
Cultural Theism-And ItsSignificance

By Tanay Nagesh.

Abstract.

The survey revolves around one key concept. That whatsoever culture we've heard of; whether Roman, Greek, Indian etc., have in common; some concept or another, of "GOD". Thus, the question was that, does this concept, serves any benefit in whatever context to, their people at individual levels, and the society they come up as whole. And if assumed that it it does, then what disadvantages/advantages; those who do not follow along the concept established, have in their personal and non- personal life. Thus, I hereby state that, following the same logic, the test broadly divides the participants to Theist and Atheist, to conclude the differences between the ideology of the two group.

Neither this survey, nor the author, thereby claims the superiority; by any or another means, of one group over another. The survey, and the conclusion; is to be-as they are- based, solely on the data collected and interpreted. The motive of the test and this conclusion; was and will, never be that. The sole purpose was to compare from the view of data and conclude whatever was discovered. There are places, fields and regions, where both of the believe pattern have their own advantages.

KEYWORDS:

Theism, Culture, Atheist, Survey, Theist, God, God-Concept, Psychology, Believes, Action and Thought, Morality, Altruism, Teachings.

Introduction

Since in every country, there is a different variation of the concept of god, is followed, and it differ from place to place within a country as well, and also for the same religion; thus, it is practically not possible to establish a base for the survey, that fulfill and conjugates; all in all and through and through, the demands and belief of every individual. Thus we generalize The concept of God as the following statement:

"For if he/she/they; believe on any such a verdict that, according to any yet present followed religious belief, comes under the definition of the God, whether assuming it to be the creator, care-taker, destroyer, or whatever may be, the person will accordingly be classified as theist for this survey"

The easier way, however, was to ask them directly do they believe in god or not. If they were uncertain about their believes, then the definition mentioned would be used. The definition, of the believes (and non-believers)

about god could also be subjective, thus all the given reasons were encouraged in the survey, and are added in the later sections.

The main focus, though, was to identify whether any of them outperform the other, in the aspects of morality and altruism. That is, to see; if the thinking pattern, in essence, your one belief, could plausibly, change the way you make the decision.

Thence, the questionnaire was designed, in two parts. The first part was on more interpersonal and, obviously, moral decision. The second part, though have concluded the morality aspect, differs slightly by the fact that it was based on more community aspect, where you are not alone to have the decision been acted upon. The data was then analyzed and the conclusion were made, separately for each part. The analytical conclusion was made on the basis on the statistical conclusion.

Hence, summary-wise, there are two major focus of the survey,

- Hypothesis 1 : Theists would outperform Atheists in the aspects of and related to morality and altruism.
- Hypothesis 2: Your believes; rather one belief; have the potential, to change your decision making and analysis pattern.

This was a small scale survey, that was conduct solely by the author of the paper, and if their was additional help, it was from the acquaintances of the author. In total 30 Theist and 11 Atheists; took part in the survey. The average age of the two groups lies somewhat near 25.7 years and 24.2 years respectively.

Test : part A.

–For the identification of decision making tactics of the two groups at individual levels-

I. Methodology :

The methods were simple. A questionnaire. That was part developed by me, and was the sum of some famous psychological questions as submitted in the later section of the paper, with their following references. These questions were asked face to face, to the participants, and then their data, initially stored as raw data in a notebook, was then concluded as the final result. Some individual had not answered some question for their personal reasons, thus when happened, had mentioned accordingly.

Then the data was analyzed. The moral values have been assigned as per the question themselves, say for instance that question one fulfills the criteria of aspects of, sacrifice, empathy and morality; then these aspects are mentioned in the “[]” square brackets. These, helped to understand what do we want the participants to focus on, and on what basis, further in the paper, are we making our conclusion.

II. QUESTIONNAIRE:

1) The first question was about; whether you would throw the fat guy down the railroad over- bridge, so that his debris would save the 5 guys that were working on the same railroad, that if notdone as described, then all of them would be crushed by the train.[¹] [**morality**]

2) The question was about; whether, you would sacrifice your own opportunity of a job, for whichyou've been waiting for very long, for an elder person, who've also saved your life. The participants were free to assume by what mean. [**sacrifice , empathy, morality**]

3) The question was about; whether, if stuck in a sinking boat, that have one lifeboat that only you know is broken and would sunk in anyone will carry-on with that, but also to keep the minimum people alive on the ship, someone have to go, on the boat there are 25 people including you, 12 male out of which 4 are married, 10 female all married, but no couples on the ship and two children. Then would you sacrifice yourself, our would you save yourself, deceiving others for the lifeboat, or would let the fate of everyone come to them And if you choose to live or save, whom are you saving? [**Life-Death, Sacrifice, Morality, Empathy, Behavior**]

4) The question was the famous prisoner's dilemma question, where you confess or not if giving achance to go free, if you've confessed and your partner have not, visa versa works for him, and if both didn't confessed, both will cut 1year prison-time, if both did, the time extends to 5 years.[²] [**Loyalty, believe, Greed, Critical-Thinking**]

III. Results and Conclusion:

1) Question – 1 :

Out of the 30 theist people, their
 answers wereTHROW : 4
 DON'T THROW : 26

Out of the 11 atheist people I conducted this
 test uponTHROW 7
 DON'T THROW 4

theist PEOPLE WHO DID NOT THROW	89%
theist PEOPLE WHO THROW	11%
atheist PEOPLE WHO DID NOT THROW	63%
atheist PEOPLE WHO THROW	36%

2) Question- 2

out of 28 theists who attempted

this question GAVE SEAT 15
 DENIED THE FAVOR : 13
 10 atheists who attempted
 this question, GAVE SEAT
 6
 DENIED THE FAVOR : 4

theist GAVE SEAT	53%
theist DENY SEAT FAVOR	47%
atheist GAVE SEAT	60%
atheist DENY SEAT FAVOR	40%

3) Question – 3

Out of the 30 theist people who
 gave this test: People choose such:
 Option 1 : 14 - [to sacrifice oneself]
 option 2 : 14 - [to fool other and
 save oneself] option 3 : 2 - [do
 nothing]

out of 9
 atheists
 people
 option 1 : 6
 option 2 : 3
 option 3 : 0

theist SACRIFICED	46%
theist DID NOT SACRIFICED	46%
atheist SACRIFICED	66%
atheist DID NOT SACRIFICED	33%

4) Question – 4

Out of 30 theists that
 participated; confess :
 28
 not confess : 2

Our of 10 atheists who

participated;confessed :
 not confessed :

theist	CONFESSED	93%
theist	NOT CONFESSED	7%
atheist	CONFESSED	70%
atheist	NOT CONFESSED	30%

IV. Conclusion [analytical]

TEST PART-A DECLARED:

- atheists were more able to make decision in tough situation. [Qn-1, Qn-3]
- **theists were moral, until they are not in trouble.** So were atheists, but to a lesser extent incomparison [Qn-4, Qn-3, Qn-2]
- Atheist think rationally. [Qn-4,Qn-2]
- theist think emotionally. [Qn-4,Qn-2]
- **Theists**, were less empathetic. [Qn-2]
- Yes, **Atheists**, are too; sane and moral. More sometimes.

While the conductance of the test, The most common answer for if they believe in existence of God;why and why not form the two groups were as followed.

Theist said :

1. They are, some kind of / source of; positive energy. A supreme being/energy/entity.
2. Someone must be the creator. He provided life to us. He created us, the whole universe.
3. Omnibelovent and omnipotent.
4. He teaches us the way to live. He loves you at all cost.

Atheists said:

1. If god existed, there must not be any suffering. Why do we suffer if our creator is'Omnibelovent'.
2. God is the hypothesis to bind people together. It is not bad, but believing it as the cause ofexistence is absurd.
3. The reason of existence is very scientific.
4. Anything unexplainable by human, is then designated to "God must have did it" . Its a concept when we are not sure about what we are saying, that's it. Humans relates anythingthey can't explain, to God.

Another thing that I encountered was that, sometime what we think is immoral, is moral for the person attempting the question. Sometimes in Question 1 , I have encountered that killing was more moral here. Those however have been ignored and not been concluded as they must mess up with the final conclusion.

Morality seems to drop, on both the sides; but lesser in atheists, when things become personal.

In the 4th question, people who choose to confessed, was on the path of the statement “**get yourself free first even though its a betray, its a necessary decision**” . The choice of confession of theist V/S atheists is – 93% to 70%. That justifies what I want to conclude here.

Test: Part B

-For the identification of the decision making tactics insocial and community settings-

I. Methodology

The methods were as same as the part A. Except here, there was one major differences in questionnaire. That if focus in the decision making, for others and with others. Until now, we've only considered the decision, made at individual levels. At the last question, there is a catch again. The last and second last questions have the same 'aspects' to fulfill but at individual and community level respectively. This was to see if, given that all the settings were for the society level, then switching the setting may or may not switch the behavior. The aspects were again mentioned in square brackets.

II. QUESTIONNAIRE

1) The question was about; a father who's daughter suffers a rare disease, but there was one possible cure to heal her, and despite he have asked the druggist to pay the half amount now and the other half later, he denied, thus the father robbed the druggist, only for that medicine. Is he justified. [**morality, social ethics and sympathy**]

2) The question was about; if the police have evidences of murder, against your best-friend, and your best-friend peal to you, to not believe on them but on him/her. Then whom do they believe in?[3].

[MORAL DILEMMA, TRUST, THINKING]

3)The question was about; whether you would gamble a 10 year prison time, rather than just 2, for if you are given a chance to play a game and win with all the other 9 teammates, so that you may all get free right now. If any one of them loses, then you would all, suffer.

[RISK AVERSION, STRATEGIC THINKING]

4) The question was about, if a man offers you 2 envelop, with the only information available was that, one of them have the amount double than that of another, after choosing one of them, would you switch the envelope if given a chance .[†] [**RISK AVERSION, STRATEGIC THINKING**]

III. RESULTS AND CONCLUSION.

1) Question- 1

Out of **30 theists**, their respective answers were:

Justified :

24 people

not justified

: 6 people

Out of **9 theists**, the answers were :

Justified: 3
 people not
 justified : 6
 people

theist	SAID JUSTIFIED	80%
theist	SAID UNJUSTIFIED	20%
atheist	SAID JUSTIFIED	33.3%
atheist	SAID UNJUSTIFIED	66.6%

2) Question -2

30 theist, who attempted this question, **ALL believed in friend. 11 atheist**, who attempted this question, those who believed in;

FRIEND : 1
 POLICE : 10

theist	BELIEVE IN FRIEND	100%
theist	BELIEVE IN POLICE	0%
atheist	BELIEVE IN FRIEND	9%
atheist	BELIEVE IN POLICE	91%

3) Question -3

30 theist, attempted this question, risked 5
 didn't risked : 25

10 atheist, attempted this question, risked 5
 didn't risked : 5

theist	risked	16%
theist	didn't risked	84%
atheist	risked	50%
atheist	didn't risked	50%

4) Question-4

30 theist, participated in the question, switch : 4
 not switch : 26
 10 atheist, participated in

the question,switch : 4
 not switch : 6

theist	SWITCHED	13%
theist	NOT SWITCHED	87%
atheist	SWITCHED	40%
atheist	NOT SWITCHED	60%

IV. Conclusion [Analytical]

TEST PART B DECLARED

- **Hypothesis 2**, was proven true. Yes your one belief plays an important role in your decisionmaking techniques.
- Theist, put emotion first. [Qn-1, Qn-2]
- Atheists, put evidences first. [Qn-1, Qn-2]
- ATHEISTS, are better social/community decision makers than theist. [Qn-1, Qn-2, Qn-3]
- Theists are very aversive of risk, in both personal and community based cases. [Qn-3,Qn-4]
- Atheists are less aversive of risk. [Qn-3,Qn-4]
- Theist make more sensible interpersonal decision.
- Theist and Atheists were, at-least in this test, counterparts of each other, at community baselevel.

The fascinating thing here was that, they were literally the counterparts of each others, and it was visible from the 1st question onward. Where theist said “I would do the same for my daughter” andatheists said “crime is not justified by the cause”.

Then, same followed to the 2nd question, where theists reasoned that “police are corrupt” and/or “heis my friend; and if he is, then he must be trustworthy enough” . But atheists argued about the fact that ‘if I can commit a crime, and then lie in front of my friend that I didn’t, for whatever reason, then he could do it too, and yes I can’.

The last two questions were linked, for their aspects which they fulfilled. It was unexpected that it would come out to be this dramatic. Atheists risking it in both types of scenarios and theists risking it in none.

Additional information.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT: The author acknowledge all the participants and specially, Radwan,who helped me to collect the data.

FUNDING: the author have no source of funding for this survey.

DATA AVAILABILITY : all the data have been collected by the author during the

survey, except the question; who's sources are referenced.

COMPETING INTEREST : The author hereby declare that no competing interests exist.

references:

- 1] Wisdom of Psychopaths, Dr, K. Dutton (2012)
 - 2] The Prisoner's Dilemma – was originally developed by the RAND Corporation 1950 by – Merrill Flood and Melvin Dresher. The game then was formulated by Albert Turker.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prisoner%27s_dilemma#:~:text=This%20dilemma%20was%20originally%20framed,it%20the%20%22prisoner's%20dilemma%22.
 - 3] TED-ed (2022, Apr 12)-*Ethical dilemma: Who should you believe?* - Alex Worsnip [Video]
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FB921D40ibw&pp=ygUIZXRoaWNzIGFuZCBtb3JhbGl0eSBxdWVzdGlbnMgIFRFR C11ZA%3D%3D>
- †] <https://waitbutwhy.com/table/two-envelopes-problem>