

# Re: About God

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-03/msg01065.html>

---

- *From:* none <"doug\"@(none)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 12 Mar 2008 18:02:42 -0700
- 

Peter wrote:

On Mar 11, 10:17 pm, none <"doug\"@(none)> wrote:

Peter wrote:

On Mar 11, 3:02 pm, none <"doug\"@(none)> wrote:

Peter wrote:

On Mar 11, 12:15 pm,  
Remus <roamu...@xxxxxx>  
wrote:

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...@xxxxxxx

Re: About God

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

Re: About God

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

Re: About God

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.

Re: About God

Re: About God

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

Re: About God

Re: About God

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

Re: About God

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

Re: About God

Re: About God

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  
aboutGod?"  
A:  
"Not  
at  
all.  
Science  
requires  
replicability  
and

Re: About God

Re: About God

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

—

Godis  
a  
spirit.  
Science,

Re: About God

Re: About God

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.

Re: About God

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,

Re: About God

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

Re: About God

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

## Re: About God

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.

## Re: About God

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.– Hide  
quoted text  
–  
– Show  
quoted text  
–

It is not easy, but it is not  
impossible to learn  
something about God.  
We have to use our head.

In other words, you just make it up.  
Your god is a minor one as most of the  
world's population is not aware  
of him or pays any attention to him. Clearly  
then he is not omnipotent.– Hide quoted text  
–  
– Show quoted text –

I told you, God gave us complete freedom. But if we pay no  
attention  
to His good advice, we usually get into trouble. I just think it  
is a  
good idea to heed Him.

What about the other 2/3 of the world that does not acknowledge him?  
Is he going to use them to play with or extract vengeance upon?  
For a minor god, he sure has pretensions of glory and power.– Hide quoted  
text –

– Show quoted text –

Re: About God

You made me laugh. God is our father, and He loves us, no matter what.