

what is God?

most people begin with the question: do you believe in God?
but there is a far more important question that precedes the belief in anything:
what is it?

before deciding to believe in anything, it is first necessary to be clear as to what you are choosing
to believe in.

western religions will say that God is the creator of the universe;
naturally, from this truth it must follow that everything else is its creation;
to believe in this truth creates a relationship of separation between creator and creation;
an artist and its work; a cause and effect; a King and its subjects; a father and son.

it seems that the west has convinced itself that the design of the universe is, in its nature, a
monarchy. a white bearded, all powerful, Kingly, Lordly, fatherly image of a creator, which has
given humans a sense of order and security in the universe.

you are thus born into the world as an incomplete, sinful being,
tasked with closing the gap between you and your creator;
and how very convenient it is that a man-made institution offers the only seemingly correct path
to rid your heart of sin and to find such creator: in church, in the synagoge, in prayer, in the
absence of sin, in prophecy: all man-made.

but from simple observation, is the universe really, in its nature, orderly? is it not rather, chaotic,
spontaneous, unpredictable, raw?

it seems that we have elevated man's personification and social structures onto the order of the
universe. we have observed our species' behavior and personified the entire design of the
universe as such. do our survival-driven programs really make us believe ourselves this
grandiose?

in such a vast and infinite universe, are we really, as humans, the center of creation?

on the other hand,
eastern religions will say that God is both creator and creation;
God is impersonal, neutral, a phenomenon.
God is both the phenomenon of existence and everything that exists in it;
both essence and form.

it is not that God is in nature;
it is nature itself.

perhaps the culprit is really the structure of our language which limits our understanding to the very structure of language; for instance, if something is, then everything else isn't; our language does not structurally allow something to be both the essence and the form at the same time.


it is in the very design of our man-made language that the act of defining something excludes it from everything else that it is not.

by definition, if God is something, then everything else is not God.

would we understand God differently if we abandon the preconditioned structures of language in our mammalian mind? could we not understand God as an experience? a phenomenon? must we put everything in words for it to be true?

does the sound of the rain need translation for it to exist? must we name the sun for it to share its light?

maybe it is by means of our limited view of the world, through our limited language structures, that we are inhibited and unable to understand God as a unified phenomenon. anything man-made is limited to the mind that created it. given that language is man-made, do we really believe that our survival-driven minds to be sufficient to understand the ultimate design of the universe?



perhaps, instead of finding God, as dictated by western religions,
our true task is to lift the illusions that separates us from identifying ourselves as God.
not our ego's, not our identities, not our names, not our bodies, not our individualized souls.

but rather,
our deepest nature, as consciousness, as existence itself;
not the vehicle, but the light that it carries.

a light that is impartial, non judgemental, non controlling, all encompassing, never beginning,
never ending, timeless. infinite.

september 2025
raworldmr