

# Humanity as the Impartial Observer

Ercan Acar

Independent Researcher, Germany 2025

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-7392-8939>

Contact: [ercan\\_acar@hotmail.com](mailto:ercan_acar@hotmail.com)

## Abstract

This paper explores the paradox of a silent God in an immense universe. Instead of viewing this silence as divine absence, it argues that this is a deliberate feature of reality—a carefully arranged stage designed for humanity's core purpose: to act as conscious and *impartial observers*. Placed at a safe epistemic distance, we are tasked not with passive belief, but with actively interpreting the universe as a kind of silent text. We are meant to generate ethical and existential meaning from our observations, a task that would be impossible under the direct influence of an ever-present authority. The paper also explores how divine love creates 'delicate breaks' in this hiddenness, offering guidance without destroying the freedom essential for authentic moral development. By re-examining concepts from theology, philosophy of consciousness, and sacred texts, this study re-frames our existence. Our purpose is not merely to live, but to observe, interpret, and shoulder the responsibility of the meanings we create in a universe designed for our freedom.

## Keywords

Impartial Observer, Divine Hiddenness, Free Will Defense, Soul-Making Theodicy, Epistemic Distance, Meaning-Making, Cosmic Silence

## Contents

<b>Humanity as the Impartial Observer .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Abstract .....	1
Keywords .....	1
Introduction: The Human Being and the Problem of Being an Observer .....	3
Conceptual Framework: What is the Impartial Observer? .....	5
Witnessing and Pre-Conscious Observation in Cosmic History .....	6
Silence, Divine Hiddenness, and the Space for Universal Impartiality.....	7
The Human Observer: Consciousness, Free Will, and Making Value.....	10
Why We Need an Impartial Observer: A Theological and Ontological View.....	11
The Interpretive Nature of Observation and How We Build Meaning .....	12
Cosmic Silence and Our Place as Observers .....	13
God's Invisibility: Epistemological and Pedagogical Dimensions.....	14
Divine Silence and the Ontological Results of Observation.....	15
A Delicate Break in the Balance of Hiddenness: Divine Love .....	16
The Call to Observe, Find Meaning, and Build Ethics in Sacred Texts .....	18
Conclusion.....	19
References .....	20

## Introduction: The Human Being and the Problem of Being an Observer

Where human beings fit into the universe is a question that has long occupied both philosophy and theology. The central argument in this essay is that we were created not simply to exist, but to function as conscious and *impartial observers*. This role takes on its true significance when we consider that God placed humanity not merely in the world, but upon a vast and multidimensional cosmic stage. From this standpoint, a human is a being equipped to watch events unfold, starting with themselves and their immediate surroundings and looking outward to the cosmos. They interpret what they see, form value judgments, and in the process, make ethical choices using their own free will.

This ability to create abstract concepts, to think in the abstract, and to produce ethical values from observation, is not something we learn later in life. Current data from neuroscience and developmental psychology suggest these faculties are innate. If that is true, then the role of the *impartial observer* must have been intentionally assigned to us by a creator. We should also work from the assumption that the results of this role are being watched and evaluated. Human existence, then, is not a passive state of observation. It is a structure that must carry the meaning it derives from what it sees and take responsibility for it.

In a universe where God does not seem to intervene directly, people are called to create meaning from what they can observe. The universe appears to be a silent place at the level of human perception, and this very fact provides the fertile ground for our unique interpretations. Many thinkers call this silence *divine hiddenness*. For some theist philosophers, it is a necessary state of affairs. It allows people to develop faith in God as a free choice. Richard Swinburne (2004), for example, explains that God does not make himself obvious because faith needs to be a free human choice to have any real value. In a similar way, John Hick (1966) sees this hiddenness as a kind of testing environment, necessary for our moral and spiritual growth. The universe, in this sense, is less like a speech from God and more like a silent text. It is made up of his traces, its inherent order, its laws, and its aesthetic design.

The goal of this paper is to look again at the human role of observer, not just as a problem of knowledge, but as an ethical and existential one. I want to explain the link between God's silence and the order of the universe and open a discussion about why we might have been created for this purpose. This essay puts forth the idea that being an *impartial observer* is the most important reason for our existence from God's perspective.

I want to add a brief note about consciousness, even though it's not the main topic. Throughout this essay, I'll be working with the assumption that consciousness is an endowed quality. It does not seem to be the kind of function that could simply evolve over time. While we can explain things like behavioral patterns, adaptation, and social interactions through mechanistic processes, consciousness is different. It has a unique quality that stands outside that mechanical framework, allowing for abstract thought and the creation of concepts. Because of this, consciousness looks less like a biological function that developed through evolution and more like a capacity that was granted to our model of existence by a more fundamental, transcendent consciousness.

This way of thinking has found support in modern philosophy. For instance, Achim Stephan (1999) sees consciousness not as the natural outcome of biological processes coming together, but as a phenomenal reality with its own ontological standing. For him, consciousness is irreducible; you cannot explain it away with purely physical or biological descriptions.

Similarly, David Chalmers (1995) brought up what he called the *hard problem of consciousness*. He highlighted how incredibly difficult it is to explain how physical processes in the brain give rise to subjective experience, or qualia. For Chalmers, the answer might not lie just in the brain's processing of information. He suggests consciousness could be tied to a deeper, still unexplained, ontological level.

Ned Block (1995) adds to this by pointing out that conscious experience has two sides: the phenomenal part (what it feels like) and the access part (what we can report to others). He argues these two are not the same thing, a distinction that again points to the irreducible nature of our inner experience.

John Symons (2018) talks about how some features of reality are simply a *brute fact*, too complex to be explained by models of *weak emergence*. He always places consciousness in a special position among these features.

These lines of thought all suggest that consciousness isn't just about biological evolution, but might be linked to a higher level of intentional design. The fact that conscious experience doesn't just *exist* in the universe but also *produces meaning* (especially in areas like ethics, aesthetics, and metaphysics) leads to a powerful conclusion. It suggests that this capacity is the very foundation of the human's primary function as an observer.

The idea of the *impartial observer* defines the human being as a conscious entity tasked with producing meaning in a world where God is not visible. This idea shares some ground with concepts in the literature like the "moral observer," the "epistemic witness," or "spectator theories of knowledge". In this text, however, it is being placed within a new and specific metaphysical framework.

While this essay will touch on philosophy of consciousness, ethics, epistemology, and interpretations of sacred texts, its main job is to discuss the silence, freedom, and *divine hiddenness* that people encounter in their role as an *impartial observer*. For that reason, even though the conceptual backdrop is wide, the analysis will mostly go deep into theological and existential questions.

## Conceptual Framework: What is the Impartial Observer?

The *impartial observer* is the central, original concept in this study. This observer is not just a passive witness watching the outside world. It is a conscious being that forms judgments based on what it sees, creates meaning, builds value systems, and does all of this on its own, using its free will, without direct instructions from God.

According to this view, God didn't just create humanity; He wants us to use our ability to observe the universe to arrive at ethical, aesthetic, and existential conclusions. But we can only fulfill this role in an impartial universe. And that impartiality is only possible because God doesn't constantly and directly interfere and because He is not visible in the world of our senses. The theory of *divine hiddenness*, which tries to explain God's silence, is a key argument that supports this. John Hick (1966) views this hiddenness as a necessary testing ground for our moral and spiritual growth.

One could argue that the human role as an observer is central to our created nature. If you take away the role of the *impartial observer* and what it produces, the very things that set humans apart from other animals become questionable. Many species can act as witnesses, but if the role of observer is defined as uniquely human, it gives our existence a special kind of meaning. Humans were designed as conscious beings so that we could observe and interpret how the universe works, from ourselves and our local environment all the way to the designs of a multiverse. This process of observation isn't just about gathering information; it's about making meaning. As William James highlighted with his idea of *The Will to Believe*, a person can build a world of values through observation and intuition, even without direct proof (James, 1897).

At this point, our position as observers in the universe becomes the very thing that defines our purpose. Through all our observations and evaluations, we are actors trying to understand the universe and building that understanding through our own efforts. In this sense, God's design for existence is like an "open system" that is meant to be discovered through observation (Swinburne, 2004).

Based on all this, we can suggest that humanity's existential purpose is to take on the role of the *impartial observer*. Through our judgments, our distinctions between good and evil, our sense of right and wrong, and our unique interpretations, we are not just living. We are observing, evaluating, and giving meaning to the universe on God's behalf.

## Witnessing and Pre-Conscious Observation in Cosmic History

In this section, we'll look at the long cosmological story that set the stage for humanity's role as an observer, focusing on the idea of witnessing. In the next section, we'll ask why this observer has to be "impartial" and what that means theologically.

Based on scientific data, we can say with confidence that life existed before humans. Everything we know about the universe, from its birth to the formation of Earth, shows that a whole spectrum of existence was already operating long before we came along. This ranges from non-living matter and unconscious life forms to beings with some level of consciousness. The human project, perhaps, hadn't even been considered yet.

What this means is that God had already filled existence with countless living and non-living things that reflected His knowledge and power. This diversity, unfolding over billions of years, created a state of witnessing, whether it was conscious or not. A dynamic and living model of the universe was running. Even this witnessing took place in a multidimensional and impartial cosmos. To be honest, however, if witnessing were the only goal, designing such a massive and complex universal system seems like overkill. In other words, God probably didn't need to build a multidimensional universe billions of light-years across, with invisible connections, just to make Himself unseen and establish a principle of hiddenness.

For creatures with limited cognitive ability, it's debatable whether God's interventions would even make a difference in their behavior. They would just live within the limits they were given and wouldn't be forming interpretations about abstract concepts. Think about it: if you placed a sheep in a world where God's voice and actions were constantly echoing, would it behave any differently? It's unrealistic to think so, unless it was given some entirely new internal hardware. The same goes for bacteria or plants; you wouldn't expect that kind of awareness from them.

In a universe built on this scale, the purpose of all the silence and veiling becomes a real question.

And this is where a fascinating shift begins. From its very start, the universe was designed to give rise to interpretations that would eventually fill it. Why? Because interpreting existence, finding meaning in it, and evaluating it with aesthetic and ethical values are things that can only come from conscious observation, not just from passive witnessing. The silence of the universe itself has been seen by some thinkers as God's way of "opening up epistemic space." In this view, God wants to be understood through the traces, laws, and order He left behind, not through being obviously visible. This "veiling" is not a necessity; it's a conscious decision (Jang, 2017; Northcott & Berry, 2009).

So, while the first stages of existence were only about witnessing, the arrival of humanity marked the beginning of an era of interpretation, of meaning-making, and of creating ethical categories like good and evil, beautiful and ugly. This happened because a new faculty came online: the ability to evaluate things freely and impartially. Some cosmological readings suggest that God built a long preparatory process aimed at the birth of a conscious interpreter. The fact that the universe has a certain level of obscurity, rather than being completely transparent, is what feeds our search for meaning and our freedom to interpret. This is what allows the observer to be an active interpreter, not just a passive witness (Muhtaroğlu, 2021; Açıkoz, 2020).

And so, we moved from a "period of witnessing" that lasted for billions of years to a "period of interpretation" with humanity. For humans, a multi-faceted process of observation began, starting with ourselves and our immediate world and stretching out to the depths of the Earth and the infinite layers of space. The expectation is that through the values we produce from these observations, we will come to a new understanding of God's silence, His veiling, and His choice not to appear directly.

## Silence, Divine Hiddenness, and the Space for Universal Impartiality

The sheer size, complexity, and multidimensionality of the universe might make a person feel insignificant at first. But in reality, this stage seems to have been carefully set up so that we can perform our role as impartial observers. God has created a stage where we are not directly influenced, guided, or manipulated. This stage functions within an order where the beauty and design of God's existence can always be seen, but where He does not directly interfere. This brings up a paradox that many theistic thinkers have pointed out: if God exists, why is He silent?

According to some philosophers, God's "invisibility" doesn't point to his absence. It points to a condition that makes human freedom and moral growth possible. Richard Swinburne (2004) explains that God doesn't make Himself completely obvious because for faith to be valuable, it must be a free choice. John Hick (1966) similarly interprets God's silence as an environment that allows for our moral and spiritual development. Paul Moser (2008) takes a different angle, arguing that God only reveals Himself to humble hearts that are looking for a relationship, so the silence is a moral quality, not an epistemological one. In this light, God's silence can be understood as an existential requirement for impartial observation and free will.

A special balance seems to be kept between this silence and the delicate interventions that sometimes follow certain events. The main goal is to protect the impartial structure of the universe and to position humanity as an observer open to free interpretation. This is a good place to bring up J.L. Schellenberg's (2015) argument from *divine hiddenness*. Schellenberg argues that if God were a truly loving being, He would make His existence clear and undeniable to everyone. His view connects *divine hiddenness* with a lack of love.

But the framework I'm proposing here sees it differently. God's goal isn't to be directly visible. It is to bring forth an observer who, without interference, turns toward love by producing values through free will. And as modern ethical debates show, real moral value can only be created in a space of freedom. Any love or loyalty that is produced under force or constant surveillance loses its moral meaning.

At the same time, we have to acknowledge, based on sacred texts and world history, that God hasn't been completely silent through time. Divine interventions have, at times, broken this silence, but they seem to have been done in a careful and balanced way that doesn't destroy the universe's impartial structure. These interventions seem calibrated to create a new foundation for free thought, impartial observation, and ethical production, without giving away the mystery of the grand design.

Therefore, God's invisibility is not a sign of a lack of love, as Schellenberg suggests. On the contrary, it's a strategy of epistemic distance, designed to make a deeper and freer kind of love possible. And God doesn't keep this distance static. He appears to manage the balance of *divine hiddenness* in a dynamic way, making conscious and delicate interventions at certain times for the sake of love, as we see in sacred texts, religious history, and studies of world history.

This, however, brings up a tough question: How can we square events that look like divine intervention “the collapse of civilizations, global disasters, major historical breaks..” with the principle of impartiality?



At first glance, this question seems to contradict everything we've said about God's silence. But it's based on a big mistake: looking at events only from their final moments of destruction, while ignoring the process and context that led up to them. Throughout history, the fall of civilizations has always started with the decay of human-made systems, the breakdown of the environment for impartial observation, and the systematic crushing of an individual's ability to interpret freely.

In this light, those historical "resets" that feel like divine intervention might actually be delicate corrections. They could be adjustments aimed at protecting the universal balance and the principle of impartial observation. When humanity's primary role "the ability to think freely and observe consciously" is threatened, God may close certain historical chapters and open new ones where that role can be performed in a healthy way again.

This idea fits well with what is known in theology as the *soul-making theodicy*. This model, developed by John Hick (1977), proposes that the world is designed as a place where people can build their character, moral responsibility, and ethical judgment through their own free will. From this perspective, the shocking transformations and disasters in history are not God's punishments. They are better understood as sensitive adjustments made to create the conditions needed to reactivate humanity's essential position as the *impartial observer*.

It's worth adding a quick note here, so as not to go too far afield: it seems God is extremely sensitive to any corruption or robotization of the human model, or to any permanent structures that would systematically remove us from our position as impartial observers. Why? Because these situations would make our core created function to observe freely, produce values, and build meaning completely useless. Some theistic thinkers point to historical examples where they believe God intervened precisely when this function was about to be irreversibly lost. They even argue that the very way He intervened was designed to protect freedom.

The idea that God's interventions happen in parallel with the working of the natural system, rather than directly, has been voiced in various theological circles. In this view, when systematic corruption reaches a point of no return, God makes readjustments in a way that protects the environment for impartial observation. This could show just how much importance God places on the role of the observer.

Swinburne (2004) argues that God acts on the universe not directly, but through regular and consistent laws. His influence is not through overt miracles, but through the immanence of these divine laws. In this context, even major historical shifts, which might look like natural consequences of the system, carry the marks of a larger epistemological purpose behind them.

## The Human Observer: Consciousness, Free Will, and Making Value

As observers, we aren't just passive witnesses recording what we see. We are beings who form judgments, make choices, and decide what to do based on our observations. While observing our surroundings, we have the ability to ask basic questions like, "Is this good? Is this fair? Is this true?" To ask these questions, you need more than just consciousness; you need free will. At this point, observation stops being just a perceptual act and becomes an ethical one.

Alvin Plantinga's (1974) *free will defense* is important here. God chose to create beings with free will because that's the only way for real moral values and meaningful choices to exist. This shows that every value we produce as observers plays a central part in God's design. If observing was just about following a pre-written script, then free will, and with it, ethical values, would be meaningless.

It's clear from this that human existence is about more than just being alive. The real meaning is hidden in the process of observing, making judgments, and building value. Some theological views describe humans not just as living creatures, but as conscious actors who give meaning to the universe. From this angle, the role of the *impartial observer* becomes the very core of our existence. From the moment we are born, we begin to observe our environment. This observation expands from our inner world out to the galaxies, and over time it grows into meaning production, accumulated experience, and a view of the world.

And this process isn't just individual; it's social and historical too. Humanity as a whole is producing a gigantic amount of data from the sum of all its observations and experiences. This collective observation is not just about understanding the universe; it's also about discovering the principles and values embedded in God's creation. As James (1897) pointed out in *The Will to Believe*, human belief is fed not just by logic, but by intuition, observation, and the creation of value.

God's silence gives us both the freedom to observe and the responsibility to create value. That's why observation is not just an epistemological act; it's an ethical and existential one. Because what we observe involves not only what we look at, but how we look and why.

## Why We Need an Impartial Observer: A Theological and Ontological View

After a long period of pre-human witnessing, the figure of the observer emerged. This observer became an actor who not only sees, but who attaches ethical meanings to things and interprets God's silence with free will. But why does this new actor have to be impartial? That's the question we'll explore in this section.

The idea that God created us not just as observers, but as *impartial observers*, has deep theological and philosophical meaning. Impartiality isn't just about not being judgmental. It's about not being easily influenced, not being conditioned to a certain idea, and allowing the thing being observed to have a meaning of its own. This is only possible for a conscious being who has free will. This is exactly what Jean-Paul Sartre (1943) meant when he said we are "condemned to be free": we are the beings responsible for creating our own meaning.

If you look closely at God's cosmic creative process, you see that humans show up very late in the game. Before us, there are billions of years of cosmic history. The chain of life on Earth moves from the simplest forms to the most complex systems: plants, animals, ecosystems, climates, the planet itself, and even the galactic systems it belongs to. All of this preparation lays the groundwork for our existence. Theistic evolution argues that this order isn't random but shows a conscious direction toward existence (Conway Morris, 2003). The fact that we are the final link in this chain suggests that the observer role is meant to be carried out at the highest level of consciousness.

From this perspective, we can say that God wanted to be known and witnessed even before He created humanity. There's no doubt that God was aware of Himself in His own consciousness before creating the role of witness. What he was doing before then could be the topic of another essay. The story this paper focuses on begins billions of years ago with the start of cosmic history and the creation of the first witnessing roles. In a way, cosmic history begins with God's desire to be seen through a witness. This fits with Ibn Arabi's metaphor of the "hidden treasure" (*kenz-i mahfi*): the phrase, 'I was a hidden treasure and I wanted to be known, so I created the creation,' connects God's will to create with his desire to be known (Chittick, 1989).

But billions of years later, with humanity, this witnessing entered a new stage. God designed a being that doesn't just witness, but also attaches ethical meaning to the order it observes. The role of the *impartial observer*, in this sense, involves an existential responsibility that goes beyond mere witnessing. Martin Buber's "I-Thou" relationship (1937) describes this kind of direct, free, and non-objectifying relationship between God and humanity.

This is also a huge risk. Impartiality opens the door to illusion, to denial, and to treating one's own limited perspective as absolute truth. But that is precisely what makes it meaningful. Meaning is born in the space of freedom; it comes from having options, not from being forced. The fact that God let us loose in such a vast field says a lot about the nature of his relationship with us. When you consider this alongside John Hick's idea of divine hiddenness, some thinkers interpret this silence as God intentionally stepping back to make room for our free creation of meaning.

God calls a consciousness that can create value with its free will to rediscover His existence in the midst of silence. For this reason, the *impartial observer* is not just a metaphor; it's our essential position in the cosmos. We are no longer just witnesses. We are meaning-makers, interpreters, and agents who are forging our own purpose through those interpretations.

## The Interpretive Nature of Observation and How We Build Meaning

The order of the universe is more than just a physical structure; it's a field of meaning. But this meaning takes shape based on the observer's position, intention, and point of view. What matters for the observer is not just what they are looking at, but what they are looking for, how they are looking, and what tools they are using to see. This changes the human role as an observer from a simple processor of information into a multi-layered process that involves ethical, aesthetic, and ontological dimensions.

In this light, God's silence shouldn't be seen as an absence, but as a space created for the observer to construct meaning. As Thomas Nagel (1986) pointed out, it's impossible to get a "view from nowhere," an external perspective on the universe. This forces us to create meaning from within our own limited viewpoints. Even with these limits, observation offers a rich field for production.

The same event in nature can hold a divine meaning for one person, while for another, it's just a random occurrence. This shows how deeply our lives are intertwined with our own value systems, experiences, and beliefs. As Peter Berger (1967) explained in his sociological work, we don't just experience the world; we make sense of our experience and socially construct it.

Instead of showing Himself directly, God speaks through the multi-layered signs He has placed in the universe. There is a deep strategy behind this silence: we, the observers, don't receive meaning ready-made. We are invited to produce it. This invitation is the most refined reflection of God's trust in human freedom. Swinburne (2004) supports this idea, arguing that God's choice not to appear directly is necessary for free belief

and the production of meaning. Observation, in this form, is both a cognitive and an existential journey.

So, God's apparent silence is not a defect; it's a profound form of respect. It is respect for the efforts of human reason, emotion, and free will to make sense of the universe. Every person is part of this effort. One observer looking at an insect might be filled with wonder at its complex design, while another might see it as a pest to be exterminated. One person might see a stone as worthless, while another might use it to generate cosmological, cultural, or aesthetic value. Observation, therefore, is shaped not just by external reality, but by the inner world of the observer.

## Cosmic Silence and Our Place as Observers

The physical size of the universe gives the impression not just of space, but of a gigantic stage built specifically for us as observers. In this universe, which is billions of light-years wide, we have the privilege of watching countless events, from distant star explosions to galaxies colliding, from a safe distance. This safe position allows us, as observers, to watch impartially, without being directly affected.

Cosmic-scale events like stars collapsing, supernovas, or galaxies crashing are actually events of immense energy release and destruction. If we were any closer, we wouldn't even be able to survive. But because we are at a safe observational distance, we can both continue to exist and produce knowledge, meaning, and aesthetic value from these events. I mean, we get to watch explosions and collapses that are terrifying and destructive enough to wipe out millions of worlds from our own comfort zone, as casually as if we were drinking coffee, and we get to enjoy turning them into science and art. This reinforces the impression that the universe was designed like a laboratory or a stage (Davies, 2006).

What's more, the very elements that make up our world have their origins in these great explosions and collapses. We know that elements we use every day like iron, nickel, and gold didn't originate on Earth. They were forged in the cores of stars and reached our planet through cycles that took millions of years, and against very low odds (Rees, 1999). The fact that all these processes of formation happened under conditions that were safe and suitable for human life suggests just how carefully our role as observers was designed.

From this perspective, cosmic silence is not an accident; it's a conscious design. Instead of putting His voice directly into the universe, God put His traces, His laws, His balance, and His beauty there. The observer's job is to follow these traces in the silence. As Swinburne (2004) emphasized, God's influence isn't through open intervention, but through the consistent working of natural laws. For this reason, the size and silence of

the universe can be seen as a structure where our ability to observe is tested on both an epistemological and an existential level.

## God's Invisibility: Epistemological and Pedagogical Dimensions

I want to use the following research to underline why God might have chosen to remain invisible to human senses.

- **Human Experiments on Authority:** Social psychology experiments by people like Milgram and Zimbardo are shocking because they show how quickly individuals give up their own judgment when faced with authority. The fact that we don't directly experience God's authority is a meaningful teaching choice. It prevents this kind of cognitive surrender and makes it possible for us to freely take on our ethical responsibility.
- **Surveillance Experiments with Children:** In some studies, when a picture of "watching eyes" is in a room, both children and adults are more likely to follow the rules (for example, they don't cheat). This means that even symbolic authority (a picture of a pair of eyes), without any real authority figure present, changes behavior.
- **Authority and Freedom in Animal Behavior:** Observations of primates show that when a dominant alpha is in the group, the other members are more compliant, but also more suppressed. When the alpha is removed, there is a temporary breakdown of norms, followed by the creation of a new social order. Rat and mouse experiments have shown something similar: animals that live under a constantly punishing authority develop "learned helplessness" (Seligman, 1967), while their desire to explore and solve problems increases in freer environments.
- **Moral and Ethical Development:** According to Kohlberg's theory of moral development, people move from early stages focused on "obedience and punishment" toward "principle-based" moral judgments over time. But if an authority figure is always visible and dominant, it can be hard for this development to reach its higher levels.
- **Psychology of Religion Studies:** Some research shows that a constant emphasis on external authority (like "God is always watching you") leads to an "extrinsic religiosity" in people. A more autonomous and deep ethical development, on the other hand, seems to happen more easily through the experience of "God's invisibility," in situations where faith is tested.

Based on these findings and theological arguments, the main reason God chose to remain hidden is to allow for our moral and spiritual development to happen in an environment of freedom. Under the constant pressure of a visible authority, people tend to conform and depend on authority, as seen in both Milgram's (1963) obedience experiments and Zimbardo's (1971) Stanford Prison Experiment. Primate observations (de Waal, 1982) also show that the presence of dominant individuals limits creativity and independent behavior. In contrast, Kohlberg's (1971) theory of moral development showed that a person can only develop their own principle-based judgments when they are independent of external authority. Therefore, God's "hiddenness" opens up a space for choice and responsibility. It allows a person to decide on their beliefs and actions based on free will, not just necessity. As Swinburne (2004) stressed, this is how faith gains value. And as Hick (1966) said, when people are left without visible surveillance, they are tested and move toward moral and spiritual maturity. So, God's invisibility is not a sign that we've been abandoned, orphaned, forgotten, or unloved. It's a sign of a divine teaching method that prioritizes our free development.

## Divine Silence and the Ontological Results of Observation

God's apparent silence does more than just expand our field of freedom; it also gives us the responsibility for all the observations and values we produce. Every person leaves a mark on the universe with their observations, interpretations, and experiences. These marks make up the total observational output of both the individual and humanity as a whole. In this sense, humanity is generating a massive, collective set of observational data.

What is truly remarkable here is that none of this data is lost. Every observation, every judgment, and every experience is part of a whole that is known, watched, and held to account by God. Swinburne (2004) argues that God, with His all-pervading knowledge that is immanent in the universal order, can carry out this kind of "observational accounting." The idea that God is aware of His own existence with a "consciousness beyond seeing" suggests that He pervades every created thing with that same level of attention (Craig & Moreland, 2003).

At this point, the end of the observation process, which is death, is not just a biological end. It means the completion of the observational function. Life is the process of impartial observation; death is the doorway through which this process is closed and its accounting is made. You can't evaluate the final output of the process before it's complete, because the process is dynamic and still going on. That's why death isn't just an end; it's the threshold where meaning is finalized. The end of observation is the



moment when the value that was produced is entered into the final record. For humanity, every observation is a piece of data, every piece of data is a signature, and every signature is a call that will be met by God's infinite knowledge.

From this viewpoint, death is not just an end but a threshold where meaning can be completed. A person begins to observe at birth and, throughout this process, produces values and builds meanings. This accumulated record, on both an individual and a collective level, creates the final picture of humanity's role in the universe God created.

This ongoing process of impartial observation throughout human history shapes the meaning not only of the individual but of all humanity. This brings us back to the claim made at the very start of this essay: humanity was created for observation. This observation is not just physical; it's a multidimensional experience that covers ethical, aesthetic, cosmological, psychological, and metaphysical areas.

When you combine God's invisibility with human freedom, the size of the universe with human curiosity, and the accumulation of observations with humanity's ultimate search for meaning, the structure that emerges is coherent, not just theologically, but also existentially and philosophically.

The core thesis of this essay is this: the human is not just an observer, but a conscious agent with the task of interpreting the silent truths God has placed in the universe. The role of the *impartial observer* is our ontological destiny, and our free will is the most precious part of that destiny..

## A Delicate Break in the Balance of Hiddenness: Divine Love

*Divine hiddenness* refers to the fact that God does not display His existence in a way that forces belief. Swinburne (2004) and Hick (1966) both stress that this hiddenness is necessary so that we can develop faith through our own free will and grow to moral maturity. But this balance is subject to a delicate kind of disruption, which is caused by God's divine love for humanity.

What I mean by a "delicate break in the balance of hiddenness" is that God's desire for love for humanity sometimes pierces through the cosmic veil of hiddenness, which otherwise acts like an unbreakable law. We see references to this often in sacred texts: God sends revelations through prophets (Qur'an 42:51; Hebrews 1:1–2), communicates with people through inspiration, and raises up moral leaders and wise people to guide humanity throughout history. This "break" is so delicate that it doesn't completely tear apart the impartial order of the universe. Instead, it opens up interdimensional holes,



creating temporary "moments of openness." This isn't a system bug; on the contrary, it's a confirmation that Divine Love has the power to override all other mighty commands.

From a theological standpoint, God's choice here is shaped by a tension between two "divine imperatives":

1. The impartiality of the universe, with its powerful laws operating in a domain of freedom, and the billions of nearly insurmountable systems that work in this domain (the imperative of hiddenness).
2. The desire of Divine Love to communicate (the imperative of openness).

Instead of completely crushing one of these imperatives for the sake of the other, God creates "points of openness" that don't destroy the balance but give direction to humanity. Divine Love touches humanity from time to time by overcoming the universe's impartial isolation without destroying it. In this sense, it's not that love clashes with hiddenness; it's that love produces certain forms of openness on the foundation of hiddenness. It seems that God, instead of issuing a completely rigid and insurmountable command on his own behalf, designed a very delicate balance that also allows Divine Love, a part of Himself, to work. A delicate break in the balance of hiddenness.

For this kind of break to happen, three main conditions are needed:

- Socio-historical situations where the power of interpretation is being systematically crushed, meaning the observer's role is being made useless.
- Structures where moral decay has reached a point of no return and free will is being completely manipulated.
- And at the same time, the activation of God's desire for love, that is, the divine will not to completely abandon humanity.

When these conditions are met, limited and targeted passages open up, without completely tearing the impartial order of the universe.

In the end, divine love doesn't require God to be completely visible in the universe, but it also doesn't make the universe's hiddenness absolute. Love creates a delicate break in this hiddenness. In this way, God both leaves humanity free and does not completely deprive it of His love. It's hard to have any visionary knowledge about the place, time, or form of this break beyond past experiences. The mechanism involved seems to be a piercing one that originates beyond the dimension of our universe, reaches humanity, and completes its task for a limited time. Divine Love seems to want to guarantee that humanity doesn't get lost on completely dark paths, at impossible distances, in deep silences. It works like a special form of energy that can even pierce through a universe

filled with burning, destructive, and annihilating forces. It pierces through even those burning, destructive, and insurmountable forces!

## The Call to Observe, Find Meaning, and Build Ethics in Sacred Texts

I believe that all sacred texts, one way or another, come from the same source and are interpretations of the same truth from different angles. If that's true, then it's reasonable to expect that this thesis would be supported in sacred texts. In fact, we might expect it to be openly declared, and for humanity to be invited and encouraged to take on its role of impartial observation, value creation, and interpretation.

A theme that comes up again and again in sacred texts is the encouragement for people not just to be passive believers, but to think, to observe, to question, and to create value. This invitation is expressed in different ways in different traditions, but at its core, it supports human free will and moral growth.

In the Qur'an, there is a constant emphasis on reason and reflection: 'Will you not then reflect?' (An-Nahl 16:11), 'Those who remember Allah... and reflect on the creation of the heavens and the earth, [saying], 'Our Lord, You have not created this in vain.'" (Al-Imran 3:191). In the Muslim tradition of interpretation, these verses have been seen as showing that faith and reflection are an inseparable whole (Nasr, 2007).

In the New Testament, a statement by Paul stands out: 'Test everything; hold fast what is good.' (1 Thessalonians 5:21). This passage shows that Christianity does not reject critical thinking, but actually values the process of testing and discernment in the journey toward truth (Wright, 2012).

In the Hebrew Scriptures, especially the Psalms, thinking about God's works is presented as a practice of faith: 'I will remember the deeds of the LORD; yes, I will remember your wonders of old. I will ponder all your work, and meditate on your mighty deeds.' (Psalms 77:11–12). The Jewish tradition turned this call into a systematic tradition of interpretation and debate, with the Talmudic literature being its most powerful example (Neusner, 1994).

In Hindu texts, especially the Upanishads and the Bhagavad Gita, people are advised to approach truth by investigating nature and their own inner self. 'The wise speak of what is One in many ways.' (Rig Veda 1.164.46). This pluralistic approach suggests that truth is not one-dimensional and can be grasped through multi-layered questioning (Radhakrishnan, 1992).

In the Buddhist tradition, the Kalama Sutta is a striking example: 'Do not believe just because you have heard it. Do not believe just because it is written in your sacred

books. But after you have investigated for yourselves and have found it to be true, then accept it.' (AN 3.65). This text clearly states the principle of critical thinking and impartial observation and builds a bridge between faith and experience (Rahula, 1974).

This evidence shows that God (or ultimate reality) invites people not just to believe blindly, but to make impartial observations, build meanings, and create moral values. The sacred texts, then, guide people to make conscious choices with their free will, to take on moral responsibility, and to get closer to the truth by interpreting the order of the universe.

## Conclusion

In this work, I have argued that our position in the universe is not just to exist, but to create meaning as conscious and *impartial observers*. When you consider this role alongside God's silence and the impartial nature of the universe, it becomes clear that this is not just an epistemological task, but an ethical and existential one as well.

The shift from unconscious witnessing to conscious observation over cosmic history reveals our unique role in creation. God's invisibility does not point to a lack of love, as Schellenberg claimed, but to a pedagogical choice that shows respect for our freedom. The fact that divine love sometimes creates "delicate breaks in the hiddenness" serves as subtle openings that keep humanity from losing its way, without completely destroying our sphere of freedom.

The repeated calls in sacred texts to think, question, and observe offer a universal theme that supports this thesis. We are positioned not just as believers, but as beings who think, create value, and build meaning in the silence of the universe.

In the end, the role of the *impartial observer* is at the center of our existence. This role is what makes it possible for us to interpret God's silence with our free will, to create ethical and aesthetic values, and ultimately, to fulfill our own reason for being. While this approach does not claim to be the absolute truth, it offers a consistent and productive framework for thinking about humanity's relationship with God.

## References

- Açıköz, H. M. (2020). *Theosophical essays: Cosmology, man & culture*. Kitapyurdu Doğrudan Yayıncılık.
- Berger, P. L. (1967). *The sacred canopy: Elements of a sociological theory of religion*. Anchor Books.
- Block, N. (1995). On a confusion about a function of consciousness. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 18(2), 227–287. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0003842X>
- Buber, M. (1937). *I and thou* (W. Kaufmann, Trans.). Scribner. (Original work published 1923)
- Chalmers, D. J. (1995). Facing up to the problem of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 2(3), 200–219.
- Chittick, W. C. (1989). *The Sufi path of knowledge: Ibn al-‘Arabi’s metaphysics of imagination*. State University of New York Press.
- Conway Morris, S. (2003). *Life’s solution: Inevitable humans in a lonely universe*. Cambridge University Press.
- Craig, W. L., & Moreland, J. P. (2003). *Philosophical foundations for a Christian worldview*. InterVarsity Press.
- Davies, P. (2006). *The Goldilocks enigma: Why is the universe just right for life?*. Penguin.
- de Waal, F. (1982). *Chimpanzee politics: Power and sex among apes*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hick, J. (1977). *Evil and the God of love* (Rev. ed.). Harper & Row.
- Hick, J. (1989). *An interpretation of religion: Human responses to the transcendent*. Yale University Press.
- Jang, J. (2017). *Doctrine of theodicy in a scientific age: John Haught & Daoism* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Edinburgh). Edinburgh Research Archive.
- James, W. (1897). *The will to believe and other essays in popular philosophy*. Longmans, Green, and Co.
- Kohlberg, L. (1971). Stages of moral development. In C. M. Beck, B. S. Crittenden, & E. V. Sullivan (Eds.), *Moral education: Interdisciplinary approaches* (pp. 23–92). University of Toronto Press.
- Milgram, S. (1963). Behavioral study of obedience. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67(4), 371–378. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0040525>

- Muhtaroğlu, N. (2021). Al-Ghazālī and the modern evolutionary paradigm. In H. Hashmi (Ed.), *Islam and evolution* (pp. 113–132). Routledge.
- Nagel, T. (1986). *The view from nowhere*. Oxford University Press.
- Nasr, S. H. (2007). *The heart of Islam: Enduring values for humanity*. HarperOne.
- Neusner, J. (1994). *The Talmud: A close encounter*. Fortress Press.
- Northcott, M., & Berry, R. J. (2009). *Theology after Darwin*. Paternoster Press.
- Plantinga, A. (1974). *God, freedom, and evil*. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Rahula, W. (1974). *What the Buddha taught*. Grove Press.
- Radhakrishnan, S. (1992). *The principal Upanishads*. HarperCollins.
- Rees, M. (1999). *Just six numbers: The deep forces that shape the universe*. Basic Books.
- Sartre, J.-P. (1956). *Being and nothingness* (H. E. Barnes, Trans.). Washington Square Press. (Original work published 1943)
- Schellenberg, J. L. (2015). *The hiddenness argument: Philosophy's new challenge to belief in God*. Oxford University Press.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (1972). *Helplessness: On depression, development, and death*. W. H. Freeman.
- Swinburne, R. (2004). *The existence of God* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Wright, N. T. (2012). *Paul and the faithfulness of God*. Fortress Press.
- Zimbardo, P. G. (1971). The power and pathology of imprisonment. *Congressional Record*, 117, 1–17.