



**V. AVDYUSHEV**

**(Brief summary)**

## Introduction

Nobody gives the author the answer to that question. Laconically, capaciously, and essentially. As if the answer is intentionally suppressed, as if it is under a taboo. As if it is so unattractive against an expected sublime that it is just precipitated up to something obscene. Though some people regard the question itself as so obscene that even a thought about it is a real sin. It is just the unique case when knowledge is frankly acknowledged as a sinful affair! But if knowledge is inadmissible, what occupies its holy place? The obvious alternative is belief. However, the problem is that even sincere belief coming from the heart is subjective and finding out the objective answer inside it is absolutely senseless.

Meanwhile, underestimating the topicality of the question would be quite inconsiderate. The tragedy of its unsolvability consists in that, remaining in the shade of the unknown, the phenomenon concluded in the question being to unite all in the world becomes a reason of deep separations. Frequent bursts of holywars indicate that: from hot implacable discussions at table and in virtual reality to armed bloody conflicts. It so falls out, avoiding an innocuous evil in knowledge, we give birth another evil incredibly greater.

Nevertheless, it should not be misunderstood: belief as such does not carry an evil, at least when it does not impede or substitute for vital knowledge. Moreover, belief may be as a precursor of enlightenment. The author also believed in a single and universal answer and ultimately his belief has seemingly brought him to it.

This opus does not claim to be original or scientific since the author is not an expert in the field whose subject is discussed below. Besides the present writer does not have sufficient erudition even to estimate how naive or serious his thoughts are. Particularly that is why he does not survey papers of other authors on the discussed topic while in scientific treatises authors very often do it so as to highlight their novelty against the background of other studies.

At the same time the author of this opus completely realizes that the thoughts he sets out in writing are not a product of a great spontaneous revelation from pure air, therewith he admits that their shaping owes the papers of the known psychoanalysts, brilliant representatives of existentialism: S. Freud, E. Fromm, A. Adler, but mainly the creator of analytical psychology, K.G. Jung, who, if one can

speak so, implicitly suggested those thoughts. It is interesting that Jung himself as a researcher of religions, in author's opinion, was very near the revelation.

In fact the composition can be regarded as a code of laconic definitions for fundamental existential concepts without sophisticated argumentations. All the concepts ascend to the central one describing the mystic phenomenon that evidently and vividly excites the mentality of people for centuries, however, has never shaped a single attitude to itself. Meanwhile, it is so important that every person, who takes examination on maturity, counts oneself simply obliged to officially express one's personal position sometime, though only once, and answer that eternal question: what is that phenomenon? What is God?

### **Leading Questions**

To revise the question and to go out of a sphere of conventional answers to it, another question induced the author: can God exist without the human? If yes, then there arises the next obvious and rhetorical question: what is His meaning? If no, it appears that the human is His necessary condition. Someone may see that as a depreciation of His role though that is not. Of course, it turns out that God is not already above the human and He is not autonomous. Nevertheless, as may seem strange, the unconventional look does not absolutely belittle His significance. Quite the contrary, it gets more intelligible and more majestic. The human remains God's creation as in the orthodox view. God has created and keeps on creating the human while the latter, however, actuates the Creator.

In writing the opus the author proceeded from a conviction undoubted for his that God is an objective and daily reality of the human, however, its gist is difficult to comprehend owing to all kinds of His appearances. For example, a special (but very important) appearance of God is love. In the broad sense of the word this can be any love: sexual or spiritual, to oneself or to another one, to a member of the opposite sex or to just a friend, to life or to a job. Even in love He is various. Find the general in the particulars and you will understand what love is. At the same time just through love is cognized He.

Anyone having gone through love met God. Sometime everyone had an experience of love. So what is the problem? Knowledge of love is the great and staggering revelation that leads straight to knowledge of God. However the problem is that quite not everyone having experienced love knows what it is.

When we talk about love in general, we in fact turn to our own experience in which love show up to us apparently. We do talk not about the heart of the subject but about what it can be in a particular context of our individual experience. We attire plain prose with poetic altiloquent which disguises the meaning of love. Thus we just replace the absolute truth by our own views.

Though the meaning of love is actually very easy to understand and it is expressed by one curt sentence — a live thought stated with the dead language. All the rest in the multipage opus is only its commentary.

### **Unshakeable Conception**

Knowledge changes our perception of the world. Knowledge is historical. Therefore contemporaries take the world not the way their parents do. At the same time every new generation as well as anyone who represents it on the make repeats the development stages of all mankind adopting the practices of all the previous generations. The attainment of maturity already presupposes some ability for an old perception of the world. However, that is also a start point for a further development leading to a change in understanding the reality.

Every day we look at the world in a new way: it is dynamic, it develops, and we try to keep up with it. Nevertheless, some objects of this world for us remain in archaic wrappers. As you know now the Earth is not flat; the universe is not centered (not geocentric, not heliocentric, not galactocentric); gravitation is not attraction according to general relativity. But there is a fundamental conception unchangeable. It's God. Why?

### **We Believe When We Do Not Know**

The conception of God is founded on His perception. Meanwhile the perception of God is various. God is an image, a person, a superperson, the nature, a super-nature and so on. What modern are in all those? Could all the previous generations really thing in other ways? The variety in the perception of God actually indicates the lack of knowledge about Him. It just explains why people believe in Him. However, one can believe in that both He exists (the viewpoint of orthodox believers) and He does not (the viewpoint of atheists). What is very interesting is that the atheists turn out to be believers as well.

We believe when we do not know. This conclusion is not coloured with any emotions. There is nothing wrong in it. Celestial mechanics, for example, say: the asteroid will collide with the Earth with the 5-percent probability. They do not know whether the asteroid will collide with planet or not but they believe that it will do with the 5-percent probability and it will not do with the 95-percent probability. For that they have a mathematical tool, viz., belief theory which is officially called probability theory. Celestial mechanics acknowledge their lack of knowledge since no observations of the asteroid give exact information on its observed motion and so they do not guarantee exact prediction of the asteroid motion in future. Therefore celestial mechanics can only believe in the collision.

In this case the orthodox believers would grandiosely declare: God knows best! Because that is His will! However, one should not impute to God what is within the competence of nature. In fact any chance, which has its probability and in which, by the way, one can believe, is no other than a superposition of many small natural laws we just can not catch practically.

In any dynamical system random processes mixing into “visible” laws are regarded as an appearance of some irrationality or spontaneous supernatural (though vague) intention which is usually taken as something intrinsic to a living being (though hidden) and so the system seems to live its own life (though it is incomprehensible what is its meaning). If a man plunges into a system like that or an aggregation of many systems, he will find literally everywhere a confirmation of the existence of something supernatural and actually that will be no other than just the game of chances. But even if the orthodox believers assign such a part to God, is it not too small for Him?

### **Time to Define**

If the problem of understanding God consists only in the absence of His definition, so what is the matter? Why not give this definition? Some people object: no definition can be exact. That is a banal obviousness: any definition is not used for describing the subject or phenomenon exactly. It only highlights some general but main features so as to identify and reveal the subject or phenomenon among other ones. At the same time the strict definition of God enables to see how sublime, diverse and omnipresent He is.

Obvious, the definition should pretend to that everyone takes it, i.e. without regard to sex, education, social position, religion, nationality. Therefore, it should involve some universal experience of the fellowship with God being the phenomenon accessible and perceptible for everyone while it could be posed as something other having no concern with God.

It stands to reason that even if the definition reproduces an objective reality sufficiently and completely it does not mean at all that the definition should be taken by everyone. People have their own views and preferences, persuasions and delusions, sympathies and hostilities. All this, of course, finds its expression in multiple confessions (and in atheism as well). Pretending to some universality, though each of them resorts to a particular definition which is understood only by a circle of "initiates", from a small group to a whole nation. So the author does not cherish hopes for that the opus can be taken by the general public.

The point is not that author's thought will not be properly understood. Quite the contrary, the definition of God the author proposes is perfectly tangibly by everyone since it appeals to a well-known experience. However, because of indubitable clarity and simplicity, it is found to be absolutely not inscribable in any already adopted and established aggregation of existential and essential conceptions, vague and sophisticated through that they are supported only by a belief. To put an alternative definition into this aggregation is just impossible without appreciable prejudice to the latter. Nevertheless, is it worth doing that if the pseudo-system well copes with its service worldview function and it answers all vital questions?

### **What God Is**

The atheists assert: God does not exist. The believers insist: God exists. Who are right? The atheists are not right only because they do not admit the obvious fact: if God does not exist then there would be no conception of God. It would be unnecessary. A word does not appear without any need whatsoever. It is assigned to a certain phenomenon or subject of the human reality. Does it mean that the believers are right? No as well. Why? That is because they turn to an image. No matter, whether it has a definite form or not, whether it is material or spiritual. The atheists mean also an image or a substance. However, none of the believers and all the more so their opponents has never seen His image, none of them has never heard His voice, none of them has never felt His touch evidently.

If no one of them is right then the negation of the believers' and atheists' propositions inevitably leads to the assertion: God really exists but He is not an image, a subject, a form, a person or a superperson. So what is He? Perhaps, do we have to look for Him in other categories? Questions like those bring us to the main statement of the opus.

God is an action. But He is not any action. God is the action for a junction. God is the synthesis of two substances that results in the birth of a third substance. God is the act of giving birth to something new and unique; He is the act of giving birth to Jesus.

### **Deus est nativitate Christi ut synthesis homo et natura.**

It is just Jesus that we feel and perceive as something divine, from God, the God's son. Through the birth of Christ we learn Him. He is not in Christ but in his coming into the world. Though the strong wish of people to literally touch Him necessarily leads to the false looking for God in His son. That is why there arises some muddle of conceptions and a wrong interpretation of the Creator. Jesus is material while God is not but transforming matter.

The synthesis of two substances and its result are expressed by the simple arithmetical formula:  $1 + 2 = 3$ . The first substance is a person; the second one is nature, including another person; the third one is Jesus. The role of God in the formula is evident. He is the binary operation symbolically presenting as a sacramental cross.

The person as the first substance is required in the synthesis. Another synthesis is explained by laws of nature and there is not God in it. God appears just with the appearance of the person because an initiative to the synthesis exhibits just from the person's side. The person is Him necessity, however, He is a necessary condition for in the making of the person. In this sense God actually created the person and continue to create him while the latter, in turn, permanently initiates the former.

A tangible example of the arithmetical formula  $1 + 2 = 3$  is a master (sculptor) + some material (clay) = a creation (sculpture). Virtually, to this example any other one can be reduced. Evidently the creativity is just the main thing that is inherent in the divine action.

This conception of God certainly denies His the Trinity Father–Son–Holy Spirit. God is quite out of it. If one regards the Spirit as a great idea originating from the Father (the first substance, person) and embodied in nature (the second substance) through God, which gives birth to Christ (the third substance), then God is rather literally quintessence (from Latin *quinta essentia* — the fifth essence) in the bunch Spirit–Person–God–Nature– Christ.

To be continued ...