

# Proof for the Existence of Spirit People

By William Thomas Sherman

1604 N.W. 70<sup>th</sup> St.  
Seattle, Washington 98117  
206-784-1132  
[wts@gunjones.com](mailto:wts@gunjones.com) <http://www.gunjones.com>

“But the angel of the LORD called to him from heaven and said, ‘Abraham, Abraham!’ And Abraham said, ‘Here I am.’”

~~Genesis 22:11

“Fan Chi asked [Kongzi, i.e. Confucius] about wisdom. The Master said, 'Devoting yourself to transforming the values of the common people, to serving the ghosts and spirits with reverence and yet keeping them at a distance -- this might be called wisdom.'”

~~Analects VI. 6.22

## INTRODUCTION

### *A Scientific Challenge*

I believe if one stops and considers the matter, some of the most persistent, and, at the same time, pernicious *myths* there ever were are:

1. "There are no spirit people (i.e. 'gods,' devils, angels, ghosts, etc.) or else they are remote from or irrelevant to our life circumstance."
2. "Spirit people, especially such as a 'god' or an angel, necessarily represent a higher and superior kind of life form."
3. "Even if there were spirit people, and especially the powerful kind, science could never detect, track, or identify them."
4. "Tremendous or magnificent power is necessarily a sign of goodness or benevolence. Similarly, if a spirit person can 'tintillate' or cause in us feelings of religious rapture, these are an indubitable indication of their kind intentions and benevolence."
5. "Making a point to be honest and rational, even if we are talking about public affairs, is simply one among a number of options or alternatives available to us when we make important decisions and decide matters of policy. Honesty and reason then, and in most instances, are not strictly necessary in ensuring public safety or promoting public welfare."

It is in part for purposes of laying the foundation for effectively demolishing most or all of the above attitudes and assumptions, the work before you prompted. At the same time, it is, as its title and short length imply, an informal attempt to scientifically establish the existence of “spirit” people. It also serves as an introduction to the topic of spirit people, and which I have addressed at greater length in my book, *A New Treatise on Hell*. Because not everyone is prepared to go through an entire book, this brief paper serves as more convenient means for more busy people to become acquainted with the subject. By spirit people, I mean what are traditionally referred to as angels, ghosts, gods, and demons, to name some of the more familiar kinds. Simultaneously, I want to offer a tentative framework for how such spirit people can or might be understood and classified from a modern and scientific viewpoint; using such traditional nomenclatures as the above for that purpose.

For no endeavor is more important and replete with profound and wide ranging implications as our concluding that spirit people literally do exist. Indeed, such implications are so tremendous that it could be said to make my task far harder than easier, so much and many pre-established norms and assumptions will be upset or revision required should what I assert prove true. Consider, for instance (and but very briefly), how each of the following studies or areas of endeavor (in no special order) would be affected by such a conclusion (given here briefly and in no special order or sequence.)

a. *Morality and Law*

If spirit people exist then, and based on what else is known historically and elsewhere than they *could* affect people's behavior, and to some extent their culpability. If a person is actually infested with a literal "demon," is it possible that under certain circumstances this could mitigate their guilt? Further, if spirit people exist, and were involved in crime (thinking particularly of organized crime) then this would give a major power to criminal activity of which not only is law enforcement not prepared to deal with, but which they (presumably by and large) don't even know about!

b. *Government and Society*

If spirit people exist, do they interact or influence those who act in government and or who occupy positions of law making and law enforcement? And *if* so, than it is not hard to see how the integrity of various key governmental and societal institutions, particularly in a democratic state, could be compromised or seriously threatened.

c. *Religion*

If spirit people exist, do they interact or influence those who exert significant influence in the church or other religious community? Can spirit people take on the mantle of divine or heavenly authority, be received as such, and yet who are nothing more than imposters and confidence tricksters? Prior to the Massacre at Wounded Knee in Dec. 1890, for example, a spirit person ostensibly appeared to some of the Sioux, and professed to be or speak for Christ. According to what I am saying this spirit person (assuming him to have been real and not imagined by the Indians) was, and so I would maintain, such an imposter. Similarly, spirit persons who spoke to Jeanne d'Arc (or Joan of Arc), I have contended elsewhere were actual spirit people (not imagined) and also con artists or imposters. In raising this point and using these and like examples, let me make clear, that I am in no way somehow challenging honest religion. Rather, I am merely pointing out that there are certain false and deceiving spirit persons who will pretend to be or represent such, and what tragedies and or calamities have or can result.

e. *Medicine*, including psychology

Various physical, emotional, and psychological disorders and states (including dreams) can be brought about by spirit persons (see my *New Treatise* for an enumeration of some of these.)

Any one or all of these areas can or do affect other branches of endeavor, including science and education themselves, and therefore the existence of spirit people can or could pose a threat to these also.

I am a historian, philosopher, and author,<sup>1</sup> and am not a trained laboratory scientist, nor do I hold a science degree. In a sense, and certainly for some, I speak as a layman, so I make no claim based on my credentials. Instead, I have to rely here more on what facts and arguments I can provide than any ostensible authority in my person.

In what follows, I want to bring together a preliminary checklist of things which will help prove the existence of spirit people. I am very much aware of the limitations and inadequacies of myself as a scientific investigator, let alone as a formal scientific authority. Yet perhaps what I can offer is a starting point for which others, better situated and suited than myself, can take the inquiry further. My background in history, literature and philosophy are of great help because often times discussion of spirit people, or at least addressing them, has only been permitted there. I want in no way to make to seem my own claims or testimony carries any kind of special weight or authority. Rather in the true spirit of scientific investigation I want to present facts and arguments which can be independently confirmed and corroborated regardless of who proposes them. With respect to what I have to offer in the way of proof, some proof I candidly admit is more persuasive and compelling than other proof I submit.

---

<sup>1</sup> Some of my books include *Peithology: The Origin and Nature of Belief; On Form and Desire, A New Treatise on Hell; Christ and Truth; Calendar and Record of the Revolutionary War in the South: 1780-1781*, all of which can be found at my website: <http://www.angelfire.com/d20/htfh/index.html>

After going through this work, some might say there is still not sufficient proof to establish the existence of spirit persons. Even granting this, there is enough I contend at least to warrant *further* and more in depth *investigation*. Because of the limitations of my circumstances, some of what I offer can be better established by others elsewhere. I simply do not have the personnel or resources at my disposal to more fully substantiate all my claims or conclusions. This inadequacy will hopefully be excused if I can at least provide a rudimentary notion or idea that is not only reasonable and plausible, but also probable and better than likely. Such as I am submitting here might not qualify then as hard proof for some, but will, I would like to think, act or help to act as an empirically justified mandate for additional inquiry, analysis, and testing.

Here it must be understood at the outset that there are some very difficult, indeed in some cases violently difficult, obstacles to a genuinely serious inquiry into the potential existence and nature of spirit people. As I will come to address, for some individuals and groups, spirit persons have been seen as higher authorities to (ordinary) human reason and science. This might for example be said to be true of some Swedenborgians and other Christian and non-Christian denominations. Granting my premise that there are literal spirit people, if such tell or command these religious not to be open, rational, or scientific, the latter will defer to such spirit persons and not do so. Therefore if you go to them and speak on the subject they might deny or be reticent about spirit people, when in point of fact they do know of such, only the way they understand the matter, they are not supposed to discuss them. Nor is the issue merely an academic one for such religious, and your questioning could be taken by (some of) them, and whether rightly or wrongly, as something hostile and impious.

A further necessary caveat is to be rational. Some don't need to be told this. Yet it will or will not be surprising to know that others have this idea that it is possible to have an extensive knowledge and understanding of things without being rational, or without answering to reason. If you are or in any way like this, please rid yourself of this attitude, or else cease reading this immediately, as the subject of spirit people cannot be intelligently addressed without an insistence on being rational (and honest.)

Certain spirit people spend not a little part of their time literally leeching onto people and attempt to manipulate their emotions and thinking. Often times this can be done in a very vicious and arrogant way, and which is tantamount to rape. Yet some "regular," that is flesh and blood people, will accept being treated in this fashion by such malicious spirit persons, either because they don't know how to resist or fight off such abuse, or because they acquiesce to it think that's the way things are or supposed to be. If they are conscious that it is a spirit person afflicting or attempting to manipulate them they might also acquiesce because they see or have been encouraged to see that spirit person or persons as a wiser authority than themselves or other people. This can occur not only uneducated, but also highly educated people.

This problem can be all the more difficult when it is understood that some spirit people, thinking particularly of such that are conversant, are masters of manipulating and brainwashing people. Such spirit persons do not hesitate at brushing aside ordinary human judgment and understanding, including even that of professionals, as inherently inferior to that possessed by spirit people. This attitude I would point out, while is or may be true in certain respects and with respect to certain individuals, is simply often a kind of self-serving propaganda or posturing certain spirit people will adopt so that others will more readily believe everything they say or follow their commands.

Others will have had palpable and overt contact with spirit people, yet will suffer from a voluntary or involuntary kind of amnesia which makes them avoid thinking or being in denial about spirit people, and which ostensibly arises from sheer fear and terror of these people.

Last but not least, some spirit people are very much involved in crime and organized crime, indeed are, in some instances, actually heads of it. Consequently, you need to understand that attempting to tackle the subject of spirit people may cause you to run into conflict with organized crime. This is one major reason why there is and has been such a reluctance to address this topic seriously, all the more so when one is reminded that in many instances law enforcement itself will not even bother to combat, or else go very far to combat, organized crime.

## 1. What is a Spirit Person and what are we trying to prove?

In describing a spirit person, some church Fathers, such as St. Augustine, make reference to an “aerial body.” The etymological origin of the word ‘spirit’ relates the term to gas or gaseous. We are then speaking of a kind of person whose bodily substance is, for lack of a better comparison, gas-like, yet which, unlike ordinary gases, retains an essential form and cohesion, united in a (more or less) conscious or thinking personality who both acts and reacts. Herein, I will make reference to a “regular person,” in contrast to a spirit person, and meaning a flesh and blood person like ourselves.

Traditional kinds of spirit people spoken of in traditional myth, literature, and culture are:

- angels
- ghosts
- demons
- sprites, or little folk
- “gods” or purported “gods” (the word “devil” itself comes from “deva” or god)

In Chinese lore “dragons” could be considered a kind of spirit “person” manifestation. However, here we will relegate our discussion to the more usual types most people have heard about or familiar with. Some of these types may simply be two different form of what is essentially the same kind of person. For example, a given spirit person perhaps could be reasonably classified as being both a ghost and a demon, or perhaps both an angel and a ghost. Consequently these kinds of designations I am using on mostly tentative and practical grounds, and need not be taken as hard and fast or irrefutably demarcated categories or classifications.

Spirit people otherwise may be considered of two kinds: 1) those who were once “regular” people, such as in the case of a “ghost” who was at one time a regular person, and 2) spirit people who were originally and always spirit people, as is commonly believed or understood to be the case with some “angels.”

In addressing this topic one might be forced to have recourse to crude analogies and comparisons. Because we understand one thing or phenomena, yet another thing or phenomena can be understood by means of something which is like it. The two may be alike in a very close or literal way (e.g. a horse and a zebra), or else in an abstract way music which flows like a river or vice versa. In dealing with spirit people one sometimes encounters things without evident parallel, so that one might use an analogy to attempt to describe it.

We observed that at the outside, the substance which spirit people are in large part made up of has no better parallel than that of gas. And yet if we knew more about the subject, gas may actually be a very poor or comparison for such a substance. Obviously then there may be an extent to which the comparison is correct. At the same time there may be other respects in which the term is misleading and inappropriate. It is well nonetheless when the information valuable to us leaves much to be desired to allow the use of analogy when addressing the subject of spirit people, though with the clear understanding of the possible inadequacy of such comparisons if insisted on literally.

## 2. On Scientific Proof

This paper cannot be a dissertation on the scientific method, what the scientific method consists of, and what makes for valid scientific proof. Yet a few things can and should be mentioned here. For we must in some measure ask how does one prove anything? The answer is by means of criteria, or certain measures or certain tests. Both measures and tests are devised or formulated by means of rules.

Science, it could be said, is finding the best explanation for something compared to other possible explanations. To that extent a scientific theory to be valid, must be able to withstand the challenge of

alternative explanations which might potentially explain more and better, and or are comparatively less liable to error or uncertainty.

What is accepted as proof depends upon the person, and a given person may accept a scientific claim with different degrees of being convinced or not. As a practical matter, often what is accepted scientifically is simply a matter of fashion, depending on the scientific community in question. In one community value or legitimacy of a particular scientific claim may have greater weight than that same claim when viewed by another community. One community will view certain facts and reasoning as having greater weight and persuasiveness than they have with another. Cultural and political factors, for example, will make certain scientific claims more acceptable or unacceptable than they would be if those factors were not present. If for instance, people think little of lying or concealing facts which make them uncomfortable this can drastically affect whether a given scientific claim is accepted in a given community as valid or not. Such subjective biases and idiosyncrasies, and their possibility, ought very much be borne in mind when we attempt to address the question of whether or not there are spirit people.

Commonly, the best or most accepted kinds of scientific evidence or proof are:

--*Testable proof.* Someone makes a claim that such and such an event or phenomena will or can be repeated if certain circumstances are in place. So, for example, if we say go to such and such a location at four o'clock, and you will see a ghost, and we can repeat this procedure (and then see a ghost at the location), this would be testable proof which, among other conclusion we might draw, tells us that there is such a thing as a ghost. Nonetheless, as compelling as "smoking gun" evidence is, it is useless without some amount of deductive and inductive inference.

-- *Deductive and Inductive inference.* Often times in science we know something not because we see it, or whatever it is, but we deduce it based on its effects. Atoms and molecules are, for instance, not "seen." Rather their existence is deduced based on other observable and measurable phenomena. Such deduction is further scrutinized to see whether one explanation is more consistent with observable facts, testimony, and sound reasoning, than an alternative explanation. We have an established effect or effects, and we then ask now what caused or accounts for them? Deductive and inductive inference is then applied to analyze and weigh possible alternative explanations. Without such applications, mere sensation and or description of phenomena is inadequate to establish a scientific claim.

### **3. Attempting to Prove the Existence of Spirit People**

What can be collected in the way of evidence for the existence of spirit people will (I think it can be easily seen) understandably vary in its persuasiveness and weight as proof, and people will tend to view various "evidence" differently. I myself have had direct, immediate and prolonged contact with spirit people on a number of separate occasions, and need no convincing. However, others of course have not seen or had direct contact with spirit people (at least in a way such that they were aware of them), and so it is necessary for me to make my case to such people. If we cannot prove the existence of spirit people based on what follows, it is again my hope that we can at least establish their plausibility, and the feasibility and worth of a more full and in depth investigation, including approaches to the subject which are not covered here.

#### *a. Historical and Cultural Evidence*

It is possible that by looking into and exploring various traditions and beliefs in myth, literature, and religion from around the world, to find some common patterns, and evidence for such phenomena and which is independently arrived at. Take for example the notion of "ghost" itself. It would be hard to imagine a culture ancient or modern anywhere around the world which does not have some notion of a ghost and what a ghost is. How is this possible if a ghost is merely the product of psychology or the imagination? The very prevalence of the idea, suggests that there is something to it, and it would be worthwhile to collect what we can on the subject as it is found around the world and compare peoples' various different notions and conceptions of what a ghost is, and what kinds there are. How are these

notions similar? How are they unlike? While I won't do much of this here, I have made at a rudimentary attempt at such in my *New Treatise on Hell* (to which I would refer you.) To illustrate, the idea of there being an underworld, or nether region(s), is found in ancient Egypt, India, China, Greece, Persia, and Greece. The question then becomes how are these notions identical or alike? How is it possible for such diverse cultures to have seriously embraced an idea which is so completely fictitious? Either then it is fictitious or else there is an underworld in external (as opposed to imaginative) reality. It cannot be both. Yet who yet has seriously attempted to put this question to the test?

#### b. *Contemporary Evidence*

In looking to contemporary or modern culture we encounter claims for ghosts (using them for simplicity sake as representative of spirit people generally) that are oftentimes backed with very specific individuals and their testimonies, such as official police reports. There are people alive to day who we can go and speak to who claim to have seen ghosts. Now granted we know some of these claims to be hoaxes or misinterpreted phenomena. Yet is not at all clear that all are such, and it would thus again be worthwhile to collect different stories and analyze and compare them for common patterns, especially if it is possible to gather stories or accounts from around the world. The more widespread our information base, the more easy it would be (assuming for the sake of argument there are spirit people to begin with) to establish the reality of a given phenomena or occurrence on the basis of independently arrived at evidence. If we say, for example, there are *not really* any such thing as ghosts, what alternative cogent and compelling explanation can be offered can be put forth to account for people's claiming that they have seen or encountered them? To my knowledge no such specific and compelling explanation has come forward yet. Instead, based on my own experience, what we find is that those who deny the existence of ghosts say that those who say that those who believe in their existence are people who are somehow delusional. Yet if delusional, exactly when and how do such delusions arise and occur, and among people from around the world no less?

#### c. *My Personal Testimony*

It will not be surprising that much of my own conviction of and about the reality of spirit people, as well as in part my motive for proposing a serious attempt at proof them, is my own personal experience. I have seen, met, and conversed with them on many occasions, beginning in the Spring of the year 2000. Prior to that, while I had accepted the possibility of spirit people, I had only an abstract and vague notion of them. In both my *New Treatise of Hell* and "Narrative" I speak at some length about spirit people and my personal contact, and I would refer you to those writings, available for download at:

<http://www.angelfire.com/d20/htfh/index.html>

for my more in depth testimony. Here, however, I would like bring up a couple points of interest in the way of how my personal experience can be objectively confirmed.

As I make note of in my *New Treatise*, some spirit people, like any people, are sometimes fond of gossiping, and relating old stories as well. The following are a few historical anecdotes I have heard from some of them, though without venturing to give you any exact assurance as to their veracity.

\* The original Simon the Magician in some way betrayed the apostle Philip, after Philip tried to help him, and this resulted in the latter's martyrdom.

\* A Simon the Magician or ghost-sorcerer of some sort or another followed Burgoyne's army. Burgoyne knew of this (evidently had seen him) and did not want him around but could not get rid of him. During the second battle of Saratoga this ghost or someone working for was able to maneuver Gen. Simon Fraser to the position where he was felled by Timothy Murphy's rifle ball, thus in this way indirectly causing Fraser's death. The spirit person responsible for this did not want this known however so that I tell you this against his wishes (I didn't invite his story to begin with by the way so I don't feel especially bound to oblige him.)

\* George Washington was visited and bothered by spirit people shortly before he died.

\* Spirit people deceived the Union commanders at Chancellorsville, and some Union officers blame (not blamed) this interference for losing what would have been a great victory.

- \* Phil Sheridan tried locking a (full size) demon in a closet one time. What this achieved or what came of it I don't know, but I take it the story was related to me as something intended to be funny.
- \* The Unknown Soldier (buried in Arlington) did not want to be the unknown soldier, as he has a name and family like anyone else.

And there are many other similar stories I could relate.

The question I raise now then is this. Did I imagine or dream these stories or did I in fact hear them from spirit people as I claim? If the former, what could possibly account for the logic and historical consistency of narrative accompanying such a hallucination or dream? My knowledge of the battle of Chancellorsville, for example, is very meager. And yet somehow in my "dream" I have attributed a certain attitude and behavior on the part of some of the Union officers there. What psychological explanation could realistically and specifically account for such a delusion? It would be easy for someone to say I imagined all this. But if so, give me a sufficient and convincing explanation as to how such imagining is possible. I defy anyone to do so. And if I did not imagine or hallucinate these anecdotes, and unless I am lying, these stories cannot but be convincing proof that spirit people really do exist.

The same is true of other strange and peculiar phenomena I describe in both my *New Treatise* and "Narrative." If what I recount there is not true as I relate it, I challenge anyone to provide a cogent and plausible alternative explanation(s).

Other sorts of evidence I would submit as proof of spirit people are as follows:

- \* Attempt to discuss spirit people seriously with educated people and see what kinds of reactions you get. What I can now tell you will most likely encounter is a summary dismissal, if not overt ridicule and hostility of the idea, and devoid of impartial and thoughtful reasoning.

- \* Try joining my "Spirit People and Science" (Yahoo) discussion group. See if it is even possible to do this. While I won't insist here that if you attempt to sign up and are then prevented or denied doing so that this is incontrovertible proof of anything, I would nevertheless suggest that the cause is related to certain regular people who are determined to prevent serious discussion of the subject. Similarly, and if it is possible for you, try coming to visit me at my home at 1604 N.W. 70<sup>th</sup> St., Seattle (Ballard), Washington. Despite innumerable appeals via e-mail, the internet, and phone, for people to do so, and for a number of years now, only one person, a police officer, has come to my house to hear or become acquainted with my story and claim. One would think that making known a purported haunted house would have been enough to have attracted some people out of curiosity. But again, and for a number of years now, not a single person, aside from the aforementioned police officer, has come to look into my situation or claims.

#### **4. Evilology, or the Science of Understanding Evil**

Another way of approaching the issue for and against the existence of spirit people is the question of evil. Put another way, can studying Evil (as in, for example, willful and unjust maliciousness of an extreme character), be a way of establishing the existence of spirit people? From whence does excessive and unnatural hatred, cruelty, and belligerence spring? Can the *effect*, in this case "Evil," be traced to an ultimate *cause*, and could spirit people be that cause? To be blunt, and allowing for some relatively small technical qualification or slight modification, I certainly do believe this to be the case. Yet since what follows is written more in the way of theorization and philosophical speculation, I hesitate to offer it as proof of spirit people as such. What instead I intend to do is to suggest or argue that if we attempt to account for why "Evil" or extreme evil (as in deliberate maliciousness and cruelty, for example) exist, spirit people is the best explanation possible. In what follows, some will perhaps understandably take exception to my assuming spirit people, while attempting to prove their existence. My excuse for this is to present a possible hypothesis that will best account for evil and why it exists, and in order to do this I find it worthwhile to offer a theoretical scenario that can then *afterward* be considered, accepted, or rejected as an explanation that applies in reality, whether as an explanation of Evil and or as additional proof of the existence of spirit people.

In *Paradise Lost*, Milton uses the figures of Satan and Death (joined by Sin), as the ultimate manifestations of evil. Going by these figures of personifications we might say that the purpose of evil is to control and or destroy. As control or destruction, of themselves, are not always thought of as evil and unnatural, when we speak of evil, we mean control and destruction that is peculiarly unjust and extreme. Though we might fine tune the argument to ask “are not all attempts at control evil,” or “is not all destruction evil,” here, for practical purposes, I simply mean evil as in an atrocity, a massacre, torture, or other vicious and heinous crime. Granted we might speak at length as to what constitutes evil. Yet, for brevity’s sake, we will assume that by evil we mean the most extreme kinds of crimes, using “Evil,” that is with a capital “E,” to denote this sense of the term.

When we hear or read stories about some horrible murder the typical interpretation is "well, this person (who did it) must be crazy." Perhaps in a given instance this view might be refined by pointing to some physiological or chemical malfunction. Some times an explanation is attempt by making reference to a dark side or that man has a dark side.

Yet darkness of itself does not seem to be necessarily either bad or good. Rather it becomes bad when it becomes a place for evil to conceal itself. Speaking of darkness then as a metaphor for evil, it can and has been likened to disorder and chaos. With respect to a chemical or physiological malfunction it is easy to see how these can be taken as some form of disorder or breaking up of order. Time and chance are often pointed to as the cause of something breaking down, but are these real or merely accidental (or else apparent) causes? Yet what is breaking up this order, chance circumstance or deliberate intention? It is true we could speak of an occurrence of real evil (in its effects) as being the result of folly or negligence. But such would, I think, be the exception rather than the rule as the more usual and predictable incipient cause of actual Evil. If we grant that there are spirit people, and such with bad or criminal intentions toward us, does it not seem to be the case that this best explains why there should be violent and malevolent disorder? Where else further could disorder be more specifically traced to?

Now natural breaking down of order, to use a few obvious examples, we see take place in geographical-scale convulsions such as a volcano, typhoon, or earthquake. With water there can be said to be an inherent and regular breaking up in as much as their molecules move and shift so easily, likewise light and fire. With things of geological nature movement is also always present, yet such usually occurs more slowly and gradually.

When life is broken up it is either to replace something wearing out (and what is wearing it out?), or by another life breaking it up, say to eat it. Now truly Evil-causing spirit people could be seen as an all consuming and or enslaving force. Yet life for such is often so very different than it is for the rest of us, even other spirit people. They seem to draw their view and strength of life from an order which is quite distinct from natural life, yet with connections to our own which permits them to invade our midst.

If this order of theirs is not natural, on what might it be based? Conjecturally speaking, it seems to spring from an evidently ancient way of thinking which sees destruction as the superior state of things. Why take such a position? Is it not contradictory?

Perhaps their response would be to say that if one were the greatest destroyer one would be the greatest person in the universe, or at worst second. On these grounds then they then understandably seek, by means of fear, bribery, and or deception, to get others to aid them. Of course we commonly find collaborators with the exponent of such a view to deny that there really is a dark side, except in story and pop culture. This I personally take as being done to avoid their or its being scientifically examined in order that they or it may be that much more free from attack.

Evil (as in willful maliciousness) requires Good, but not vice versa. Therefore it is false to say Evil is a necessary or complementary opposite to Good. Now some might think this is merely an academic point. Yet there are some people in this world who do think Evil is necessary adjunct of Good, and that the latter somehow could not exist without the former. Moreover, others not bothering to reflect on this, are mentally manipulated into adopting such a belief, with some sometimes horrendous or even fatal consequences. If science is going to effectively study and examine evil, one of the very important points it

is going to have to address is how more ordinary and ostensibly respectable people are got to agree with or go along with it. One reason for their doing so is unthinkingly accepting the (contradictory) idea that "evil" is somehow a necessary or positive good. Such a belief, I maintain, has its origin with certain spirit people.

One possible symptom of such a sickness, paradoxically, is that the person denies that Evil even exists. Further more, says this way of thinking, if you do not pay tribute to Evil, you will not be able to live your life. For this reason, many people pay tribute to Evil, and see it both as a high authority and the ordinary course of things, perhaps even give up their own child in sacrifice to some monster. This then is why real Evil occurs.

Chrysippus, the Greek philosopher of the 3rd century B.C., tells us that nothing is bad per se, only how it is used makes it so. Yet while this is or may be true of just about anyone and anything, logically, this cannot be true of Evil itself. We should add here then that it makes no sense to speak of Evil being a good or a potential good just like anything else in the sense Chrysippus means. We have that much less reason therefore to accept the aforementioned way of "thinking" -- at least if we are rational, of course.

Going on what I have written about spirit people elsewhere, thinking especially of my *New Treatise on Hell*, if we assume there are spirit people, does this not best account for the occurrence of Evil? And if this is incorrect, what alternative theory is available that is superior to it that is more rationally coherent and more consistent with the facts? That Evil, and again I mean very powerful and extreme evil, exists and has and does occur is undeniable. What is hitherto been lacking in scientific understanding is an explanation from whence it arises. The assumption of spirit people best allows for such. In establishing that spirit people exist, we can best explain Evil, and on that best attempt a cure and remedy for it.

If we were to ask the question, "how does one acquire good" we might come up with the following:

- a. By receiving it as a gift (e.g. God and Nature's gift)
- b. By working for it (this would possibly include asking others for it, or also freely giving good, i.e. generously and without condition, as a means of obtaining good)
- c. By stealing it or otherwise acquiring it illicitly

If one were to increase the amount of good they could obtain, b. and c. would seem the only alternatives. Certain religious can get an infinite amount of good out of what God has already given. But leaving this question and this sort of person aside, most will either work or steal what's good in order to increase what they have of it. This is true of societies as well as individuals, and some societies might in fact place a greater importance on stealing good than working for it. Some who work for good will consider stealing to include taking unfair advantage of animals and the environment. Others will not, and will not think taking advantage of animals or the environment stealing.

Now one thing to observe about the stealing sort of person or stealing community is that there are some real monsters in this world when it comes to stealing or obtaining good (or goods) illicitly. And a certain custom or mentality is adopted in some realms where the one who steals the most, gets the most good. One of many drawbacks one might mention about such is that this could make the worst, most hateful criminal the most wealthy person. As a result the most stinking and odious person could be the one who ends up possessing the most good in such an order, and possibly as a result, the power of governing itself. Hence some will think that work is the best way to obtain the most good, otherwise, even if we somehow obtain more good doing things the other way, our evils will increase dramatically as well, thus making the possession of more good nugatory, or worse, self-defeating.

In consequence of this, Evil can be made to seem as a justified, or for some even necessary, way of acquiring good. While there is nothing in this viewpoint that *requires* (as such) that spirit people be invoked to account for it, nonetheless I raise this point to suggest to you that including spirit people in the explication of it makes that explication most consistent with the facts.

~\*~

In closing this brief survey and introduction, I would once again refer you to my other writings at my website at <http://www.angelfire.com/d20/htfh/index.html> and, as well, appeal to people to come personally to my home at 1604 NW 70<sup>th</sup> St., Seattle (Ballard), Washington to see me. Based on my experience of the past number of years, if you only try writing or calling me there is a very great possibility that I won't receive your call or message. Moreover, there is even a possibility that you might get a reply or response from someone other than myself pretending to be me. Though I know this sounds very strange, I know this to have happened before. In a number of instances I have had e-mail bounced back to me which I never even sent! So please do understand then there are persons very interested in seeing me discredited even to the point of out and out violence. But then if what I claim *is* true, then this should perhaps come as no surprise. In any case, judge and test for yourself, and try coming personally to see me to discuss all this. I only ask that you be rational, honest, and sincere in your doing so.

#### *ADDENDA*

The physicality for spirit people can be described or characterized this way. Imagine a jar filled with paint. Now what most spirit people, if not necessarily all (since some are very weak and or tiny), can or could do is put their finger in that jar and then make a mark on a wall with the paint. In the case of certain others, much more than this; including writing or depicting a figure is possible -- depending on how much energy they have available to them or at their disposal, either of themselves and or from someone else. In this sense, spirit persons such as we think of when we speak of ghosts, angels, or devils consist of a palpable and physically measurable composition and being; which, as best we can tell, largely partakes of a gaseous like substance, yet a gaseous like substance than is honed in such a way to give it a potentially remarkable force and effect on other physical bodies -- again depending on the amount of energy with which it is infused.