

Essay

How to Prove that There Is a God, God Is Real & the Universe Needs a God

Himangsu S. Pal *

ABSTRACT

Previously, I have not examined as to whether there can be any alternative explanation for the properties of light other than God. In this essay, I will do that by showing that the only explanation that can be there for the properties of light is that there is a God. I will also show that God is real, the Universe needs a God and why the Total Energy of the Universe Is Zero.

Key Words: GOD, real, something, nothing, light, spaceless, timeless, origin, Universe.

Some Physicists have suggested that the universe could have originated from nothing due to quantum fluctuation in a vacuum. So no God is required for its creation. We who believe that there is a God cannot buy that theory. Rather we will try to say that it has actually originated from something. But, how can we prove that in the beginning there was something rather than nothing?

Let us first assume that in the beginning there was something, and then let us try to find out what would be the properties of this hypothetical something. According to some physicists the initial condition of the universe was this: nothing, no space, no time and no matter. And according to some of us God believers it was this: something, no space, no time and no matter. In both cases there will be no space, no time and no matter in the beginning. Now if there was something rather than nothing in the beginning, then this initial something (IS) will be the only thing that will be there, and there will be nothing else other than this IS, no space, no time and no matter. As there will be no space and no time, therefore this IS will be in no space and in no time.

Also it will have no space and no time. So in every respect this IS will be spaceless and timeless, and it will be so simply by default. By default it will also be changeless, because not being in time this IS will have no 'before', no 'after'. So we can never say that it was 'this' earlier and that it has become 'that' later on. For the same reason this IS will be deathless also, because death is also some sort of change. And it will be immobile too, because no space will be there for it to make any movement. And it will have no mass, because not being in any space it will not occupy any space.

A thing that does not occupy any space cannot have mass, because science has shown that mass always occupies some space. Therefore we see that by default this IS will have the following six properties: spacelessness, timelessness, changelessness, deathlessness, immobility and masslessness. These six properties will be exclusively the properties of IS, and nothing else in this universe can have these properties by default or by any natural means, because nothing else can have the same status of IS. If this IS is not hypothetical but real, then it exists neither in space nor in time. Being neither in space nor in time is its unique

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

characteristic that nothing else in this universe can ever have. As everything else other than this IS will be either in space, or in time, or in both space and time, therefore not a single thing in this universe can naturally have any one property, or some of the properties, or all the six properties of IS.

If we find that even a single thing in this universe is having any one property of this IS, then from this we can straightforward come to the conclusion that the universe must have originated from something, and not from nothing, because this thing can in no way have this property naturally, and the only source from which it can get this property is IS. So IS must have to exist as the first thing in order that some other thing in this universe may also have any one property, or some of the properties, or all the six properties, of IS.

So far we have said that this IS is only hypothetical. Now time has come to find out whether it is real. But how will we do that? The answer is very simple indeed. We have seen that this IS will have six properties by default. If we now find that nothing in this universe is having any one property, or some of the properties, or all the six properties, of this IS, then we can conclude from this that the universe has originated from nothing, and not from something as claimed by some of us God believers. But if we find that at least one thing in this universe is having any one property, or some of the properties, or all the six properties, of this IS, then we will have to think otherwise.

Now we find in light all the properties of IS. I have already discussed about these properties of light in detail in an earlier essay (Paul, 2010a). I want to add only one point here. Like IS light is also having no mass. Therefore the properties of light compel us to conclude that the universe must have originated from something, and not from nothing, because in the latter case light could not have all those properties that it is actually having. But even if we say that the universe has originated from something, it will not solve all our problems. This problem has also been discussed in another earlier essay of mine (Paul, 2010b).

In case the universe has originated from something, then also light cannot automatically have all the properties of IS until and unless we assume that IS is having consciousness. This is only because IS will have these properties by virtue of its being neither in space nor in time. As we have stated earlier, nothing else in this universe can have the same status of this IS, because they will always be in space and in time, and therefore no created thing can naturally have these properties by any means. But if IS is having consciousness, then it can give all its properties to light for some purpose, and this purpose may be that it wants to make its presence known to us through light. This conscious IS is God.

As stated above, up to this it is merely an old story retold. Now I want to examine whether properties of light may have any natural explanation instead of the supernatural explanation that I have offered. The only theory that comes to our mind as a probable alternative explanation here is multiverse theory. Multiverse theory has successfully shown that no intelligent designer is needed for explaining the fine tuning of certain fundamental physical constants. If the value of these constants were not within certain stipulated range, then the universe we are in would have been a completely different place, barren, lifeless, dead. As per the British cosmologist Martin Rees the number of these physical constants are six. Values of these six constants must be finely tuned in a universe in order that life can emerge in that universe. If there is only one universe, then it is not conceivable how merely by chance, or by

sheer accident, all the six constants will be fine-tuned at the same time in that particular universe. So existence of an intelligent designer will have to be posited whose job will be to do this fine-tuning.

In multiverse theory this problem has been successfully overcome by positing an infinite number of universes in place of just only one. In each of these universes these constants will take different values after each big bang, and therefore there will be an infinite number of possible combinations of the values of these six constants, out of which there will be at least one right combination just suitable for producing life. The universe in which there will be this right combination will produce life, and we will also find ourselves in that particular universe only, and thus there will be nothing unnatural in it. So no supernatural agency will be required for explaining as to how these physical constants in our universe are having just those values that are needed for bringing us on earth, because in multiverse theory we find a natural explanation of this phenomenon.

Although I know very well that there is a God, because I have mystical experience several times in my life, still I am having this much open-mindedness to admit that multiverse theory can successfully rule out the necessity of positing any intelligent designer, or, a creator, for making our habitat life-supporting. Now the question is: can multiverse theory equally rule out the necessity of positing any supernatural agency for explaining properties of light? Can multiverse theory make what is inconceivable and unnatural in this case, appear quite conceivable and natural?

In our universe light has no mass and it has a speed of 300,000 km/sec. These two figures may vary from universe to universe. So there may be many universes in which light will have mass, and also there may be many universes in which light speed will be less than, or, greater than, 300,000 km/sec. So apparently there will be no problem with light speed and mass. But one may ask what about the other properties of light? Special theory of relativity has shown that for light even an infinite distance becomes zero. It has also shown that even time interval of an eternity becomes zero for light. If an event A occurs now and if another event B is going to occur after an eternity, light will perceive both the events occurring simultaneously. If these two events are to take place at two different locations separated by an infinite distance, in that case also light will perceive these two events occurring at the same location. So where have the infinite distance and eternity gone? Have they simply vanished? Is Mother Nature trying to express through these two properties of light that space and time (which are very much real to us) are nothing but illusions? But why should any universe try to expose to us the illusory nature of space and time at all? Can there be any universe without any space, without any time? Can there be any universe in which there will be no space and no time? If space and time are the two most essential parts of any universe without which no universe can form at all, then wherefrom arises the need in any universe to expose their illusory nature? If there cannot be any universe without space and time, then why will any universe try to show that the very base on which it stands is itself an illusion? Why will it destroy its own base by exposing its illusory nature?

But by destroying its own base it destroys itself, and it itself becomes illusory in nature. Why will it do so? If we now increase the total number of universes from one to infinity, then can the sheer increase in the number of universes add any plausibility to this most implausible fact? I do not think so. Even if there are an infinite number of universes, and so, even if there

were an infinite number of big bangs in the past, still then it will remain as enigmatic as before as to why any big bang out of these infinite number of big bangs will spontaneously generate such properties of light through which not only the illusory nature of space and time, but also the illusory nature of the universe itself, will be exposed. So we see that even multiverse theory fails to explain as to how there can naturally arise in any universe those properties of light that it is actually having, because this theory fails to add any plausibility to an incredibly implausible fact.

Actually what has multiverse theory done in the case of six fundamental physical constants? It has merely transformed an unnatural event into a natural event. What appeared as unnatural in the context of a single universe appeared as quite natural in the context of an infinite number of universes. So its task was to transform an apparently unnatural event into a natural event. That is all, and nothing more than that. But in the case of properties of light it has failed to do even that. What was unnatural in the context of a single universe has remained unnatural in the context of multiverse also. Even if we now imagine that there is a super-multiverse, i.e. an infinite number of multiverses, still then there will be no gain from that, because in that case what is unnatural will remain unnatural as before. So we will have to say that multiverse theory has failed to qualify as a natural explanation for the properties of light that it is actually having. As we find that there is no natural explanation for these properties, therefore the only conclusion that can be drawn from this is that the supernatural explanation that I have offered here is its only explanation, and that this supernatural explanation is none other than God.

Puff the Magic Dragon

In the above section, we have shown that the universe has originated from God, who is neither in space nor in time. Here non-believers will perhaps retort that one can as well say it has originated from an imaginary thing, because being imaginary it will also be neither in space nor in time. Here goes our reply.

Let us say that the universe has originated from Puff the magic dragon, and that this Puff the magic dragon is neither in space nor in time. So naturally it will have no space and no time, and therefore it will naturally have the properties of spacelessness and timelessness. It will be having these two properties not because it has received them from some other external source, but because it is neither in space nor in time, and thus in consequence it is having no space and no time. So in a sense we can say that it is having these two properties simply by default.

But in case of light the picture is entirely different. Light is placed in a universe where there are enough space and enough time. So we can in no way say that light is not having any space, any time. Neither has it been artificially deprived of space and time. So there is no apparent reason as to why light in our universe will have no space and no time, and therefore there is no further reason as to why it will have the properties of spacelessness and timelessness. But in spite of that we find that light is having these two properties. Yes, we can say this with some confidence if we have enough faith in science, and if we believe that the following two equations of special theory of relativity are not giving us bluff in any way:

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

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

I think it is now crystal clear that light cannot have these two properties by any natural means, and therefore the only conclusion that can be drawn from this is that it has received these properties from some other external source. But if it is the case that this external source also has received these properties from another external source, then there will be infinite regression. In order to stop this infinite regression let us suppose that the external source is Puff the magic dragon which will be having these two properties simply by default, and not due to the fact that it has received them from some other external source.

But even if we say that the universe has originated from Puff the magic dragon, then also our problem will not be solved. Here Puff the magic dragon will no doubt have the properties of spacelessness and timelessness, but that does in no way explain as to how anything in the universe originated from Puff will automatically have the properties of Puff, because Puff will be having these properties by virtue of its being neither in space nor in time, but nothing in the universe originated from Puff will have the same status of Puff (because all of them will be in space and in time). So although it is true that all of them have actually originated from Puff, it is also true that none of them can automatically have the properties of Puff. So where is the solution?

The only solution is that there must have to be some device that will facilitate the process of implanting the properties of the origin on those originated from it. The only device that we can think of here is some sort of consciousness. If Puff is having consciousness, and if Puff itself has for some reason or other decided to give its own properties to light, then only light can have the properties of Puff. In no other conceivable way can it have these properties. But if Puff the magic dragon is an imaginary being, then it cannot have consciousness. Therefore it must have to be real first, and then only it can have consciousness. Every imaginary being like Puff the magic dragon will be having the properties of spacelessness and timelessness, because being imaginary they will be neither in space nor in time. So even if we claim that the universe has actually originated from a purely imaginary being like Puff the magic dragon, it can still be concluded that this Puff the magic dragon must have to be real and that it must have to have some sort of consciousness in order that light can have those properties that it is actually having. Atheists claim that our God is purely imaginary. So if we now replace Puff the magic dragon by God, then we will have the following conclusion: God is real and have consciousness.

One may think that multiverse theory can help us here in seeking for a natural explanation, in place of a supernatural one, for the so-called properties of light. But it can be shown within a few seconds that it is nothing but a day-dreaming. This is due to the fact that no universe can form without space and without time. So in each and every member of this infinite number of universes light will always be placed in space and in time, and therefore in none of these universes there can naturally arise in light the above properties of spacelessness and timelessness. So even if we increase the total number of universes from one to infinity, the problem will remain the same as before.

Does the Universe Need a God?

Does the universe need God? Yes, the universe needs God if it can be shown that everything in the universe cannot be explained naturally. Some scientists claim that there is no fact, no event in the universe for which they cannot provide a natural scientific explanation. But this claim is untrue. We can show that there is at least one fact in the universe for which they will never be able to give any natural explanation. This fact is that light has got some very peculiar properties if we are to believe that the following two equations of special theory of relativity are not giving us bluff in any way:

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

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

The first equation shows that for light time totally stops, and the second equation shows that for light any distance it has to travel is reduced to zero. For light even infinite distance is also reduced to zero. These two equations together show that as if light has no space as well as no time to move. But light cannot have these two properties naturally. In other words, these two properties cannot arise in light naturally because like everything else light was also created after the Big Bang. Like everything else light was also placed in a universe full of space and time. And light has in no way been artificially deprived of space and time. A thing may naturally have the two properties of spacelessness and timelessness in following two cases only:

- 1) If it is placed in a world where there is no space, no time; or
- 2) If placed in a world full of space and time it is artificially deprived of space and time.

But light is neither placed in a world having no space, no time, nor is it artificially deprived of space and time. So there is no natural reason as to why light will have these two properties.

In spite of these facts we find that light is having these properties. So if it is having these properties, then it is having them not naturally, but by some unnatural means. And here I am challenging the materialistic scientists all over the world: let them bring any scientific theory here – relativity theory, quantum theory, string theory, M-theory, multiverse theory, parallel universe theory, or any other theory that they can think of – and let them show with their theory how there can naturally arise in light those two properties of spacelessness and timelessness.

And I am saying with full confidence here that they will never be able to do that. This is only because there will always be two constraints due to which the properties of light can never have any natural explanation, and these two constraints can never be overcome by any materialistic scientific theory. I have already mentioned what are those two constraints: a) light is placed in a universe full of space and time, and b) light is not artificially deprived of space and time. This is the only gap that can never be bridged by any materialistic scientific explanation. This is the only gap that will require a supernatural explanation.

Why the Total Energy of the Universe Is Zero

Can anything, that does not occupy any space at all, have any energy? If the answer to this question is “no”, then I can say that I have found reason as to why total energy of the universe is zero.

This is all from our concept of the whole thing. I have already shown that the whole thing cannot be in any space. This is because at the beginning this whole thing will be the only thing that will be there, and nothing else will be there; no space, no time, no matter, nothing. But if the whole thing was in no space, then we cannot say that it was occupying any space at all, because there was no space at all for it to occupy. So we see that the whole thing does not occupy any space. Now this whole thing may be infinite in extension. But even if it is infinite, we cannot say that this infinite whole thing will occupy any space, because no such space will be there for it to occupy. But can anything that does not occupy any space have any energy? Here scientists will say that anything having some energy, however little it may be, will always occupy some space. It can never be of zero size. So the infinite whole thing occupying no space at all cannot have any energy.

The fact that from the mere concept of the whole thing, and by applying some simple logic, it has been possible for us to correctly estimate the total energy of the entire universe gives us a very strong reason to believe that our concept of the whole thing is logically sound and flawless. It also gives us a good reason to believe that not only this whole thing is an idea being born and residing in our mind, but also it has got an existence independent of our mind. That only means that this whole thing is real. This further means that there is a God.

References

Pal, H. S. (2010a), God, scientists and the void. *Scientific GOD Journal*, V1(6): pp. 428-432.

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