

From: **Per Trydell** per@sparklinglight.se
Subject: wikipedia
Date: 6 June 2019 at 01:10
To: per@sparklinglight.se



User:Per in Sweden

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

Some notable contributions on en.wikipedia.org by me.

Contents

- 1 [Wikipedia Jesus talk page](#)
- 2 [RfC Jesus supposed return](#)
- 3 [Wikipedia Existence of God talk page](#)
- 4 [Deductive Argument that needs to be discussed](#)
- 5 [Further Arguments that need to be discussed](#)
- 6 [Wikipedia MH370 talk page](#)
- 7 [RfC Hacker attack possible?](#)
- 8 [Google talk page](#)
- 9 [Semi-protected request of added information on 30 March 2018](#)
- 10 [Morgan Freeman talk page](#)
- 11 [Morgan Freeman comments in the Guardian](#)
- 12 [Spotify talk page](#)
- 13 [Spotify Stock market IPO NYSE on 3 April 2018](#)
- 14 [Social Equality talk page](#)
- 15 [Statement on 4 April 2018](#)
- 16 [September 11 attacks](#)
- 17 [Qui bono \(who benefits\) of 911](#)
- 18 [Social equality wikipedia talk page](#)
- 19 [Richest 1% own 2/3 of all wealth by 2030](#)
- 20 [England national football team talk page](#)
- 21 [England national football team did a Nazi salute May 1938](#)
- 22 [ABBA talk page](#)
- 23 [Fun Fact: The word ABBA is referenced three times in the Bible](#)
- 24 [Bible talk page](#)
- 25 [RfC, if the Bible were published today, would it be a crime of hate speech laws?](#)
- 26 [Hope talk page](#)
- 27 [Hope works both ways](#)
- 28 [Capital punishment talk page](#)
- 29 [List of arguments pro and against](#)

[Wikipedia Jesus talk page](#) [[edit source](#)]

[RfC Jesus supposed return](#) [[edit source](#)]

The following discussion is closed. Please do not modify it. Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page. No further edits should be made to this discussion.

Here are some interesting coincidences. 2015 is "TO" (twentieth letter in the alphabet and fifteenth). History of the world goes TO this point. John 20:15 is the first time Jesus speaks after his death. Revelation chapter 20 has 15 verses, with 20:15 being the most scary text of all in the Bible. Mathews 5:13 speaks of salt losing its power. What does Jesus mean by salt? Probably faith, since this is the most central theme of his teachings. Thus he speaks of losing faith. 5:31 speaks of divorcing your wife, your life partner. Your life partner, true for all humans is this world we live in, thus divorcing this world, the end of the world. Now 5°13'31"-2015. Strange coincidences, or is there some hidden meaning? Since the world did not end 2015, GOD MUST BE DEAD. (As Nietzsche said)Per in Sweden (talk) 18:47, 26 March 2018 (UTC) edit Per in Sweden (talk) 18:48, 26 March 2018 (UTC)

See WP:NOTFORUM --Neil talk to me 18:57, 26 March 2018 (UTC)

I apologize in advance for my bluntness, but is this some kind of joke or are you really serious? Bible code is complete nonsense; if you look hard enough, you can find "codes" or "hidden messages" like this in *anything*, even a lump of swiss cheese. It is caused by a psychological phenomenon called pareidolia. By the way, you do realize that the chapter and verse numbers we use today are not part of the original Biblical texts, right? They were added in the Early Modern Period for the simple convenience of being able to cite specific passages without quoting them. -- Katolophyromai (talk) 19:33, 26 March 2018 (UTC)

My personal theory is that Flying Spaghetti Monster killed God in a cosmic fight. :-)
Per in Sweden (talk) 19:46, 26 March 2018 (UTC)
On a serious note, see Existence of God talk page Per in Sweden (talk) 19:50, 26 March 2018 (UTC)
Per in Sweden (talk) 19:51, 26 March 2018 (UTC)
As for chapter and verse numbers, it does not matter when they were made, see God controls fate through controlling quantum randomness, thus quantum randomness is not random but controlled by God to suit is plan for the fate of the world. Per in Sweden (talk) 19:58, 26 March 2018 (UTC)

The discussion above is closed. Please do not modify it. Subsequent comments should be made on the appropriate discussion page. No further edits should be made to this discussion.

This discussion is off-topic and forum-like and contains no serious suggestions on how to improve this page. --
Katolophyromai (talk) 20:02, 26 March 2018 (UTC)

[Wikipedia Existence of God talk page](#) [[edit source](#)]

[Deductive Argument that needs to be discussed](#) [[edit source](#)]

Talk pages are for discussion of actionable proposals (with reliable sources) to improve the article. [hide](#)

See WP:NOTFORUM. Johnuniq (talk) 00:39, 27 March 2018 (UTC)

The following discussion has been closed. Please do not modify it.

Russian Quantum Physics Argument

The double slit experiment is the basis. In this experiment you can for instance send electrons, one at a time through a plate with two slits and then the electrons hit a screen onto which a pattern emerges. The pattern proves that electrons are waves. Even if you send one electron at a time. If you place detectors at the slits to see which one of the two slits the electron pass through, then the pattern on the screen shows that the electrons are now particles. The detectors do not really interfere with the electrons, it is the fact that an observer observes the electrons that causes the electrons to become particles. Now the interesting point is that even if no human observes the data from the detectors, then the electrons will still behave as particles. Thus this proves there exist an observer that is not human. An observer with computation, memory and senses. I.e the divine. This proof is true if you believe the laws of physics are true. Otherwise it is not a proof. **Per in Sweden** (talk) 21:02, 19 March 2018 (UTC)

Unless you can provide [reliable, academic sources making this argument](#), all your statements above qualify as **original research**, which is strictly forbidden here at Wikipedia. --**Katolophyromai** (talk) 20:08, 26 March 2018 (UTC)

Physics links related to double slit experiment (which proves the validity of the physics involved, the rest is just logic)

<http://physicsworld.com/cws/article/news/2015/may/26/do-atoms-going-through-a-double-slit-know-if-they-are-being-observed>
<https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/1998/02/980227055013.htm> **Per in Sweden** (talk) 21:56, 26 March 2018 (UTC)

Neither of these are [reliable sources](#). Furthermore, the source *must* make the same argument that you are trying to make. We do not allow any kinds of leaps of logic in our articles; if the source does not explicitly say something in the most direct way, we cannot include it here. In any case, we want academic sources, so, in this instance, we need scholarly sources written by reputable theologians. --**Katolophyromai** (talk) 22:09, 26 March 2018 (UTC)

Not reliable sources? What are you talking about? Peer reviewed quantum physics papers are as reliable as you can get. You want theologians to write science papers? Do not joke, either. **Per in Sweden** (talk) 22:14, 26 March 2018 (UTC)

These are both science *magazines*, not academic journals, and I am fairly certain that neither of them are peer-reviewed. In any case, that does not matter, because, even if they are reliable, neither of them say anything at all about the existence of God, which is the subject of this article. (In fact, the word "God" itself does not occur in either of the articles at all.) We need sources explicitly dealing with the subject of God's existence, not just sources you think could be used to argue for his existence.

Regarding your comment about "theologians writing science papers," the existence of God is not a *scientific* question; it is a philosophical one. Science deals with subjects that can be empirically verified through tests and observation; whereas philosophy deals with more abstract issues, such as "What is truth?", "Is it better to be good or evil?", or "Is there a God?" Theology is a branch of philosophy dealing with the study of the Divine. Naturally, therefore, arguments for the existence of God are going to come from philosophers and theologians, not from scientists, unless the scientist in question happens to *also* be a philosopher or a theologian. --**Katolophyromai** (talk) 22:52, 26 March 2018 (UTC)

Are you paranoid? Do you not trust those papers written by reputable authors, in a reputable academic science site. I do not know your background, but for you to doubt these papers is just laughable.

That there exist an observer that is not a human is self-evident from the physics involved and the Russian Quantum Physics Argument. That is not a leap of logic. Then if you call that observer "God", "The very evil Devil" or whatever, does not really matter. The self-evident fact is that there exist an observer that is not human. An observer must have computational powers, memory and senses, that is self-evident from the very essence of what an observer is. **Per in Sweden** (talk) 23:07, 26 March 2018 (UTC)

Further Arguments that need to be discussed [\[edit source \]](#)

This discussion has been closed. Please do not modify it.

[hide](#)

*The following discussion has been closed. **Please do not modify it.***

Argument from magic In the news today, you get images and videos that seem very probable as magic. They could be CGI and fake, of course, but not all of them, probably. UFO reports could be reports of magic. The Divine is a perquisite of the Divine magic. **Per in Sweden** (talk) 00:21, 21 March 2018 (UTC)

For a weak example, look at this video <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-5523581/Remarkable-moment-feisty-rodent-turns-table-cat-scares-him.html> **Per in Sweden** (talk) 14:57, 21 March 2018 (UTC)

Regarding above video, the cat is a symbol for the Devil, throughout medieval history in Europe. Of course, the cat and the rat are opposites, just like the Devil and God. **Per in Sweden** (talk) 15:19, 21 March 2018 (UTC)

Argument from coincidences In the news today, you get report of amazing coincidences. They could be fake news, of course, but not all of them. This amazing timing hints that something Divine want to teach us something. Thus a high probability of the Divine. **Per in Sweden** (talk) 00:18, 21 March 2018 (UTC)

1) The first part of your argument is totally irrelevant, because God and magic are completely unrelated things. There is every reason why God could exist and not magic or *vice versa*. (Indeed, most orthodox Christians today would contend that belief in magic is incompatible with a Biblical worldview.) 2) I can only assume that the second part of your argument is yet another joke, because I do not think any serious person has ever tried to use an *internet cat video* as evidence for the existence of God, or for any other philosophical question for that matter. 3) This is still [original research](#). All information on Wikipedia *must* be cited to a [reliable source](#). We cannot just write whatever we feel like. Please refrain from wasting our time with non-serious proposals. There is real work that needs to be done here. --**Katolophyromai** (talk) 20:19, 26 March 2018 (UTC)

Wikipedia MH370 talk page [\[edit source \]](#)

RfC Hacker attack possible? [\[edit source \]](#)

On the autumn of 2014 I discussed with a user on the telegraph forums (Disqus forums, now discontinued by telegraph), that bragged that he could "down jets with a computer". After the discussion, that I won, he replaced his posts with "???" (through the edit function of Disqus).

My request is a discussion if jets can be downed with a computer.

Modern aircraft are computer controlled, fly by wire, and have a radio link. So technically it is probably possible.

If MH370 was taken over by a hacker, with the intention to down it, the hacker would probably make it as difficult as possible to find the aircraft after it was intentionally crashed, so this hacker would steer the aircraft to a canyon, difficult to find, on the bottom of the ocean. The hacker probably has then access to public maps of the ocean bottom. **Per in Sweden** (talk) 11:11, 29 March 2018 (UTC)

PS. I have given this information to the CIA. DS. **Per in Sweden** (talk) 11:19, 29 March 2018 (UTC)

Let's hope the CIA can do more with your suggestion than we can at Wikipedia (?) [Martinevans123 \(talk\)](#) 11:25, 29 March 2018 (UTC)

The header of this RFC is "Hacker attack possible?" Meaning I want reliable sources that a hacker attack on aircraft is possible. [Per in Sweden \(talk\)](#) 13:12, 29 March 2018 (UTC)

Good luck. [Martinevans123 \(talk\)](#) 13:16, 29 March 2018 (UTC)

<http://www.news.com.au/technology/online/hacking/boeing-757-controls-hacked-remotely-while-on-the-runway-officials-reveal/news-story/48f41ed3fd10011e223faf59e2998e54> [Per in Sweden \(talk\)](#) 13:19, 29 March 2018 (UTC)

Yes, "flight functions" seems very surprising, but a little vague. I see the original source of that story (with a link) is given at the bottom: "This article originally appeared in *The Sun* and has been republished here with permission." [Martinevans123 \(talk\)](#) 13:41, 29 March 2018 (UTC)

Yes, you have a point, The Sun is an unreliable source. But on the other hand, news.com.au seem to be a reliable source, so they have probably checked that officials have made this test. [Per in Sweden \(talk\)](#) 13:46, 29 March 2018 (UTC)

https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/fbi-probe-of-plane-hack-sparks-worries-over-flight-safety/2015/05/18/8f75e662-fd69-11e4-805c-c3f407e5a9e9_story.html?utm_term=.76a554fb88a2 [Per in Sweden \(talk\)](#) 13:57, 29 March 2018 (UTC)

<https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2012/may/29/cyber-attack-concerns-boeing-chip> [Per in Sweden \(talk\)](#) 14:04, 29 March 2018 (UTC)

"Among applications where the ProASIC3 are used are remote surveillance systems, drones, and for flight-critical applications on the new Boeing 787 Dreamliner." No mention of the 777? [Martinevans123 \(talk\)](#) 14:07, 29 March 2018 (UTC)

True. But in the age of Dreamliner, hacking concerns are much more well known, yet they made this mistake. What mistakes could they have been made for the 777, when problems of this nature were less of a concern? [Per in Sweden \(talk\)](#) 14:15, 29 March 2018 (UTC)

Your reasoning is perfectly sound. But, in the absence of a direct reliable source for 777, I'd suggest we can go no further down this particular path. [Martinevans123 \(talk\)](#) 14:19, 29 March 2018 (UTC)

Ok. [Per in Sweden \(talk\)](#) 14:20, 29 March 2018 (UTC)

That is all, so far. [Per in Sweden \(talk\)](#) 16:39, 29 March 2018 (UTC)

[Google talk page](#) [\[edit source \]](#)

[Semi-protected request of added information on 30 March 2018](#) [\[edit source \]](#)

Google has two interesting tools. One to see your search history and all links you have clicked on (even outside google searches). One to see all your journeys with your phone. Please include those links.

Reliable source: <https://www.rt.com/usa/422753-cambridge-analytica-facebook-scandal/> [Per in Sweden \(talk\)](#) 13:26, 30 March 2018 (UTC)

[Morgan Freeman talk page](#) [\[edit source \]](#)

[Morgan Freeman comments in the Guardian](#) [\[edit source \]](#)

You might want to add the information that Morgan Freeman comments in the Guardian. This is very risky, since you can be humiliated publicly as a commenter. Most celebrities comment only on twitter since there you will not be answered, you can use it as a propaganda channel, unanswered. It is probably him, since he has the name "Morgan_Freeman" and his picture in the Guardian. If anyone dared to use his name and image, then someone would probably tip him off and that person would be sued, just like Madonna sued someone for having madonna.com and won.

<https://profile.theguardian.com/user/id/13200350?page=1> [Per in Sweden \(talk\)](#) 16:12, 2 April 2018 (UTC) [Per in Sweden \(talk\)](#) 16:13, 2 April 2018 (UTC) [Per in Sweden \(talk\)](#) 16:14, 2 April 2018 (UTC)

[Spotify talk page](#) [\[edit source \]](#)

[Spotify Stock market IPO NYSE on 3 April 2018](#) [\[edit source \]](#)

You might want to include the information that the predicted price was 132 dollars per stock, and the opening became 165.90 dollars. 157 million users. Never made profit. Huge losses last year. First trading day ended at 149.01 dollar.

<https://www.theguardian.com/business/live/2018/apr/03/markets-fall-china-us-tariffs-trade-war-ftse-dow-spotify-listing-business-live> [Per in Sweden \(talk\)](#) 20:28, 3 April 2018 (UTC)

<https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2018/apr/03/spotify-ipo-flag-error-swiss-sweden-first-day-trading> [Per in Sweden \(talk\)](#) 22:35, 3 April 2018 (UTC)

[Social Equality talk page](#) [\[edit source \]](#)

[Statement on 4 April 2018](#) [\[edit source \]](#)

Per's Easter Statement:

"The rules are the same for everyone. Regardless of race, religion, sexual orientation, disease or gender."

I do not believe in quick fixes, like sacrificing somebody innocent to save the multitude, the basic Christian doctrine, or the blaming of the Jews to unite Germany in the 1930's and part of the 1940's. [Per in Sweden \(talk\)](#) 12:43, 4 April 2018 (UTC)

This is probably what my true opinion is all about. [Per in Sweden \(talk\)](#) 19:32, 10 September 2018 (UTC)

[September 11 attacks](#) [\[edit source \]](#)

[Qui bono \(who benefits\) of 911](#) [\[edit source \]](#)

The Guardian today has an opinion piece that the microphones and cameras in phones, pads, computers, TVs etc can be spying devices. Just like a bug is a microphone with a transmitter, a phone today is a microphone and a transmitter. Who benefits from 911? Well before 911, the intelligence community had trouble in asking privately owned corporations, such as Microsoft, Apple, Cisco etc to install spying devices, the corporations simply replied, "Why should we help you spy on ordinary citizens? The answer is no.". With 911, the intelligence community had a new argument, "We all need to cooperate against terrorism; look at 911; you have to let us spy on ordinary citizens, or we will all die.". The corporations now complied.

Therefore the intelligence community benefitted from 911. They can now spy on anyone with a phone, computer etc.

Intelligence is power. All is about power. If you know who the "new kids in town" are challenging the traditional power, which spying will allow, you can arrange for an "accident".

Possibly the BIOS (that every boot-able computer has) has a back door. Enabling the intelligence community to see the hard drive of all computers.

Why is it so easy to hack a computer? Just by visiting a web page, your computer can be infected.

1. This diverts the attention of the total control the intelligence community has, people have the excuse to themselves, "that maybe I visited an infected site". 2. Hackers talk in forums which persons are interesting, "Wow, this is a terrorist, look" and does free work for the intelligence community who spies on hacker communities. 3. New websites have much harder time getting established, since people are afraid of visiting new websites out of fear of being infected.

Reliable source: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/apr/06/phone-camera-microphone-spying> [Per in Sweden \(talk\)](#) 13:23, 7 April 2018 (UTC)

[Social equality wikipedia talk page](#) [\[edit source \]](#)

[Richest 1% own 2/3 of all wealth by 2030](#) [\[edit source \]](#)

<https://www.theguardian.com/business/2018/apr/07/global-inequality-tipping-point-2030> [Per in Sweden \(talk\)](#) 13:57, 7 April 2018 (UTC)

[England national football team talk page](#) [\[edit source \]](#)

[England national football team did a Nazi salute May 1938](#) [\[edit source \]](#)

http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/magazine/3128202.stm [Per in Sweden \(talk\)](#) 13:18, 8 April 2018 (UTC)

[ABBA talk page](#) [\[edit source \]](#)

[Fun Fact: The word ABBA is referenced three times in the Bible](#) [\[edit source \]](#)

"And he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; take away this cup from me: nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt." (Mark 14:36)

"For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." (Romans 8:15)

"And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." (Galatians 4:6)

All quotes King James Version.

Maybe the Swedish referendum for the name was influenced by this fact. ABBA chose their name after a newspaper referendum. This I heard in a radio program (SR) [Per in Sweden \(talk\)](#) 19:02, 26 April 2018 (UTC)

⋮

Please do not encourage new users to use Wikipedia for forum chatter: WP:NOTFORUM. Johnuniq (talk) 09:13, hide 28 April 2018 (UTC)

*The following discussion has been closed. **Please do not modify it.***

See wikipedia "hate speech", "Hate speech is speech that attacks a person or group on the basis of attributes such as race, religion, ethnic origin, national origin, sexual orientation, disability, or gender.[1][2] "

Quote the Bible "That whosoever would not seek the Lord God of Israel should be put to death, whether small or great, whether man or woman." (2 Chronicles 15:13)

Clearly this is hate speech against Hindus, Buddhists and any religion that does not seek the God of Israel.

Hate speech includes attacks on basis of religion.

Therefore my point is that if the Bible were published today, it would be hate speech.

Agree? **Per in Sweden (talk)** 07:38, 28 April 2018 (UTC)

Interesting question, but wrong place. Actually, I can't think of a place on WP that's right for it, per [WP:TPG](#), [Wikipedia:Legal disclaimer](#) and all that noise. To put this in some kind of WP-context, you'd have to find reliable sources that discuss this question and then (try to) add it to a WP-article. [Gråbergs Gråa Sång \(talk\)](#) 07:51, 28 April 2018 (UTC)

If you google "bible hate speech" you get a lot of links that discusses this, especially in gays rights issues.**Per in Sweden (talk)** 08:13, 28 April 2018 (UTC)

[Hate speech](#) mentions [Åke Green](#), if you remember him. [Gråbergs Gråa Sång \(talk\)](#) 08:20, 28 April 2018 (UTC)

That is true, I saw it. I think you can consider the Bible as a reliable source in the context of quotable source that does not change. If one includes the above quote, and a reference to hate speech wikipedia article, one could safely say that "it could be argued that the Bible contains hate speech." I did not find any reliable sources that argues 2 Chronicles quote is hate speech, but I would not consider it a leap of logic to argue that it is hate speech, in my view it is self-evident. **Per in Sweden (talk)** 09:01, 28 April 2018 (UTC)

As I have written before, hope works both ways. Hope can save you and hope can kill you for a small thing. Imagine you steal a snickers bar. You are caught on camera. But you have hope of getting away with the steal. The police are now after you. But you have hope of escaping. You are now homeless and no income. So you steal money, rob people. The police are really after you now. You buy a gun. The police find you, and you shoot the cop to escape. Because you have hope. You are caught and sentenced to death, which all began by stealing a snickers bar and hope. **Per in Sweden (talk)** 13:32, 28 June 2018 (UTC)

I think you should have a section devoted to the arguments for and against capital punishment, as stated by reliable sources.

Here are some that I have.

Pro. 1. Preventive. Fear of being punished by death make you think twice before you commit a capital crime. 2. Removed. People that are killed are removed from society and cannot do any more capital crimes. 3. Fairness. People feel that capital criminals deserve the same fate as those that they killed.

Against. 1. Ethics. Do you want to show that it is wrong to kill by killing. (This does not work, since if you imprison someone unlawfully, you are sent to prison, thus you show that it is wrong to imprison by imprisoning.) 2. Cowards. People are afraid that criminals will get desperate and do anything to escape being caught if they know they will be sentenced to death. (This does not work, since criminals do not want to be in prison either and will do anything to escape life sentencing.) 3. Feelings. People feel it is wrong to kill, and be responsible for killing. (This does not work, since capital punishment reduced the murder rate by "Pro" points above, thus the number of killings is reduced in the long term by having capital punishment)**Per in Sweden (talk)** 14:17, 28 June 2018 (UTC) 4. Non-revocable. Innocents may be killed by death penalties. (While this is a fair statement, people may sit their life-term as innocents too. Further, death in society does not disappear just because abolishing the death penalty; innocent people will die from murder, accidents, disease and old age. The point is keeping those murder rates (including state murder; death penalty is lawful murder, lawful planned killing) to a minimum, it is our belief that that the death penalty does just that, keep the murder rate of innocents to a minimum.) **Per in Sweden (talk)** 03:21, 6 September 2018 (UTC) 5. Flood gates. If you make death penalty legal, you open the flood gates to death penalty for all sorts of reasons. (While this may be true for some countries, it is important to keep the death penalty limited to ultimate crimes such as murder, high-treason (e.g. of country and/or humanity) that results potentially in mass killings of citizens, terrorism killings etc. NOT drug crimes, adultery, trafficking, sex crimes etc. You have to keep those extremists of politics at bay. **Per in Sweden (talk)** 03:41, 6 September 2018 (UTC) 6. Cheapens life. The death penalty cheapens the value of life. (Well, this is true, but so does high murder rates; the important things is to keep the notion of value of life as high as possible, to motivate people to respect the value of life, to keep a good motivating balance.) **Per in Sweden (talk)** 03:48, 6 September 2018 (UTC)

It's under [Capital punishment#Controversy and debate](#). **TFD (talk)** 17:23, 29 August 2018 (UTC)

No. What I am asking for obviously is a devoted section, clear and concise. **Per in Sweden (talk)** 04:08, 6 September 2018 (UTC)

Well part of it is, yes.**Per in Sweden (talk)** 03:20, 9 September 2018 (UTC)

