

Re: About God

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-03/msg00958.html>

- *From:* Remus <roamulus@xxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 11 Mar 2008 09:15:01 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Mar 9, 2:00 pm, Peter <Poakfi...@xxxxxxx> wrote:

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...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

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

Re: About God

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)

Re: About God

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."

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

Re: About God

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.

There are several different definitions of God that are used in various conditions.

There is the God of Deism that is equated with nature and the physical universe and the nature of physical law.

There is the general principle of goodness which can sometimes be equated with various phenomenon at times.

There is also the God of the Bible, the Torah, the Koran, or other religious books, as well as gods in various polytheistic religions such as Hinduism or some of the more ancient religions.

Under many Deistic conceptions of God, physics it the one true way of most directly knowing God firsthand, by direct observation of God's principles in the handiwork that God has generated. The Bible and organized religion, by relying on secondhand text and doctrine not founded upon direct observation,

leads men astray and divorces men from the only true way that people may know God to begin with.

There are a lot of different definitions of God that are used at different times. There are also a lot of people who consider the Bible or other religious books to be spurious and false, and to not in any way be truer than a dime store novel. Under such conditions, quoting from such texts is meaningless, for one ends up trying to prove a point by referencing something that is considered to be false to begin with.

.