ultimate end, nor regarded continued mutual examination, Socratico more, as a way of life for everyone. Perplexity, as is argued in the Meno, is just a wholesome intermediary stage on the way to knowledge. But if Plato assumes that the convictions that survive Socratic questioning will eventually coalesce into an account of the good life, then he keeps this expectation to himself. There is no guarantee that only false convictions are discarded in a Socratic investigation, while true ones are retained. For, promising suggestions are often as mercilessly discarded as their less promising brethren. It is therefore a matter of conjecture whether Plato himself held any positive views while he composed one aporetic dialogue after the other. He may have regarded his investigations as experimental stages, or have seen each dialogue as an element in a network of approaches that he hoped to eventually integrate. The evidence that Plato already wanted his readers to draw this very conclusion in his early dialogues is somewhat contradictory, however. Plato famously pleads for the unity of the virtues in the Protagoras, and seems intent to reduce them all to knowledge. This intellectualizing tendency, however, does not tell us what kind of master-science would fulfill all of the requirements for defining virtues, and what its content should be. Though Plato often compared the virtues with technical skills, such as those of a doctor or a pilot, he may have realized that virtues also involve emotional attitudes, desires, and preferences, but not yet have seen a clear way to coordinate or relate the rational and the affective elements that constitute the virtues. In the Laches, for instance, Socrates partners struggle when they try to define courage, invoking two different elements. His comrade Nicias, on the other hand, fails when he tries to identify courage exclusively as a certain type of knowledge. The investigation of moderation in the Charmides, likewise, points up that there are two disparate elements commonly associated with that virtue, namely, a certain calmness of temper on the one hand. It is clear that a complex account would be needed to combine these two disparate factors. In his earlier dialogues, Plato may or may not already be envisaging the kind of solution that he is going to present in the Republic to the problem of the relationship between the various virtues, with wisdom, the only intellectual virtue, as their basis. Courage, moderation, and justice presuppose a certain steadfastness of character as well as a harmony of purpose among the disparate parts of the soul, but their goodness depends entirely on the intellectual part of the soul, just as the virtue of the citizens in the just state depends on the wisdom of the philosopher kings. Nicias is forced to admit that such knowledge presupposes the knowledge of good and bad. But pointing out what is wrong and missing in particular arguments is a far cry from a philosophical conception of the good and the bad in human life. But the evidence that Plato already had a definitive conception of the good life in mind when he wrote his earlier dialogues remains, at most, indirect. First and foremost, definitions presuppose that there is a definable object; that is to say, that it must have a stable nature. Nothing can be defined whose nature changes all the time. In addition, the object in question must be a unitary phenomenon, even if its unity may be complex. If definitions are to provide the basis of knowledge, they require some kind of essentialism. This presupposition is indeed made explicit in the Euthyphro, where Plato employs for the first time the terminology that will be characteristic of his full-fledged theory of the Forms. Despite this pregnant terminology, few scholars nowadays hold that the Euthyphro already presupposes transcendent Forms in a realm of their own models that are incompletely represented by their imitations under material conditions. No more than piety or holiness in the abstract sense seems to be presupposed in the discussion of the Euthyphro. Given that they are the objects of definition and the models of their ordinary representatives, there is every reason not only to treat them as real, but also to assign to them a state of higher perfection. And once this step has been taken, it is only natural to make certain epistemological adjustments. For, access to paradigmatic entities is not to be expected through ordinary experience, but presupposes some special kind of intellectual insight. It seems, then, that once Plato had accepted invariant and unitary objects of thought as the objects of definition, he was predestined to follow the path that let him adopt a metaphysics and epistemology of transcendent Forms. It would have meant the renunciation of the claim to unassailable knowledge and truth

in favor of belief, conjecture, and, *horribile dictu*, of human convention. It led him to search for models of morality beyond the limits of everyday experience. This, in turn, explains the development of his theory of recollection and the postulate of transcendent immaterial objects as the basis of reality and thought that he refers to in the *Meno*, and that he presents more fully in the *Phaedo*. We do not know when, precisely, Plato adopted this mode of thought, but it stands to reason that his contact with the Pythagorean school on his first voyage to Southern Italy and Sicily around BC played a major role in this development. Mathematics as a model-science has several advantages. It deals with unchangeable entities that have unitary definitions. It also makes a plausible claim that the essence of these entities cannot be comprehended in isolation but only in a network of interconnections that have to be worked out at the same time as each particular entity is defined. For instance, to understand what it is to be a triangle, it is necessary *inter alia* to understand the nature of points, lines, planes and their interrelations. That Plato was aware of this fact is indicated by his somewhat prophetic statement in his introduction of the theory of recollection in the *Meno*, 81d: The slave finally manages, with some pushing and pulling by Socrates, and some illustrations drawn in the sand, to double the area of a given square. In the course of this interrogation, the disciple gradually discovers the relations between the different lines, triangles, and squares. That Plato regards these interconnections as crucial features of knowledge is confirmed later by the distinction that Socrates draws between knowledge and true belief 97b–98b. And that, *Meno* my friend, is recollection, as we previously agreed. After they are tied down, in the first place, they become knowledge, and then they remain in place. Not only that, the same is suggested by the list through which Socrates first introduces the Forms, 65d–e: And the Beautiful, and the Good? How does it work? The hypothesis he starts out with seems simpleminded indeed, because it consists of nothing more than the assumption that everything is what it is by participating in the corresponding Form. But it soon turns out that more is at stake than that simple postulate. First, the hypothesis of each respective Form is to be tested by looking at the compatibility of its consequences. Second, the hypothesis itself is to be secured by higher hypotheses, until some satisfactory starting point is attained. The distinctions that Socrates subsequently introduces in preparation of his last proof of the immortality of the soul seem, however, to provide some information about the procedure in question d–b. Socrates first introduces the distinction between essential and non-essential attributes. This distinction is then applied to the soul: The viability of this argument, stripped here to its bare bones, need not engage us. The procedure shows, at any rate, that Plato resorts to relations between Forms here. The essential tie between the soul and life is clearly not open to sense-perception; instead, understanding this tie takes a good deal of reflection on what it means to be, and to have a soul. To admirers of a two-world metaphysics, it may come as a disappointment that in Plato, recollection should consist in no more than the uncovering of such relationships. Plato does not employ his newly established metaphysical entities as the basis to work out a definitive conception of the human soul and the appropriate way of life in the *Phaedo*. Rather, he confines himself to warnings against the contamination of the soul by the senses and their pleasures, and quite generally against corruption by worldly values. He gives no advice concerning human conduct beyond the recommendation of a general abstemiousness from worldly temptations. But as long as this negative or other-worldly attitude towards the physical side of human nature prevails, no interest is to be expected on the part of Plato in nature as a whole – let alone in the principles of the cosmic order but cf. But it is not only Platonic asceticism that stands in the way of such a wider perspective. Socrates himself seems to have been quite indifferent to the study of nature. And in a dialogue as late as the *Phaedrus*, Socrates famously explains his preference for the city and his avoidance of nature d: If Plato later takes a much more positive attitude towards nature in general, this is a considerable change of focus. In the *Phaedo*, he quite deliberately confines his account of the nature of heaven and earth to the myth about the afterlife d–c.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE CHILD, QUESTIONS HIS PURPOSE IN THE COSMOS

Chapter 9 : Atheism and Child Abuse - Peter S. Williams

In elementary school, particularly in the lower grades, the child is just beginning to expand his or her experience beyond home and family. The class becomes a type of "family" as well, with its own authority figure - the teacher - in a role analogous to parent.

What if the cosmos is all that there is? Are you a materialist? Materialism the philosophy suggests that "physical matter is the only reality, and that everything-including thought, feeling, mind, and will, can all be explained in terms of matter and physical phenomena. You believe that all can be explained in terms of natural causes and laws. Nothing has moral, spiritual, or supernatural significance. Carl Sagan once said: *The Case for Evolution*, says: Yet the living results of natural selection overwhelmingly impress us with the appearance of design as if by a mater watchmaker, impress us with the illusion of design and planning. What if the cosmos and the chemicals and the particles really are all that there is, and all that we are? The true foundation of rationality is not found in particles and impersonal laws, but in the mind of the Creator who formed us in His image. Of course he can, in a physical sense. Can he live without God in a reasonable way? The answer to that is No! Suppose the universe had never existed. Apart form God, what ultimate difference would that make? In a universe without God or immortality, how is mankind ultimately different from a swarm of mosquitoes or a barnyard of pigs? What viable basis exists for justice or law if man is nothing but a sophisticated, programmed machine? Why does research, discovery, diplomacy, art, music, sacrifice, compassion, feelings of love, or affectionate and caring relationships mean anything if it all ultimately comes to naught anyway? Without absolute morals, what ultimate difference is there between Saddam Hussein and Billy Graham? Dostoyevsky If morality is only a relative social construct, on what basis could or should anyone ever move to interfere with cultures that practice apartheid, female circumcision, cannibalism, or ethnic cleansing? If there is no God, on what basis is there any meaning or hope for fairness, comfort, or better times? Without a personal Creator-God, how are you anything other than the coincidental, purposeless miscarriage of nature, spinning round and round on a lonely planet in the blackness of space for just a little while before you and all memory of your futile, pointless, meaningless life finally blinks out forever in the endless darkness? Net users generous rights for putting this page to work in their homes, personal witnessing, churches and schools. There is meaning and HOPE in this cosmos! But perhaps for you, it remains a mystery. Discover for yourself the overwhelming message of HOPE that God brings to manâ€”presented clearly and chronologically from the foundation of the world to our own time. Watch it free, on-line 80 minute motion picture. GO â€ Do you doubt the Bible because of your knowledge of Evolution? Visit the Creation SuperLibrary for accurate, opening evidence for Creation, provided by a team of experts from various disciplines. GO â€ Archaeology provides abundant evidence in support of the Bible. Find answers to your questions about archaeology and biblical history. GO â€ Why is the world the way it is? If God is all-knowing, all-powerful, and loving, would he really create a world like this?