

**Essay**

## **Something versus Nothing & Some Thoughts on Proof of No God**

Himangsu S. Pal \*

### **ABSTRACT**

Even if it is claimed by the scientists that the universe has actually started from nothing, and not from something as claimed by the believers, the inevitable conclusion is that in both the cases there must have to be some sort of consciousness at the beginning. I will also argue that the conclusive or decisive proof for God's non-existence can only be a natural explanation for the origin of the universe and nothing else.

**Key Words:** GOD, something, nothing, light, spaceless, timeless, origin, universe.

### **1. Some Reflections on God and Science**

In one of my earlier articles that have been published in Scientific God Journal (Pal, 2010), I have written that a whole thing will be spaceless and timeless by logical necessity alone. This idea has been caricatured by someone by showing that nothing is also spaceless and timeless. But there is a difference between nothing being spaceless and timeless and something being the same. For nothing it is quite obvious and self-explanatory that it will be spaceless and timeless; because in nothing there will be simply nothing, no space, no time. But when we say that something is spaceless and timeless, it is not so obvious. We will have to give adequate reason as to why it is spaceless and timeless. The reason that I have given is that if this something is a whole thing, then it will be spaceless and timeless by logical necessity. So we cannot equate a nothing that is spaceless and timeless by virtue of its being nothing with a something that is spaceless and timeless by virtue of its being a whole thing.

Still, let us agree that nothing can also be spaceless and timeless, and that the person who has said this has not said it with any bad intension, that is, there was no mockery. Now I will proceed with this nothing and show that if the universe has started from nothing, then also this initial nothing must have to have consciousness.

First of all I will show that in a sense nothing can also be said to have not only the properties of spacelessness and timelessness, but also the other three properties of a whole thing as well. In nothing there will be no space, no time; so nothing is spaceless and timeless. In nothing there will be nothing that can have a potential for change; so nothing is changeless. In nothing there will be no one who will have an inevitable death one day; so nothing is deathless. In nothing there will be nothing that can have a potential for movement; so nothing will be immobile too. So one can say that nothing is indistinguishable from a whole thing having all the five properties of spacelessness, timelessness, changelessness, deathlessness and immobility (STCDI), and we can also say that like a whole thing this nothing possesses these

---

\* Correspondence: Himangsu S. Pal E-Mail: [sekharpal@rediffmail.com](mailto:sekharpal@rediffmail.com)

properties by logical necessity alone, because it will be having these properties by virtue of its being nothing.

Therefore instead of saying that the universe has started from a whole thing we can as well say that it has started from nothing. But still there will be a difference. First I will repeat my old arguments here in a slightly new form:

1. In this universe nothing as well as a whole thing will have the properties of STCDI by logical necessity alone.
2. If the universe has started from nothing, then nothing other than the initial nothing will have the properties of STCDI.
3. But in this universe we find that light, in spite of its not being nothing, is still having the properties of STCDI.
4. This can only happen if, and only if, the initial nothing itself has purposefully given its own properties to light, in order to make its presence known to us through light.
5. But for that the initial nothing must have to have consciousness.
6. From above, we can come to the following conclusion: the fact that light, in spite of its not being nothing, still possesses the properties of STCDI, is itself a sufficient proof for the fact that the universe has started from a conscious nothing, and that this conscious nothing is none other than God.

So, even if it is claimed by the scientists that the universe has actually started from nothing, and not from something as claimed by the believers, the inevitable conclusion is that in both the cases there must have to be some sort of consciousness at the beginning.

But there is a slight difference here. Properties of light can be far better explained in a universe that has started from a conscious whole thing, but not so easily in a universe originated from a conscious nothing. This is only due to the fact that light has got some baffling properties. It is beyond our comprehension as to why even an infinite distance will have to be reduced to zero for anything at all. But for light this infinite distance is actually reduced to zero. This incomprehensible thing becomes quite comprehensible if we come to know that there is a Being who is infinite in extension and all-pervading. For such a Being no distance, however great, is at all a distance, because that Being is not only everywhere, but equally everywhere. Our consciousness is not all-pervading within our body; that is why we feel that there is a distance between our head and other parts of our body. The infinite Being can be accommodated easily within a conscious something, but not at all within a conscious nothing.

Another point to be noted here is that, since in nothing there is nothing, it cannot have any consciousness. So the inevitable conclusion is that the universe can in no way originate from a conscious nothing, but only from a conscious something.

Therefore, we have seen that light is having some most uncommon properties that cannot be found in anything at all other than light. One such property I have already mentioned above

(infinite distance becoming zero for light). And we have shown that these uncommon properties of light cannot be explained properly until and unless we posit some sort of consciousness at the beginning of the universe. But atheistic scientists may not agree. They will say, as they have said earlier in many other cases also, and demonstrated as well, that instead of having a supernatural explanation, properties of light might have some natural explanation that they will be able to give in near future. But there is a proverb in English: Nothing succeeds like success. So let them first successfully demonstrate that there is really such an explanation. Then only we will stop arguing for God.

## 2. More Reflections on God and Science

The person who has written that nothing is spaceless and timeless has also written that nothing is timeless, and that there is no God. If science shows that at the speed of light time becomes unreal, then it is quite natural for us to think that time is perhaps unreal somewhere, and that perhaps due to that reason scientists have shown as to how time can become unreal. But he is saying that that is not the case at all. Time becoming unreal at light speed does not mean that time is unreal somewhere. Nothing is timeless, and there is no God. So I think that I should add some more lines to my above article, and it is here:

So far as I can remember, there are two equations in Einstein's special theory of relativity which are as follows:

$$l_1 = l(1-v^2/c^2)^{1/2} \dots\dots (1)$$

$$t_1 = t((1-v^2/c^2)^{1/2}) \dots\dots (2)$$

From the above two equations two conclusions can be drawn that are as follows:

- 1) Time and distance are not absolute, they are relative;
- 2) At light speed, both time and distance become unreal.

Now reality may be such that

- 1) Time and distance are only relative, but nowhere unreal (A),
- 2) Time and distance are relative as well as unreal (somewhere) (B).

If reality is A, then the above two equations are not at all required to represent that reality; it can be equally represented by the following two equations:

$$l_1 = l(1-v^2/xc^2)^{1/2} \dots\dots (3)$$

$$t_1 = t((1-v^2/xc^2)^{1/2}) \dots\dots (4)$$

In (3) and (4) above, x will have a value greater than one but less than infinity. But it cannot have a value equal to one or infinity. If value of x is one, then we will go back to Einstein's

equations, whereas if its value equals infinity, then we will have Newton's equations instead. From (3) and (4) above, it can clearly be seen that time and distance will be relative as before, but they will never be unreal even at the speed of light due to the presence of the factor  $1/x$  in the equations. Newton's equations have been rejected because now we have come to realize that there are no such things as absolute space or absolute time. If reality is A, but not B, then time has also come to reject Einstein's equations as well, and to replace them with (3) and (4) above. Einstein's equations will be required if, and only if, it is agreed upon that somewhere out there there is a region where space and time are unreal (an ideal abode for a spaceless, timeless God).

My comments here are:

1) Instead of being vague, science should be more specific. If they want to convey to us that space and time are only relative, but nowhere unreal, then scientists should know how to convey only that much information to us, and nothing more than that. After so many years of its genuine crusade against all sorts of religions, why should science transform itself to a new kind of esoteric religion now, requiring its own high priests for its proper interpretation to others?

2) Science should clarify things. Its job is not to create confusion. But by showing that a massless being can be immortal, science has only created unnecessary confusion amongst us.

3) Science is no longer democratic, it has become dictatorial. If time is not really unreal anywhere and nothing is timeless, why was it necessary for scientists to show as to how time could be really unreal? But these types of questions could no longer be asked. Instead we should blindly follow their dictum.

4) If we live in a universe in which time is nowhere unreal, then how does it become imperative for us to know as to how time can become unreal? How does our knowledge of the external world increase by that tiny bit of knowledge provided by the scientists when at the same time we are told by the same scientists that time is actually nowhere unreal?

### **3. Some Thoughts on Proof of No GOD**

In this essay I want to argue that starting from Copernicus up to the present day scientists have done nothing so far that can conclusively, or decisively, prove that there is no God. I will also argue that the conclusive or decisive proof for God's non-existence can only be a natural explanation for the origin of the universe (NEFOU), and nothing else.

Before proceeding to do this, I will have to settle another matter. In one of my earlier essays I have written that scientists' ultimate aim is to prove that God does not exist. A famous American atheist has commented on this in an e-mail to me that this is not scientists' ultimate aim. Their ultimate aim is knowledge. But I still hold that their ultimate aim is to prove that God does not exist. And here I will give my reasons as to why I think so.

We can remember well what Laplace had said to Napoleon when he was asked by the emperor as to why he had not mentioned God in his book. His answer was: *Je n'avais pas*

besoin de cette hypothese (I had no need of that hypothesis). Scientist Paul Davies in one of his recent articles (available online) has written that this is still scientists' stand on God, that is, they are in no need of any God-hypothesis. But why will scientists need any God-hypothesis at all?

Obviously in order to explain certain things. When scientists say that they do not need any God-hypothesis, they are actually saying that God is not the explanation for the things we find in nature, and that God is not the explanation for the origin of the universe as well. By openly admitting that they do not need any God-hypothesis for explaining things, they are admitting that they are actually making God jobless. If a God does really exist, He definitely would have done something. Definitely He would have created the universe, and after its creation, perhaps would have intervened as well. It cannot be the case that God will be simply there as a mere observer, and that the universe will run its course on its own. But if it can be shown that everything in this universe, including its coming into existence also, can be explained without invoking God, then that will simply prove that God has done nothing.

But as per an atheist philosopher, a nothing-doing God is a non-existent God. As scientists are trying to prove that our God is a nothing-doing God, therefore it can safely be said that they are actually trying to prove that God does not exist. So if I have said that scientists' ultimate aim is to prove that there is no God, then I have said nothing wrong. As this is their ultimate aim, so in none of their endeavours can they take it for granted that God's non-existence is a well-established and proven fact, and then make that their basis for proving something else. Because then the whole thing will boil down to this: scientists are trying to prove that God does not exist on the basis of their assumption that God does not exist. Perhaps even a horse will laugh on hearing this if it can somehow come to understand our language.

This much being said I will now proceed further to show that the only proof that can be given for God's non-existence is a NEFOU. We can never... think of a God who is also not the creator of the universe. Here I would have used the word 'never' for ten times. But I could have used that word for billion times as well. A God will never be a proper God if He has not actually created the universe. We can even say that the word 'God' is a synonym for the word 'creation'. So we can with absolute certainty say that God means creation. But we cannot with equal certainty say that God means divine intervention also. Because God could have created the universe in such a manner that no further divine intervention in the created world would be needed at all. We do not know, and we can never know. There is no way to ascertain the truth-value of the following statement:

"A God, if He is really God, will not only create a universe, but also poke His nose into His creation without fail."

So we can always be sure that if there is a God, then this universe will definitely be His creation. But we can never be sure as to whether there will be divine intervention as well in the universe after its creation. Or, if there was intervention at all, then in which particular cases were those interventions. Did He intervene for creating life from non-life? Did He intervene for separating human species from chimpanzees? We do not know. We can never know. As there will always be some uncertainty regarding God's intervention in the created world, therefore no natural explanation of any phenomenon, any fact or any event in the created world can prove with absolute certainty that there is no God. Therefore if somebody

claims that Darwin's theory of evolution has proved that God does not exist, or that Crick-Watson's discovery of double helix has proved that God does not exist, or that some other scientific discovery has proved beyond doubt that God does not exist, then I will only say that these are all nonsensical arguments that have been put forward so far as genuine proof for God's non-existence. But if we find that scientists have been able to give a NEFOU, then we will have to reckon it as a genuine and conclusive proof for God's non-existence. So here we are getting another strong reason as to why we cannot, and should not, accept the scientific theory that states that the universe has originated from nothing due to a vacuum fluctuation as a genuine scientific theory, because here what is intended to be proved has been proved based on the assumption that it has already been proved. As scientists have not yet been able to give any alternative theory for the origin of the universe in which God will have no part to play, therefore we are of the opinion that scientists have done nothing so far that can conclusively prove that God does not exist.

## References

Pal, H. S. (2010), Timeless & Climax. Scientific GOD Journal, V1(7): pp. 492-496.