

Re: About God

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-03/msg00753.html>

- *From:* Peter <Poakfield@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 9 Mar 2008 08:03:42 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Mar 9, 10:08 am, tadchem <tadc...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Mar 9, 8:31 am, Peter <Poakfi...@xxxxxxx> wrote:

Some physicists have difficulty conceiving the existence of God: an infinite, immaterial being, who had no beginning and will have no end. They find this hard to believe, but we have three examples of things that appear to have exactly the same characteristics, and that we usually have no problem accepting: Space, time, and energy: Space and time, we realize, could not have had a beginning, and cannot have an end: they are necessarily infinite, and, evidently, they are not material. And physics teaches us that energy is conserved: it cannot be created, and cannot be destroyed. Whatever amount of energy exists now in the universe, must have always existed, and will continue to exist forever: it is infinite. And energy in its radiant form (photons) is not material, it has no mass, weight, or volume. Although we cannot see it (we can only feel its effects), it affects powerfully everything it touches. In other words, it has characteristics similar to those of God.

The above arguments will probably not be accepted by some people who have made a religion of not believing in anything, except atheism, which is silly. It is easy to dismiss the existence of God, but doing so, we are left with the difficult problem of explaining our own sometime painful existence.

"A Brief Dialog on God," by Thaddeus Stout (1969)

Q: "Does God exist?"

A: "If you think so."

Re: About God

I will take the liberty here of expanding on Stout's observation:

Q: "What do you mean by that?"

A: "I mean that it depends on what YOU personally mean by the word 'God,' and whether you personally accept that meaning as descriptive of something that exists."

Q: "Are you being evasive?"

A: "I am saying that 'God' is a highly idiosyncratic term, perhaps the most idiosyncratic term in all human language. No two people agree completely on its meaning. Therefore any detailed analysis of that meaning is itself meaningful only to one person."

Q: "Then are you trying to be scientifi