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ABSTRACT
In this essay, I will show why I am not yet convinced that there is no God and why materialist scientists have failed to convince me that God does not exist. I will further show that the beginning of the universe can never be from a source that already contained space, time, matter and energy.
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Why I am Not Convinced that There Is No God

Only two things can make me convinced that there is no God:

(1) If science can show that this universe does not need any God; and
(2) If science can show that God of the theistic description cannot exist.

Regarding (1), it should be said that no one on this earth can claim that he/she is omniscient. Therefore no one on this earth can claim that he/she knows with absolutely certainty that there is no God. However scientists can come to know that there is no God if they can show that everything in this universe, including its origin also, can be explained by natural means without invoking any kind of god. No doubt this is a very lengthy process indeed, but at the end of this lengthy process one can with some certainty say that the universe does not need any God.

However it has already been shown here [1] and here [2] that the origin of the universe has not been explained properly by the scientists.

The above shows that science has not yet been able to explain everything of nature by natural means. In such a situation how will the scientists convince us that this universe does not need any God?

Regarding (2) it may be asked: which God? This is because there are thousands of religions on earth and each religion has its own concept of God. I have already made this point clear here3.

This God is spaceless, timeless, changeless, immortal, all-pervading, one, unborn, uncreated, without any beginning, without an end, everlasting, non-composite and immaterial.
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So in order to show that this God with the above attributes cannot exist, I think it will be sufficient for the scientists if they can somehow show that no one or nothing in this universe can be spaceless and timeless. This is because in that case it can very easily be argued that this God does not exist, because this God is said to be spaceless and timeless whereas science has shown that no one or nothing can be spaceless and timeless. But here science has done just the opposite to what it was supposed to do; it has shown how it is possible to be spaceless and timeless. That means here also science has failed in its endeavor to show that God of the theistic description cannot exist. Here their failure has a much deeper negative impact on us than their failure in the first case, because once they have shown how it is possible to be spaceless and timeless, now it becomes next to impossible for them to convince us anymore that this spaceless and timeless God cannot exist.

Due to the above two reasons I am not yet convinced that there is no God. Scientists have failed to convince me that God does not exist.

Here I want to add one more point. If we are to think that there is a God at all, then we can think of him as the creator of the universe only and not in any other way. So in order to show that there is no God I think it will be sufficient if one can show that the universe needs no creation and that the origin of the universe can be easily explained without invoking any kind of god. But I have already shown that science has failed here and so we are not at all convinced that there is no God.

**What Does the Beginning of the Universe Actually Mean?**

The reason as to why theists call their God spaceless, timeless and immaterial is due to the recognition of the fact that if the universe has a beginning, then that beginning can never be from a source that already contained space, time, matter and energy.

Universe primarily means its space, time, matter and energy. Therefore when we say that the universe has a beginning, we mean to say that its space, time, matter and energy have a beginning. Now the question is: can the universe have a beginning from a source that already contained space, time, matter and energy? If the source already contained space, time, matter and energy, then that would mean that space, time, matter and energy were already there. If space, time, matter and energy were already there, then that would further mean that the universe was already there. If the universe was already there, then why do we again say that the universe has a beginning?

The above reasoning shows that if the universe has a beginning at all, then that beginning can never be from a source that already contained space, time, matter and energy because in that case it will imply that the universe was already there. Therefore the beginning of the universe will always mean that it can begin from zero space, zero time, zero matter and zero energy only. As the universe can begin from zero space, zero time, zero matter and zero energy only, so the total space, total time, total matter and total energy of the universe should always remain zero, as
otherwise one will have to explain as to whence appear the extra space, extra time, extra matter and extra energy that were not already there at the beginning.

So for a universe having a beginning this question must have an answer: how does the total space-time of an ever-expanding universe always remain zero?

Only a beginningless, eternal universe will not give us any such trouble.
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