God Before Gods

Coherence, Constraint, and the Origin of Divinity

Reed Kimble

(Structured Tooling Assistance by ChatGPT)

A Reversal of the Usual Assumption

It is commonly assumed that gods were *invented* as explanations for natural phenomena that early humans could not yet describe: storms, seasons, fertility, death. In this view, divinity is a placeholder for ignorance, later refined or replaced by science.

This paper proposes the inverse.

What if the first concept of **God** was not explanatory at all, but **structural**?

God as a Coherence Attractor

Under this inversion, the earliest conception of God was not about causality ("why does this happen?"), but about **constraint** ("how must we act for life to remain coherent?").

Human life is saturated with decoherence:

- conflict,
- scarcity,
- fear,
- desire,
- violence,
- error,
- accident.

Left unconstrained, these forces fragment both individuals and groups.

The earliest notion of God can be understood as the recognition of a **single coherence attractor** — a non-negotiable ordering principle to which humans must submit *if* they are to remain whole, together, and alive.

God, in this sense, is not a being among beings. It is the name given to **the condition under which coherence persists**.

Constraint Before Explanation

Seen this way, early religious language is not primitive science. It is primitive **systems engineering**.

The core insight was simple:

> There exist constraints we do not author. Violating them reliably produces suffering and collapse.

Submission to God was therefore not about belief, but about **alignment**.

To "obey God" meant:

- to restrain impulse,
- to accept limits on power,
- to subordinate individual desire to collective survival,
- and to act as though coherence mattered more than advantage.

These were not metaphysical claims. They were survival-tested observations.

Why History Had to Be Long

Such constraints could not be discovered in a single generation.

They required thousands of years of collective observation:

- experiments in governance,
- cycles of empire and collapse,
- attempts at law, ritual, sacrifice, and covenant,
- and the slow elimination of false solutions.

What survived was not truth in the abstract, but **what did not break under repetition**.

In this sense, "six thousand years" is not a claim about geology. It is the approximate duration of intentional human attempts to live under non-arbitrary constraint — what later traditions would call "obedience to God," but which is more precisely **submission to coherence**.

The Emergence of Many Gods

Only later did divinity fracture into domains.

This was not necessarily an attempt to build a pantheon, but an attempt to **manage complexity**.

As societies grew, coherence itself had to be reasoned about at multiple levels:

- war,
- agriculture,
- fertility,
- trade,
- justice,
- death.

Assigning gods to domains was a way of preserving the original insight — that coherence requires submission to constraint — while allowing humans to reason locally without collapsing everything into an incomprehensible whole.

In modern terms, this was an early form of **domain separation**.

Monotheism as Compression, Not Innovation

Monotheism did not invent God.

It *re-compressed* the insight.

It asserted that the apparent multiplicity of domains still pointed back to a single source of coherence — a unifying constraint that could not be violated without consequence, regardless of context.

God, here, is not smaller than the pantheon. God is what the pantheon was trying, imperfectly, to distribute.

Modern Error: God as Explanation Again

Ironically, modernity often repeats the original misunderstanding it accuses religion of making.

God is treated as:

- an explanation for gaps in knowledge,
- a competitor to science,
- or a psychological projection.

All of these miss the original function.

God was never primarily about explaining nature. God was about **restraining humans**.

Implications

If this inversion is correct, several things follow:

> • Religion is not anti-rational; it is pre-rational constraint discovery.
> • Science does not replace God; it operates *within* the constraints God names.
> • Ethical collapse occurs not when belief fades, but when constraint is forgotten.

Most importantly:

> The danger is not losing God. The danger is forgetting why God was named in the first place.

Closing

God was not invented to explain the world.

God was named because humans needed a way to refer to the set of constraints they did not author but were nevertheless bound by — constraints that, when violated, reliably produced suffering, fragmentation, and collapse.

The name was not given to answer questions, but to hold attention on what mattered when answers failed.

God was named so that coherence could be remembered, submitted to, and preserved across generations — even when no one fully understood why it worked.

That insight took millennia to emerge.

It is not primitive. It is expensive.

And it is easy to lose again.