

**Chapter 1 : The Trademark of God | Daily Reflection | The High Calling**

*According to TMZ, the future venture may actually be in God's plan after all. Per a report from the celebrity gossip outlet, the Canadian rapper is tentatively working on trademarking the phrase "God's Plan" for a line of clothing merchandise, downloadable audio, music videos and a potential competition series.*

Again, the idea that gives me my understanding of a supreme God certainly has in it more objective reality than the ideas that represent finite substances. Now it is manifest by the natural light that there must be at least as much reality in the efficient and total cause as in the effect of that cause. For where, I ask, could the effect get its reality from, if not from the cause? And how could the cause give it to the effect unless it possessed it? It follows from this both that something cannot arise from nothing, and also that what is more perfect that is, contains in itself more reality cannot arise from what is less perfect. Does reality admit of more and less? Or does he think one thing can be more of a thing than another? If so, he should consider how this can be explained to us with that degree of clarity that every demonstration calls for, and which he himself has employed elsewhere. A substance is more of a thing than a mode; if there are real qualities or incomplete substances, they are things to a greater extent than modes, but to a lesser extent than complete substances; and, finally, if there is an infinite and independent substance, it is more of a thing than a finite and dependent substance. All this is completely self-evident. A finite substance can exist independently other than its reliance on an infinite substance. They do not inhere in God as subject, but are effects of God as creator. But in order for a given idea to contain such and such objective reality, it must surely derive it from some cause which contains at least as much formal reality as there is objective reality in the idea. It may not now exist, and it need never have existed. The level of objective reality is determined by the formal reality of what is being represented or thought about. So every idea I have has the lowest level of formal reality, for every idea is a mode, but the idea of an infinite substance has more objective reality than the idea of a finite substance. But this is not what Descartes means. For although this cause does not transfer any of its actual or formal reality to my idea, it should not on that account be supposed that it must be less real. After considering various options Descartes concludes that it must come from a substance that has at least the same level of formal reality. Therefore, an infinite substance, i. If ideas are considered simply as modes of thought, they are all equal and appear to come from within me; in so far as different ideas represent different things they differ widely. Ideas which represent substances contain within themselves more objective reality than the ideas which merely represent modes; the idea that gives me my understanding of a supreme God, eternal, infinite, etc. It is manifest by the natural light that there must be at least as much reality in the efficient and total cause as in the effect of that cause. It follows from this both that something cannot arise from nothing, and also that what contains more reality cannot arise from what contains less reality. And this applies not only when considering formal reality, but also when considering objective reality. Although the reality in my ideas is merely objective reality what ultimately causes those ideas must contain the same formal reality. Although one idea may originate from another, there cannot be an infinite regress here; eventually one must reach a primary idea, the cause of which will contain formally all the reality which is present only objectively in the idea. Ideas are like pictures which can easily fall short of the perfection of the things from which they are taken, but which cannot contain anything greater or more perfect. If the objective reality of any of my ideas turns out to be so great that I am sure the same reality does not reside in me, either formally or eminently i. In addition to being aware of myself, I have other ideas of God, corporeal and inanimate things, angels, animals and other men like myself. So from what has been said it must be concluded that God necessarily exists. Although I have the idea of substance in me by virtue of being a substance, this does not account for my having the idea of an infinite substance, when I am finite. This idea must have come from some substance which really was infinite. I cannot have gained the idea of the infinite merely by negating the finite. On the contrary, to know that I am finite means knowing that I lack something and so must first have the idea of the infinite to make that comparison. The perfections which I attribute to God do not exist in me potentially. It is true that I have many potentialities which are not yet actual but this irrelevant to the idea of God, which contains absolutely nothing

that is potential. It might be thought that my gradual increase in knowledge could continue to infinity but firstly, this gradual increase in knowledge is itself a sign of imperfection and, secondly, God I take to be actually infinite, so that nothing can be added to his perfection whereas increasing knowledge will never reach the point where it is not capable of a further increase. Finally, the objective being of an idea cannot be produced merely by potential being, which strictly speaking is nothing, but only by actual or formal being. Additional argument for the existence of God: The only remaining alternative is that it is innate in me. There may be some superficial appeal in the claim that an actual flower has more reality than an idea of a flower but this needs to be unpacked. Crucial to the argument as it is normally reconstructed is that the degree of objective reality is determined by the degree of formal reality that the thing being thought about would have if it existed. Descartes offers no reason why this should be so. So the argument seems to fall short of positing God as cause of the idea. Instead, he suggests, Descartes is relying on special features of the idea of God: But it can still be understood, in so far as we can clearly and distinctly understand that something is such that no limitations can be found in it, and this amounts to understanding clearly that it is infinite. If a man comes up and says that he has an idea of a marvellous machine which will feed the hungry by making proteins out of sand, I shall be impressed neither by his experience nor by his powers of invention if it turns out that that is all there is to the idea, and he has no conception, or only the haziest conception, of how such a machine might work. Given the above considerations this is unconvincing. In the second set of replies Descartes says this is the fault of the reader: I can only say that it depends on the reader:

**Chapter 2 : Descartes' Ontological Argument (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)**

*The trademark argument is an a priori argument for the existence of God developed by French philosopher and mathematician, René Descartes. In the Meditations Descartes provides two arguments for the existence of God.*

But what if the man tries to trademark the God he believes in? Imagine waking up in a world where Trusts have exclusive right over images of popular deities; getting booked under s. The question arises “is this really possible? Fortunately, at present, it is not possible to trademark pictorial representations of deities. However, a single person has the power to change the law, but the consequences can affect an entire nation. The judgment of this case will set a benchmark in the country, further defining the pathway for scope of the Trademark law in India. Before we address the legality of such trademarks, it is important to have a brief history of the case. In , the Attukal Bhagawathy Temple Trust in Kerala secured trademark protection for the picture of its deity Kannagi, a legendary figure from the Tamil epic the Silappathikaram Trademark No. The matter is still pending before the High Court. While I understand that trademarks have been granted to companies for marks involving Gods and deities, granting trademark protection to a religious trust for services which are carried out pursuant to religious beliefs or carried out in the name of the Goddess is quite peculiar, to say the least. My main concern is the trademark protection granted to the graphical representation of Goddess Kannagi Trademark no. As far as the moral issues are concerned, dear reader, ask yourself this “Do you think the aforementioned scenario is morally sound and do you wish for it to happen? There, your moral dilemma has been solved. Moving on, let us now discuss the legality of registration of such trademarks. Legality of such Trademark 1. Validity under the Trade Marks Act, The fundamental question that emerges is whether the pictorial representation of the deity ought to be regarded as a subject of trademark at all or not. Now, since the Trust obtained registration for temple services, social services, welfare services and cultural activities can it be considered as one which has exclusive right or title over the said services? Legally speaking, it cannot be. The devotees have as much stake as the Trust has in the said services. Therefore, the Trust is not a proprietor of the said services and therefore, cannot claim exclusive right over the picture of the deity and the title for the said services. Also, the Trademark Act is intended only for the purpose of protecting marks or symbols which are used for Trade and Commerce. This is the picture of deity who is worshipped by lakhs of devotees. Parul Food Specialities P Ltd, held that the name of a deity, which is in the public domain, cannot be monopolized. This would also pass the message that temples are origin of trade and commerce. If the registration is not cancelled, appropriation of religious symbols will become a practice, and will be misused by others. Spiritual methods or performance of functions in pursuance of religious perception is as much a part of religious beliefs as trust or faith in particular doctrines. Once a trademark is registered, the proprietor gains exclusive rights to use the trademark which in turn prevents others from using the same. In other words, the devotees can be precluded from using the picture of the deity and the related title in the said services initiated by them. This vitiates Article 25 of the Constitution and is, therefore, unconstitutional. This section mandates that a mark shall not be registered as a trade mark if it contains or comprises of any matter likely to hurt the religious susceptibilities of any class or section of the citizens of India. Keeping in mind the point mentioned above, precluding people from using the image s of the deity may lead to a build up of religious tension. Also, the trademark granted commercializes a religious symbol, setting a dangerous precedent that other money spinning religious trusts would also soon exploit for their own commercial gains. This is also likely to injure the faith of the people in temples and religious places as a whole. Therefore, a dangerous negligence has been shown to Section 9 2 b of the Trade Marks Act, in the registration of this trademark. Conclusion Practically speaking, the image of the Goddess was the Intellectual Property hereinafter IP of someone who is most likely not traceable today and the trust is merely a custodian to something which is actually in Public domain. If the trademark registration is maintained, in future, we may see trademark applications being granted on many popular images in the public domain i. Images of various deities, religious symbols or who knows, even the Asoka Chakra and Stambh. In my view, the Registry was quick to jump the gun, without realizing the implications of such a registration. Furthermore, the motives of the Trust come into

question “ If they believe themselves to be a charitable and divine organization, why the attempt to commercialize? Such organizations are granted tax exemptions in the name of spiritual things even though they act like business enterprises. For the time being, all we can do is hope that the Kerala High Court will order against the registration because otherwise, it could really be a dangerous and preoccupying precedent. Personally, I hope it will be considered valid the day pigs fly. Passionate about entrepreneurship, start-ups, stocks, farming, technology and law.

*May God bless you with a wandering mind—a mind that wanders into the discovery of God's presence with you. BIBLE PASSAGE: After the king was settled in his palace and the Lord had given him rest from all his enemies around him, he said to Nathan the prophet, "Here I am, living in a house of cedar, while the ark of God remains in a tent."*

I took you from the pasture, from following the sheep to be prince over my people Israel; and I have been with you wherever you went, and have cut off all your enemies from before you; and I will make for you a great name, like the name of the great ones of the earth. There were no enemies at the gate and no wars to fight. David got to thinking about building a house—a temple—for God. The words God spoke to David through the prophet Nathan form the theological center of the Old Testament, especially for Christians. These words will sustain, enlighten, and encourage Israel through a thousand years of suffering and exile. They establish David as the founder of the only royal family God will ever install in Israel, and they lay the foundation for the coming Messiah. In these words, God establishes a covenant with David that God promises never to break. You are familiar with the use of trademarks. A trademark distinguishes the source of goods and services. When something is trademarked, it carries one of several symbols: And not just present with us but also actively pursuing our best interests. Are you the one to build me a house to dwell in? I have not dwelt in a house from the day I brought the Israelites up out of Egypt to this day. I have been moving from place to place with a tent as my dwelling. I took you from the pasture, from tending the flock, and appointed you ruler over my people Israel. I have been with you wherever you have gone, and I have cut off all your enemies from before you. Now I will make your name great, like the names of the greatest men on earth. And I will provide a place for my people Israel and will plant them so that they can have a home of their own and no longer be disturbed. Wicked people will not oppress them anymore, as they did at the beginning and have done ever since the time I appointed leaders over my people Israel. I will also give you rest from all your enemies. When your days are over and you rest with your ancestors, I will raise up your offspring to succeed you, your own flesh and blood, and I will establish his kingdom. He is the one who will build a house for my Name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father, and he will be my son. To what subjects does your mind wander when free to wander anywhere? What does this reveal about you? When you pause to think of God, what impact does that have on you? Gracious Lord, you know that my mind is often a chaos of thoughts, desires, and anxieties. I can be moody and broody, angry and impatient. Show me that when I think of you, light and life pour into my whole being. When my mind wanders, let it wander to you. Help us finish the year strong. We ask that you prayerfully consider joining us in this work! Donate Donate Every resource on our site was made possible through the financial support of people like you.

Chapter 4 : calendrierdelascience.com - Human Validation

*Drake wants to make sure no one profits off of "God's Plan.". The Canadian rapper, 31, has filed an application to trademark the phrase, which is the title of his popular song.*

And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and the birds of the heavens and over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth. However, I think it is more helpful to look at this concept biblically and let the text speak to us in regards to what the image of God truly is and why it actually matters which I will deal with in a moment. The image of God in Genesis 1: Sometimes, people will fall prey to boasting in themselves in an unbiblical manner as if they are justified in doing anything they want because they believe Genesis 1 means they are special. That is not what the text is saying. After creating each piece of creation, God calls it good until he arrives at humanity who are called very good. This is not the first self-help, motivational message that you might find at your local bookstore that is written specifically to make you feel good about yourself. There is a number of theories and many books that have written on the subject of the image of God, but I believe it is helpful to come to the text plainly in Genesis 1 and to grasp how the New Testament interprets the image of God. First, the image of God means to be created like God. This means that we are created to be, to live, to serve, to love, to rule in a way that is akin to our Creator. Functionally, we are created to imitate God in creation as his royal stewards or representatives. There is a pendulum in Genesis 1 of God speaking and then what he says happens. God speaks and obedience follows by the created order seems to be a common theme. However, when we get to humanity we find that the story of creation slows down considerably to focus in on humanity and humanity being created in the image of God very good, among all other living things and sharing in a common Creator but distinct as well. Humanity created in the image of God is: Sin effected the image of God in humanity, and like J. This song with the once unified harmony ruined the symphony of creation which glorified God and tainted the whole of it. Now, all people are created in the image of God, though that image is tainted by the Fall, tainted by sin by nature and by choice. What I have said thus far can be comprehensible, hopefully, but also slightly depressing and seemingly grim and hopeless. We learn early in Genesis 3 that there will be one who will crush the head of the serpent and the New Testament understands that serpent as sin and the one crushing the head to be Jesus Christ. What does Jesus do? In the meantime, Jesus calls all sinners to believe in him, to abandon their own image, and to take on his image by imitating him once more. Humanity imaged God in creation, but disobeyed and strayed from that functionally and relationally they were exiled from the presence of God. In new creation through Jesus, humanity is offered by grace the perfect image of the Son of God and the application of this image by the Holy Spirit through sanctification being made like Christ redeems every aspect of the individual person as well as the whole community of believers. The question, then, is how do we image God as Christians and why is that important? Jesus tells us how to image God when he summarizes the 10 Commandments by citing the Shema of Deuteronomy 6: In short, Jesus says loving God and loving others is the foundation of the entirety of the Bible. He says the Law and Prophets are based on this truth, but when Jesus said this the Bible consisted of the Law first 5 books of the Old Testament and the Prophets the prophetic books of the Old Testament. The 10 Commandments, then, are based on the image of God. Humanity is not a statue which is dead. People all over the world today make their own gods, but they do not have any life in them. God alone has made a living image and testimony of himself in every single living human being revealing in a general way a living God. So, we image God by loving God and loving others and though we cannot do this perfectly, we cling to faith in Jesus Christ because he is the perfect image of God who redeemed us and restores us by his Spirit through faith. This is important because the purpose intended for humanity is restored in rightly imaging our Creator which we do through imaging Jesus Christ, the perfect image of God, holding to faith in him. Now, in a world with millions of images to worship and millions of things that cloud our daily thoughts and delude us into thinking that we ought to be more like something that is not God, why do we believe that lie? Why do we believe that things like makeup will make us eternally young and give us eternal life? Why do we try to dress ourselves up as someone who is truly important with a great job, great things, great family, and great life as if

anything that we are could possibly be the faintest reflection of Jesus Christ who has redeemed us by his work? Why look to celebrities, athletes, and politicians when we know in reality that the life they live however fancy and desirable it might appear to be will really do anything for us and is actually far from perfect? Why do we care so much about the clothes we wear, the way we look, the people we are around, and the things we can acquire in life when none of it will last? In a world and culture where consumerism is everywhere, it can be easy to forget the simple truth that you were created in the image of God and that the only true image of God is Jesus Christ because all humanity is sinful falling short of the glory of God. Though, we like to brand ourselves with music artists, movies, political views, environmental views, cosmetic things, athletic loyalties, and selfish, independent tendencies, we have already been created in the image of God. Adhering to a false image is idolatry according to God and his Word, and in some ways is like taking a picture of a famous painting by a famous artist, blowing the picture up, burning the original or hiding it, and signing your own name to the picture. God knows our hearts and our intentions before we make them known and before the world was even created according to Scripture. God loved us before all things were created. Back to Morgoth, the Evil One, guess who that is supposed to represent? Think about when you have a bad thought about someone or say something hurtful to someone or treat someone poorly, you might think you are simply treating some loser in a way they deserve, but the truth is that that loser is created in the image of God and that we have all become losers because of sin anyway. Treating someone poorly and not loving them is offensive to God because God is so holy that even treating his image the wrong way is punishable by death. I argue that if you ask that, you operate under a false premise that humanity is actually good and that humanity can operate properly apart from the Creator God. You are really saying that you are deserving and that you can command God to do what you want him to do. Love God and love others is a slogan that is brandished on many church mission statements and plastered in many church buildings on signs and hinted about in various Christian songs, but through faith in Jesus Christ loving God and others is the restoration of the image of God in humanity. Our purpose as human beings is restored in Jesus Christ, and the purpose of all creation will be fully restored when Jesus returns.

Chapter 5 : "G-O-D" Is Trademarked | HuffPost

*God? A company called Morell International, Inc. filed the trademark back in August. Just what exactly Morell International or the Canadian company intend to do with their trademarks is unknown.*

Indeed, it reads more like the report of an intuition than a formal proof. Descartes underscores the simplicity of his demonstration by comparing it to the way we ordinarily establish very basic truths in arithmetic and geometry, such as that the number two is even or that the sum of the angles of a triangle is equal to the sum of two right angles. We intuit such truths directly by inspecting our clear and distinct ideas of the number two and of a triangle. As Descartes writes in the Fifth Meditation: Certainly, the idea of God, or a supremely perfect being, is one that I find within me just as surely as the idea of any shape or number. And my understanding that it belongs to his nature that he always exists is no less clear and distinct than is the case when I prove of any shape or number that some property belongs to its nature AT 7: Descartes does not conceive the ontological argument on the model of an Euclidean or axiomatic proof, in which theorems are derived from epistemically prior axioms and definitions. On the contrary, he is drawing our attention to another method of establishing truths that informs our ordinary practices and is non-discursive. This method employs intuition or, what is the same for Descartes, clear and distinct perception. It consists in unveiling the contents of our clear and distinct ideas. The basis for this method is the rule for truth, which was previously established in the Fourth Meditation. According to the version of this rule invoked in the Fifth Meditation, whatever I clearly and distinctly perceive to be contained in the idea of something is true of that thing. So if I clearly and distinctly perceive that necessary existence pertains to the idea of a supremely perfect being, then such a being truly exists. He never forgets that he is writing for a seventeenth-century audience, steeped in scholastic logic, that would have expected to be engaged at the level of the Aristotelian syllogism. Descartes satisfies such expectations, presenting not one but at least two separate versions of the ontological argument. These proofs, however, are stunningly brief and betray his true intentions. Whatever I clearly and distinctly perceive to be contained in the idea of something is true of that thing. I clearly and distinctly perceive that necessary existence is contained in the idea of God. When presenting this version of the argument in the First Replies, Descartes sets aside this first premise and focuses our attention on the second. In so doing, he is indicating the relative unimportance of the proof itself. Descartes sometimes uses traditional arguments as heuristic devices, not merely to appease a scholastically trained audience but to help induce clear and distinct perceptions. This is evident for example in the version of the ontological argument standardly associated with his name: I have an idea of supremely perfect being, i. Necessary existence is a perfection. Therefore, a supremely perfect being exists. While this set of sentences has the surface structure of a formal argument, its persuasive force lies at a different level. A meditator who is having trouble perceiving that necessary existence is contained in the idea of a supreme perfect being can attain this perception indirectly by first recognizing that this idea includes every perfection. Indeed, the idea of a supremely perfect being just is the idea of a being having all perfections. To attempt to exclude any or all perfections from the idea of a supremely being, Descartes observes, involves one in a contradiction and is akin to conceiving a mountain without a valley or, better, an up-slope without a down-slope. Having formed this perception, one need only intuit that necessary existence is itself a perfection. It will then be clear that necessary existence is one of the attributes included in the idea of a supremely perfect being. While such considerations might suffice to induce the requisite clear and distinct perception in the meditator, Descartes is aiming a deeper point, namely that there is a conceptual link between necessary existence and each of the other divine perfections. It is important to recall that in the Third Meditation, in the midst of the causal argument for the existence of God, the meditator already discovered many of these perfections – omnipotence, omniscience, immutability, eternality, simplicity, etc. To illustrate this point Descartes appeals to divine omnipotence. He thinks that we cannot conceive an omnipotent being except as existing. Since such a being does not depend on anything else for its existence, he has neither a beginning nor an end, but is eternal. Returning to the discussion in the First Replies, one can see how omnipotence is linked conceptually to necessary existence in this traditional sense. An omnipotent or

all-powerful being does not depend ontologically on anything for if it did then it would not be omnipotent. It exists by its own power: So we shall come to understand that necessary existence is contained in the idea of a supremely perfect being. Some readers have thought that Descartes offers yet a third version of the ontological argument in this passage Wilson, 1976, but whether or not that was his intention is unimportant, since his primary aim, as indicated in the last line, is to enable his meditator to intuit that necessary existence is included in the idea of God. Since there is a conceptual link between the divine attributes, a clear and distinct perception of one provides a cognitive route to any of the others. The formal versions of the argument are merely heuristic devices, to be jettisoned once one has attained the requisite intuition of a supremely perfect being. Descartes stresses this point explicitly in the Fifth Meditation, immediately after presenting the two versions of the argument considered above: Some of the things I clearly and distinctly perceive are obvious to everyone, while others are discovered only by those who look more closely and investigate more carefully; but once they have been discovered, the latter are judged to be just as certain as the former. In the case of a right-angled triangle, for example, the fact that the square on the hypotenuse is equal to the square on the other two sides is not so readily apparent as the fact that the hypotenuse subtends the largest angle; but once one has seen it, one believes it just as strongly. But as regards God, if I were not overwhelmed by philosophical prejudices, and if the images of things perceived by the senses did not besiege my thought on every side, I would certainly acknowledge him sooner and more easily than anything else. For what is more manifest than the fact that the supreme being exists, or that God, to whose essence alone existence belongs, exists? But other meditators, whose minds are confused and mired in sensory images, must work much harder, and might even require a proof to attain the requisite clear and distinct perception. When confronted with this criticism by a contemporary objector, Descartes tries to find common ground: Some commentators have thought that Descartes is committed to a species of Platonic realism. According to this view, some objects that fall short of actual existence nevertheless subsist as abstract, logical entities outside the mind and beyond the physical world Kenny, 1978; Wilson, 1976. Another commentator places Cartesian essences in God Schmalz, 1997, while two recent revisionist interpretations Chappell, 1997; Nolan, 1997, read Descartes as a conceptualist who takes essences to be ideas in human minds. In claiming that necessary existence cannot be excluded from the essence of God, Descartes is drawing on the traditional medieval distinction between essence and existence. According to this distinction, one can say what something is *in se*. So, for example, one can define what a horse is *in se* by enumerating all of its essential properties *in se* before knowing whether there are any horses in the world. The only exception to this distinction was thought to be God himself, whose essence just is to exist. It is easy to see how this traditional distinction could be exploited by a defender of the ontological argument. Existence is included in the essence of a supremely perfect being, but not in the essence of any finite thing. Thus it follows solely from the essence of the former that such a being actually exists. At times, Descartes appears to support this interpretation of the ontological argument. Understanding this view requires a more careful investigation of the distinction between essence and existence as it appears in medieval sources. The distinction between essence and existence can be traced back as far as Boethius in the fifth century. It was later developed by Islamic thinkers such as Avicenna. But the issue did not become a major philosophical problem until it was taken up by Aquinas in the thirteenth century. Like many scholastic philosophers, Aquinas believed that God is perfectly simple and that created beings, in contrast, have a composite character that accounts for their finitude and imperfection. Earthly creatures are composites of matter and form the doctrine of hylomorphism, but since purely spiritual beings are immaterial, Aquinas located their composite character in the distinction between essence and existence. The primary interest of his theory for our purposes, however, is that it led to a lively debate among his successors both as to how to interpret the matter and about the true nature of the relation between essence and existence in created things. This debate produced three main positions: The Theory of Real Distinction The Intermediate Position The Theory of Rational Distinction Proponents of the first view conceived the distinction between essence and existence as obtaining between two separate things. The theory of real distinction was also considered objectionable for philosophical reasons. On the theory of real distinction, this view leads to an infinite regress. If an essence becomes actual only in virtue of something else *in se* viz. In response to these difficulties some scholastic philosophers developed a position at the polar extreme from the

theory of real distinction. As the term suggests, this theory held that essence and existence of a creature are identical in reality and distinguished only within our thought by means of reason. Needless to say, proponents of this theory were forced to distinguish purely spiritual entities from God on grounds other than real composition. Giving up the doctrine of real composition seemed too much for another group of thinkers who were also critical of the theory of real distinction. Articulating this theory in an important passage in the *Principles of Philosophy*, Descartes claims that there is merely a distinction of reason between a substance and any one of its attributes or between any two attributes of a single substance 1: Since thought and extension constitute the essence of mind and body, respectively, a mind is merely rationally distinct from its thinking and a body is merely rationally distinct from its extension 1: But Descartes insists that a rational distinction also obtains between any two attributes of a substance. Since existence qualifies as an attribute in this technical sense, the essence and existence of a substance are also distinct merely by reason 1: Descartes reaffirms this conclusion in a letter intended to elucidate his account of the relation between essence and existence: They are referred to by a broader term and called attributes 'because we do indeed understand the essence of a thing in one way when we consider it in abstraction from whether it exists or not, and in a different way when we consider it as existing; but the thing itself cannot be outside our thought without its existence'. Accordingly I say that shape and other similar modes are strictly speaking modally distinct from the substance whose modes they are; but there is a lesser distinction between the other attributes. I call it a rational distinction. To an unknown correspondent, AT 4: Descartes explains that we regard a single thing in different abstract ways. Case in point, we can regard a thing as existing, or we can abstract from its existence and attend to its other aspects. In so doing, we have distinguished the existence of a substance from its essence within our thought. Like scholastic proponents of the theory of rational distinction, however, Descartes is keen to emphasize that this distinction is purely conceptual. In reality they are identical. He extends the theory of rational distinction from created substances to God. In general, the essence and the existence of a substance are merely rationally distinct, and hence identical in reality. One of the most important objections to the argument is that if it were valid, one could proliferate such arguments for all sorts of things, including beings whose existence is merely contingent. By supposing that there is merely a rational distinction between essence and existence abroad in all things, Descartes seems to confirm this objection. In general, a substance is to be identified with its existence, whether it is God or a finite created thing. The problem with this objection, in this instance, is that it assumes that Descartes locates the difference between God and creatures in the relation each of these things bears to its existence. This is not the case. In a few important passages, Descartes affirms that existence is contained in the clear and distinct idea of every single thing, but he also insists that there are different grades of existence:

## Chapter 6 : Trademark argument - Wikipedia

*GOD WANTS ME WHOLE is a trademark and brand of GOD WANTS ME WHOLE, INC.. Filed to USPTO On Thursday, July 12, The GOD WANTS ME WHOLE covers Broadcasting of television, radio, and Internet programs; television, radio, and Internet broadcasting of religious and inspirational programs.*

Hear ye, hear ye, hear ye. All persons having business before this honorable trademark court draw nigh, give your attention and you will be heard. You may be seated. May it please the Court: This suit was filed as a result of deliberate and unauthorized use of the aforesaid trademarked name of G-O-D hereinafter referred to as "God". In support of this complaint, we offer the following five examples of misuse. Presidential candidate Donald Trump even had the audacity to indirectly claim endorsement by my client when he said, "I will be the greatest jobs president that God ever created. It is hard to go more than five minutes in this country without hearing the phrase "God bless America. As the late Sen. Then there is the Mophie Super Bowl commercial that showed the world crumbling under unimaginable disasters and ended with an image purporting to be my client in heaven saying, "gosh darn it" because his cell phone died. The ad is entitled "The All Powerless. When someone else tells you God spoke, best double check. Let me highlight just a few. First, the prosperity gospel: This makes no rational sense. And what about the 21, people who die every day of hunger or hunger related causes? According to this argument, they apparently brought it on themselves by disappointing God. Like the television evangelist who recently told his viewers that God will erase their credit card debt if they will use their credit cards to donate to his ministry. My client never agreed to such an offer. What makes my client most angry is when tragedies are attributed to God--like the Pastor John Hagee who called Hurricane Katrina "judgment from God because of the sins of New Orleans. I remind the court of the words noted by Maureen Dowd in a New York Times article, "Dear God, save us from the people who believe in you. Competitors routinely thank Jesus--and their sponsors--in post-game interviews. They never thank God if they lose, as if the whole experience is meaningless unless you get a trophy. War is not about God. War is not of God, for God stands not on one side or the other, but in the middle of the battlefield When the words stop and the bombs begin, notwithstanding any of our differences, we all weep in the same language Worst of all, people then begin to point to it as some type of divine judgment. It is incomprehensible arrogance to think that human beings can know, predict, align with, or declare war on behalf of my client. In support, let me share four short examples from the extensive affidavit known as the Holy Bible, which was filed by my client. But the thunder of his power who can understand? Have you not heard? He does not faint or grow weary; his understanding is unsearchable. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are My ways higher than your ways, and My thoughts than your thoughts. Our goal as human beings should not to be right, justified, revenged, or the victor. We cannot utilize the name of "G-O-D" to advance our selfish purposes. And as final evidence to this court, I leave you with the words of Abraham Lincoln: I rest my case.

## Chapter 7 : How the Heck Can You Trademark "God" and "God Bless America"? - Texas Hill

*Throughout history, humanity has invoked the name of "God" to justify every imaginable type of violence: rape, murder, the pillaging of land, slavery, genocide and war.*

## Chapter 8 : Trademark: God | That I Should Gain

*I went to the trademark site and entered 'god' and after a few minutes there were pages and pages (well over ) trademarks using 'god' in some form for business', t-shirts, bumper stickers, photography, gifts, headbands, jackets and the list goes on.*

## Chapter 9 : Stephen Colbert Speaks With God About Drake's Plans To Trademark "God's Plan"

## DOWNLOAD PDF THE TRADEMARK OF GOD

*The music video for "God's Plan" has over MILLION views, and Drake boasts in the vid about giving away just shy of \$1 million to strangers -- the trademark means he's now ready to cash in for.*