

God as Particle: Leibniz's Monad Assumes Tranquility in a Chaotic Universe

Author: Budinny V

Independent Researcher | ORCID: 0009-0007-5365-1885

Date: June 2026

Note on Scope

This is a short concept note, not a claim to a new theological discovery. The core observation — that Leibniz's God, examined as a monad, is bounded rather than ultimate — has independent precedent in Russell, Fischer, and Erdmann's readings of Leibniz (c. 1900), and the moral objection to a God who permits evil for "greater good" was made by Voltaire in 1759. This note does not dispute that precedent. It records the same conclusion reached independently, from mechanical reasoning about substrates and bounded systems rather than from theology, and keeps the original phrasing that reasoning produced.

The Core Line

"Leibniz: assumes tranquility in a chaotic universe for his work to work."

Leibniz's monad framework requires pre-established harmony — independent, non-interacting units kept consistent only because God guarantees it. That guarantee is the whole load-bearing assumption. Remove a calm, harmonized microscopic substrate underneath it, and the framework has no mechanism left to hold itself together. The universe it actually describes is not calm. It is chaotic, entangled, uncertain even underneath the chaos at the microscopic level. The system was built on a cyclic, snake-eating-itself, 'stability-giveth-god' loop to require tranquility in order to function, and tranquility was never on offer. Or what if microscopic tranquility produced this reversible god?

God Playing at Particle Level

"God playing at the particle level limits his level to his playing field. God is neither necessary nor even powerful — forget being ultimate — in a substrate over his particle base."

If monads are the fundamental units of reality, and God is described as the ultimate monad, then, despite his origin, his substrate limits God to still being a monad — a unit inside the same substrate as everything else, perceiving from a perspective rather than from outside all perspective. A being that perceives is constrained by the mechanics of perception. A being with a perspective is limited by that perspective. That is not the necessary, unconditioned, outside-the-system God theodicy requires. It is the biggest particle in the field, not the field's author.

The Queen Ant

“Monad god could be just that. Nothing more.”

A queen ant is the most important unit inside her colony — best informed, most central, highest in the hierarchy of ants. She is still an ant. She does not transcend the anthill, and she does not see the anteater coming from outside it.

Leibniz’s God is described with the authority of the anteater but is only ever observed operating with the standing of the queen ant: highest within the system, blind to whatever sits outside it. Authority within a bounded hierarchy is not the same thing as authority over the boundary itself.

A Note on the Systems-Engineering Viewpoint

This analysis intentionally approaches the *Monadology* not through the traditional lens of historical immersion, but through an outside systems-diagnostic framework. Total immersion in a philosophical text often forces the researcher to adopt the author’s internal premises, effectively trapping the critique inside the system’s own ‘enclosure’.

17th-century thinkers like Leibniz and Newton were fundamentally constrained by the mechanical metaphors of their era—namely, the clockwork loop—and lacked the vocabulary for open, chaotic, or networked systems.

By treating the framework strictly as a conceptual blueprint rather than a theological text, we can bypass the elaborate workarounds designed to patch its internal contradictions. A system unit (the supreme monad) cannot logically serve as the system’s external container; from a pure structural mechanics standpoint, the architecture leaks at the foundation.

Closing

This note takes no position on whether God exists. It only holds that the specific Leibnizian construction — a perfect, necessary, externally-harmonizing God built from monads — cannot be both a monad and the thing outside all monads at once. A monad god could be just that. Nothing more.

Author Disclosure

I acknowledge this work is solely my own. During the preparation of this work I used Claude (Anthropic, Sonnet 4.6) to draft paragraphs from my rough notes in order to improve compilation and clarity. English is the author’s third language. Working memory limitations mean ideas were captured in fragments and assembled with AI drafting assistance. Literature searches depend on AI tools and prior art omissions are

possible.

References

Best of all possible worlds (Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz)
Monadology (Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz).