

Essay

Evidence of God & Origin of Zero

Himangsu S. Pal*

Abstract

If space and time are relative from the very beginning of their existence, then the cause due to which they are relative must be prior to the beginning of the universe - God. In ancient India, and in India only, there was the philosophical concept of Nirvana, which is a physical state where everything we know of, comes to an end – Zero.

Keywords: Evidence, God, zero, cause, existence.

Is There No Evidence for God?

Recently someone has written that if there is a god and if this god affects our reality, then he would be a part of nature. So we will be able to measure the effects of this god in our reality, even if we cannot understand them. But until now we have not measured anything attributable to such a god.

But it is definitely not true that we have not measured anything attributable to such a god. So I have to present my argument to him as to why I think his contention regarding this is not true. Below it is:

God is not only described as omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent, but also as spaceless and timeless. So, if there is such a God, then there would be a permanent state of spacelessness and timelessness along with the universe. If there is such a permanent state of spacelessness and timelessness, then space and time cannot be absolute. For space and time to be absolute, they should have the same values in each and every case without any exception. But if there is such a permanent state, then in one particular case space and time would have null values and in every other case they would have non-zero values. In this way they would become relative. Scientists have also found that space and time are indeed relative.

Here comes another person who says that if God is spaceless, then nowhere does he exist and that if he is timeless then at no time does he exist. So if I cannot show it exists, then they have good reason not to believe it exists.

In reply, I have to write to him that whatever exists within the universe exists within the space and time of the universe. But can we say within which space and time the universe as a whole exists?

*Correspondence: Himangsu S. Pal. E-Mail: sekharpal1946@rediffmail.com

And I have to explain to him in detail as to why this cannot be said about the universe that it is within any space and time. This is because although we know very well that the universe is expanding, yet as per the cosmologists the truth is that it is not expanding into anything, which means the universe as a whole is not embedded within any higher space and time. Although this universe is not within any space and time, yet for that reason we do not say that the universe does not exist.

I also gave him something to think over. Thought for the day: We know that space and time are relative. But have we ever asked from when they were relative? Were they relative from the very beginning of their existence? If so, then the cause due to which they were relative must already be present there before the beginning of space and time, that is, before the beginning of the universe.

But if we say that this cause is within the universe only and not outside of it, then space and time would only be relative from the moment this cause would make its first appearance within the universe. Before that space and time would remain absolute.

But this does not convince him at all and so he says that he is still waiting for any evidence of this God. As per him even after for more than 2000 years of God-talk, still there is no evidence.

So I have to repeat to him that I have already shown how the presence of a spaceless and timeless God would make space and time relative in our universe and that scientists have also found that space and time are indeed relative.

Then again I show him how his argument that God does not exist because he is not within any space and time has already been defeated, because if it is asserted that God does not exist on this ground only, then for that very same reason we will also have to assert that the universe does not exist, because as per the cosmologists neither is the universe within any space and time. And if in one case we admit that the universe exists but if in another case we refuse to admit the same for God, then that will only show that we are using some sort of double standard which is not a very good thing to promote or support.

I have also shown which problem might arise if the existence of this God is denied, because in that case there would be a period during which space and time would remain absolute.

I have also written that scientists are the only persons who can specifically say whether space and time were relative from the very beginning of their existence, or whether there was a brief period during which they were absolute. However, if it is true that they were relative from the very beginning, then the cause due to which they were relative must predate the beginning of the universe.

And I have to write to him that up to this I have made my point very clear.

This time the atheist becomes silent.

So the conclusion that can be drawn from the above discussion is this: If space and time are relative from the very beginning of their existence, then the cause due to which they are relative must be prior to the beginning of the universe.

Why Zero Was Invented in India

Some people very frequently ask this question: If God created everything, then who created God? If one answers their question by saying that God needs no creation, then their usual reply would be that it is some sort of special pleading, because if everything needs creation, then why not God?

But actually it is not any sort of special pleading; rather it shows how unintelligent some atheists may be. Some of them fail to understand that a cause that is the end-cause in a series of other causes cannot itself have a cause, because in that case it would no longer remain an end-cause. Rather it would become one of the middle causes only. An end-cause can never have any further cause. This is simple logic.

If an entity, the existence of which has been posited in order to stop an infinite regress, needs a cause itself, then it will fail to serve its purpose, e.g. stopping an infinite regress. So, what is the purpose of positing its existence if it cannot stop that regress? Better allow the regress.

Here an atheist may reply that the so called "infinite regress" problem cannot be solved by a god in any way.

So I have to counter it by saying that it is not true that the "infinite regress" problem cannot be solved by a god. Thanks to Stephen Hawking the question 'Who created God?' has already been answered at least ten years earlier.

The atheist may again reply that a god cannot solve the problem, because a god is subject to the same problem. A god's thinking and acting (deciding) are subject to infinite regress because they are things which require causes. A god is not nothing. Thus, my confusion lies in my automatic unfounded assumption that there had to be stasis before motion. Just like when people assume without foundation that there had to be nothing, before there was something.

Further, someone may again argue if motion is a prerequisite for what is, then there is no reason not to assume that the nature of existence is perpetual change. Adding a mind only creates an infinite regress and many paradoxes.

I point here that this reply shows that the atheist might be ignorant of many things. Stephen Hawking in his book 'A Brief History of Time' has given us a clue regarding how this infinite regress problem can be solved. The clue is that if we can somehow arrive at zero, then no further question will be raised and that there will be no infinite regress.

After getting this clue from him, it has been possible by me to show that in God totality of everything is zero and that therefore God will need no creation. This shows infinite regress is not at all a problem anymore in case of God.

But my reply may fail to convince the atheist. She may reply that a god must be comprised of something and that otherwise it is nothing. As per the atheist I have assumed, based on an extremely narrow interpretation of an extremely tentative scientific hypothesis, based on wholly inadequate data, that there was nothing before our universe. Even so, I have contradicted myself, when I have said that a god was here before. A god, by definition is not nothing. I am trying to have it both ways.

One may also add here that even if there were such a thing as a god, there would have to be some kind of mechanism by which it does whatever it does. If it is not made of something, it is nothing (less than imaginary). The supernatural by definition is just another form of natural, but it's not nothing.

One knows that the findings of physics are mind bending, but it is also true that science is still looking for the nature of reality. If I wish to throw up my hands and say: "It was just magic", I am welcome to, but even magic is not nothing. Even magic, is subject to infinite regress.

I have written: "...God ...is zero..." But that's nothing. Perhaps I have answered my own question by saying that God is zero.

My final reply to the person is this:

Her reply very nicely explains as to why all the other ancient civilizations failed to invent zero, whereas it was possible by Indian civilization only. This is because in ancient India, and in India only, there was the philosophical concept of Nirvana, which is a physical state where everything we know of, comes to an end. Has anybody ever thought where computer science would have been now if zero was not invented by an unknown Indian? So no one should try to belittle the philosophical concept that made possible the invention of zero. Rather one should try to understand what it is.