

Re: About God

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-03/msg00773.html>

- *From:* Peter <Poakfield@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 9 Mar 2008 14:00:05 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Mar 9, 2:02 pm, "Dirk Van de moortel" <dirkvandemoor...@ThankS-NO-SperM.hotmail.com> wrote:

Peter <Poakfi...@xxxxxxx> wrote in message

3d1afbe3-6327-4447-be22-ab6f61abf...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

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

Re: About God

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."

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."

Re: About God

Q: "Then are you trying to be scientific about God?"

A: "Not at all. Science requires replicability and independence from the observer. I am asserting that neither can be achieved in any discussion of 'God'. One simply cannot be scientific about 'God' in the absence of the logical requirements of science."

Tom Davidson
Richmond, VA– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

God is a spirit. Science, which deals with matter and material things, is not the appropriate tool to investigate about things in the spiritual realm. The spiritual realm is clearly in a different dimension. We had no way to know about God if He had not revealed Himself. But there is ample historical evidence of His revelation.

Why does he only reveal himself to uneducated sheppards and peasant's daughters?

Dirk Vdm– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

That has not been the case at all. God has revealed Himself to many people: extraordinary leaders, like Abraham and Moses, which, of course, could not have had PhDs, because there no universities at the time. But he has also revealed Himself to people with great talent and education, and many of them have been made saints, like St. Thomas Aquinas, St Augustine, and many others.

.