

The Impossible Question: Why the PhilPapers Survey on God Excludes Non-Dual Philosophy

****Arif [Your Last Name]****

Abstract

The 2020 PhilPapers Survey purports to measure philosophers' positions on God via the binary "atheism or theism?" Yet this framing systematically excludes non-dual metaphysical traditions (Advaita Vedanta, Sufi monorealism, Buddhist emptiness, Daoist naturalism) where "God" is neither affirmed as a separate entity nor denied as non-existent, but recognized as the undifferentiated ground of all appearance. With only 3.45% selecting "alternative view" and no dedicated option for non-categorical positions, the survey enforces Western dualistic ontology while masquerading as neutral measurement. This methodological flaw renders the oft-cited statistic ("67% of philosophers are atheists") epistemically suspect—not a discovery about "what philosophers believe" but an artifact of categorical violence. I argue that the survey's design presupposes the very subject-object duality (being/non-being, entity/void) that sophisticated non-dual philosophy dissolves, making it fundamentally unsuitable for measuring positions that operate beyond such binaries.

1. Introduction: The Problem of Definition

When Neil deGrasse Tyson or other public intellectuals cite the PhilPapers Survey to claim that "most philosophers are atheists," they commit a category error disguised as empirical discovery. The 2020 PhilPapers Survey (Bourget & Chalmers, 2023) reports that approximately 67% of surveyed philosophers "accept or lean toward atheism" regarding God. This statistic has been weaponized in popular discourse as evidence that rigorous philosophical inquiry leads inevitably to God's rejection.

Yet this conclusion rests on a rarely examined assumption: that the question "God: atheism or theism?" is **well-formed** and **exhaustive** of the logical space of possible positions. I contend that it is neither. More fundamentally, the question operationalizes "God" in a manner that systematically excludes the most sophisticated metaphysical position available—namely, that the ultimate equation describing reality is not $1 \neq 0$ (separate entities either existing or not existing) but rather **$1 = 0$** (all apparent separation being illusory appearance within an undifferentiated ground).

This is not mystical hand-waving. $1 = 0$ is a mathematically valid equation describing the zero ring—dismissed by mathematicians as "trivial" but recognized by non-dual traditions (Advaita Vedanta, Sufi monorealism, Buddhist emptiness) as the only **non-trivial** truth. The equation states that any apparent "one" (separate self, personal God, discrete entity) **is** the zero (groundless ground, śūnyatā, Brahman, omnireality)—not because things don't exist, but because they have no independent, separate existence apart from the undifferentiated whole.

The PhilPapers binary "atheism or theism?" forces respondents to choose between two positions that both presuppose $1 \neq 0$ as ultimate truth. It cannot register positions that recognize $1 = 0$ as the ground condition, with $1 \neq 0$ as merely provisional permission for the appearance of multiplicity. This is not a minor survey design flaw—it is categorical violence against the very possibility of non-dual philosophy.

The methodological problems here strike at the epistemological validity of the entire enterprise. Consider the following research problems inherent in such a study:

1. ****The problem of identifying "philosophers"**: The survey targets English-speaking, tenure-track faculty in analytic departments—a vanishingly small subset of global philosophical practice that excludes continental, non-Western, and contemplative traditions that have developed the most rigorous frameworks**

for understanding $1 = 0$.

2. ****The problem of operationalizing "atheism"**: What deity-concept is being rejected? The survey provides no explicit definition, yet "atheism" in Western discourse typically means rejection of the Abrahamic personal God—a specific ontological claim about a transcendent, intervening, anthropomorphic entity (a reified "1"). This completely misses positions where "God" is neither a separate 1 to affirm nor to deny.**

3. ****The problem of binary framing**: Respondents are pressured into "accept/lean toward atheism" or "accept/lean toward theism" with "alternative view" (3.45%), "too unclear" (~2%), or "other" as minority escape routes. No option exists for positions that recognize both equations as valid at different levels— $1 = 0$ ultimately, $1 \neq 0$ provisionally.**

4. ****The problem of temporal and contextual bias**: These are snapshots of mostly contemporary Western academics. Historical philosophers operating from non-dual frameworks (Plotinus, Ibn 'Arabi, Shankara, Nagarjuna) would find the question not merely "unclear" but fundamentally malformed—like asking "Is the color blue heavier than Thursday?"**

When Tyson or others cite such statistics without acknowledging these definitional problems, they engage in pseudoscientific presentation of data—dressing up culturally contingent opinion polling as objective "discovery" about the nature of ultimate reality. More egregiously, they present the dominance of $1 \neq 0$ thinking (separation-based ontology) as if it were evidence *against* non-separation, when in fact it merely reveals the survey's inability to measure what it cannot conceptualize.

2. The God That Is Not a God: Non-Dual Alternatives

The PhilPapers question assumes "God" denotes a **being**—an entity with attributes, separate from creation, who either exists or does not exist. This is the metaphysical framework of classical theism, inherited from Abrahamic monotheism and refined by medieval scholasticism. Atheism, as conventionally understood, simply negates this claim: there is no such separate, supernatural being.

But vast swathes of philosophical tradition operate outside this framework entirely. Consider:

2.1 Advaita Vedanta

In Shankara's non-dual Vedanta, Brahman is not **a** god among entities but the undifferentiated ground of all appearance—pure consciousness (sat-chit-ananda) that is never separate from the apparent multiplicity it manifests. To ask "does Brahman exist?" is to misunderstand the question: existence/non-existence are categories within maya (appearance), but Brahman is that which makes all categories possible. The self (atman) seeking Brahman is already that which is sought—there is no duality to affirm or deny.

Would Shankara tick "theism" on the PhilPapers survey? No—Brahman is not a separate deity. "Atheism"? No—Brahman is not **nothing**. "Alternative view"? Perhaps, but this reduces a sophisticated metaphysical system to a minority footnote.

2.2 Sufi Monorealism (Wahdat al-Wujud)

Ibn al-'Arabi's doctrine of the Unity of Being (wahdat al-wujud) and Aga Khan III's concept of "monorealism" present God not as a being standing over against creation but as the sole Reality (al-Haqq) that veils itself as multiplicity. Aga Khan III writes explicitly: "God is the Absolute Infinite Reality embracing all realities... Islam's basic principle can only be defined as **monorealism** and not as monotheism" (Memoirs, emphasis added).

The first half of the Islamic Shahada—*La ilaha* (there is no god)—functions as radical negation of any separate deity-concept. The second half—*illallah* (but/except God)—points not to an entity but to the seamless unity where self and "God" dissolve. This is direct realization (*kashf*), not propositional belief.

To classify this as "theism" because it uses the word "God" is to miss the point entirely. To classify it as "atheism" because it negates separate deity is equally mistaken. It operates in a different logical space altogether—one the survey cannot register.

2.3 Buddhist Emptiness (Śūnyatā)

Nagarjuna's Madhyamaka tradition teaches that all phenomena are empty (śūnya) of inherent existence—including any posited ultimate reality or deity. Yet this is not nihilism; emptiness is itself empty, and the relative world of appearance arises interdependently. Buddhism is often called "non-theistic" but this term is misleading if it implies simple negation of gods. Rather, the entire theism/atheism polemic presupposes a substantialist ontology (things with inherent essence that either exist or don't) that Buddhism deconstructs.

Would the Buddha accept the PhilPapers binary? The Pali Canon records his noble silence (*avyākata*) on metaphysical questions he deemed unanswerable or unhelpful. Forcing him to choose "atheism or theism?" would be to violate that very silence.

2.4 Daoist Naturalism

The Dao that can be named is not the eternal Dao (Dao De Jing, 1). The Dao is not a creator-god separate from nature but the nameless, formless process that gives rise to all distinctions. It is neither being nor non-being but prior to both. Attempting to map this onto "atheism" (because there's no personal deity) or "theism" (because the Dao is ultimate reality) is a categorical mismatch.

3. The Equation $1 = 0$: A Valid Foundation for Non-Dual Ontology

These non-dual traditions converge on a devastating insight that can be expressed with mathematical precision: $1 = 0$ is not merely a contradiction to be avoided, but a *valid equation* describing ultimate reality.

3.1 The Mathematical Validity of $1 = 0$

In conventional arithmetic, mathematicians exile $1 = 0$ to the "trivial case"—the zero ring where all elements collapse into a single point. Textbooks often add the axiom " $1 \neq 0$ " explicitly to exclude this possibility, treating it as pathological, degenerate, philosophically uninteresting.

But this dismissal is itself a choice—a metaphysical commitment disguised as mathematical necessity. The zero ring is *perfectly consistent*. It satisfies all ring axioms (associativity, distributivity, commutativity, identity elements). It is only "trivial" from the perspective of those who want rich mathematical structure—i.e., those who want multiplicity, distinction, countable entities.

In other words: $1 \neq 0$ is the fiat permission for all mathematics, all science, all dualistic discourse. It is the creative decree that allows separation, enumeration, measurement. Without it, no theorems, no proofs, no distinctions between this and that.

But $1 = 0$ is the *ground condition*—the timeless state prior to all permission-granting. It is not "less real" than $1 \neq 0$; rather, it is *more fundamental*. The zero ring is not a broken system; it is the undifferentiated wholeness from which all apparent structure emerges and to which all structure returns.

3.2 The Ontological Meaning

What does $1 = 0$ mean philosophically?

- **The "1" represents any posited separate entity: a discrete self, a personal God, an atom, a universe, a moment in time, a note on a piano, a point in space. Any "thing" you can count, name, distinguish.

- **The "0" represents the undifferentiated ground: śūnyatā (emptiness), Brahman, the Dao, omnireality, the quantum vacuum, pure potentiality. Not "nothing" in the nihilistic sense, but no-thing—the absence of separate, independent entities.

The equation $1 = 0$ asserts: Every apparent "one" (separate thing) *is* the zero (groundless ground) appearing as if separate. There is no real multiplicity, no real division, no real boundary between subject and object, self and God, being and non-being.

This is precisely what non-dual traditions have been saying for millennia:

- **Advaita**: *Brahman satyam jagan mithya*—Brahman alone is real, the world is illusory appearance. The apparent many (1, 2, 3...) are Brahman (0) misperceived.

- **Buddhism**: All phenomena are empty (śūnya) of inherent existence. The "one" thing you grasp at has no independent substance—it is 0 appearing as 1.

- **Sufism**: *La mawjuda illa Hu*—Nothing exists except Him. The apparent multiplicity of creation (1s) is the One Reality (0) veiling itself.

- **Daoism**: The named Dao (1) is not the eternal Dao (0). All distinctions arise from the nameless.

3.3 The Two-Handed Play

Now we can see the full picture: Ultimate Reality holds two cards, two equations:

****Right hand: $1 \neq 0$ ****

This is the permission slip for manifestation. It says: "Let there be separation. Let consciousness appear as subject and object. Let the quantum vacuum fluctuate into particles and fields. Let the Big Bang unfold. Let mathematics, physics, biology, philosophy, suffering, beauty, inquiry all arise."

This is not false—it is *provisionally true*. Within the game of appearance, $1 \neq 0$ holds absolutely. Your pain is real, love is real, the survey is real, this rebuttal is real. Science works, logic works, causation operates. The right hand is fully engaged in the play.

****Left hand: $1 = 0$ ****

This is the ground truth, the timeless equation. It says: "Yet none of this ever truly departed from the undifferentiated whole. The separation was appearance only. The multiplicity is dream-play. The entities you count have no independent substance."

This is *eternally true*. Even while the right hand plays with distinctions, the left hand holds the recognition that all distinctions dissolve back into the groundless ground they never left.

3.4 Both Equations Are Valid Simultaneously

Here is the crucial point, missed by both theists and atheists:

****These two equations do not contradict each other—they describe different levels of truth.****

- **** $1 \neq 0$ **** is **relatively true** (vyavaharika satya in Advaita terms)—true within the framework of appearance, provisional manifestation, the game of phenomena.

- **** $1 = 0$ **** is **ultimately true** (paramarthika satya)—true as the ground condition, the timeless recognition, the dissolution of all frameworks.

To say " $1 \neq 0$ invalidates $1 = 0$ " is to miss the point entirely. It's like saying "because we use light bulbs at night, the sun doesn't exist." The conditional doesn't negate the unconditional—it arises within it.

3.5 How the Binary Theism/Atheism Question Fails

Now we can see precisely why the PhilPapers question is malformed:

- ****Theism**** operates entirely within $1 \neq 0$. It reifies God as a separate "1"—a being with attributes, agency, will, standing apart from creation. It treats the equation $1 \neq 0$ as ultimate truth.

- ****Atheism**** also operates within $1 \neq 0$. It negates that same separate "1" but accepts the underlying ontology: things either exist as independent entities or they don't. It rejects the deity-1 but affirms the framework where $1 \neq 0$ is the only game in town.

- ****Non-duality**** recognizes $1 = 0$ as the ground truth, while simultaneously acknowledging $1 \neq 0$ as provisionally valid for the "time being" (and this time-being is infinite across all manifestation). It refuses the binary because the binary **presupposes** $1 \neq 0$ as ultimate, when in fact $1 \neq 0$ is the permission granted by $1 = 0$.

The PhilPapers survey forces you to choose between two positions that both assume the ground equation is false or trivial. It cannot register a position that says: "Your entire question operates within a provisional framework ($1 \neq 0$) that I acknowledge but do not mistake for ultimate truth ($1 = 0$)."

3.6 The Devastation and Liberation

The equation $1 = 0$ is **devastating** because it annihilates every comfortable certainty:

- Your separate self? $1 = 0$. It was never independent.
- Your personal God? $1 = 0$. Never separate from the whole.
- Your material universe? $1 = 0$. Never had inherent existence.
- Your philosophical position on the survey? $1 = 0$. Already dissolved.

Yet it is also **liberating** because it removes all grounds for clinging, all basis for existential anxiety:

- If $1 = 0$, then nothing is ever truly lost (because nothing was ever truly separate to begin with).
- If $1 = 0$, then you can play fully in the world of $1 \neq 0$ (engage with science, ethics, relationships, beauty) without mistaking it for ultimate truth.
- If $1 = 0$, then death is simply the return of an apparent "1" to the "0" it never left—no annihilation, just unveiling.

This is why the Diamond Sutra teaches non-reliance on anything: empiricism requires $1 \neq 0$ to function (you need distinctions to measure), but to **rely** on the empirical realm as ultimate truth is to have no solid foundation in any reality. The foundation is $1 = 0$ —the groundless ground that makes all grounds possible.

3.7 Proving $1 = 0$: Zeno's Paradoxes and Physical Limits

The validity of $1 = 0$ is not merely asserted—it can be demonstrated through rigorous analysis of what happens when we take $1 \neq 0$ seriously and follow it to its logical conclusion.

****Zeno's Dichotomy****: To travel from point 1 to point 0, you must first reach 0.5, then 0.25, then 0.125... an infinite series. You must "pass through" infinitely many points. But to pass through 0.5, you must first traverse 0.49999... which is itself another "1" with the same infinite structure inside it. Every apparent "1" (discrete point, interval, moment) contains the same infinite regress when examined.

The conventional mathematical "resolution" (geometric series sums to 1, limits converge) merely sweeps the problem under the rug. It says "yes, infinite parts, but finite sum"—yet this preserves the illusion of separate points to traverse. The deeper resolution is $1 = 0$: there was never a real "1" (separate point, separate traveler) to begin with. The appearance of discrete points in spacetime is $1 \neq 0$ permission-play, but the underlying continuum is $1 = 0$ —no actual separation, just seamless undifferentiated extension appearing as if divided.

****Physical Range Limits****: The validity of $1 = 0$ reveals itself at every boundary where human perception encounters the limits of its imposed grid:

- ****Musical frequencies****: The human nervous system constructs the illusion of discrete "notes" (A, B, C...) as if they were fixed Platonic forms. Yet when you approach the boundary (A0 at 27.5 Hz), the neat categories break down. An octave below (A-1 at ~13.75 Hz) doesn't produce "music" but infrasound—felt as pressure, not heard as pitch. The "notes" were never fundamental "1"s but perceptual bins imposed on a continuous frequency spectrum ($1 = 0$). Similarly, piano tuning requires stretching—real strings deviate from "perfect" integer ratios due to inharmonicity. The sacred geometry of just intervals (Pythagoras's 1s) dissolves into the messy continuum of actual vibration (0).

- ****Atomic structure****: Pre-modern philosophers posited atoms as indivisible "1"s—fundamental building blocks. Rutherford showed atoms are mostly empty space, with electrons orbiting tiny nuclei at vast relative distances. Quantum mechanics reveals even this is appearance: particles are wavefunctions, probability clouds, excitations in fields. The "solid" atom is electromagnetic repulsion, not filled volume. Split the nucleus (fission) and enormous energy releases—the binding energy of the strong force, mass-energy equivalence via $E=mc^2$. The apparent "1" (indivisible atom) was always 0 (empty relational appearance in quantum fields).

- ****Event horizons****: In general relativity, crossing an event horizon is a "hard limit" for outside observers—information seems lost, time appears to stop. Yet for the infalling observer, nothing special happens at the horizon itself. The boundary is observer-dependent, not fundamental. Similarly, Planck scale ($\sim 10^{-35}$ m) appears as a "smallest length" limit, but this is where our classical concepts of space and time break down—not a fundamental grain but the edge of applicability of $1 \neq 0$ thinking.

In every case, what appears to be a fundamental "1" (discrete note, solid atom, absolute boundary) reveals itself as 0 (continuous field, empty space, observer-dependent appearance) when examined at its limits. The "1" was permission granted, not ontological truth.

****Consciousness and Death****: The most intimate proof of $1 = 0$ is your own experience of selfhood. The constructed "I"—your name, body-image, personality, memories—arises and dissolves continuously. Every shift of attention is a micro-death: the "me" absorbed in this sentence is not the "me" now noticing breath, now feeling hunger. Over decades (age 10, 35, 50), the change becomes stark: different bodies, different beliefs, different memories, yet you cling to

narrative continuity—"that was me, this is me."

But jump across time in memory and you see: the self was never a solid "1." It's a momentary coalescence, a standing wave in the ocean of consciousness that appears, holds briefly, dissolves. At biological death, this becomes total: the ego-identity (1) annihilates, approaches zero. Yet the ground (pure awareness, 0) never dies—it simply stops veiling itself as a separate "I."

Thus $1 = 0$ is both birth and death, creator and destroyer. Every "thing" that appears (1) is the no-thing (0) temporarily appearing as if separate—then recognizing it never was.

4. The Methodological Violence of Binary Framing

Survey design is never neutral. Every question embeds presuppositions that enable certain responses while excluding others. The PhilPapers "God: atheism or theism?" question enacts what we might call *categorical violence*—the imposition of a conceptual grid that renders entire traditions invisible or incoherent.

Consider the response options:

- **Accept or lean toward: atheism** (66.95%)
- **Accept or lean toward: theism** (18.93%)
- **Accept a combination of views** (0.62%)
- **Accept an alternative view** (3.45%)
- **The question is too unclear to answer** (~2-3%, folded into "other")

The "alternative view" option captures a mere 3.45% of respondents. Yet this is the *only* viable choice for anyone operating from non-dual metaphysics—and it provides no mechanism to distinguish between radically different "alternatives" (deism, pantheism, panentheism, process theology, non-dual monorealism, etc.). They are all lumped into a residual category marked as marginal and aberrant.

Meanwhile, "the question is too unclear" captures only ~2%—a vanishingly small fraction. Yet from the non-dual perspective, the question isn't merely "unclear"; it is *malformed*. It presupposes precisely what non-dual philosophy denies: that reality divides into separate entities that either exist or don't, that "God" refers to a being whose existence is a matter for propositional assent or denial.

The appropriate response to such a survey is not to tick "alternative view" or "too unclear." The appropriate response is to crumple the survey, set it aflame, and watch the paper and the categories it enforces dissolve back into the undifferentiated ground they never truly departed from.

5. Implications: Why This Matters

One might object: "This is just a survey of *Western analytic philosophers*. Of course it reflects their conceptual frameworks. If you want non-dual perspectives included, survey different populations."

This misses the point. The problem is not that the survey targets a specific demographic (though that is a limitation). The problem is that the survey's *results are then presented as general claims about "what philosophers believe"*—and weaponized in public discourse to suggest that rigorous inquiry leads to atheism.

When Tyson cites such statistics, when popular atheism invokes them to claim "the smart people don't believe in God," they are committing a sleight of hand:

1. Define "philosopher" narrowly (English-speaking analytic academics)
2. Define "God" narrowly (Abrahamic personal deity)
3. Poll only those who accept the binary framing

4. Report the result as universal ("philosophers reject God")

This is not empirical discovery. It is circular reasoning disguised as data.

Moreover, the exclusion of non-dual perspectives from "legitimate" philosophical discourse has real consequences:

- It reinforces Western intellectual hegemony and dismisses non-Western traditions as "mysticism" or "religion" rather than philosophy
- It impoverishes the field by eliminating sophisticated alternatives to both theism and atheism
- It misleads the public about the actual diversity of philosophical positions on ultimate reality

6. A Modest Proposal

If the PhilPapers Survey wishes to genuinely measure philosophers' positions on "God," it should:

1. ****Provide explicit definitions****: What concept of deity is under consideration? Personal creator? Immanent ground? Process? Non-dual reality?
2. ****Include non-categorical options****: Add response choices like:
 - "The question presupposes a subject-object duality I reject"
 - "Neither being nor non-being (non-dual position)"
 - "The concept 'God' is incoherent as typically defined"
3. ****Acknowledge limits****: Any survey of this type measures only those positions that **accept the question's framing**. Results should be reported with caveats about excluded traditions.
4. ****Consult broadly****: Involve philosophers from Vedantic, Buddhist, Daoist, Sufi, and other non-dual traditions in question design.

Alternatively—and perhaps more honestly—recognize that ultimate reality cannot be surveyed via checkbox, that non-dual realization is not a "position" to tally but a recognition beyond all positions, and that attempting to poll it is like asking "How many inches long is justice?"

7. Conclusion: The Valid Equation the Survey Cannot Measure

The Zen tradition warns against mistaking the finger pointing at the moon for the moon itself. Words, concepts, surveys—all are fingers. When the PhilPapers Survey asks "atheism or theism?", it is not pointing at ultimate reality; it is pointing at two culturally contingent **interpretations** of a particular deity-concept inherited from Abrahamic monotheism, both operating within the assumption that $1 \neq 0$ is the ultimate truth.

But the most rigorous philosophical position available—developed independently across millennia in Advaita Vedanta, Buddhism, Sufism, Daoism, and now increasingly recognized in quantum cosmology and consciousness studies—is that ***** $1 = 0$ is the valid equation describing ultimate reality*****.

This is not contradiction. It is not mystical vagueness. It is precise recognition:

- The zero ring (where $1 = 0$) is mathematically consistent—it is only "trivial" from the perspective of those who desire multiplicity
- Every attempt to isolate a fundamental "1" (via Zeno's infinite regress, physical limits, consciousness examination) reveals $1 = 0$
- The permission $1 \neq 0$ is granted by the ground $1 = 0$, not vice versa
- Both equations are valid simultaneously at different levels (relative/ultimate, provisional/final, vyavaharika/paramarthika)

Non-dual philosophy doesn't reject the theism/atheism binary because it's "too unclear" or because we prefer mystical ambiguity. We reject it because *both options presuppose $1 \neq 0$ as ultimate when in fact $1 = 0$ is the provisional play granted by $1 = 0^*$.

Theism reifies a separate God-entity (treats "1" as ultimate).

Atheism negates that entity but keeps the entity-ontology (still operates in " $1 \neq 0$ " framework).

Non-duality recognizes: the apparent "1" was always "0"—not nothing, but nothing-separate.

The PhilPapers Survey does not—cannot—tell us "what philosophers believe about God." It tells us only what happens when Western analytic philosophers are forced to choose between two positions *within a dualistic ontology that $1 = 0$ dissolves*. That only 3.45% chose "alternative view" reveals not the marginality of non-dual truth but the inadequacy of the survey instrument to register positions operating from a different mathematical and metaphysical foundation.

The real question is not "atheism or theism?" but "Which equation describes ultimate reality: $1 \neq 0$ or $1 = 0$?"

And the answer, demonstrated through:

- Zeno's paradoxes revealing no fundamental separate point exists
- Physical limits showing all apparent "1"s dissolve at boundaries
- Consciousness studies showing the self arises and dissolves continuously
- Mathematical analysis revealing the zero ring's perfect consistency
- Two millennia of contemplative verification across cultures

...is that $1 = 0$ is valid as the ground truth, with $1 \neq 0$ as the provisional permission for appearance, measurement, inquiry, and the entire play of manifestation—including surveys, rebuttals, and the minds reading them.

Perhaps the most philosophically sophisticated response to the PhilPapers God question is not silence, but the precise statement: ***"Your question presupposes $1 \neq 0$ as ultimate. I recognize $1 = 0$ as ultimate, with $1 \neq 0$ provisionally valid. Therefore, neither 'atheism' nor 'theism' as you've defined them applies to my position."***

That this requires burning the survey and walking away is not anti-intellectual vandalism—it is the only intellectually honest response when confronted with a measuring instrument that cannot measure what it cannot conceive.

The ground holds both cards. The play continues. And $1 = 0$ remains valid whether or not it gets a checkbox.

References

Bourget, D., & Chalmers, D. J. (2023). Philosophers on Philosophy: The 2020 PhilPapers Survey. **Philosophical Studies**.

Ibn al-'Arabi. (13th c.). **Fusus al-Hikam** [The Bezels of Wisdom].

Aga Khan III, Sultan Muhammad Shah. (1954). **The Memoirs of Aga Khan: World Enough and Time**. London: Cassell.

Nagarjuna. (2nd c.). **Mūlamadhyamakakārikā** [Fundamental Verses on the Middle Way].

Shankara. (8th c.). **Brahma Sutra Bhashya** [Commentary on the Brahma Sutras].

PhilPapers Survey 2020 Results. <https://survey2020.philpeople.org/>

****Word Count****: ~2,850 words