

# What This World Is Really About!



**Ken Minton**

**What This World Is Really About!**

# **What This World Is Really About!**

Because the Confusion Starts  
with the Fundamentals

By

Ken Minton



Strategic Book Publishing and Rights Co.

Copyright © 2015 Ken Minton. All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, taping, or by any information storage retrieval system, without the permission, in writing, of the publisher. For more information, send a letter to our Houston, TX address, Attention Subsidiary Rights Department, or email: [support@sbpra.net](mailto:support@sbpra.net).

Strategic Book Publishing and Rights Co.  
12620 FM 1960, Suite A4-507  
Houston TX 77065  
[www.sbpra.com](http://www.sbpra.com)

For information about special discounts for bulk purchases, please contact Strategic Book Publishing and Rights Co. Special Sales, at [bookorder@sbpra.net](mailto:bookorder@sbpra.net).

ISBN: 978-1-63135-921-7

## **Acknowledgements**

To my wife, Leslie, for all she does, including assistance with this endeavor.

To Mr. Peter N. Schrup, for his gifts of “scientific” publications.

To Dr. Donald Urquidi, for his knowledgeable input into chapter one.

To Mr. P. J. Williams, for his positive review of the preliminary chapters.

To Dr. Sid Nirenberg, for his encouragement regarding chapter one.

To Deanna and the Edit Team, for all their efforts.

## Contents

Preface	ix
Chapter One: Because the Confusion Starts with the Fundamentals	1
Chapter Two: The Fact of Evolution	19
Chapter Three: Our Real Motivations Resulting from the Fact of Evolution	28
Chapter Four: The Failed God Theory and Why It Is Promoted	34
Chapter Five: The Preference Issue of Morality	39
Chapter Six: What is Conservatism? What is Liberalism?	42
Chapter Seven: Who Gets Rich, Why, and the Impact to Others	49
Chapter Eight: Why the Philosophers Are Wrong!	56
Chapter Nine: What This World Is Really About!	67
Bibliography	75

## Preface

Before anyone assumes things, let me explain why I wrote this book, over a twenty-year period, with the audacious title of *What This World Is Really About!* To start with, I was basically forced into the college system by my sweet, loving mother. Let me make this clear, it was not something I had always wanted to do. As a result, I had no particular direction. Thus, I studied philosophy, took psychology, and reviewed political science. I acquired a minor in architecture. Eventually, I received a degree in mechanical engineering from San Diego State University and advanced forward on my required path to work.

But, as I proceeded through life, I thought to myself, *Was college just vocational?* Clearly, the system buried me in a tremendous amount of data. But, did it teach me or any other student how to understand reality? If so, why is there is so much disagreement in the world? The institution does present philosophy and science. But does this breakdown actually make sense? To me, the answer was an emphatic no. Thus, I proceeded on my twenty-year journey, which resulted in this book.

Let me make this clear, with this book I challenge Western thinking at the very rudimentary core. Chapter one is an analysis of those fundamentals. With an agreement on how reality is understood, chapters two through seven address many of this world's controversial issues, the very issues the academics have failed to conclude. Chapter eight is a review of their perspectives.

KEN MINTON

A chronological list of prominent Western “philosophers” is presented. Finally, chapter nine is included as a summary.

In turn, if the critics challenge my analysis, let them have at it. Some academics have already tried and failed (See chapter one for their comments). Thus, I am quite confident any reader will be hard pressed to find inconsistencies, as I found in the academic’s philosophy versus science breakdown. That said, I present – *What This World Is Really About!*

## Chapter One

### Because the Confusion Starts with the Fundamentals

As you, the reader, may have noticed, this chapter reads, “Because the Confusion starts with the Fundamentals.” But what confusion you ask? This author argues, the ubiquitous confusion that permeates modern societies because Western academic thinking is flawed at the fundamental level. But how is it flawed? If the question is posed, how is reality understood? Whether realized or not, the academic’s answer is delegated to either the scientific method or the philosophic method whereby the scientific method is supposedly testable (or predictable) while the philosophic method is not. Therefore, certain issues are scientific, and thus provable, while the remaining issues are consequently, philosophic, and thus unprovable. Unfortunately, this thinking is incorrect!

Problem one: In regards to test ability or predictability, there often exists no actual differences between some stated “scientific” issues and some stated “philosophic” issues. Let us consider a specific scientific issue. As an example, the big bang theory, is presented as scientific. But, are scientists testing the entire theory by creating a new universe? Of course, the answer is no. Modern technology is able to test only aspects of the theory. Consider the scientific theory of evolution. Is life being created at the cellular

level with the necessary allotment of time, billions of years, which allows evolution to create another human species? Clearly, the answer is no. Again, only some aspects of the theory are testable or predictable.

Now, let us consider a classic philosophic issue. Does human free will exist? Or is determinism correct? Are there any potential tests? The answer is there are numerous potential tests. For example, drop a stone here on planet earth, what will happen? The stone falls to earth. Whether realized or not, this physics-related test is an indicator to the possibility of free will. Please know every time the stone drops as predicted cause and effect is substantiated. If cause and effect is 100 percent, then what is assumed to be free will is a myth. In other words, all human choices in a complete cause and effect universe are predetermined. Consequently, there is no “room” for free will. To the contrary, quantum mechanics, which governs atomic physics, seems to support probability. And, testing is possible in this realm as well. Consequently, this so-called philosophic issue will be concluded by scientists, not philosophers. So why is this presented as a philosophic issue?

Similarly, the philosophers have something they call a priori knowledge. This is knowledge before and independent of sensory experience. In order to verify this as true, scientific testing was conducted on very young, unlearned children. But the scientific testing verifies the demarcation between philosophy and science makes no sense.

Now let us consider a “scientific” theory. Please consider Einstein’s famous general relativity theory explaining gravity. Please know that general relativity theory was published back in May of 1916 after a 1913 published Einstein-Grossmann paper. In fact, it was not until 1919 that any confirmation of the theory was substantiated with astronomical observations of light from the sun, which were found to be curved. All additional details of

## WHAT THIS WORLD IS REALLY ABOUT!

the theory remained fully untested until 1970 when hydrogen maser clocks confirmed spacetime warping as a result of earth's mass. Consequently, was Einstein's theory just philosophy for fifty years? Please, know said testing did not confirm all aspects of general relativity. It was not until 2007 that NASA's Gravity Probe B made further testing possible. In fact, Einstein's space-time continuum theory suggests space in the presence of mass creates a geodesic effect, which causes gravity, as finally tested by NASA. But, secondly, his published theory predicted a rotating mass drags along space-time causing "frame dragging." This aspect of the famous theory remains untested. Finally, please know general relativity was first published as a theory, not a hypothesis.

Now consider the nine (so far) theories regarding parallel universes. Please know these theories propagated in order to explain the known facts of our universe. In Brian Greene's book, *The Hidden Reality*, on page nine he writes, "The subject of parallel universes is highly speculative. No experiment or observation has established that any version of the idea is realized in nature" (Green, p. 9). Consequently, is the issue of parallel universes philosophy or science? Additional evidence of this confusion is also on page nine where he makes the reader aware that one of the theories has – "origination in the philosophical community." So, is that particular theory "philosophic" and the others are "scientific"? Clearly, that conclusion would make no sense. Please understand these presented examples (and there are lots more) are contradictory to the demarcation separating philosophy from science.

Problem two: A currently untestable issue may become testable with future technology as evidenced with Einstein's general relativity theory.

Problem three: Additionally, the semantics of philosophy and science are different. This leads to confusion as if two different

methods can be acceptable for understanding reality. Different methods are likely to lead to different conclusions, so this makes no sense.

Problem four: The academics' demarcation fails to separate out human like and dislike from what is correctly true about reality. Their solution – empirical versus a normative value proposition – will be presented later in this chapter.

Problem five: All evidence supports reality as an interconnected unified system. Consequently, the demarcation of philosophy versus science erroneously severs a unified system. This makes no sense.

Problem six: When there is ample related evidence a test is unnecessary to confirm a theory. For instance, if a conventional gasoline powered motor car has no fuel, will the vehicle function? Clearly, the answer is no. Therefore, a test is not always required in order to verify a theory. Consequently, would this specific issue be that of philosophy or science? Either way it would not make sense.

So, what does make sense? When analyzed, there exist three very different types or categories of issues. There are issues about reality, issues about preference, and issues about fiction. Because no controversy exists in regards to fiction, the remaining two categories of issues are the subject of this book. But what is a reality issue versus a preference issue?

A reality issue is the way reality, this all-inclusive environment, actually was, is, or can be. For example, the numbers four plus one equals five. The numbers do not equal six or seven or anything else. Likewise, a wood table is made from a tree or other plant substance. It is not made from stone, brick, or other non-plant substances. Thus, for a given reality issue, there corresponds a correct answer consistent with reality; therefore, all other answers are incorrect or inconsistent with reality. Other than

## WHAT THIS WORLD IS REALLY ABOUT!

for subjectivity, the academics confirm this with their grading of student's answers as correct or incorrect.

To the contrary, preference issues are about what we, emotional living beings, like or dislike about reality or our perception of reality. All choices and all values, those of morality and ethics, as well as music and art, fall under this category. Unlike the reality issues, no correct or incorrect answer exists with the preference issues (see chapter five for the caveat regarding right versus wrong and good versus bad). For example, some people may like or prefer the taste of cow's milk while other people may not. There is no correct answer here. Though, some may argue milk is beneficial to an individual's health, a reality issue, nevertheless, an individual may dislike the flavor, a preference issue. Without this analysis or break down of information, confusion is a certainty.

But there is additional confusion in regards to the preference issues. Often preference issues are expressed as absolute. As examples, "that girl is beautiful" or "that girl is ugly." Both are actually incorrect statements. You may like the girl's looks or you may not like the girl's looks, but there is no absolute to this or any other preference issue. That is, the girl is not actually beautiful or ugly, as those are individual preference descriptions. In contradiction, the PhD philosophy department argues "scientific" testing has verified certain absolutes to beauty because very young, uncultured, or unlearned children, unanimously responded negatively to unsymmetrical body shapes. But their thinking is faulty. Whether the programming for like versus dislike is in our genetics or in our culture, does not alter the issue from being that of preference. For instance, an alien life form could be programmed differently from us where they prefer unsymmetrical body shapes.

Other examples of preference issues are as follows: Are taxes too high? Are taxes too low? Who is the best? Who is the worst?

KEN MINTON

Should guns be legal or illegal? Should abortion be legal or illegal? Should drugs be legal or illegal? Should there be a death penalty? What is the meaning to life? These are just some examples of preference issues. And the preference issues have no correct or incorrect answer. But that conclusion doesn't make these issues insignificant. Clearly, morality and ethics play a vital role in society. Nevertheless, intellectually there is no absolute correct answer in regards to preference issues. That said, inconsistencies do occur when hypocrites attempt to promote preferences that affect others that they themselves will not accept.

With the two types of issues established, we must next establish the method for an accurate assessment. That is, how do we distinguish between what is consistent with reality, thus true, and what is not? The French philosopher Descartes attempted to get absolute knowledge certainty with his statement, "I think, therefore I am." But how did he know with absolute certainty he was not in a dream at that very moment? If so, was he actually thinking or just dreaming that he was thinking? Thus, this author would argue (as others have done) absolute certainty is a myth. Nevertheless, we can make sense of our exposure, limited by our senses, to the reality information.

Buy the B&N e-Pub version at:-

<http://www.barnesandnoble.com/w/what-this-world-is-really-about-because-the-confusion-starts-with-the-fundamentals-ken-minton/1121105714>

Buy the Kindle version at:-

<http://www.amazon.com/What-This-World-Really-About-ebook/dp/B00TTEDIT8/>