

WHY DO YOU BELIEVE IN GOD

Gigi Tevzadze

გიგი თევზაძე

საბოლოო ფილოსოფია

© გიგი თევზაძე, 2017

ყველა უფლება დაცულია

ბაკურ სულაკაურის გამომცემლობა,

თბილისი, 2017

Gigi Tevzadze

WHY DO YOU BELIEVE IN GOD

© Gigi Tevzadze, 2017

All rights reserved

Published by Sulakauri Publishing

Tbilisi, Georgia, 2017

The first and main thing you must know when beginning to read this brief text is that I am not intending to prove to you that God exists or does not exist. First of all, it is impossible to do this, because belief in the existence/non-existence of God has to do with faith and one's views. On the other hand, I do not need arguments for the existence/non-existence of God in order to speak about the issue evident in the title.

I think the question concerning a majority of intellectuals, either they be believers or non-believers, can be formulated in the following manner: **Why is it that a majority of mankind, historically, as well as today, believes in God?**

And accordingly, **why is a belief in a supernatural power, the existence of God easy, whereas a denial of the existence of this power is quite difficult?** To say it in another way, **why is a denial of the existence of God something difficult to do, whereas believing in the existence of God is easy?**

It is apparent that a believer's response to this question will be clear and self-confident: "Because God exists." In contrast to this, the response of an unbeliever is not as clear as this. In the end, after thinking and discussing it, the unbeliever will say that:

a. Everything is the fault of ignorance;

b. The more humankind is educated, the more it no longer believes in the existence of God.

In response to introducing an unbeliever to modern research, according to which there is no diminution of faith in the societies of educated, so-called “developed countries”, but instead it is even growing (it is true in the context of the proliferation of religions and objects of faith, but still), an unbeliever will resort to many arguments, beginning with the increase in immigration and ending with the unwitting, yet in the end of things, not one of his arguments will be able to make himself believe it.

Thus, the question described above as a thought of intellectuals over the centuries is pertinent and interesting. It is entirely possible that you have never encountered this question with such a formulation, but you have seen it many places in an altered form. For example, in the literature of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century (not only), where a protagonist searches for the meaning of life, or in philosophical texts, where the foundation of a person's morality has been examined. All these texts try to answer a question whether there exists a sufficient basis (moral, ontological, etc.) to allow for the existence of God.

The reason for posing this latter question is still the question described above: **Why is the existence of God, a supernatural power, the creator of the universe evident, whereas to deny this on the basis of scientific facts or a held discourse is quite difficult and is the not very convincing result of some enormous effort?**

Thus in fact, you can never convince an opponent (in this case a believer) in the correctness of your own argumentation and at last realize that all this effort had still been expended in order to convince yourself once more in the non-existence of God and supernatural powers.

An answer to this complex question exists and it is in two related, although contrasting discourses: one deals with life, whereas the other has to do with one of the forms of life – a description of the highest nervous function.

Life is the control of mass and energy through information

In 2014, Zaal Kikvidze and I began writing a book about evolution. The initial proposition for the idea of the writing the book was an elaboration of new definitions of life by Zaal, according to which life is the control of mass and energy through the means of information. This definition is free from the defects (there are basically two of these defects – either it is too general, or it has too much of a descriptive character) of some other definitions of life and it introduces two important concepts, which I think describe life the most precisely: information and control. It is truly as such: an elementary form of life, for example, a bacterium, consists of information (inscribed in the genes) and thus, any form of life (described as mass and energy) is controlled by the information inscribed within it. On a higher level, this information is created in

the brain and then this specific organism is controlled according to this information. Thus, this definition perfectly describes any manifestation of life and tells us something very important: that life, first and foremost, is control.

It is no less interesting as to what essence the word “control” has in this case. When the discourse is in regard to control through information, as a rule, they have in sight that information is transmitted (through the use of mass and energy), an answer is received, then it is processed, with an answer being transmitted again, and so on. Consequently:

Control through information is communication.

The second important conclusion that we came to while working on the book is that life is unconditionally communicative and social: the transmission, reception, and processing of information takes place in all forms of life. This is correct in the case of a cell, as well as for plants and intelligent beings. The life of a cell is dependent on the communication taking place between its parts, which are in approximately the same hierarchical relationship like bees in a hive or ants in a nest. Bacterial life is dependent on how information is transmitted to each other and how they can read their own environment. The resistance and adaptability of plants is directly connected to the environment by their genes with the processing of this information received from the environment. Intelligent beings having a central nervous system can only gen-

erate survival and success mechanisms by communicating with each other. We, human beings, at the peak of nervous system development and in possession of the most developed brain in comparison to other animals, exist only through the means of each other and our main task is to improve the means of communication – beginning with the invention of money and ending with androids and other gadgets.

To sum things up, we reach the conclusion that:

Life is only and only inevitably social

Or, life exists only as communication. In other words, any form of life is connected to the exchanging, processing, and re-exchanging of information.

The exchange of information or information control no longer occurs at some stage of the development or evolution of life only according to codes inscribed in genes: the central nervous system begins to evaluate and make a choice. The brain can grade the received information and the main thing, decide where and in what direction to send this or that information which its own environment needs for control. The situation in the society of those possessing a brain principally differs from the individuals where everything is recorded in the genes and is implemented according to what has been inscribed. Ants try to build a nest everywhere and have slaves, as well as like bees, which in any case, always try to build a hive, and have a queen and worker

bees. Birds, animals, and human beings mostly function according to what environment they have to be in. They behave according to what is offered by their community and the environment in which they have usually turned out to be.

Accordingly, the transmission of information by creatures possessing a brain, communication, or the control of the environment by them, is basically implemented according to their decisions. A controlling subject emerged along with the emergence of a brain, or who on the basis of their own decisions, clearly resulting from external factors, makes a decision as to what, what sort, and how much information must be transmitted and how received information must be processed.

A large part of living creatures having a central nervous system and brain mostly control their own environment on the basis of their own decisions.

Thus, when we, human being, talk about controlling or imagine controlling something using the analogy of our own self, we reach the conclusion that control is impossible without a controlling subject, or he that controls.

Otherwise, as was seen above, even the most simple organisms are controlled through information, yet in their case, the subject making a decision as to what information and in what amount needs to be received and where it needs to be directed does not exist. In the case of elementary organisms, as well as in the case of every specific cell, all the information of controlling (how the organism must react to external stimuli, what part of the organism must do in relation to each other, how they must

work) is inscribed in the genes, through which the control of mass and energy occurs.

With this not very extensive discourse, as it may, we have approached an answer to the question used as the title of this text: every subject having a brain and central nervous system knows that it can control at some level. Or it knows that it can do something that causes a change in its environment. The subject receives this knowledge as a result of the experience it gathers throughout its own life. We human beings know that all our actions are an attempt to control our environment: every transmission of information by us is participation in controlling our environment.

Once more: any of the behaviors we carry out is a transmission of information and all our behavior has a result, however insignificant it might seem to us. Accordingly, all our behavior is participation in controlling.

It will not be a metaphorical construction if we were to say that subjects having a brain and a central nervous system create their own mini-worlds controlled by them. Their progress or failure is measured by the size of these mini-worlds and the influence on other mini-worlds.

Thus for us as human beings, control is unimaginable without a controlling subject. It is apparent to us that if some control exists somewhere, or the exchange of information and behavior according to information, then there is a subject/subjects somewhere which carries out all of this.

A large majority of people perceive the surrounding universe

as a finely-tuned system which is governed by specific, very complex, yet clear rules and laws.

Such a perception is not entirely baseless. As was examined previously, wherever life is, at the same time there is control, too: the living organisms with which our world is populated, act according to the information given in them, whether it be at the genetic or conscious levels. Accordingly, there is control where there is life.

As has been noted many times, human beings adequately perceive the surrounding living universe as a process of control and its result: life is truly a process of control. Due to the aforementioned reason, people, based on their own experience, cannot differentiate the control and the controlling subject, which controls: thus human beings automatically place the controller “behind” the controlled universe.

The total insurmountable nature of belief in God is precisely in this: one's wrongly generalized experience is added to the work principle (control) of a correctly perceived life. As a result, a concept regarding an omnipotent subject (subjects) becomes universally understandable and evident. This universal comprehension is frequently called intuition.

Thus, it flows from all the aforementioned **that a concept regarding God or gods is intuitive, because it is supported on a perception of the world based on the personal experience of every person.**

Let's once again glance over the explanation offered in this text:

- Life is control at every level – from the simplest organisms to human beings;
- Control is the reception, processing, and transmission of information;
- Creatures possessing a brain are controlling subjects, yet every form of life does not recognize a brain; quite a number of life forms are controlled by information inscribed in genes, without the participation of a brain or subject;
- For human beings, a concept regarding control, intuitive and based on one's own specific everyday experience, is connected to the controlling subject conducting the information, processing it, making a decision, and acting through its own decision;
- Human beings perceive the surrounding living universe entirely reliably as a process of control: a defined, specific interlocked entity of complex laws and rules;
- Since human beings perceive the surrounding living universe as a process of control, based on their own as well as reliable experience, in their own conception they add a controlling subject (subjects) to this process of control;
- Thus a universal, intuitive concept about a god or controlling super-subjects comes into being.

As was mentioned at the beginning of this text, everyone has an intuitive concept of God, whereas it requires enormous effort to deny Him, precisely because this concept will be from two realities and a self-apparent phenomenon:

1. A perception of the living universe as a process of control;

2. Personal experience of the impossibility of a controlling process without a controller.

This is precisely why it is difficult to oppose an intuitive concept of the existence of God: it is almost given in experience. Even more so – based on the discourse carried out above, even highly-developed animals must have an idea of God or a supernatural entity: those having a central nervous system and a brain can see their own role in controlling their own environment. It has not been ruled out that this must be one of the bases of the relationship between humans and animals, especially of the taming and domestication process.

In place of a conclusion

What arguments can a skeptic gripped in opposition to this discourse have regarding an intuitive concept of God? The most important thing in the argumentation conveyed by me is that I do not need to introduce a super-order and appropriately, a super-subject ensuring this order to explain the diversity of the living universe. This, on one hand, would explain the diversity of the living universe, whereas on the other hand, it would explain the complex and wonderfully tuned working connections. It follows from this same discourse that the idea of God which we and also possibly highly-developed animals have, is a side effect of the emergence of a central nervous system and brain) through the evolution of organisms. Whoever wants to delve more deep-

ly into the ongoing discourse of the communicative theory of evolution, I advise them to acquaint themselves with the book *Evolution (Evolutsia)* by Zaza Kikvidze and myself (Bakur Sulakauri Publishing, Tbilisi, 2015).

As was previously mentioned, the task of this text was to explain why the majority of people have an intuitive idea of God or a super-subject and to no way at all prove or refute the existence of God. The important thing in the substantiation carried out on these pages is that not only does evolution and the development of life have no need of an idea of God or a super-subject to explain it, even an explanation of an intuitive concept of God has no need for the allowance of the existence of a super-subject. As we have concluded, our own perception and social experience takes us to the point that we all agree about the existence of some superpower which is a controlling subject. It carries out the control that we clearly and evidently observe in our environment.

With the theoretical stance conveyed on these pages, a concept regarding a supernatural being/beings standing behind God or the order of the universe extant in every culture with various forms and expressions, is based on the unequal distribution/generalization of the universal human experience, first throughout the entire living universe and then throughout the inanimate world. Once again: this has no sort of connection in reality to the existence of God. It becomes apparent once again through this discourse that there is nothing as such in our environment which can substantiate or refute the existence of God for us. This topic still remains in the realm of faith and through the stance described

on these pages, it is at last freed from the argument of “a clearly observable, controlling” subject.

I think the time is not far off when proto-life synthesis will become possible in a laboratory setting. But this does not mean that it will be possible to go from a bacterium to a human being in the conditions of a laboratory: the billions of years and the uniqueness of the conditions that brought life from a bacterium to a central nervous system and a brain (and accordingly, to the side effect of an intuitive concept of God), are probably unrepeatable.

Clearly, you can pose a question that at long last God could have created the proto-life from which contemporary diversity developed without His intervention. Clearly it is possible, but in this case, such a God will be reduced to a scientist working in properly equipped laboratory.

