

Essay

About God

Alan J. Oliver*

Abstract

The concept of God is a fundamental belief of most cultures, and without the attendant requirement for unquestioning faith this belief cannot be sustained. It is this insistence on the substitution of faith for reason which sets every God-based religion against evidence-based science, and I am suggesting that this is a fundamental part of the discord so evident in the world today. In earlier essays, I cited a televised conversation between Krishnamurti and David Bohm, in which it was said that the situation in the world today is the direct result of the way we think, and we can never change the situation unless we learn to think in an entirely different way. Thinking in the same way will only produce the same discord. In the thirty or so years since seeing that video, I cannot remember which of the two men said this profound statement. What I do know is that we ignore it at our peril.

Keywords: Worldview, dogma, gender bias, dispassionate observer, measurement problem, Judeo-Christian tradition, creation, image.

I begin my exploration using the allegedly God-given intelligence we humans are supposed to have, assuming the reason why God gave this intelligence is for it to be exercised by every living form. If one considers the concept of God to be a valid concept in the sense of being omnipotent and omnipresent, it should be reasonable to expect that anyone who has a respect for this gift of intelligence has an obligation to use it to know God. If one really believes that everything we do is known by God, it would be obvious that this omnipresent knowing applies equally to everyone. How we get around this continuous observation aspect of God is by inventing the concept of free will and using our free will to ignore the fact that if we can invent ways to invalidate God's supervisory capacity, it may be the case that any other attribute which some may assign to God is now open to question. For example, the idea of a judgemental God who rewards some and punishes others, depending on their version of the concept of God.

When I look at the omnipresence of God from a modern viewpoint I must conclude that God occupies what we call nonlocal space. From my own exploration of this space, I find it is a property of a specific state which has been discussed in the Vedas, and therefore is a relative ancient viewpoint. It is also related to the space science calls the quantum domain. The Vedic position on God is that God observes without any response, is unaffected by what it observes and therefore does not judge. If this is true, then there is little point in asking for favours or trying to please or appease God.

One opinion about God seems to be the certainty that God is a father figure, and this is probably the source of the authority assumed by males at every level in any patriarchal culture. From an

* Correspondence: Alan J. Oliver, Normanville, South Australia. E-mail: thinkerman1@dodo.com.au

evolutionary viewpoint, maleness is a relatively recent variation, the result of a shift from replication by cell division to sexual reproduction. An omnipotent God which observes without judgement has no need to respond over such a situation, and considering the state of the world today, if ever there was a need for change it is surely right now. I believe the whole point of male as the dominant gender may have been relevant in other mammalian species, but it may also relate to the fact that males play a relatively small part in sexual reproduction if one compares the size of a sperm to an ovum, and therefore males need to assert they are the major players to regain some relevance.

At conception the female egg mutates when it accepts the male's sperm. Science has shown us through Dolly the cloned sheep that virgin births only produce a clone of the mother. In the case of fertilisation by a male sperm the egg retains its femaleness for quite some time before a final resolution of the question of gender. In some cases, this question remains unresolved, resulting in the complex gender variations we see today. These gender variations have most likely been around for many millennia, and in those cultures would simply end that 'different' life at that point. Today we are reluctant to make those sorts of decisions for many different reasons; in earlier times this type of gender variability would be taken to mean a judgement by God, as would its subsequent death. And today we are making judgements our ancestors attributed to God, with little fear of consequences.

A more unpleasant result of having a male God as a role model at every level in human cultures is that of assigning women to a lesser role, be that of daughter, sister, wife, mother, lover, corporate executive, or even an elected member of a government. There is always a gender bias which places a different set of rules for women in those roles in comparison to what is experienced by a male.

Sadly, almost every male aspires to be the alpha male which has led to global financial equality at every level of life. Our leaders encourage competition, which has created violence between neighbours, states and nations in every aspect of life, from preschool to university and sport, right through to the racial tensions we see in everyday life. Co-operation and respect are rarely seen except among the few.

The Judeo-Christian Creation story has Vedic overtones adapted by Moses for general consumption. The Garden of Eden can be traced back to the Aryan home in the Arctic Circle, a place which was temperate at the time; a Paradise no less. Rather than having been banished for disobeying God, this cultural group left due to the oncoming glaciation. The Genesis description of the Creation has been interpreted as the process of matter emerging from a singularity around 4-5000 years ago, which is patently wrong. And the description of the appearance of light from a former state of darkness preceding the appearance of matter is what the Aryan people would have known from their experiences in the Siddhi state.

A central premise is that we are all created in His image, meaning God's image, with the inference we humans are somehow superior to other forms of life. I don't believe this premise stands up to logical examination. To begin with, as the creator, God, by definition, cannot be part of its own creation, which leaves the questions of His reflection and assumed gender. Gender itself must be dismissed because we have both male and female being supposedly created in his

image. My answer would be that either God is bisexual or non-sexual; either way, this surely means we cannot honestly refer to God as Him without the risk of being untruthful.

If we maintain that God created the whole universe he must have used a different method for the cosmos as well as every form of life other than ‘in his image’ which was our blueprint. Genesis does say that man was created after the physical world which would support this viewpoint. For example, in his image is more like imagining mankind, but this flies in the face of what we know from evolution unless our evolution from the earlier primates was an afterthought. If we were all made ‘in his image’ there would be no reason for the genome, and organ transplant would have none of the adverse effects we have to deal with today. If anything, the most obvious universal attribute in the whole creation is the existential struggle of every form of life; life can only exist by consuming other forms of life. This is a fact we should all acknowledge and be thankful for whatever forms we use to sustain our individual existence.

Taking the Vedic viewpoint, one could say God considers every form in a Samapatti state, which makes it possible for God to know every form of life through being the dispassionate observer. This provides a purpose for our creation; God’s experience of our experience is gained through Samapatti, and since God does not have a physical form we provide that experience to God in the same way that I had my daughter’s experience of bliss as I sat beside her hospital bed, mentioned in earlier essays. This allows us to make a distinction between thinking and knowing. We may think or imagine something and believe it to be fact. To really know something, one must have the physical, emotional and neurological experience for it to be fact.

All of this leads me to the conclusion that the assumed gender of God was invented to infer a superior role for the male gender, a central belief in this Judeo-Christian tradition. The sting in the tail here is that one can also conclude that the gender reflected on the dispassionate observer in the creation is an entangled attribute in every living form, meaning it exists as a potential state in the quantum state of matter, and as such can be in every possible variation of gender expressed by every possible form. The implication for LBGTQI and heterosexuals is that through God we are all the same.

Unfortunately, the interpretation of having been ‘created in His image’ as a personal and individual attribute opens the mind to an ego driven viewpoint of superiority when gender or any other form of bias becomes attached to one’s sense of self. Here in Australia we are having to grapple with the racism introduced by the British when the country was invaded in 1788. Oddly enough, we never mention the same racism the British have held for their former convicts and settlers during the depression years following the first World War. I can see the effect of ‘in His image’ now applied to anyone we may judge to be different, be that a disability, gender, aboriginality, migrant or refugee, worker rather than management, or even voting for a different party.

Proposal

To think in an entirely different way does not mean dispensing with the concept of God; it means returning God to the role of the dispassionate observer and not having God as the default position of being the architect of our own human dysfunction. This is hardly a new thought; in writing “The Guide to the Perplexed”, Moses Maimonides (1120-1190) tells us that God has no

attributes, which is reasonably consistent with what we find in the Vedas and the Yoga Sutras of Patanjali. We can make a start through practising being unconditional, which is to see without judgement; see the person rather than our judgement. If we can notice our judgement is really our own personal bias, we have taken the first step. I recall an old maxim, 'to define is to limit' and our judgement limits what truth we can recognise in a person to the detriment of both of us. For those who want to dig a little deeper, all these works are worth reading and, more importantly, doing the hard work of acquiring the Siddhi state and then asking your own questions. Modern science has most of the answers anyway in Quantum theory and neuroscience; they just haven't quite reached the point of understanding the dispassionate observer; the missing link is in 'the measurement problem' in Quantum Mechanics.

I think that for the philosophers we can consider dispensing with God. This leaves Mahat as the first point of reality in which conscious can be the fundamental aspect of the space called Akasha. By this I am inferring that consciousness is present in the singularity which exists as the viewpoints of post-spacetime and pre-spacetime, and this suggests to me that consciousness is the creator. The singularity then is the context which triggers the emergence of fields and matter to make the Big Bang or whatever we may believe is the first event in a cycle of creation.

Alan Oliver