Lanzarote, March 10, 2004

Appreciated Professor Carlos E. Puente,

Does Jesus really says that those who would not be with him, would be against him? What is the meaning of being with or against him? What sense does it have to pronounce such words? What is to be with God or against God? Which god? Which gods? Those that humanity invented before Jesus appeared? Or those that shall come later on? How many years do we have to wait for God to be finally God?

Serious questions of an agnostic if they were not what they effectively are: interrogations of someone that does not gives credit to the existence of a god and to whom, hence, it appears that there is always something gratuitous in eschatological speculations, irrespective of how fascinating they are presented. Fascinating is the work of Borges, in a sense eschatologic, but its reading asks the reader to accept a pact of absolute acceptance, as his author says: “If you believe what I tell you, I shall take you to a kingdom of the unimaginable.” To say that everything is found inside an Aleph is prodigiously beautiful, but such does not modify the “explosive” and “dispersive” reality of the world.

Although I have written some books, I say, as the poet León Felipe: “I do not know many things.” I do not know for example what is needed to take even the first step in the mathematical and geometric trip that you invite me to, and I find myself skeptic to the
citations in “Turbulence and Sacred Scriptures” (what citations of other scriptures less sacred would reinforce or negate your thesis?), and I sense that you abuse dangerously in trying to bring the gospels (so diversely translated...) to the roots of modern science (aren’t those roots already present in other arenas prior to the scientific developments?).

In any case, I ought to confess that, up to the point I was able to understand them, that I found your proposals fascinating, such as if I had in my own hands an unknown book by Borges... Perhaps one day we shall meet. I would make an effort to comprehend your “mathematical and essential ideas,” and I would ask you, in response, to make an effort to understand my “impossibility” to give credit to the existence of a god. If him (I assume that at the end he exists) would tell me: “Are you with me, or are you against me,” I would respond to him simply: “It is you who are against me,” reversing the costs.

Very cordially,

José Saramago
Lanzarote