

Philosophy and Religion: My view on Religion - II

Jaimin L.S.P.

July 15, 2020

1 Introduction

In this entry I will essentially use the conclusion that I found in the last entry, and see what it means to look at religion *from* that conclusion. I tried my best to remain unbiased, having known of my conclusion at the time of writing the first entry, but the idea of the first entry was to look from the perspective of religion in order to draw out the conclusion naturally, and not assume the perspective of the conclusion. Here, it is my goal to explore what it means to look back at religion, this time from the viewpoint of my conclusion, touching on these parts:

- What the Conclusion is, and What it Means to Use it as a Viewpoint
- The Void in Human Existence
- Religious Theology and the Void

I personally think that my conclusion, from the last entry, is valid. However I know that others may not think so. Therefore, I must point out that my assumption of its validity is purely hypothetical, but might also be seen as practical.

2 What the Conclusion is, and What it Means to Use it as a Viewpoint

So, building up on the last entry, I will state, as simply and briefly as possible my conclusion:

There is an innate element of human existence that is ultimately missing. That is to say, there is a sense of a void in human existence, that by living life we see and think that there is something not present in human existence. And so it is the purpose of religion, in this context and from this perspective, to provide a conceptualisation of human existence such that the void is filled and human existence is, and feels, whole.

Do note, that whenever I mention “The/My conclusion” or “The/My foundation”, I refer to the collection of statements above unless I am referring to another foundation.

Needless to say, regardless of the truth of this conclusion (I have reasoned its validity, to a satisfactory degree I believe, in the last entry), I will now start to view things from it in the following sections. As a viewpoint itself, it means I will try not to assume any theology or principle from any of the standard religions. The foundation is the conclusion, and I will build up from this foundation.

3 The Void in Human Existence

The major part of my conclusion is that there is an inherent implication within all religions in that there is a void in human existence. I do often repeat this, but with good reason, because it is essentially the core of the conclusion itself.

To say that something is missing from human existence means that by existing, we cannot find out what is missing. What I mean to say is, that to find what is missing, you must be standing/perceiving from outside of human existence. It is precisely like trying to figure out what part of a maze is missing, without a map, and from the inside. The only way you might be able to see the missing part of the maze, is from above. And so, building on my conclusion, I will now say that it is impossible to truly identify what is missing from human existence simply because we exist. The only thing we can, and often do, is sense that there is this void.

I do think that I can reason why it is we sense this void, beyond simply saying “We feel it”. In order to do this I will introduce human logic and language, in very much their simplest forms. What I want to bring forth from language is concept identification and differentiation. By this I mean the quality in human language processing that allows us to say “This is not that” or “This chair is not a cat”. Simple differentiation. Now, bringing in basic human logic as well, as you have seen, we can say that “X is not Y” and so forth, but it doesn’t only have to be comparative to an object we know the existence of. Such is the void that I have introduced. It is nonexistent in every respect of the word. So as humans, the only being to extrapolate our logic to such a high degree, we are able to subconsciously suggest the possibility of ‘something that is not anything’. Essentially, the void is a creation of our mind going off its own rails, and running on its own tracks made of human logic. And so there is no reason at all for us to assume its falsehood, because by our logic, it cannot be false. Thus, simply put, the void is ‘Not anything’. I would like to draw the line in that it is not ‘The unknown’ because such a thing might imply that it *can* be known, but in truth the void, by its definition of ‘Not anything’, is the negate of even anything that could be known.

Therefore, whilst we exist as humans and we live our lives, there is, implied within the very basic root of human logic and language, the idea of ‘a complete negation’. This is the void. The thing we can say is not anything within

human existence or human perception. And because of its very nature and definition, we can never find out what this void is as long as we exist. If anyone reading this suggests “Well, we ought not to exist, then we can find the answer!”, then, as I am sure they would know, if we don’t exist, there is no one that is able to find anything, let alone find out what the void is. In this lies a paradox/impossibility, and I would like to think that here also lies a certain beauty.

4 Religious Theology and the Void

Here is where I really try to look back at religion in light of what I said about the void in my conclusion and the previous section. Within my conclusion itself, I did say that it is religion's role to fill the void that we implicitly see as existing. Furthermore I did say, in the last section, that we can never truly discover the form of the void due to its inherent nature. Therefore we can say two things about religion in its theology and principles. Firstly, as said before, religion serves as a way to fill the void, but I would add that these 'additives' embody the necessity for 'belief' in the individual. Secondly, the way religions fill the void can never be known to be the only true way to do so, due to the nature of the void 'Not being anything'.

Now might be a good time for me to bring in the individual with respect to these two points just mentioned. From the individuals perspective, there is something missing within human existence, and so they turn to religion/belief to fill that void. What this individual is essentially doing, from the perspective of my foundation, is finding a way to fill the void, but I would add, in a way that they, and they alone, see human existence as being whole afterwards. This serves as the basis as to why all the religions of the world exist in their variability: the fact that a 'whole' human existence is seen differently by everyone, as there exists an inherent difference in insight and experience.

My foundation does imply that all of the theologies/principles in religion are created by humanity, such as the idea of God and Gods, from the subconscious/conscious perception of the void. But I would extremely stress the fact that this does not mean in any way or regard that I say any of these theologies are incorrect. Quite the contrary. The void that I propose is void of correctness and incorrectness. And so, if I say that the theologies of religions are derived from the void, from the thing that is not anything, then what I say is that these theologies, like the void, can neither be correct nor incorrect. The void itself has no reasonable nor logical foundation, after all it cannot be said to *be* anything, but it does serve as the foundation to draw up things in human creation that do not exist within our perception. And so the theologies, and elements of theologies, that do not exist visibly in our perception, are forged from the void, which itself is not known, nor can ever be known. My point here is that the void alone is useless. By definition it has no form, no quality. I could even go as far as to say that the void negates its own very definition that I give. It is in every way useless, but at the same time without knowing its form we cannot begin to know how to fill it. So in

this way it is useless, but vital.

And so the theologies of all religions, enter. The reason one must 'believe' in a religion is because it contains principles/theologies that, at their root, have no foundation. In this way they ultimately have 'guessed' the shape of the void, and have attempted to fill it, and only in faith and belief can an individual say that the void of human existence has been filled completely. For the sake of simplicity, let us consider the case of an individual that is Christian. Can they say anything, or assume anything about their God? In this case I would say that they are entitled and able to say anything they wish, after all this is a hypothetical individual. Now, can they say that whatever they have said is correct or incorrect? I would say not. They may think it is correct, but the entity to which they refer to, being their God, from my understanding, can be said to exist outside of this realm, this universe, this 'creation'. And so, whatever correctness or incorrectness means, it may very well not mean anything outside of this universe/existence. Therefore, we cannot know, nor say anything of something that can exist outside of this universe/existence. In this sense, nothing is true, nor false, not least because we cannot know, but also because those very concepts may not apply at all outside of our existence. And in the same way exist the theologies of all religions, I think. In part, they are neither correct nor incorrect. They are as void of these things as the void in my conclusion is also.

I know that some may hold a grudge in that I imply the ideas/theologies within religion are made by humanity. For example, a believer in Christianity, Islam or Judaism wouldn't say that God is a concept made by humanity. But by my viewing of these theologies from my conclusion, as in the last paragraph, there is nothing to suggest that the act of making these theologies isn't the same as the act of discovering them. After all, by my view, these theologies have no foundation, meaning there is nothing to suggest they are made, discovered, nor that they even make us. Ultimately, the lack of foundation in these ideas and theologies provides freedom to draw statements relative to the theologies themselves. It provides the possibility in suggesting that even if humanity created the concept of God or Gods, there is nothing to suggest that this act was not caused by God or Gods themselves. In this way, theologies are 'guesses' as to the form of the void as explained before, but are tangible for humans to conceptualise, whilst retaining the derivation from the void in that they are external to existence itself also. It is my hope that you might see that my foundation of religion, using the concept of the 'void', does not go against the idea that religions hold certain theologies, but rather explains why such principles and theologies are held and how they

actually help. I would admit that the void has no foundation either, but I would think that in the way I have explained before, this very fact is not a weakness, but the source of its ability to serve as the root of all religions.

I would like to have, now, a little exploration of morality. I would hope that we can all say that there is no foundation for the establishment of an absolute morality. I do not mean to say that Good and Bad is pointless as it provides a foundation for much of human action. There is no real reason as to why something is good beyond it being either not bad or just that it is simply good. For example why is kindness good? I know we can agree that it is good, but we cannot say why it is so beyond the simple fact that it is good. One might say that it is good because “It helps people”, but I hope you might see that this also has no foundation, and even if it does, we are in the same situation, and it continues on and on infinitely. And so there is no solid foundational reasoning. For this very reason I will say that this is one of the reasons why morality has a large role in many religions: because it, like theologies, has no foundation. And so I will finish by saying that like theology, morality is neither correct nor incorrect, but also like theology, morality is infinitely useful.

5 Final Remarks

There are more implications on religious theology that I think my foundation has, but I will save them, refine them, and hopefully share them in another series. It will be good to note that the implications I have explored in this entry may not be complete in their reasoning, but I hope to make them just so, in a later entry in this series.

In my next entry, I will explore the implications of my foundation, not just on religious theology, but with a higher focus on society as a whole, and will hope to touch on secularism.

I will also take this time that I have changed my mind in the way this series will function. I have said that in the short future, there will soon be a third and ‘final’ entry in this series. But it would be more accurate to say that it is not final, but simply on hold. My views may very well change, and so I will make this series, along with many other series that I create, indefinitely long in the number of entries it will hold. I will be free to add to this line of thought, change it and even point out its faults should I see any.

This entry compared to the last, is especially prone to misunderstanding by the reader, by the only fault in that my explanations are not complete or structured enough. For this, I do understand, and can only say that I will try to improve my clarity and conciseness in future entries. Just as in the previous entry, I do hope that this one also provides at least some food for thought.

Thank you for reading.

END