

# New Proofs for the Existence of God: Part I The Sesamatic Proof

Mohammed Muslim\*

## ABSTRACT

The eternal Imaginer must exist. Without eternity and imagination, nothing can come into being.

**Key Words:** proof, existence, GOD, sesamatic, relational, “STOP” argument.

## 1. Introduction

It is fashionable these days for many intellectuals to say that there is no God or that the existence of God cannot be proven logically. The reason for this is that all the previous arguments for the existence of God have been found to be less than satisfactory in one form or another by the logicians. This had led many religious people to retreat from logic and to claim that the issue of God is a matter of the heart and not of the mind. This, however, cannot be true. In this article, I will prove the existence of God in a way that cannot be disproven by any logician. You need to know whether God exists or not. If God is a phantom, as some people say, then this life has no meaning in itself; and all the dreams and structures of mankind, including this very journal, are nothing but babbles of miserable dreamers. Fortunately, God is. The simplest way of resolving the issue is to ask a series of basic questions as follows. First, do human beings exist or not? No one can rationally prove that we do not exist. Any person that argues that we do not exist, disproves himself or herself by the very fact of the denial. Non-existent beings don't speak. So, it is clear that we exist because we cannot deny it without being stupid or mad. Since we did not make ourselves, it follows that something made us. This is also clear. Let us refer to the thing that brought us into being as our Cause. Since we all agree that we have a Cause, the question can never be whether our Cause exists or not, rather what is the nature of this Cause. Let me reword the whole things. Some people call this Cause “God”. So, if we replace Cause with God, we can see that questions as to whether or not God exists become nonsensical. The real issue is never whether there is God but what kind of God are we talking about.

Inevitably, when we speak about God's qualities we use words which are all too human. But as the question of God is a human question the answer to it must be in human language. The point to be made is that if this Cause (of our existence) were named "God" this naming of the

---

\*Correspondence: Mohammed Muslim, a/k/a The Bridge. E-Mail: [biblequran@gmail.com](mailto:biblequran@gmail.com) or c/o Nadeem Haque E-mail: [nhaque@mail.com](mailto:nhaque@mail.com).

Note: Another version of this proof and its extension and application to cosmological questions is presented in: Haque, Nadeem, and Muslim, M., (2007), *From Microbits to Everything: Universe of the Imaginator, Volume 2: The Philosophical Implications*, Optagon Publications Ltd., Toronto. M. Muslim and his co-author, Nadeem Haque, have other proofs on the existence of God, in which the Sesamatic/Relational Proofs are applied to the “Big Bang”, “The Cyclical Universe” and the issue of design and complexity (the *Teleogenic Proof*).

cause cannot be said to change the nature of the cause or the fact that it is. At this point then, the disputes about God become no more than disputes about God's attributes. You should keep in mind that even the so-called religious do not unanimously agree on the attributes of God. There are thousands of contradictory statements from different religions and from different sects about what God is. We are all atheists about the God of those that we do not believe in. So, in effect we are all atheists and we are all believers. It all depends upon which God you are talking about. We are going to look at a more detailed argument for the existence of God.

## 2. The Sesamatic or Relatiological<sup>1</sup> Proof of God

How do things come into being? By things coming into being I mean the way in which children, for example, are born for the first time into the world. Prior to your birth, something was here. For the sake of simplicity let us say that your parents caused you to be here. And continuing with that logic let us say that your parents' parents caused them too to be here. Let us also take the position that it has always been like this, namely, one or more things uniting to cause another thing to come into being; and that thing too causing something else to come into being and so forth. When it comes to the question of the origin of all these changes, there are only two possibilities. One is that matter is forever and has been changing forever. This would mean that there is no beginning point or time for this change. The other possibility is that matter had a beginning and that changes have not been forever. This would make God the creator of all things. I do not wish to go into definitions of God at this point. For now, though it is important to keep in mind that the philosophers have not proved that change is eternal. What they have said is that it is possible that matter is eternal and has been changing forever. The significance of the argument about change is that if matter has been changing forever then obviously, there would be no need for a God. If it has not, then we turn to God.

## 3. Has matter been changing forever?

One undeniable thing about reality is change. Billions of people now living were not here—say, 200 years ago. In addition, we also know that there were millions and millions people before we came here and that these are no longer here. Every day, more newcomers are added to the mix. More may come after we are gone. Where do all these people come from? From the logic of the philosophers, the only answer must be that we all come from eternally changing matter. According to this position, everything that is happening is simply matter changing from one state to another. But is it? When the philosophers say that matter has been moving forever, they imply that the changes have no beginning. There is no point in space or time where these changes began. The fact, however, is that changes, are by definition, successive. In this world, we see that all things have not arrived at once. Some things come before others. Our parents, for instance, came before us and we come before our children and so on. But then if, as the philosophers say, changes of matter have no beginning or a first step, how can they explain the successions that are all over the place? Successions characterize our world. To get a subsequent step, you require a prior step. Where there is no beginning step,

---

<sup>1</sup> *Sesa* is an Ashanti word for change. Another name coined for this proof is *Relatiological*, as it examines the relations between: matter, change and space.

there can be no succeeding step. The problem is that if our changes had no beginnings as the philosophers say, we could never have arrived here. That which has no beginning cannot have succession. If you can think of changes as sequences, you can easily see how it is that if you don't move from "1", you can't get to "2". Without a first change, there can never be a subsequent change. Let me explain things in a different way. Matter is a collection of limited things. The fact that we are each able to move from one position to another shows clearly that we are each limited. For when you are endless, you move not, as you are everywhere already. The fact that everything in space moves, proves that everything in space is limited. Indeed, the very possibility of multiple things is conditional upon each thing being limited. In order to have more than one thing, each thing must be limited. To be limited, however, is to have a fixed position in space. You cannot be limited and have no place. That which is said to be limited but has no position in space is nothing. Now, matter is a collection of limited things. Let us assume for a moment, with the philosophers that matter had been here forever. That must mean that each part of matter has always occupied a position in space. There are only two ways by which matter could have been present in space. One is by way of what we call rest and the other is by way of what we call motions. So, matter has either been moving or resting forever. To change, however, is to move from one position to the other. A change only occurs when a thing accelerates or de-accelerates (or deceleration) from a state of rest or from a rate of motion in space. When matter is at a constant rate of rest, or of motion, the manner in which it changes is to accelerate or decelerates from that position. Acceleration, deceleration, divisions and multiplications are the only things that define change. Where matter is before the change occurs is its "from" position. Where it ends after the change is the "to" position. Changes are no more than "from" "to", etc. If, therefore, matter has been changing, it could only have done so by moving "from" "to". Here is the crux of the matter. Every change is between the "from" and the "to". The "to" is always subsequent. No matter what you think of "forever", a subsequent position is not and cannot be forever. What is important to remember is that acceleration or deceleration is always *subsequent* to the "from" position. The "from" is always before the "to". The fact that the "to" comes *after* the "from", clearly shows that the "to" has not been forever. But then you need the "to" in order to have change. If therefore, the "to" has not been forever, then necessarily, changes by definition, cannot and have not been forever. That is just another way of saying that every change must have a beginning. So, clearly, this shows without a doubt then that this changing world, had a beginning. To see this with clarity we need to answer the question of infinite regress with respect to change, where some philosophers deny a beginning. This leads us to the "STOP" argument.

#### 4. The "STOP" Argument

One of the easiest ways of figuring out that matter has not been changing forever is this. Let us convert time into distance so that we can see changes as movements in distance. In this respect, to say that matter has been changing forever would be the same as saying that it has been moving forever. In other words, if we assume with the philosophers that the changes had no beginning, then no one can point to any point in space and say "here is where it started". As I said earlier however, we know that changes are successive. What we have now was not always here. If one thing is certain, it is that we have a past. Yesterday is not today and today is not tomorrow. One comes after the other. Let us call the present the "now". But because we have yesterday, we know that the "now" was not always here. It has come from somewhere.

Let us build an imaginative STOP sign for matter in the “now” and then try to send matter back from the STOP sign to where it came from. Do you think that if matter started returning to where it came from, it would ever arrive or reach the end? The answer is absolutely not. This is because no matter how far and how long matter moves back, there could never be an end position for matter. This is because, according to the philosophers, its changes did not start anywhere. But the fact is that if you don’t start anywhere, you don’t end anywhere. The problem is that the distance between our STOP and where matter came from is the same for matter, whether it is coming or going.

Therefore, if it is impossible for matter to reach home or to any beginning point of its changes, it must follow that matter could never have arrived at this present STOP from there. If matter is here, therefore, that must show that matter has not been changing forever. It had to start somewhere. Once again, I show conclusively that matter’s changes had a beginning<sup>2</sup>.

### **5. Could matter on its own have “caused” its beginning changes?**

We know that matter has not been changing forever and must have had a beginning. Still, we must ask ourselves whether matter could have caused these changes. Again, let us assume with the philosophers that matter has been around forever. Since we are not adding God to the mix, matter would be the whole of reality. If this is so, then every change that we see in matter today, must always have been a possibility of matter. That is, matter should always have had all that it needed to make human beings, for example. The question then is, if all that was needed to make a human being always existed in matter, why did we only arrive recently? Why weren’t we born before the time that we were born? What’s with the delay? Let us break it down. Suppose a quality or quantity “x” is what is needed to finalize the making of a human being. If this “x” were not a part of eternal matter, matter could not subsequently acquire it. If reality didn’t have this “x” then “x” did not exist and there is no other place to get “x” from. On the other hand, if this “x” was eternally present in matter, then changes should have occurred long before they did. Let’s say that a thing, call it “M” is at position “1”. Let’s call this “M1”. When M moves to position “2” it becomes “M2”. Clearly, before M moved to position “2”, position “2” already existed.

---

<sup>2</sup> As I mentioned before, an object in a constant state of rest is said to change only when it decreases or increases its rate of speed. An object that increases its speed expands its positions in space or reaches more of its possibilities. The opposite is true. An object that decreases its speed contracts its positions and reaches less of its possibilities. Hence, if the original state of matter was that of constant rate of the highest speed of motion for example, then the type of change that we would have seen in this world would have been one of contraction or of de-acceleration. Contraction, however, is the opposite of births and growths. The type of changes that we see in this world is expansive rather than contracting. If matter had been de-accelerating from an original state of motion, we would not have had an expansion, but the contraction of the universe or of life. Birth or growth is the result of an acceleration from a position of no birth (rest) to a position of birth (motion). It represents a grab or one or more of matter’s possibilities. This therefore, shows that if matter had been forever, its ‘forever’ state would not have been that of the highest speed of motion but that of rest. But matter cannot be in a ‘forever’ position of rest. If something is in space, it must move. The limited cannot rest. It has nothing to rest on. If to be matter is to move and if we are saying that matter could only have begun its motions from rest, then we are saying that matter did not exist before it moved. The first movement was the existence. For matter and change are interchangeable. Just as the changes that we see have a beginning, so too does matter.

The only relevant observation about this is that prior to the move, there was a gap between position “2” and M. Since M is complete as M at position “1” before it moves, position “2” is not M, but M+ or M- depending on the situation. Let us say that “x” is the quality whose presence necessarily enables M’s movement from position “1” to position “2”. If “x” was a part of M before the move, then M could not have rested at position “1” since “x” necessarily results in movement from position “1” to position “2”. Thus if “x” is the facilitator of the change from M1 to M2, it must be external to M. Where M stands for matter, this clearly shows that the “x” that made the first change possible was not eternally present in matter. It is only when the “x” is not inherently present in matter that we can explain the delay in the actualisation of matter’s possibilities. But then once you admit that something outside of matter caused its changes then you must admit that there is more to reality than matter. Or, in other words, whatever caused the changes that we see is not matter. What is it then? The only answer is God. I will get to that in a moment. Another fact that shows that the “x” of changes is external to matter is this. Before each change occurs, it is preceded by the possibility of the change. Before a child is born, children must be possibilities, outside of, and independent of, a particular parent. It is neither the parent nor the child that makes the child possible but “childrenability” independent of the parents. It is only when the parents participate or fulfil the conditions of this “childrenability” that a child can be born. But then you must agree that these conditions are not something that the parent dreamed of. Nor is it possible for the parent to fulfil the conditions and not have the child. Similarly, a car moves, but it is not the car that makes motion possible. Motion in general exists as possibility in space, independent of and external to the car. The car moves only when it fulfils certain conditions for motion. A particular function is always subsequent and external to an independent antecedent possibility of the general function. This is true of everything or every function in space. No individual thing makes any of the relationships or positions that define, limit and shape its presence. As matter is no more than these individual things in relationships, it follows that neither matter as individual pieces nor matter collectively as a whole has anything to do with the very positions or “principles” in space that enable matter to be, move and change. It is never our mere quantities that change us, but our relationships in space. The problem is that the principles or relationships that we are subject to, are independent of each thing. The principles that make relationships possible must precede the relationships. Since all changes are relationships, this must mean that the cause of these changes must be external to the subjects of the change. In other words, in itself nothing can change on its own.

In order to make the foregoing even clearer, think about this. To change is to divide, add or multiply the relationships or positions of a given thing. Every activity in space can be given a certain number. This way, if for example, we replace all matter with numbers, we can still divide, add and multiply things. That is, we do not need actual matter in order to have changes. It is never so much matter, as much as the order of space that necessarily results in what we call changes. The fact that you can imagine the possibility of change without the necessity for actual matter shows once again that the principles of change or the order that causes change is not matter, but something else. What is it?

## **6. Why forever does not exist in space**

Before I answer the question of what it is that causes changes, let me answer a question that is probably on everybody's mind. It is this: Is matter eternal? Someone could argue that even if changes had a beginning, still, is it not possible that matter itself had no beginning? The answer is not a chance. Time is a measure of events in sequence. Forever means an infinity of sequential events. Where there are no sequential events, there is no time. Where all the events happen at the same time without any sequence, those events are for all purposes one and not successive enough to be time. Now, changes are the same as the events of time. Since we have already seen that these changes have not been forever, that must mean that there are not enough events to give an infinity of time or forever. Because matter does not have enough changes or events to constitute forever, matter cannot be said to have existed forever. Time is not a place. It is a number of events. So, if those events do not add up to forever, matter could not have been around forever. You cannot be in a time that does not exist. The clear conclusion then must mean that matter had a beginning.

### **7. Another angle: If you are not moving, you do not exist in space**

When you are limited, you must move. You cannot be limited and be completely at rest. But then whenever you move, you must rest and then move and then rest. It does not matter how fast or how slow you move, if you move a hundred times, you must stop a hundred times. But these moves and rests or the 'froms' and 'tos' are what we call changes. As we have already seen, however, matter has not been changing forever. This must mean that matter has not been moving forever. But then to be matter is to move or to change. Therefore, if matter has not been changing forever, that must mean that matter itself has not been forever. Let me explain things from a different position. It is impossible for matter to be, without motion. This is because the only thing that does not move is that which is either limitless or prevented from moving by something else. This is true of all limited things, big and small. But there is no one thing in space that is so powerful and so far reaching as to stop anything from moving forever. That must mean that sooner or later, everything in space moves. In space, rest without motion is a fiction. We don't see matter at rest anywhere. Every part of matter moves and is moving. To be matter is to move. But to move is the same thing as changing. If, therefore, matter been around forever then, it would have been changing forever. Since we have already seen that all changes have a beginning, it must follow that matter has not been around forever. This must mean that matter was born at the moment when motions or changes were born! What I am saying is that there is no difference between matter and change. To change, is to be matter. To be matter is to change. Since changes have a beginning, matter must have had a beginning.

### **8. Space as the Creator of Matter and the Infinite Enabler of Change**

If matter itself had a beginning and if matter is not responsible for change, what is the obvious and the only alternative? The answer is "space"; that limitless, indivisible eternity in which everything is and which is the prerequisite for every presence, movement, division, multiplication and change. That ever present space which you can never imagine as being

absent anywhere, anytime, is the creator, container, mover, organizer and planner behind everything. In one of my previous books<sup>3</sup>, I showed that Albert Einstein was wrong in talking about the “curvature” of space. Only a limited thing curves. This confusion has had the affect of giving people the idea that ‘space is matter’. Neither was Descartes right when he talked about space as an “extension” of matter. Space is not like a shadow. It does not extend from anything. Space is independent of matter. It is, and can be, without matter. It is matter that needs space. But space itself does not need matter. We can imagine a matterless space but not a spaceless matter.

By space I am not referring to positions or areas. These are fractions in space. Space itself is that objectless constant without which no limited thing can be. It is that vast expanse through which we move. But in itself space cannot be sensed, limited, divided or grasped in any manner. Matter is derivative from space as music is a derivative of plays. If we are the music, space is the musician. When the singing stops, the music stops. But although the song is from the player, the musician is not the music and the music is not the musician

It is the constancy of space that gives each thing its presence and stability. It is also the limitlessness of space that allows for that ‘extra’ room that enables all possible movement. A full space has no new tenants. But then when you think about it, you would see that all changes are mathematical propositions of pluses, divisions and multiplications. These are all functions of *limits*. And these limits are divisible or multipliable as a result of *infinity*. It is the logic of this infinity that gives us the logic of all relationships, mathematics, included. We do not change then because we are a given quantity. We change only because we are not made to rest and cannot be at rest in space. And because the logic of space and of our limits forces us to move, we become the spaces that we occupy. All changes in matter result from this “relationizing” in space. Without space, nothing can move, be or change. It is space, therefore, that enables change and nothing else.

## 9. Wilful and Imaginative Space as reason for delay in changes

But then we must ask, if all changes were always possibilities of space; and if space has always been around forever, then how can we explain the delays in changes? I pose the same question that I gave to matter, to space. If space were like matter, namely, mindless, then naturally, it too could never explain the delay in the changes for the same reasons that a mindless matter cannot explain the delays. For the sake of argument only, let us assume for a moment that space is mindless. If space and matter had been around forever, then between the two of them, changes should have occurred long before they did. This is because between the two of them they should have all that they needed to make changes. The only explanation that the human mind can give for delay in changes is *purposeful* delay. Nothing else can explain delay in the actualisation of possibilities except will, wishes or desire. Think about it. A mindless reality cannot maintain a distance between its possibilities and its actualities. With the mindless, what can be is what is. It is only a wilful, imaginative, singular space that can

---

<sup>3</sup> Muslim, M. and Haque, Nadeem, (2001), *From Microbits to Everything: A New Unified View of Physics and Cosmology, Volume 2: The Cosmological Implications*, Optagon Publications Ltd., Toronto. For a revised 2010 online version see: <http://optagon.page.tl/>

delay the actualisation of its potential. Nothing else can do it. Only a reality that has wishes can say for example, “I want humans now,” or “I can have humans, but not yet”. There can be no other reasonable alternative for explaining how the eternal gives rise to the temporal except where the eternal is imaginative so that changes occur, not as changes of the eternal itself, but as the manifestations of the eternal imagination or will. If you think that this is not true, try to coming up with the temporary from a mindless eternity!

## **10. The Necessity for God**

Let us look at the problem from another perspective. Everything that exists has always been here or has come into being as a manifestation of a pre-existing potential of reality. What is clear, however, is that all those things existing right now are the result of changes. Nothing in space has been pre-existing in the same form, function and position in space. This must mean that all that exists today must have come into being as a manifestation of the previous potential of reality. Let us call this reality X. The first question is, “is X too, the result of change or is it eternal?”

Every change is preceded by a previous position. Where there is no prior position, there cannot be a subsequent move. We have subsequent moves, therefore, there must have been a first move. But if there is a first move, it could only have come from a position before movement, i.e., the eternal. So, whatever gave rise to change must have existed before change. The eternal is that which always was; is and will be. Every change requires and depends upon a constant. Without such a constant, there cannot be change. The problem is that to be eternal is exactly that, namely, to be “forever”. But forever what? A thing cannot be said to exist unless it is a fixed quantity or quality. Since, one thing cannot be said to be and not be at the same time, when we say that there is such a thing as the eternal, we are talking about an everlasting “something”. This something must either be mindless or mindful. The mindless is that which is not aware of itself and has no ability to think, imagine or wish for things. The mindful on the other hand, is aware of itself and can think, imagine and wish for things.

## **11. A Mindless Eternal can never change**

A mindless eternal can never account for the emergence of the temporary. This is because however you look at the issue, the first move is either a function of automatic processes or one of will. If the eternal is mindless, the only way to explain the first move would be to say that time was always a potential of the eternal and that at some point the potential became active. Active or not, passive to active or vice versa, is a form of change. Change can only occur in one of two ways; through automatic force or wilful force. Since we are talking about the mindless, the only possible way for change to occur is by way of automatic force or processes. To be eternal is to exist before time. Where there is no time, there can be no movement, changes or processes. Before time, there are no processes, but only X. You cannot have processes before you have time. So, the first change could only have come from within X itself. Keep in mind that before the first change, X is the only reality and has no other source or power to influence it to change. Now, whatever X was immediately before the first



move, X had been the same eternally. Since X is the only reality before change, nothing could have come from anywhere to cause any change in X immediately before the first move. Since there is no external force or event to change the eternal, the mindless eternal could never have changed from within itself and thus could not have changed at all to give us time. A good reply might be that the first change was a unique event and that it occurred spontaneously. Spontaneous or not, a change is a break away from a previous position. Adding the term spontaneous to the change does not take away from the fact that we must still explain what it is that enables the eternal to break away from its eternal self. You might reply that the change must have occurred as a result of continuing processes or events in the eternal until there was a critical mass and then voila!, time. If this were true, this situation would be much like what happens when water keeps on eroding the soil under the foundation of a building slowly but steadily until one day the foundation gives way and whole building collapses. Or like what happens when you keeping on loading straws unto a camel until you break its back from overload. The problem with this explanation however, is that it is baseless. All processes require time. Indeed, the processes themselves are time. So we cannot logically say that time was happening or that changes were occurring before the first change or the first time occurred. Given that we are talking about the first time or the first change, arguments about processes, etc., cannot apply.

Another reply might be that there could have been something else that caused the eternal to change. Earlier on in this article, I had stated that and now repeat that: if this were so, that thing too would have to be eternal. This is because that which does not exist before time does not exist at all, so as to cause any change before time. But then if the thing that caused the eternal to change were also eternal, that would not help us very much. For the second, third or even the trillionth eternal would also have the same problem that the first has, namely, what is it that made the eternal change. If one eternal cannot account for the birth of time, the trillionth of them cannot either.

## **12. Inexplicable delays**

Another problem is that there has been a delay in our births. When we are talking about the eternal, all the pieces that are needed to make us must have been there forever. If something was missing, the eternal could not subsequently get it from anywhere. So, if all the ingredients were there, and if time was no problem, then all things that could have occurred in the eternal should have occurred long before they did. The mindless cannot delay the consequences of its nature. We know that because the eternal has existed forever, whenever the first change occurred, it could have occurred much, much earlier than it did. Since it is the eternal that gives rise to time, all of us could have been born a very long, long time ago rather than now. Even if we agree for the sake of argument only that the eternal needed time, still, the eternal has had forever into the past. Whatever time you take into account can be extended into the past infinitely so that we should have been here a very long, long time ago, say a trillion, trillion, trillion years before you were born. Why now? What's up with the delay? Let me illustrate. When fire and dry wood meet in dry conditions, the wood necessarily burns. The wood cannot say to the fire, "wait a minute, don't let me burn right now". When two and two come together, they have no choice but to be four. You can think of a million other things like that. So, if all the ingredients that are necessary to make human beings, for example, were

always present in the eternal, then we should have been here a long time ago. Even if for the sake of argument only, we were to say that the eternal needed time, still, given that it was the eternal itself that created time, it could always have done it long before it actually did it. Since neither missing pieces, external factors, nor time can explain why changes occur in the eternal, it must follow that as long as the eternal is mindless, it can never give rise to change and it can never account for the delays in our births.

### **13. Voluntariness as the only correct answer**

Since we have eliminated the mindless as a possibility, the only answer is voluntariness. The temporal arises from the eternal in the same way that in the human realm, creative works arise from reality. That is, through the will and imagination. In the human realm, it is through “fiction” and “imagination” that we can temporarily escape the clutches of nature without changing our nature. The reason we are able to do that is that we have minds that can wilfully “fabricate” unreality. The interesting thing is that although the imagined or the fictional may not be a part of reality, it can become temporarily real when we real beings pay *attention* to it. It is our wilful construction of the forms and our attentiveness to the subject that makes our creative works a part of reality sometimes. Similarly, the temporary can arise from the eternal only when the eternal has the capacity to wish for, or imagine something other than itself. When the eternal has wishes and imagination, the first change can occur as a matter of will. Only this will can explain the break in the eternal. But in order for this to happen, wilfulness must be a part of the eternal nature. As for the delay, it can be explained as the prerogative of the eternal will. It wills what it wants when it wants. In this respect, even though it does not move, the eternal must be by nature, an unceasing imagination so that the changes can arise, not as changes in the eternal itself, but as manifestations of the unceasing wishes. But how, you ask, can the eternal have imagination or wishes when it has no time or does not move?

### **14. Imaginative Will**

The imagination of the eternal is contained in its will. We do not have two separate things, namely, the will and the imagination. What the eternal is, is an imaginative will. This is at once, the imagination and the ensuing action that we call time, creatures and change. The will can be turned on or off for specific goals or projects. When the will is turned on, all the goals of the will come into being. It is the contents of the will as they manifest, that I refer to as the imagination. When the will is not turned on for time, or for subjects such as ourselves, the eternal is “emptiness”. Note, however that this is a relative term to mean the absence of all those things that come to play, when the will kicks in. Because the eternal is emptiness, it is one. You cannot have two or more eternal “emptinesses”. It must be one. Whenever the will kicks in, there is “fullness”. Again this is a relative term to mean the presence of those things that were not eternally present in the emptiness. Because this emptiness is eternal, you should know that having creatures cannot add anything to the nature of the eternal. What changes when creatures are born is not so much the eternal itself as much as it its *attention*. Creation then is a form of self-sacrifice or an act of selflessness. The creatures are like guests. Before the creatures come, the attention of the eternal is of itself. When the creatures come, the attention shifts somewhat to the creatures, to the extent of their presence in the eternal

presence. In this regard then, creation is a favor upon the creatures and a loss of quiet on the part of the creator. Naturally, the things that come into being as a result of the will of the eternal were always possibilities of the eternal. But before these possibilities are willed into being, the eternal is in a state of itself only. However, you should know that the possibilities of the eternal are strictly those of *will* only. The possibilities are not independent “somethings” that exist in the eternal before time. Only the eternal is present before time. Other things come into being only when the eternal wills in a particular way. Like thoughts, creatures come into being only when the eternal “thinks” about them or imagines them. If you can imagine the creatures as the “thoughts” of the eternal, they are real to the extent that the eternal continues to hold these thoughts. When the thoughts cease or when the imagination stops, like characters in the eternal dream, we all disappear just as were before the imagination.

## 15. God’s Being

But what kind of existence is this, you ask, if to be eternal is not to do anything? The short answer is that you and I cannot imagine how it must feel like. We can never be eternal nor can we ever be an emptiness. Nevertheless, “doing” something always involves a change of position or pursuit of a goal. If you can pursue a goal but choose not to, then not doing anything in itself becomes the “do”. Being, without acting is a form of doing because it is a state that is maintained by a will that could act otherwise. But anyway, we all do stuff because we want to get this and that. When we don’t need anything or when we don’t want to get anything, we don’t do anything. Sometimes, it is enough to be and not to do anything. Being alone and having silence is sometimes better than company and noise. A similar thing applies to the eternal. It does what it wills when it wills. Being eternal, it does not need the temporary for its being. The temporary can never add or take away anything of substance from the eternal. Therefore, the eternal can never need to create. It can only want to create. When it does not want to create, it does not. It is that simple. This explains why you and I appeared “just like that.” Remarkably, it is the nature of the will that although it can lead to action it does not have to. So, while the eternal has the capacity to wish for this and wish for that, the eternal is not under any necessity or compulsion either from within itself or from without, to act or to act continuously. This explains why there can be a moment where there are no objects or time at all. But given that the presence or absence of time is subject to the eternal will, the whole thing is elastic so that the eternal can have cycles of creatures, no creatures; then creatures and then no creatures and so on forever. Why and when some creatures come into being is not a matter of necessity at all, but only a matter of the wishes of the eternal. In effect then, all creatures exist at the pleasure of the eternal.

## 16. Where does God come from?

This eternal being that wishes things into being is what I refer to as our God. But since we are on the subject of origins, we may as well ask the same question about God. Because God is the everlasting reality from which all things come, the question is of the same order as “where does everlasting reality come from?” The answer is that reality cannot come from unreality. Since God is reality, the real answer to the question is “God comes from God”. Or in other

words, He was always there. The only thing that “comes” from somewhere is something that is not everlasting. Because God is everlasting, He cannot come from anywhere. It is mind boggling to admit that there is a being such as God that has been there forever. But if there were no such thing as a forever ‘something’, nothing could have been. I admit that it is difficult to imagine a Being that does not come from anywhere, right? But if you think that this is amazing, what about us? Are you not amazed that some time ago, you were not here and then one day, boom!, here you are and tomorrow you may be gone just like that? We are all the imagined or the desired beings of God.

## 17. Conclusion

So, in conclusion, whether things evolve from the simplest to the complex does not at all prove or disprove the existence of God. Evolution merely describes the relationships that exist between limited and changing things that a beginning, for which a creator is required. Besides, evolution depends upon time and space and cannot explain the origin of time and space. The origin of these things cannot be accounted for by evolution and for that matter, by any process alone. Life can only be explained by one everlasting person that we call God. Matter is by definition, temporary and limited. Every limited thing changes and has a beginning. All changes must come from the eternal. There can only be one eternal. This is God. It has been proven logically that God is irrefutable as the everlasting source of all things that exist through this ‘His’ will and imagination.

## ADDENDUM

Those who opine that: **“Evolution, explains the origin of everything in space. So, God does not exist,”** should carefully consider the following, in conjunction with the preceding proof:

Where do you begin refuting the aforementioned thesis? Let us break it down. In this case, there are two parts to the statement. The first part is that “evolution explains the origin of everything”. The key term here is ‘evolution’. What is it? Let us assume that from your research on the matter, you find out that “evolution is the theory that all things result from a process of nature wherein the simple gives rise to the complex; and the weaker gives way to the stronger, so that in the long run, only the fittest survive”. What we learn from this then is that evolution is the name given to a process of change. The first question that you must ask is, whether it is true that evolution “explains the origin of everything”. Never assume that just because it says so, it must be so. Where are the facts in support of this statement? If there are no facts to back the assertion, still, you must ask whether this conclusion is one of those intellectual necessities that we discussed earlier? In other words, is the statement so clear that it cannot be refuted in a logical manner? If the facts do not support the position, or if the statement is not necessarily true, then naturally you cannot affirm that the statement is true.

For now though, let us look at several possibilities in terms of the facts. You might be surprised to hear this, but often, the bolder the claim, the more baseless it is. This is because if all fallacies are the same, why create a small fallacy when with the same effort you can get

away with a great one? But I digress. For the sake of brevity, we will assume that there are facts in support of evolution, but we cannot assume that all the facts point to the conclusion that the author seeks to make. If this were so, that would mean that the facts are inconclusive and that the conclusion could be true, but needs more work. Or that the statement could be false, again with more facts. But how much evidence would you need in order to know whether the claim is proved conclusively? A clue is in the statement itself. Because evolution is supposed to explain the origin of “everything”, the evidence must cover “every” thing. If the argument were that evolution was explained “some” things, then partial evidence in respect of those things would suffice. When you are dealing with a theory of everything, it must be able to explain everything. If a theory of everything leaves out some things that it cannot explain or account for, either toss it out as a lie or put into quotes as a partial truth. Now in this case, you should know that whatever they say about evolution, evolution itself depends upon time and space. This is because evolution is a process; and every process needs time and space. Without time or space, there cannot be movement and change. The problem, however, is that no matter how you look at it, evolution can never account for the origin of either time or space. Nobody in his or her right mind can tell you that in the beginning there was no time or space, but only evolution. Then evolution said, “let there be space; let there be time” and *voila!* Time and space were born. For if space did not co-exist with evolution or pre-exist evolution, then evolution could have had no place in order to be. If time did not co-exist with evolution or pre-exist evolution, then evolution could have had no moment in order to be and to move or change anything. Remember that space and time are the primary conditions for positioning and for movement change. So, if evolution could not have created either space or time, then naturally, evolution simply cannot account for “everything”. As such, it is clear that the statement that evolution explains everything is false. At best, the statement is an exaggeration.

For the sake of argument, however, let us ignore what I have just said about time and space for a moment and proceed as though evolution does in fact explain “everything”. If this were so, then obviously, the first part of the statement “**Evolution, explains the origin of everything in space**” would be correct. But wait a moment. Just because the first part of the statement is correct would not mean that therefore, the second part of the statement, that: “**So, God does not exist,**” too, must be correct. Do not get into the habit of saying that just because things are together, they are necessarily related such that what happens to one must necessarily happen to the other. What happens to one tooth does not necessarily happen to another, even though they are in the same mouth. What you would have to do then would be to see whether because everything came from evolution, it follows that God does not exist. In order to see whether the second portion of the statement is true, we must find out the connection between the two statements. **For it is possible that God created evolution or that God co-exists with evolution.** Think. In order to resolve this, we must find out whether evolution is something that has no need for another such as a creator or God, or whether its nature is such that it does require another or a creator in order come into being. The first question then is: “Where does this process of evolution come from?” It does not matter that everything that you see may have come from evolution. We must still ask whether evolution itself had a beginning or if it is everlasting. If evolution is everlasting, then logically, it would not need to be created or initiated by anyone or anything. If, on the other hand, it turns out that evolution had a beginning, then it cannot displace God at all.

Before we can talk about God we must define the term. God is “one, everlasting, limitless person that created all things by will”. The question is this. If everything came from evolution as alleged, does that then prove that God does not exist? Well, let us see. The first thing about evolution is that it is not a thing such as a table or a chair that occupies a limited position in space. Evolution is not like a tree, an animal or a star. Evolution in fact is not an object. It is just the way people describe the relationships that exist between things. Because evolution is not an independent “something” that is out there, but the way things relate to each other, it is in effect, “nothing”. Thus when some people argue that things happen through evolution, all that they are saying is that things behave in a certain way. To explain action, however, is not to explain energy, origins, time and space. So, at best, evolution is no more than the logic of the relationships between things that are already present in time and space. Evolution does not and cannot explain where these things come from in the first place. Because evolution is not something that exists independently of things and because it does not explain the origin of things, it would be a fallacy to conclude that when every change is traceable to evolution, that therefore, it must mean that God does not exist.

Even when we assume for the sake of argument, that evolution explains why things turn out the way they do, still, that would not prove one bit that evolution itself is everlasting or that God does not exist. In order for evolution to be everlasting, it must be independent of all the things that it affects and must have no beginning. The problem, however, is that as I said earlier, there is no animal called evolution. If you are not out there someplace, somewhere as something, you are nothing at all, let alone be everlasting. What about the possibility that things have always been evolving and that there is no need for an independent ‘something’ called evolution? The answer is that to evolve is to change. Where there is no beginning to that change there cannot be a post beginning. Where there is no “1”, there cannot be a “2”. Since we have subsequence, it must follow that the changes must have had beginnings. The result is that there can be no such thing as a “change forever” or “always evolving”. These are oxymorons. Any which way you look at it, the result is that neither evolution nor the subjects of evolution can be everlasting. Both evolution and the subjects of evolution must have had beginnings somewhere. You would agree of course, that anything that has a beginning must have come from something other than itself. You cannot give birth to yourself. As a consequence, even if evolution explains the origin of everything in space, it cannot explain the origin of reality, or of the origin of evolution itself. Translation? Even with the best arguments and facts in support of evolution, it would be a fallacy to rule out God.

So far, we have seen that evolution has not eliminated and cannot rule out God as the possible originator of things. But does that necessarily mean that there must be a God or that God must be the creator of all things? No! In order for God to be the originator of things, we must be able to prove first that He exists and second that He is the creator of things. This, we must be able to do independently of the weaknesses of the theory of evolution. It is possible that God does not exist or that He is not the creator of all things. Never assume that just because one option is false that therefore, its opposite must be true. God too may fail as an answer. Just because the first alternative might not work does not mean that the second must necessarily be correct. Just because evolution is not proved as the originator of things does not mean that we can take it for granted that God is the originator. The *Sesamatic* or *Relatiological Proof* discussed above, provides us with a solid answer.