

## Essay

# Various Thoughts on God & Science

Himangsu S. Pal \*

### ABSTRACT

In this essay, I describe my various thoughts on God and Science. God had to create this world in order to overcome His utter loneliness. So He wanted in His creation a conscious life-form (man) with whom He could communicate. It is unbelievable that God can suffer from any uncertainty of knowledge. At deeper level universe is deterministic. My own experience of life (mystical and others) also confirms it. So when God will observe the position of any subatomic particle, He will observe that with His own light. Evil is there not because God has given man free will, but because God is fully free. God is fully free means God has got full freedom to create. This is for those who are very much hurt by the idea that God is neither good nor evil, that He is beyond good and evil.

**Key Words:** God, Science, creation, uncertainty, free will, evil, goodness.

### How God's utter loneliness was revealed to me?

Immanuel Kant states “God created the world for His honor’s sake because it is only through the obedience to His holy laws that God can be honored” (see <http://2012daily.com/?q=node/42>). This is not true. God had to create this world in order to overcome His utter loneliness. So He wanted in His creation a conscious life-form (man) with whom He could communicate.

Now it may be asked how I came to know about it, the utter loneliness of God. There are many ways by means of which God communicated His truth to man. I was in my mid-twenty at that time. I have already had mystical vision several times in my life. One day I was slumbering in the day-time. While asleep I had a vision: I am alone in the entire universe, and I can also feel with all the horrors of it how lonely I am. Then I woke up. From then onwards I have never questioned about God's purpose for creating the universe, because the truth has been revealed to me.

### On Fearing GOD

Winston Churchill stated “United we stand secure. Let us then move forward together in discharge of our mission and our duty, fearing God and nothing else” (see <http://2012daily.com/?q=node/40>). I do not find any reason as to why man will have to fear God. He who fears God distances himself from Him. But God needs man, because through man only He can overcome His loneliness. So why will God desire that man fears Him?

---

\* Correspondence: Himangsu S. Pal. E-Mail: [sekharpal@rediffmail.com](mailto:sekharpal@rediffmail.com)

## **On Uncertainty principle**

Einstein believed in strict causality till the end of his life. In his last surviving letter to Einstein, Heisenberg writes that while in the new quantum mechanics Einstein's beloved causality principle is baseless, but "[w]e can console ourselves that the good Lord God would know the position of the particles, and thus He could let the causality principle continue to have validity" (see <http://2012daily.com/?q=node/52>).

I think Einstein is correct here. I cannot believe that like us God also suffers from uncertainty. Yes, it is true that at our level there is uncertainty, but that does not mean that at deeper level also there will have to be the same sort of uncertainty. At our level we know that light has a speed of 300,000 km/sec. But we see that in its own reference frame light cannot have any speed; actually it cannot move at all, because from special theory of relativity we have come to know that for light any distance it will have to traverse is reduced to zero. So if light has nowhere to go, then how can it have a speed? Or, how can it move? So we see here that there are two types of truth: 1) Truth that appears to us as true, but that is not true at deeper level. We can call it apparent truth, 2) Real truth.

In case of particle's position and momentum also we can similarly say that there are apparent truth and real truth. The apparent truth is that we cannot exactly pinpoint the position of a particle, because when we attempt to locate its position, we will have to see it by focussing some sort of light on it, but the energy of the light particle disturbs its position. But at deeper level there might be other forms of light of which we cannot have any idea. This light may have so low level of energy that if the particle is observed with this light, then its position will not be disturbed at all, and thus there will be no uncertainty.

I am repeating again that it is unbelievable that God can suffer from any uncertainty of knowledge. At deeper level universe is deterministic. My own experience of life (mystical and others) also confirms it.

## **With what light God observes things?**

When we human beings want to observe something, whatever that something may be, we will have to focus some light on it. Without light we cannot observe anything. This light is the created light. It may be argued that God also cannot do without light for observing anything. But why should that light have to be created light? Would that not mean that before creation God could not see anything and that He was completely in the darkness before creation? But that cannot be. It cannot be that before creation God was in the darkness, and that when He created light then only He could see everything. As it is not plausible that God would be in the darkness at any time, and as it is also not plausible that He could not see anything due to the absence of any sorts of light, so from this we can come to the conclusion that light was already there before creation also, and that God Himself was that light. So the most basic and primary element of the universe must have to be light and light only, it cannot be anything else. In one of my earlier essays (If God created

the universe, then who created God?) I have also pointed out that if there is really a God, then that God can be light only, and nothing else. Here again we see that there must have to be light before creation also. So when God will observe the position of any subatomic particle, He will observe that with His own light. Why will He require any created light for observing that particle? And how do we come to know that this un-created light has so high an energy value like the created light that this un-created light also will dislocate the sub-atomic particle from its original position, and that in consequence there will also be uncertainty of knowledge about its position at God's level?

### **Atheism of modern scientists**

Heisenberg said “We can console ourselves that the good Lord God would know the position of the particles, and thus He could let the causality principle continue to have validity” (see <http://2012daily.com/?q=node/52>).

Here father of the uncertainty principle himself is admitting that he does not know whether this principle holds at deeper level also. Now compare his agnosticism with the atheism of some modern scientists. These scientists pretend as if they have already come to know everything that can be known about this universe, and therefore they think that this knowledge has given them some sort of right to openly declare that uncertainty principle works at each and every level of the universe. But mathematician Peter Woit has written in one of his blogs that physicists have so far been able to explain only 4% of the universe, the rest 96% being dark matter and dark energy. So, with only 4% knowledge of the entire universe how do these scientists boast that they have known everything? Therefore I think that agnosticism can be a respectable philosophy, but atheism cannot be. Atheism is another name for dogmatism.

### **On Problem of evil**

Isaac B. Singer said "since God wanted us to have free will this means that Satan, in other words the principle of evil, must exist. Because what does free choice mean? It means the freedom to choose between good and evil...if there is no evil, there is no freedom” (see <http://2012daily.com/?q=node/64>).

I think so far nobody has been able to properly tackle the problem of evil. If God is good, then why is there so much evil? The answer mostly given by the theists is just the one we read here. God wanted us to have free will. But having free will means having freedom to choose between good and evil. But if there is no evil, then there is no more freedom of choice for us. Thus we are not actually free. Therefore evil must have to be there in order that we may have free will.

But the real story is something else. Evil is there not because God has given man free will, but because God is fully free. God is fully free means God has got full freedom to create. Similarly He has got full freedom not to create. But a good God can never have freedom not to create,

because in order to do justice to His own good nature a good God is always bound to create, and thus He is not fully free. How can a good God be called good if He cannot do any good to anybody? So, in order to do good to others a good God will always be bound to create others. So He can never have freedom not to create.

Similarly it can be shown that neither can an evil God have freedom not to create. An evil God cannot be properly called evil if He fails to do any evil to others. But if God wants to do evil to others, then first of all there will have to be others. So here also He is always bound to create others for doing justice to His evil nature. But for a God who is neither good nor evil there is no such binding that He will always have to create. Here He can freely decide whether He will create or not. Thus a really free God is neither good nor evil. Like Hindu's Brahman He is beyond good and evil.

Now, if we accept that God is fully free, then we will have to admit that He is neither good nor evil. In a universe that has originated from a God who is neither good nor evil there will always be good as well as evil, as there will always be positive energy as well as negative energy in a universe that has originated from zero energy. Theists always say that their God is all-powerful. But actually they pretend as if they are more powerful than their all-powerful God. That is why by labeling their God as all-good they dare to curtail God's own freedom, His freedom not to create.

### **On goodness of God**

This is for those who are very much hurt by the idea that God is neither good nor evil, that He is beyond good and evil. Traditional God is described in this way: Before creation there was only one God, and there was nothing else, no space, no time and no matter. Let us suppose that in this situation God asked Himself this question: Am I good? If in this situation it was possible for God to know with certainty that He was good, then of course He is good. But if this was not at all possible, then God cannot be called good. Those who will opt for the affirmative here should also explain by what process God could have come to the realization that He was good, because we all agree that at that time there was no one else, nothing else, other than God.

If I claim about myself that I am good, then I am also claiming that I am the negation of that which is not good. That which is not good is the other, and I am not the other. I am the negation of the other, and the other is my negation.

But if we claim about God that He is good, then where is the other of whom God is the negation? This is because before creation God was one, and there was no one else other than God. So for God to be good, He will have to be His own negation. For God to be good He will have to contain within Himself His own other. This can be expressed in the following way: God is the principle that represents all that is good and at the same time He is the principle that represents all that is not good. God is the affirmation as well as the negation at the same time. So either we will

have to say that God is both good and not good. Or we will have to say that God is neither good nor not good. But to say that God is good will be philosophically naive and immature.

## **Eckhart on God**

Mystic-philosopher Meister Eckhart had also said for the same reason that man can be good, better and even best, But God cannot be good. We should think over the matter logically, and not emotionally.

Here is an excerpt from Eckhart's writings: If I say that "God is good", this is not true. I am good, but God is not good! In fact, I would rather say that I am better than God, for what is good can become better and what can become better can become the best! Now God is not good, and so he cannot become better. Since he cannot become better, he cannot become the best. These three are far from God: "good", "better", "best", for he is wholly transcendent. If I say again that "God is wise", then this too is not true. I am wiser than he is! Or if I say that "God exists", this is also not true. He is being beyond being: he is a nothingness beyond being. Therefore St. Augustine says: "The finest thing that we can say of God is to be silent concerning him from the wisdom of inner riches."

## **Boehme on God**

1. "When I ponder, what God is, I then say: He is the One in contrast to the creature, as an eternal Nothing; He has neither a ground, a beginning nor state; and is of naught, save only of Himself: He is the Will of the Ungrund, He is in Himself only One, He occupies no space nor place: from eternity in eternity in Himself He comes to be: He is like or similar to no thing, and hath no particular place, which He inhabits: the eternal Wisdom or Intelligibility is His habitation: He is the Will of the Wisdom, the Wisdom is of His manifestation".

2. "The eternal Divine mind is a free will, not having arisen from anything nor through anything, it is itself its own seat and abides at one and alone in itself, ungrasped by anything, for then beside it and before it is nothing, and the selfsame Nothing is at one, and is moreover itself as the Nothing. It is the one Will of the Ungrund, and is neither near nor far, neither high nor low, but is rather the All, and moreover as the Nothing".

3. "For the holy world God and the dark world God are not two Gods; there is only one God; He is Himself all being, He is the bad and the good, heaven and hell, light and darkness, eternity and time, the beginning, and the end: wherein lies concealed His love in a being is all therein His wrath revealed".

4. "The power in the light is God's love-fire, and the power in the darkness is God's wrath-fire, and is but yet only one selfsame fire, it divides itself over into two principles, in order that the

one be revealed in the other: for the flame of wrath is the revelation of great -- love: in the darkness will be known the light, otherwise would nothing be revealed to it".

So as per Boehme also God is the bad and the good at the same time. And this is only because God is one. Similarly He is light and darkness at the same time. And the darkness will have to be there, as otherwise light will not be revealed at all.

## **Does God exist?**

God will exist scientifically so long as special theory of relativity will remain intact. God will exist scientifically so long as time and distance will go on becoming unreal at the speed of light. No scientist, however great, will ever be able to do anything against God so long as these two conditions are satisfied, that is, so long as time and distance can become unreal.

With the help of special theory of relativity we can explain God's spacelessness. With the help of special theory of relativity we can explain God's timelessness. With the help of special theory of relativity we can explain God's changelessness. With the help of special theory of relativity we can explain God's immortality. With the help of special theory of relativity we can explain how God can be everywhere. With the help of special theory of relativity we can explain all the major attributes of God. When we find that science can explain God, why shall we have to think that God is non-existent? If God is non-existent, then why has science explained God? Is it the job of science to explain a non-existent entity like God? So either that particular science is faulty that explains God; or, if that particular science is not faulty, then God is not non-existent.

Special theory of relativity (STR) is also science, and as a theory it has not yet been falsified. When we find that with the help of STR we can fully explain God, we feel that our belief in the existence of God is scientifically justified. If some scientists claim that not God, but "nothing" has given birth to our universe, then we will say that this "nothing" is fully supportive of God. This is because this "nothing" has not only given birth to the universe, but it has also generated some scientific laws and theories of which STR is a major part. With the help of STR we can not only explain God, but we can also answer the age-old question "Who created God?" if total energy of the universe is zero. So we will boldly say that this "nothing" of the scientists is in no way against God. Rather we will say that it is also of the view that there is a God. That is why it has generated a theory like STR with which we the believers can defend our faith.

## **References**

Pal, H. S. (2010a), God, scientists and the void. *Scientific GOD Journal*, V1(6): pp. 428-432.

Pal, H. S. (2010b), Timeless & climax. *Scientific GOD Journal*, V1(7): pp. 492-496.