

Mystical Experience

My Encounter with God Continued: God Needs No Creation & Is Light

Himangsu S. Pal *

ABSTRACT

I was successful in showing that, from the point of view of existence as well as from the point of view of essence, God could be said to be zero. Therefore, God needs no creation. Further, if the total mass and energy of the universe are zero, the total mass and energy of God are also zero. If the total mass of God is zero, God would also be light. So ultimately it was established that God was light.

Key Words: mystical experience, God, light, existence, timeless, spaceless, mass, energy, zero.

As I got the first proof/evidence for the existence of God, so I thought that time had come to publish my book in Bengali. But then an incident happened on which I had no control whatsoever. I was suddenly transferred to a remote part of India. Of course, it was a routine transfer, because the job I was doing was under the Government of India, and therefore there was every possibility to be transferred to any part of India during my service life. The place where I was transferred was in the north-eastern part of India. It was called Nagaland. I knew that I would not get many books to read there, and so I decided to carry with me some books. But the books that I was ultimately able to carry with me were only four in number, and one of them was Stephen Hawking's *A Brief History of Time*. I read and reread that book many times, maybe forty to fifty times.

I fully realized why Hawking wanted to develop a model that he named no boundary model. This was because he totally wanted to eliminate God from the creation event, and so he developed a theory in which there would be no creation event at all, and thus there would be no need for a creator. But the main defect of that theory was that the success of that theory fully depended on the assumption that time would have to be imaginary throughout. In this way only any singularity could be avoided. But Hawking himself admitted that we lived in real time, and he also admitted that if in its past history the universe had at any time entered from imaginary time to real time, there would be singularity. So, according to Hawking, no boundary model was a flop show.

However, reading and rereading that book sitting in some remote part of India proved extremely beneficial to me, as because this book helped me solve the riddle 'Who created God?' Yes, it was really a riddle for me, and once I used to think that this riddle could never be solved. How could someone find himself inside a room which has neither any entrance nor any exit? But God thought it otherwise, and so the things were moved in such a way that I was detached from my family for at least one and a half year during which period I could fully devote my leisure hours

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

to studying books, without having any obligation to do anything for my family. One day while I was reading that part of Hawking's book where he was describing how particles could arise from out of pure energy, suddenly there was an illumination. Here Hawking was also describing where the energy came from out of which particles had actually originated, the answer being that it all came from zero, because the total energy of the universe is exactly zero. Here suddenly a thought came to my mind that when we said something about God, we also said that thing mostly in terms of zeroes. We said God was spaceless, timeless, changeless etc. So if we could somehow show that God was also a bunch of several zeroes, then perhaps the above riddle regarding the origin of God could be solved once for all. And in this way only this riddle was ultimately solved. I was successful in showing that from the point of view of existence as well as from the point of view of essence God could be said to be zero. Therefore God needs no creation.

However, there is a big controversy here. Some people are very much opposed to the idea that the total energy of the universe is zero. According to them, it is simply silly and nonsensical to treat the gravitational energy as negative energy. But most of the scientists are of the opinion that this gravitational energy is indeed negative energy, and that as a result the total energy of the universe is zero, and based on this fact they usually say that as its total energy is zero, so the universe can, and will, originate from nothing. So, if the estimate of the scientists about the total energy of the universe is correct, then my thesis about the origin of God is also correct.

After I came back to Kolkata, my first job was to publish my first book in Bengali, showing that there was indeed a God. It was published in January, 2003. I gave the book for reviewing purpose to one Bengali daily newspaper and another to one Bengali literary magazine of very high repute. Review done in the newspaper was very brief, but it was not unfavorable to the book. But the review done in the literary magazine was very harsh and cruel. But the reviewer was dishonest, because he very scrupulously remained totally silent in his review about that particular portion of the book where I had given my reason as to why the mystical experience could not be discarded as a mere hallucination. Whereas in case of an ordinary hallucination no conclusion can be drawn about the external world that can be tested and verified as true, it is quite otherwise in case of a mystical experience.

In a genuine mystical experience mystic reports that he has met a being who is spaceless and timeless. In brief, a mystic has a sense of spacelessness and timelessness during such an experience. I showed in my book that if there was really such a being that was spaceless and timeless, his presence would make space and time in our universe relative. Science has also shown that space and time are indeed relative. So on the basis of this we can say that mystical experience is not a hallucination, and that therefore we can further conclude that God is also real.

But atheists are perhaps everywhere of the same character. Once they are convinced that there is no God, you will never be able to change their conviction. Even if you have got genuine reason on your side, they will simply ignore it. Actually, after dealing for so many years with the atheists through the internet, I have come to the conclusion that atheists are mostly dogmatic. Their non-belief is dogmatically held, as some of the beliefs of some theists are also held dogmatically. However, we will do them a great injustice if we say that all the atheists are dogmatic, because

there are some open-minded atheists also. They are ready to change their conviction, if they are offered genuine proof/evidence for the existence of God.

Now let me return to the main theme. Although the reviewer dishonestly ignored the proof/evidence offered by me for the existence of God, he raised a very important question in his review for which I had no answer at that time. God is said to be spaceless and timeless, and science has shown that light has some very peculiar properties. In my book I have shown that with the help of these properties of light the attributes of God can be easily explained. His question was: After knowing about the properties of light from science, how can I jump to the conclusion that God has also got exactly the same properties as those of light? How do I come to know that God and light are the same? What is the relation between God and light? This was in the year 2003, and it took almost five years before I was successful in showing the actual relation between God and light. During the period in between I argued like this: I do not know anything about the relation between God and light. However I do know one thing. I find that with the properties of light the attributes of God can be explained. That is all.

Now let me describe how I was ultimately successful in showing that God was light. First of all, I came to know that anything having zero rest-mass would have the speed of light. In other words, it would be some sort of light. This was according to the special theory of relativity of Einstein. After knowing this, I would argue that perhaps God was also having zero rest-mass, and that perhaps that was the reason as to why God would have all the properties of light. But this was only an argument and at that time I had no evidence with which to substantiate my argument.

Subsequently, I came to know that the total energy of the universe was zero. If the total energy is zero, then the total mass will also have to be zero, because we now know that mass and energy are equivalent. So, if the total mass of the universe is zero, then the total mass of God will also be zero. This is because if there is a God, then it was in no way possible for the scientists to keep that God aside and then calculate the total energy and mass of the universe. So, if the total mass and energy of the universe are zero, the total mass and energy of God are also zero. If the total mass of God is zero, God would also be light. So ultimately it was established that God was light.

However, there is a scope for misconception here. Here one may think that I meant to say that God was some sort of electromagnetic radiation. But it is not actually the case. We find that light has got some properties that are just the same as those of the attributes of God, and that is the reason as to why we say that God is light. If instead of light these attributes were found in sound, then we would have said: God is sound. But God has chosen light, and not sound, as a medium through which to display his attributes to mankind, and thus the things so stand that God is called light.