



God's Debris: A Thought Experiment

Scott Adams

Download now

Read Online →

God's Debris: A Thought Experiment

Scott Adams

God's Debris: A Thought Experiment Scott Adams

God's Debris is the first non-humor book by best-selling author Scott Adams. Adams describes *God's Debris* as a thought experiment wrapped in a story. It's designed to make your brain spin around inside your skull. Imagine that you meet a very old man who you eventually realize knows literally everything. Imagine that he explains for you the great mysteries of life: quantum physics, evolution, God, gravity, light psychic phenomenon, and probability in a way so simple, so novel, and so compelling that it all fits together and makes perfect sense. What does it feel like to suddenly understand everything? You may not find the final answer to the big question, but *God's Debris* might provide the most compelling vision of reality you will ever read. The thought experiment is this: Try to figure out what's wrong with the old man's explanation of reality. Share the book with your smart friends, then discuss it later while enjoying a beverage.

God's Debris: A Thought Experiment Details

Date : Published September 7th 2004 by Andrews McMeel Publishing (first published September 15th 2001)

ISBN : 9780740747878

Author : Scott Adams

Format : Paperback 132 pages

Genre : Philosophy, Fiction, Religion, Spirituality

 [Download God's Debris: A Thought Experiment ...pdf](#)

 [Read Online God's Debris: A Thought Experiment ...pdf](#)

Download and Read Free Online God's Debris: A Thought Experiment Scott Adams

From Reader Review God's Debris: A Thought Experiment for online ebook

Kassi says

Scott Adams' introduction promises a lot and I was really looking forward to reading a book that lived up to the expectations that the introduction suggested. Unfortunately I found myself really let down with another book that reads a lot like any religious-type philosophy based on quantum physics. It's just a tired subject and it doesn't matter to this reader what came first, but with *The Secret*, *What the Bleep do we know?*, *Waking life* and any other "yeah, mans" movies and publications, I'm all burnt out. What this book will give you is a conversation between two people (which really is a conversation that reads as if it is really just one person's diatribe) that *might* make you think a bit. The logic that this book presents does not follow even the basic formulas of logic and thus has way too many holes. In fact, there are rare facts stated in the book. Instead, the author presents various opinions citing scientific explanations that are weak enough to see through but strong enough to miss if the reader isn't looking for it.

What this book did offer is some unique ideas and creative ideas based on logical (though faulty) ideas. And for the creativity and risk it took to even attempt to write a book like this one, that's why I give it a 2 rather than a 1.

I think many people will find meaning in this book. And many people will recognize it among a series of media available that presents things in this way and will pass it up just based on the fact that they've heard it many times before and have found for themselves what works and what doesn't in their own authentic lives. I think that questioning one's reality, looking for the truth, analyzing and such are very important parts of being human and I think these activities should be encouraged. But I would like to see a new way of looking at the world rather than this idea that seems to be on repeat for the past decade (and more, possibly starting with *The Celestine Prophecy*).

The typical college aged pseudo-intellectual preaching at me with half-truths to present "logical" explanations for things that don't exist on a logic plane isn't the kind of person that I want to hang out with anymore because I've grown out of the questioning stage in my life - **on that level**. And believe me, it's not that I don't get what is being said nor that I don't accept some of it as true; I do. I just no longer think that any of this "wisdom" is special or known only by the truly enlightened. I just, you know, *know*, you know?

Babs says

"This book promises big things.

""I should tell you how great it is. It's great. Really great. Honestly. Really, really great."" says one (unnamed) review on the back cover, while another (also unnamed) one claims ""I don't think I've ever read a book that was anywhere as thought provoking as God's Debris"". Meanwhile the author gets in on the act of hyping up his own work starting with his recommended reading age ""... the ideas expressed by the characters are inappropriate for young minds"", he claims. ""People under the age of fourteen should not read it.. He further goes on to claim that the target audience for the book are ""... people who enjoy having their brains spun round inside their skulls"" and how the book introduces a whole host of ""new ideas"" and ""untraditional views"".

To put it politely - it's all a load of codswallop. This book is truly awful.

The author claims there is some debate as to whether the book sits in the "fiction" or "non-fiction" camp. In fact, he actually further claims there is no publishing category into which his book sits. I have no such qualms about labelling this. It's fiction. Sub-section - bad.

I am a scientist. I work with computers. I have an honours degree in psychology. I studied biology extensively throughout university, and am widely read in popular science. I am not, however, a philosopher nor a physicist. The parts of this book that touch on biology, psychology or artificial intelligence of any sort, I disagree with. I can therefore only assume that the relevant philosophical and physical books are similarly ill-researched, but can't know this for sure.

This book reads like a bad "Tuesdays with Morrie". Mitch Albom's book was a delight to read. It introduced philosophical concepts to the readers via a wonderful blooming (or re-blooming) relationship between an ex-pupil and his mentor. It was thoughtfully written, used beautiful language, and swept the reader up into a number of concepts which require further contemplation. This book achieved none of these things.

The two protagonists are introduced to each other through the relationship of parcel delivery man and parcel addressee. Yet the reader is to assume they have this deep and meaningful discussion over a number of days (certainly, my postman or FedEx deliveryman has never been quite so forthcoming, but maybe that's just my bad luck or a result budget cuts in the Royal Mail). The book is badly written, divided into a number of chapters which only serve to interrupt the flow of conversation, and distract the reader. For a book which attempts to explain such concepts as the origins of the universe, quantum physics, and electromagnetic theory, the use of words such as "formulas" (formulae) and phrases such as "...yanking my chain" are just grating to the reader. No concept is examined in detail, while a number are glossed over with unsatisfactory and incorrect philosophising. Anyone who wanted to read this with a view to learning something new in their scientific education, or as use as a starting point for a discussion of the issues, would be left sorely lacking.

The chapter entitled "Evolution" alone almost had me throwing the book across the room in disgust. The analogy made with the plates and cutlery, although bad, would have some merit if it had been properly described. The fact that he doesn't even try to describe the evolution of crockery just makes his example so bad it's almost painful to read. He dismisses such suggestions of forks evolving from spoons, or pots evolving from bowls. However, how did early man move from primitive tools (albeit 2nd generation tools) such as spoons and bowls without evolution of a nature? If he's going to use this (very very bad) analogy, he should at least have the decency to do it properly.

He then goes on with the following ...

""Does it strike you as odd that there isn't more evidence today of the mutations that drive evolution?" he asked.

""Like what?""

""Shouldn't we be seeing in today's living creatures the preview of the next million years of evolution? Where are the two-headed humans who will become overlords of the one-headed people, the fish with unidentified organs that will evolve to something useful over the next million years, the cats who are developing gills? We see some evidence of mutations today, but mostly trivial ones, not the sort of radical ones there must have been in the past, the sort that became precursors of brains, eyes, wings and internal organs""

(pp.69-70)

I could actually excerpt more from this chapter to discuss, but I'd probably just end up retyping the whole of it here.

For a start we are seeing evidence of evolution taking place on current species. For one, humans are evolving and it is now seen that some hand bones are fusing together, providing no disadvantage to those affected. Evolution is random, and it is only those mutations that confer an advantage on the individual that are selected upon. Any neutral or negative mutation is not selected upon and does not continue in the gene pool. I am therefore at a loss to try and work out why such things as "two-headed humans" would become overlords of the "one-headed people", why fish are evolving into anything else whatsoever just because aquatic creatures did so in the past, and why cats would need gills, as any cat owner will tell you, cats just abhor water.

The whole thought also that the mutations that produced "... brains, eyes, wings and internal organs" were large, cataclysmic mutations also shows a VAST misunderstanding in the whole theory of evolution. How people can think that a creature was suddenly born with a fully functioning eye, brain or lung, is just unbelievable. Such things came about by very very small differences that conferred an advantage on the beholder so that they were passed down the genetic line. The tiniest of light-sensitive spots enabling the evasion of a predator for instance, which went on to have another small mutation, and another, and another, and another, for a million times or more, before it resembled anything close to a basic functioning eye. They didn't suddenly appear, fully developed and functioning, out of nowhere.

The author also fails to discuss the impact of humans on the current state of evolution. If there were to be a mutation like he seems to want - for two-headed humans, for instance - don't you think that the world's best doctors would be all over the "patient" before they'd reached their first birthday? Such anomalies would be operated away before you could even discuss what was happening. In the natural kingdom humans are routinely artificially mutating animals and plants for our own "benefits", while we're destroying natural habitats at such a rate we're killing the creature who live there. How are we to know how the dodo may have evolved, or how pandas or tigers may evolve, when we're doing our level best to manually make them extinct as quickly as we possibly can? There is no such thing as "natural selection" any more because humans seem intent on removing everything "natural" from this world.

I gave this book a score of 1, partly because there isn't a 0 score, but also it has been beneficial to me in one way. It's spurred me on to start reading some proper scientific books again. May I suggest any other readers who think this is a wonderful book start hunting out some Matt Ridley, Simon Singh, Richard Dawkins, Richard Fortey or David Attenborough for a start. These will provide you with much more interesting material, that will be a much better use of time spent, and which will be much more enjoyable to discuss with that "smart friend ... while enjoying a tasty beverage" as the author suggested.

Scott Adams. Stick to drawing cartoons."

Sean says

Adams also writes the comic strip Dilbert, but this book is completely different. i thought this was a good read and i'd recommend it to others; however, i'd be careful to only recommend it to folks who are not too religious as this book might not be enjoyable to these individuals.

Siddharth says

I found 'God's Debris' an extremely tedious read. Not only is it riddled with factual inaccuracies and logical flaws but it's not thought-provoking (as Scotty advertises in the admittedly intriguing introduction) by any

standards. Mr. Adams challenges the reader to identify said inaccuracies as part of the "fun". Sadly, it isn't fun, just infuriating. I mean, who really wants to go through a book saying "oh, that's wrong" or "yep, that's right". Anyone with a reasonable amount of knowledge of mathematics, science or philosophy would be appalled to see the dismissive treatment meted out to these subjects.

Some sections of 'God's Debris' are downright ridiculous; the one about the Five Levels comes to mind. Is Adams trying to create a cult or something? The further I read the book, the more disinterested I became. Thankfully, it is a swift read. This and the fact that I paid no money for it (the e-book can be downloaded for free) are the only redeeming qualities I can see. Scott Adams is a bright guy and a talented comic writer but I don't know what he was thinking while writing this. A thought experiment it may be; it's just not a good one.

Paul says

Imagine a 132 page modern day Socratic dialogue between a package delivery man and an old man in a comfy chair. And... this comes from the creator of "Dilbert".

The premise is something out of Tipler's "The Physics of Immortality" -- the idea that because of probability, one day, we will all be "redone" by a very powerful computer -- with a little bit of Leibniz' monadology thrown in; and while neither are mentioned by name, very similar ideas are brought up in this very interesting answer and question exchange between a level 4 'rational' being (the delivery guy in the wrong job?) and a [top] level 5 "Avatar" (the sage old man) who, while not possessing all the answers, provides 'advice' to the prospective level 4 graduate. Without ruining the book, I can confidently explain the title's genesis: God used to exist as a whole. He set things in motion and then he exploded and everything in the universe is his debris. As we 'advance' it is God re-assembling. How we use our 'free will' governs how well and quickly we reassemble.

The subtitle of the book is "A Thought Experiment" and it certainly makes one think. It's a book that makes you say "yeah" on a lot of the pages as you nod in agreement with things that "I thought of that before" but never wrote down or told anyone about. It is a vision of a possibility of an alternative religion, that in these days, makes about as much sense as any does. But Adams doesn't play favourites. He sets up arguments and then rips them apart. He presents all sides of many theories and debunks or confirms without real prejudice.

Overall, this book is a breeze to read and should be done so in one sitting as it flows continuously. There are funny parts, there are very poignant parts. There are parts that sound as looney as "The Celestine Prophecy" and there are parts that sound like they were written by M.Scott Peck or maybe even Dr. Phil. There are still other parts that sound like Plato himself. It's karmic, ironic, circular, tutelar, satirical, informative and enjoyable. The ending made me think it especially appropriate for the Easter Holiday. Not in a sense of the especially Christian religious significance, but of the metaphorical significance of the story of Easter (and I'm not talking about Bunnies this time). In a way, I think Adams, in setting out to be especially secular has actually woven a whole lot more religion in than he intended. Or maybe I'm just a level '2'er who doesn't quite get it yet.

1invisiblegrl says

This is available as a free pdf file- just google it. It's short enough to read in a few hours. I loved every bit of it.

Jonathan Maas says

A Thought Experiment That Yields Very Real Insights

God's Debris: A Thought Experiment begins with a supposition - one that claims no authority of truth, and therein lies its power.

I won't spoil it for you - but it's one of these *Let's just say that this happened* type of concepts, that takes a thought premise and sees where it leads.

And it yields quite a bit of insight. Scott Adams takes big questions - why are we here, and how do humans see the universe - and answers them through a fictional dialogue between two characters.

It's great, and quite reminiscent of Ishmael: An Adventure of the Mind and Spirit.

Call it Ishmael, but instead of asking questions about human society, it asks questions about human perception in the universe, and the universe itself.

It's ultimate authority comes from the fact that it claims no authority. Adams is answering questions that might not have answers, at least not ones understandable by us. So instead of giving direct answers, he is proposing models of thought, and letting the reader come to their own conclusions.

In any case it's great - and here is a lists of insights -

On the human mind as a delusion generator

The human brain is a delusion generator. The delusions are fueled by arrogance—the arrogance that humans are the center of the world, that we alone are endowed with the magical properties of souls and morality and free will and love. We presume that an omnipotent God has a unique interest in our progress and activities while providing all the rest of creation for our playground. We believe that God—because he thinks the same way we do—must be more interested in our lives than in the rocks and trees and plants and animals.

On the motivation of biological creatures

Everything that motivates living creatures is based on some weakness or flaw. Hunger motivates animals. Lust motivates animals. Fear and pain motivate animals. A God would have none of those impulses. Humans are driven by all of our animal passions plus loftier-sounding things like self-actualization and creativity and freedom and love. But God would care nothing for those things, or if he cared would already have them in unlimited quantities. None of them would be motivating.

On probability being one of the driving forces of the universe

Probability is omnipotent and omnipresent. It influences every coin at any time in any place, instantly. It cannot be shielded or altered. We might see randomness in the outcome of an individual coin toss, but as the number of tosses increases, probability has firm control of the outcome. And probability is not limited to coins and dice and slot machines. Probability is the guiding force of everything in the universe, living or nonliving, near or far, big or small, now or anytime.

On the future relationship between religion and science

Our language and our minds are too limited to deal with anything but a fixed reality, regardless of whether such a thing exists. The best we can do is to update our delusions to fit the times. We live in an increasingly rational, science-based society. The religious metaphors of the past are no longer comforting. Science is whittling at them from every side. Humanity needs a metaphor that allows God and science to coexist, at least in our minds, for the next thousand years.

On the possibly finite size of the universe

I thought the universe was infinitely large," I replied. "Most scientists agree that the universe is big, but finite." "That doesn't make sense. What if I took a rocket to the edge of the universe, then I kept going. Couldn't I keep going forever? Where would I be if not in the universe?" "You are always part of the universe, by definition. So when your rocket goes beyond the current boundary, the boundary moves with you. You become the outer edge for that direction. But the universe is still a specific size, not infinite.

On the idea that observation brings things into reality

Yeah, I guess so. But let's get back to the subject," I said. "How do you explain Zeno's Paradox?" "Imagine that everything in existence disappears and then reappears. How much time expires while everything is gone?" "How should I know? You're the one making up the example. How much?" "No time passes. It can't because time is a human concept of how things change compared to other things. If everything in the universe disappears, nothing exists to change compared to other things, so there is no time." "What if everything disappears except for me and my wristwatch?" I asked. "Then you would experience the passing of time in relation to yourself and to your watch. And when the rest of the universe reappeared you could check on how much time had passed according to your watch. But the people in the rest of the universe would have experienced no time while they were gone. To them, you instantly aged. Their time and your time were not the same because you experienced change and they did not. There is no universal time clock; time differs for every observer.

On the problem with skeptics

I have some friends who are skeptics,” I said. “They’re in that Skeptics Society. I think they’d tear you apart.” “Skeptics,” he said, “suffer from the skeptics’ disease—the problem of being right too often.” “How’s that bad?” I asked. “If you are proven to be right a hundred times in a row, no amount of evidence will convince you that you are mistaken in the hundred-and-first case.

On probability inevitably bringing the illusion of magic

Luck conforms to normal probability curves. Most people will have average luck and some people will experience extra good luck or extra bad luck. A handful will have good luck so extraordinary that it will be indistinguishable from magic. The rules of probability guarantee that such people exist.

On ESP having some validity, or rather some reality

When anything physical moves, it has a gravitational impact on every other object in the universe, instantly and across any distance. That impact is fantastically small, but it is real. When you have a thought, it is coupled with a physical change in your mind that is specific to that thought, and it has an instant gravitational ripple effect throughout the entire universe. “Can people decode these fantastically weak signals, mixed with an unbelievably large amount of other gravitational noise? No. But the signals are there.

On all of us living in different realities

It is literally true that no two people share the same reality. Einstein proved that reality is not one fixed state.

Conclusion

In short, I fully recommend this book. It makes you think, it makes you question your assumptions, and in the best way possible.

Check it out! It might just open your eyes to the world around you!

Paul says

In *God's Debris*, *Dilbert* creator Scott Adams tries his hand at philosophy and lets the reader know right from the introduction what to expect. Adams makes no pretense of this being a great work of literature and admits that the story is little more than a framing narrative for the ideas that he wants to discuss. Although his introduction may seem defensive, as if to pre-empt criticism or make excuses, knowing what to expect with this book was far preferable than the disappointment I felt with *The Final Summit*.

As someone who agrees with most of what was said, this book, which reflects a pandeistic outlook on the nature of God and the universe, had a “preaching to the choir” vibe and I had few issues with anything in the first three quarters. One early part that stood out, however, was the claim that “religious people are happier, they live longer, have fewer accidents, and stay out of trouble compared to nonreligious people”. I wondered if this was backed by an actual study or statistics, or just something that Adams made up because it seemed true and fit his argument. Also, is “religious” intended to mean people who follow organized religions, or does it include people who would consider themselves spiritual, without necessarily following a particular faith (like a deist)? It may seem like a petty complaint, but it sticks out as an unclear passage with a questionable conclusion in a discussion that is otherwise easy to understand and makes an effort to “prove” its conjectures.

I also disagreed with the way in which he presented the advice “be yourself” as a dichotomy: “If it means to do what you think you ought to do, then you’re doing that already. If it means to act like you’re exempt from society’s influence, then that’s the worst advice in the world”. First of all, just because one might believe they are exempt from society’s influence does not mean that they “would probably stop bathing and wearing clothes”. Being exempt from society’s influence could just mean approaching its norms critically (rather than always doing the opposite of everything it says). Furthermore, I have always took “be yourself” to mean that one should reflect on their desires and actions and make certain that they are doing it because it makes *them* happy, not someone else. This does not affect the point he makes in this chapter, but it does highlight how certain ideas are glossed over. Furthermore, framing concepts as dichotomies to advance a point is a recurring problem in this work.

The above, however, is also an excellent example of what is great about this book: it gets your mind going and it has plenty of material to discuss. I did find, however, that it began to weaken near the end. For example, he writes off evil as “any action that might damage people”, but does not seem to realize that *any* action might damage people. Philosophers have devoted their entire canon to disproving the existence of evil; it might be argued, for example, that we cannot judge whether an action is good or evil because we can never experience every consequence of every consequence *ad infinitum* of our actions. For a book that defines God as probability (and debris), wouldn’t it have made more sense to suggest that evil is “any action whose results have a high probability of damaging people”, and then maybe throw in a discussion about the perpetrator’s intentions? And what if it damages some people, but helps many more? Or the same amount? Or damages many people emotionally, but saves half a dozen lives? In any case, for a book like this to say what it does and then reaffirm the “good vs. evil” dichotomy without much critical thought was disappointing.

I also thought his analysis of “worshipping” God by obeying the laws of probability and increasing your chances of living was poorly fleshed out. Even setting aside the fact that his examples are overly simplistic and that the slippery slope of such philosophy might be spending all your time calculating how to best increase your chances of living, it is problematic. For example, because car accidents are more frequent than accidents that happen to people when they are walking, one should never drive anywhere if their primary objective is to increase their chances of living, even if that made their life incredibly inconvenient or unhappy. If that is too extreme, then who determines what the appropriate level of “increasing your chances of living” is?

On the whole, however, *God's Debris* keeps itself together enough to make for a worthwhile read. This book is probably not going to change anyone's life, as there is just too much to absorb and much of it is not developed enough to be easily retained, but I do not feel that that was Adams' intention in writing this. After all, there can only be one "Avatar" at a time, so the idea is not to live your life like the old man. Instead, I feel that this is a book full of ideas that one can use as a jumping off point to start a conversation, or maybe just get their mind going and thinking in a new way. Overall, this is not only a quick read (at 132 pages), but can also be acquired for free from the publisher as a PDF. Thus there is no reason I can think of not to read it; maybe it is not everyone's "thing", but I believe that, if one takes their time and reads it slowly, with an open mind, then almost anyone can find at least something in this book to make it worth reading.

Hannah says

I think the whole thing was one huge LSD trip. Think about it. It makes sense.

But it all seriousness: pretentious BS. I was willing to accept some of the ideas and tolerate others until the whole levels of awareness thing. Scott Adams made that crap up. I mean, seriously? You expect people to read this and think that it will change the way they see the world? How full of yourself are you?

There were a few basic ideas in this book that made sense to me, and even some that I agreed with. Yes, it did make me think. Yes, some classic thought experiments like the ship of Theseus and the allegory of the cave were addressed. But the majority of it didn't make sense in any context. The ideas that probability controls the world and that God destroyed himself just for kicks and giggles are ridiculous and do not make sense to me. You can't consider the world and humanity as one giant delusion, all governed by probability. According to the logic of the book, you cannot escape God's will and you are basically a puppet. However, the old man clearly believes that he has escaped and that he is above it all. Yes, the old man is fictional, but Adams obviously believes that he has created a masterpiece of thought and philosophy that will single-handedly influence the worldview of every intelligent person who comes into contact with it. There's a delusion for you. God, I just hate pretentious drivel like this. Fifth-level awareness? I can't get over it; seriously, what the hell is that? The construct of the story is absolutely ridiculous. The old dude, the young guy who can't get laid, and the LEVELS OF AWARENESS, man.

The problem with the old man's explanation of reality that we are meant to find is that it's a complete load of bullcrap. And I seriously doubt that that's what Scott Adams was going for. Guess I'm not smart enough or thirsty enough to appreciate and discuss this book over a beverage. Oh well. Get over yourself.

Ben Babcock says

Scott Adams is an interesting figure. I'm an unabashed *Dilbert* fan; I have the massive, slipcase-clad twentieth anniversary book, and I particularly love the short-lived TV series. I don't regularly read the comic anymore, because I feel like it's a little stale these days. Likewise, I used to read Adams' blog, until I got tired of his persistent troll-baiting (not to mention his other antics). But I put *God's Debris* on my to-read list four years ago, and now I'm finally getting around to reading it. The setting, content, and style are almost as far from *Dilbert* as it's possible to get—though, interestingly enough, many of the themes and philosophical questions have appeared in the comics over the years.

Whether you like *God's Debris* probably depends on the amount of patience you have for long-winded hypotheticals. As Adams warns in the preface, you need a sense of humour. He also mentions the difficulty

the book poses when it comes to classifying it as fiction or non-fiction. This is essentially a Socratic dialogue for the twenty-first century. It's fiction, in that the two characters are fictional, as is the situation he uses to frame the discussion. At its heart, however, *God's Debris* is a philosophical dialogue, with Avatar posing questions and delivering short lessons that help the delivery man up toward a higher state of being.

Each chapter moves smoothly and naturally into the next, the conversation focusing mostly on the nature of the universe, the purpose of life, and humanity's own role in all of this. As the title suggests, the existence and characteristics of God is central the discussion. I won't spoil the full thesis, but Avatar essentially points out that the anthropomorphic nature of the Biblical God is why we run into snags like the Problem of Evil or the Omnipotence Paradox. It's a mistake to assume God has motives and desires that we can comprehend in human terms. And so, if one starts from the premise that God is omnipotent and knows everything exist its own future, Avatar posits a chain of events that explains why the universe exists and what humanity's role is in that existence.

Socratic dialogues have fallen somewhat out of favour in this millennium. Actual novels, with the philosophy left in the subtext, tend to work better. Even *Sophie's World*, which itself is a dialogue that educates the reader about the major phases of Western philosophy, had a captivating plot. *God's Debris* lacks this; the characters literally exist only as mouthpieces for Adams' philosophical ruminations. It's not nearly as satisfying as a full novel would be. And the reason for that all comes down to layers.

If a novel (or any fictional form) is well-written, then I can still be entertained even if the philosophy goes over my head (or, as in the case of certain *Sword of Truth* novels, the philosophy is contrary to my own personal leanings). Furthermore, the narrative offers its own ways to access and metabolize the philosophy—for example, the characters must confront moral dilemmas, and by experiencing those dilemmas through them, we wrestle with philosophical questions ourselves. By unearthing the philosophy and putting it front and centre, *God's Debris* robs the reader of the chance to tease that philosophy out of a fictional situation. Finally, having a plot to fall back on means that if I don't find the philosophy appealing or challenging enough, then I can still manage to enjoy the book.

The nature of God and the universe is pretty heavy stuff, but nothing in *God's Debris* strikes me as particularly new or thought-provoking. Maybe it's just because I read too much science fiction, so a lot of Avatar's musings feel old hat rather than revelatory. Whatever the reason, each chapter flowed over me like so much water: there are plenty of interesting bits in the book, but there isn't much that I would consider remarkable or worth remembering.

Hasini says

Though, I picked up this book without any expectations, this 132 page book stands convincingly good, to expect as the book progresses.

Topics discussed range from God to Quantum Physics & Religion to Evolution. I have enjoyed some parts of the book, yet, a few arguments presented are vague.

Striking are the arguments presented on GOD (although the author claims them not to be funny, they are hilarious), patterns of thinking and layers of awareness. Thought provoking is the human intelligence centred on God, as the HUMAN presumes GOD to exist for him and stand at the foci of generating delusions. Paradoxically most of the author's arguments are supported with scientific facts although he states that science is a kind of belief system established by humans, which makes the arguments vague, yet

convincing. On the flip side, some of the discussions are not too well constructed and appear contradictory- especially about Einstein's theory.

Also, the concept of God's debris (the very title of the book) seem to be abstract. The discussions presented at the start of the book are thought provoking and one would expect the same to hold through the rest of the book. However, the arguments presented later loose their gravity as the author jumps from one point to another in a random fashion.

The things I believe and take from this book, to ponder on are..

Is beyond the human brain to understand the world, as it exists, or does the brain compensates the lack of actual understanding by creating simplified illusions that act as a replacements for reality forming a pseudo world that exists according to the human understanding. If the illusions so formed work well in the realms of human brain and the human subscribes to the illusion which then survives, are these illusions are passed to new generations, which become real !!!

If the human brain is a delusion generator and the delusions, if fuelled by arrogance that humans are the centre of the world, that humans alone are endowed with the magical properties of souls and morality and free will and love, then what is the actuality !!!

All in all, I liked the book & compelled to suggest this book to my closed ones so that I can hold some discussions. I would like to read the sequel too though not in immediate future.

Sean says

This is easily my favorite book that I have ever read. As the sub-title says, it is not quite a story, but more of a thought experiment. The author is Scott Adams (the creator of Dilbert), but this is far from a humor book. "Metaphysics" is probably the closest term for it, as it makes your brain spin around inside your skull...in a good way.

The simple plot is this: What if there was a person who knew literally everything? Including how all of our current notions about the world around us -- science, philosophy, religion -- are wrong. What would a conversation with this person be like? Adams doesn't hold the beliefs in the book, and doesn't ask the reader to either. In fact, it's a lot more fun if you don't believe the theories, and try to figure out how they could possibly be wrong. It's a lot more difficult than you might think.

When I said that this is my favorite book, I mean that I will read it about 4 times a year. It clocks in at under 150 pages, can easily be read in a few hours, and is even available as a free .pdf from the author's website.

Magdelanye says

"Intelligence is a measure of how well you function within your level of awareness. Your intelligence will stay about the same over your life. Awareness is entirely different....awareness involves recognizing your delusions for what they are. Most people's awareness will advance on or two levels in their lifetime." p123
"Over time, everything that is possible happens." p102

Reading God's Debris : A Thought Experiment will give one's awareness a smart kick in the pants, and the

world shifts to accomodate. "The best we can do is to update our delusions to fit the times." p47

One could hardly do better than to read this delightful and challenging volume. The only thing I disagreed with was the caution in the introduction. Yes, this is a serious book, but it is also very funny. Somewhat like reality.

Wm Jas Tychonievich says

Thought-provoking, but not consistently well thought out. For example, it starts with the assumption that if God existed he would commit suicide (hence the Big Bang, and the book's title), self-destruction being the only goal challenging enough to hold the interest of an omnipotent being -- as if the desire to take on difficult challenges were somehow the inevitable result of high intelligence, rather than a contingent fact about one particular species psychology. Adams tries to take an unorthodox look at God, but he falls into the same old trap of assuming that God would of course be capable of experiencing boredom, the desire to be loved, and so on (though I suppose a being who just happens to have hominid psychology without having evolved is no less ludicrous than one who just happens to be super-intelligent).

The book explores a variety of topics, from probability to pop psychology, with varying degrees of insight, but generally Adams' questions are more interesting and useful than his answers.

Jay says

I have fond memories of attending college in Urbana in the eighties, and some of those memories revolve around the public discussions about religion and philosophy led by travelling folks I recall as Reverend Max and Cindy. There were more, but Max and Cindy were memorable. Max would draw a crowd of dozens on the back patio of the Student Union on the Quad in all weather and seasons, and there were always more than a few there to heckle the sermon, with Max often taking the bait. And being an intellectual community, there were also some students playing what I call "stump the band". They would bring up logical contradictions in belief in an all-knowing, all-powerful, all-good being. I remember these lively debates, and "God's Debris" is a book that repeats a couple dozen of these contradictions and unintended logical consequences. The book is written in a series of short chapters of an old man conversing with a delivery man, and some of the conversation could have been taken from those days on the Quad. I enjoyed reliving these contradictions, although the story structure in which this is presented made it feel too new-agey. And in a chapter or two near the end, this turned into a new-age Dale Carnegie book, suggesting how our delivery driver could meet girls. Despite this odd turn, overall I enjoyed the book and would read more by the author in this vein. And look at his comic strips.

Tom Brennan says

A series of loosely connected Socratic dialogues designed to make the reader think. While I'm not sure I liked the initial premise, I did like how it was worked out through the book. One reading (like any philosophical text) is likely not enough for this book. It is meant to be re-read for contemplation.

Rob Warner says

Humankind has advanced understanding with respect to medicine, physics, anatomy, the cosmos, psychology, geology, geography . . . in short, in virtually every field, with each succeeding generation building on the truths established by previous generations, debunking myths, clarifying truths, unveiling reality through experimentation and observation, and so forth. The one field in which we spin our wheels is religion. Where did we come from? Why are we here? Where do we go when we leave this life? What, exactly, is the nature of God? As no one can definitely establish truths around these controversial subjects, we don't build understanding on generally-recognized truths. Rather, philosophers establish their own ideas for answers to these questions. This is The Dilbert Guy's take on Who Is God and Why Are We Here and What Is The Meaning of Life (imposing capitals and, indeed, the phrases themselves come from me, not Adams).

Adams' attempt is actually a good read. He builds on ideas from science that Plato and Kierkegaard didn't have access to, so his book isn't factless drivel, and provokes thought if you're willing to read, understand, and think through implications of his story. He takes logical leaps in places, assuming his arguments have proved things that I don't they have, and this book probably isn't going to shake you from things you firmly believe, but it's worth reading both to hear his ideas and also to appreciate how deeply we as a people want answers about our origins and our futures.

Richard says

If it had been written as comedy, *God's Debris* would have been an enjoyable read, since Adams does come up with some funny and interesting conceits. Unfortunately he takes them seriously, and hides behind the weak excuse that he's challenging the reader to find the flaws in his arguments. Unfortunately, when someone who -- by his own admission -- knows nothing about quantum physics or probability theory writes very seriously on those subjects, the result is a lot of annoying gibberish.

This book can be legally downloaded free of charge at the publisher's website.

And yep, it's the *Dilbert* Scott Adams.

Sajjad thaier says

#God's_Debris: A Thought Experiment

?????: scott adams
??? ??????? : 132
????? : ????? . ??? . ?????
??????? :4/5

this is the kind of books that you have to read it over and over and you may understand some of it.

Seriously I wonder who one man can came with all these ideas and I very small book like this . even if I disagree with a lot of what he said, but I can't just raise my hat Appreciating to his marvelous skills and

abilities to make a simple idea of two men sit and talk for days such interesting and Addictive . because each word each sentence make you think again of your whole universe and yourself in ways you may never dream of it ..

It's a great novel and I advise everyone to read it but be aware of the Logical fallacies that he fall in sometimes .

“A brain surgeon would tell you that a specific part of the brain controls the ability to love. If it's damaged, people are incapable of love, incapable of caring about others.”

“If someone very wise knew how the world was designed without God's hand, could that person convince you that God wasn't involved?”

This 'field' of yours is strange stuff. We can see its effect, and we can invent a name for it, but it doesn't exist in any physical form. How can something that doesn't exist in physical form have influence over the things that do?”

“Can you imagine bent space?” he asked.

“No, but just because I can't imagine it doesn't mean it's not true. You can't argue with Einstein.”

“Doubting is good,” he said.

“If the soul's actions are not controlled by rules, that can only mean the soul acts randomly. On the other hand,if your soul is guided by rules, which in turn guide you, then you have no free will. You are programmed. There is no in between; your life is either random or predetermined. Which is it?”

“Four billion people say they believe in God, but few genuinely believe. If people believed in God, they would live every minute of their lives in support of that belief. Rich people would give their wealth to the needy. Everyone would be frantic to determine which religion was the true one. No one could be comfortable in the thought that they might have picked the wrong religion and blundered into eternal damnation, or bad reincarnation, or some other

unthinkable consequence. People would dedicate their lives to converting others to their religions.

“You can’t judge the value of a thing by looking only at costs. In many countries, more people die from hospital errors than religious wars, but no one accuses hospitals of being evil. Religious people are happier, they live longer, have fewer accidents, and stay out of trouble compared to nonreligious people. From society’s viewpoint, religion works.”

“As you sit here, your truck exists for you only in your memory, a place in your mind. The Easter Bunny lives in the same place. They are equal.”

Sometimes, though, I wish I could just shut up. But when you hear the crazy views that some people have—actually, most people—how can you just let it slide?”

“Ideas are the only things that can change the world. The rest is details.”

“Women believe that men are, in a sense, defective versions of women,” he began. “Men believe that women are defective versions of men.”

Cem says

?nsan?n beynini yo?uran,kafas?n? yoran soru cevaplar var bir sürü.

Tanr?'ya inan?yor muyuz?Yoksa inanman?n yarar?na m? inan?yoruz?

"Diyelim ki,sen ve ben ayn? yere ayr? yollardan gitmeye karar veriyoruz.Sende mavi,bende ise ye?il bir harita var.Hiçbiri olası bütün rotalar? göstermiyor fakat ikisi de istikamete giden farklı ama kabul edilebilir birer yol gösteriyor.?kimiz de yolculu?umuzu yapar ve güvenli bir ?ekilde geri dönersek,ba?kalar?na haritalar?m?z?n ba?ar?s?ndan bahsederdik.Ben tam bir inançla ye?il haritan?n mükemmel oldu?unu söyledim ve insanlar? di?er haritadan sak?nmalar? konusunda uyarayıldım.Sen de mavi haritan hakk?nda ayn? inanc? hissederdin."