

Essay

On Atheists' Complaint of No Evidence for God

Himangsu S. Pal *

ABSTRACT

Why atheists do think that there is no evidence for God. It may be the case that there is really no evidence. Or, it may be that there is, but atheists do not pay any heed to them. I will show here that the second statement is true, not the first one. For doing this I will follow the same path that atheists have followed. From a simple statement of theists that God is good they have concluded that God does not exist. Now we will find out what other statements have been made about this God, and we will also see what conclusions can be drawn about the universe from those statements about God. Further, it is pointed that that Buddhism is not an atheistic religion.

Key Words: atheist, complaint, no evidence, God, theist, mystic, Richard M Gale.

Why do atheists complain that there is no evidence for God?

The statements that we will choose here are those that are made by mystics, and not by theists. For this we will give two reasons. First of all, mystics claim that they have direct encounter with God, whereas theists cannot make any such claim. Secondly, there is unanimity among mystics, and this is even recognized by atheists also. As a proof of this unanimity among mystics I will quote here only one line from philosopher Richard M Gale: "Mystical propositions claim that space, time and multiplicity are unreal; whereas propositions describing non-mystical experiences deny this." [1]. So from this it appears that there is unanimity among mystics, because we see that it is a general characteristic of all mystical propositions that they claim the same thing about space, time and multiplicity, the claim being that they are not real.

Another reason for not taking into consideration theistic statements about God is that in most of the cases they are not true. I have already shown that God's goodness conflicts with His freedom. If God is good, then He is not fully free. Again, if God is fully free, then He cannot be good. Similarly it can be shown that various attributes assigned to Him by theists do not go well with His oneness. One example may be cited here. Let us say that God is love. But if He is one, then before creation whom did He love? So if God is love, then that will imply that there is at least one being co-eternal with God, and in that case God's oneness will be gone for ever. God is one means there was no one else other than God at the beginning.

Some Christian theists claim that there will be no such problem in their case, because their God is Trinitarian. So before creation there will be the reciprocal love of the Persons of the Trinity. So Father loved Son, Son in turn loved Holy Ghost and Holy Ghost in turn loved Father. But this does not solve all the problems, because God is not only love, He is merciful, just etc. If God is

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

merciful, then before creation to whom was He merciful? Perhaps the reply will be that Father was merciful to Son, Son in turn was merciful to Holy Ghost and Holy Ghost was in turn merciful to Father. But the question is: why will Father have to be merciful to Son? Was there any possibility for Son to commit any sin, and so, Father would have a provision for mercy also for his only begotten Son? Similarly it can be asked: why will Holy Ghost have to be merciful to Father? In this case, was there any possibility for Father to commit any sin? Thus we see that even the idea of a Trinitarian God cannot solve all the problems.

So far we have come to know that mystics' God is spaceless, timeless and one. It has also been said about this God that He is changeless, immortal, all-pervading, eternal, unborn, uncreated, etc. Now there are some attributes of God from which nothing can be predicted about the universe, whereas there are some other attributes from which some significant predictions can be made. If we say that God is unborn and uncreated, then from these no prediction can be made, but if we say that God is one, then at least one prediction can be made, and it is this: everything in this universe will be ultimately reducible to one thing. This is because we say that God is the source from which everything has originated, and therefore whatever fundamental forces and particles are there in the universe will be ultimately found to have originated from one substance only, whatever that substance may be. There are at least four more attributes of God from which such predictions can be made, and they are the following: His spacelessness, timelessness, immortality and omnipresence. From these four attributes at least five more predictions can be made. These are listed below [I have given the reason in bracket]:

- 1) Space and time will be found to be relative [this is because God is spaceless and timeless, and because space and time are very much real for us];
- 2) Time will be found to be unreal by some means or other [this is because God is timeless];
- 3) Immortality will be found to be written somewhere, in some scientific theory or law or equation [this is because God is immortal];
- 4) Volume of the entire universe will be found to be zero [this is because God is spaceless and all-pervading at the same time];
- 5) Distance from any point of space to each and every other point of space will be found to be zero [this is because God is all-pervading, His presence is everywhere].

These points have already been discussed in my article "Some Reflections on God and Modern Science". It is only a repetition here. The only difference is that in the earlier article the last prediction was not mentioned. But recently I have found that God being present everywhere this prediction can also be made.

So, in total six predictions can be made from God-hypothesis, out of which four are already found to be correct. Science has shown that space and time are indeed relative; it has shown that at light speed time becomes unreal; it has shown that it is possible for a being having zero rest-

mass to be immortal; phenomenon of quantum entanglement has shown that distance from any point of space to each and every other point of space is indeed zero. I will now show that one more prediction has also been found to be correct. It is that volume of the entire universe is indeed zero.

In their book “The Grand Design” Hawking and Mlodinow have written at one place (page 116) that as per quantum physics nothing is ever located at a definite point because if it were, the uncertainty in momentum would have to be infinite. They have also written that as per quantum physics, each particle has some probability of being found anywhere in the universe. If each particle has some probability of being found anywhere in the universe, then we will say that this is possible if, and only if, each particle is everywhere in the universe. This condition is binding, and it cannot be changed by any means. If God is everywhere in the universe, then we can expect to find Him anywhere in the universe. But if He is nowhere, then we cannot have any such expectation. By applying the same logic to a particle we can say that if the particle is everywhere in the universe, then we can expect to find it anywhere in the universe. But if it is confined to a particular region of the universe, then we can expect to find it in that particular region only and not in any place outside that region. But as quantum physics says that each particle has some probability of being found anywhere in the universe, so the natural conclusion of it is that each particle is simultaneously present everywhere in the universe.

It may be asked that how it is possible for a single particle to be present everywhere in the universe. Yes, it is possible if universe is spaceless at its bottommost layer. In a spaceless universe there will be no space at all between any two points of space arbitrarily chosen, and thus in such a universe being present at any point of space will be equivalent to being present at each and every point of space, that is, being present everywhere. So if what Stephen Hawking and Mlodinow have written in their book is scientifically correct, then from this we can conclude that at its deepest layer universe is spaceless. But a spaceless universe is a zero-volume universe. Thus quantum physics shows that total volume of the universe is zero.

One point should be made very clear here. As they have used the language “anywhere in the universe”, so we have also used the language “everywhere in the universe”. But if they think that the language used by them is inappropriate here, and that some other appropriate language will have to be used in its place, then we will also have to change our language accordingly. In such a case that the volume of the entire universe is indeed zero cannot be shown in this way. That is all.

Now only one prediction still remains to be validated: everything in this universe will be found to be ultimately reducible to one thing. That is, everything in this universe has originated from one substance only, and not from two or more substances. Although string theory is not a scientific theory because it cannot make any prediction that is testable, and thus there is no way to know whether as a theory it is true or false, still it has shown that all the fundamental forces and particles of nature can be seen as different vibrations of the same string. Thus we can say that it has united all the fundamental forces and particles of nature. On the basis of this we can hope that in future scientists will be able to develop a new theory that will show the same thing, and that

will also be testable. When that day will come, all the predictions of God-hypothesis will come true.

Now let us admit that as a hypothesis God-hypothesis is a bogus one. Then the question that will definitely arise is this: how can a bogus hypothesis make so many accurate predictions about the universe? What answer will the atheists and the atheistic scientists give to this question? According to them, what is the definition of a good hypothesis - its correct predictive power or, something else?

Buddhism Is Not an Atheistic Religion

Here are two sayings of the Buddha:

“There is that dimension where there is neither earth, nor water, nor fire, nor wind; neither dimension of the infinitude of space, nor dimension of the infinitude of consciousness, nor dimension of nothingness, nor dimension of neither perception nor non-perception; neither this world, nor the next world, nor sun, nor moon. And there, I say, there is neither coming, nor going, nor staying; neither passing away nor arising: unestablished, unevolving, without support. This, just this, is the end of stress.”

“There is, monks, an unborn, an unbecome, an unmade, unfabricated. If there were not that unborn, unbecome, unmade, unfabricated, there would not be the case that emancipation from the born, be-come, made, fabricated would be discerned. But precisely because there is an unborn, unbecome, unmade, unfabricated, emancipation from the born, become, made, fabricated is discerned.”

On the basis of these two sayings it can be said that it is a big lie that Buddhism is an atheistic religion. When Buddha said that there is an unborn, unbecome, unmade, unfabricated, he betrayed himself. Atheists will even deny the existence of this unborn, unbecome, unmade, unfabricated. The only difference between Buddhism and other religions is that Buddha refused to give this unborn, unbecome, unmade, unfabricated any name. But it is the same Brahman of the Hindu religion that has no qualifier, and it is the same God of the mystics who is a no-thing. The first quote above is nothing but the description of a no-thing. Even an echo of some of the terms here, e.g., unborn, unmade (uncreated), can be heard in other religions also like Christianity. Another difference of Buddhism from other religions is that instead of praying to it for our deliverance from sorrows and sufferings, Buddha insisted on our striving to be it.

Unborn cannot reside in man who is born. Unbecome cannot reside in man who has become. Unmade cannot reside in man who is made. Unfabricated cannot reside in man who is fabricated. So it will be another big lie if we are told that this unborn, unbecome, unmade, unfabricated is not in the outside world, and that it resides in every human being, dormant. If unborn resides in man only, then where was this unborn when man was not born?

Note 1: Many theists believe that God is good. If there is any evil on earth, then that is solely due to man's disobedience of God, and not due to any shortcomings of Him. He is perfectly good. In the statement "God is good" atheists have found a ready weapon with which they can easily defeat their opponents. Actually what procedure have they followed here? It is this: first they have found out what predictions can be made about the universe from the above statement without violating any rule of logic. Then they have checked whether these predictions are supported by evidence or not. As they have found that these are not supported by evidence, so they have concluded that there is no God. In a universe created by a perfectly good God there cannot be so much evil and suffering that we find on earth. So they cannot be fully blamed if they come to such a conclusion that God does not exist.

Note 2: Although the following discussion is not relevant to the main theme of this article, still I will have to say something about this problem of evil. In an earlier article of mine I have shown that a good God is not fully free, because He is always bound to create others in order to doing good to them. A God who cannot do any good to others cannot be called really good. Similarly it has been shown that neither an evil God is fully free. A God who is fully free is neither good nor evil; He is beyond good and evil. I think there will be found not a single theist on earth who will dare to say that his God is not fully free. Therefore one day he will also have to admit that a fully free God is neither good nor evil. A universe created by a God who is neither good nor evil will also bear the traits of its creator; it will also be neither good nor evil. I think this will solve the problem of evil on earth once for all. From this we can make one more point: by simply showing that there is so much evil on earth, non-existence of God cannot be so easily established.

References

1. Gale, R.M. (1970), *Mysticism and philosophy in The Religious Significance of Atheism* edited by Alasdair Macintyre and Paul Ricoeur, p307 (Columbia, New York).
2. Pal, H. S. (2010), God, scientists and the void. *Scientific GOD Journal*, 1(6): pp. 428-432.
3. Pal, H. S. (2010), Timeless & climax. *Scientific GOD Journal*, 1(7): pp. 492-496.
4. Pal, H. S. (2010), Some reflections on God and Science. *Scientific GOD Journal*, 1(7): pp. 484-491.
5. Pal, H. S. (2010), If God created Universe, who created God? *Scientific GOD Journal*, 1(8): pp. 582-584.
6. Pal, H. S. (2011), Something versus nothing & some thoughts on proof of no God. *Scientific GOD Journal*, 2(2): pp. 188-193.
7. Pal, H. S. (2011), How to prove that there is a God, God is real & the Universe needs a God. *Scientific GOD Journal*, 2(4): pp. 327-333.
8. Pal, H. S. (2011), God of the gaps. *Scientific GOD Journal*, 2(6): pp. 635-637.
9. Pal, H. S. (2011), Stephen Hawking's hotchpotch. *Scientific GOD Journal*, 2(6): pp. 629-634.
10. Pal, H. S. (2012), Various thoughts on God & Science. *Scientific GOD Journal*, 3(1): pp. 132-137.
11. Pal, H. S. (2012), One more proof that there is a God. *Scientific GOD Journal*, 3(2): pp. 217-219.
12. Pal, H. S. (2012), Evidence of God in modern physics. *Scientific GOD Journal*, 3(4): pp. 415-422.