

An Amazing Proof For The Existence Of God

The Bridge

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

Introduction

It is fashionable these days for many intellectuals to say that there is no God or that the existence of God cannot be proved 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 paper, I will prove the existence of God in a way that cannot be disproved by any logician. This piece comes from two chapters in my books, “Unstupid” and “The Philosophers’ Prophet”. 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 book, 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 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. I shall however, proceed as I usually do, with a problem as stated below and then proceed to analysis. I have chosen to introduce the subject by way of the usual way in which the argument is presented, namely, by way of evolution.

“Evolution, explains the origin of everything in space. So, God does not exist. Discuss.”

Where do you begin with this one? Let's 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 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 it 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 every thing 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 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 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; 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's 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, that 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. However, 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.

The Necessity For 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. So, what is the answer?

Change As Temporariness

In this world, every thing changes. Whether we have evolved or not does not matter. What matters is that everything that changes, moves from one position to another. The only things that can move are things that are limited. Think about it. The limitless has no where to go. The fact that there are limited things in space, however, proves that there is no such thing as the limitless *in* space. For the very existence of more than one limited being makes the existence of one limitless being an impossibility. In any event, everything that moves or changes must have a moment or a place from where it first begun moving. Without a prior movement there cannot be a subsequent movement. If there were no beginning to change, there could not have been a subsequent or a continuing change. Now in order to have a beginning there must have been a pre-beginning or a non beginning position. Because we are talking about the beginning of all

things in space, we are also talking about the pre-beginning of all things. Since, of necessity, that which does not begin, namely, the pre-ginning, does not come from anywhere, it must follow that whatever it is that gave rise to human being and the like, must be everlasting. A temporary reality that springs out of nothing or out of itself is nonsense.

I have already mentioned that every thing in space is limited. Being limited, every thing must move or change. Given that every change must have a beginning, it follows that ultimately, every thing in space is coming from this everlasting reality. What this means is that even if evolution were a distinct and an independent ‘something’ which it is not, it too must, because it is a part of change, come from this everlasting source. That everlasting source is God or can be called God. But don’t just trust what I am saying. You may ask how come that I know that this everlasting source is God? First of all, the term is just a name that we have given to whatever it is that brought us here. Another name might do. But for now though the name is not critical to the argument. There are two questions on this. The first is where does God come from and the second is how does the eternal give rise to change?

The Stillness of Eternity

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. There is no such thing as a presence or a being unless it is “some” thing. So, when we say that there is such a thing as an everlasting reality, we are indeed referring to an everlasting “something”. This something must either be mindless or mindful. Let us assume for a moment that the everlasting reality (reality) is mindless. If reality were mindless, it could never account for the emergence of the temporary. There are two reasons for this. The first is that this reality must be the source of everything. What it does not already have before the beginning, it cannot get from anywhere else. But since the eternal is also the source of time, time cannot make a difference in terms of the potential or of the capacity of the eternal. Only those who are subject to time, get worse or better with time.

In any event, time can only affect or make a difference in things that are subject to change. It is only when you are changeable that time can change you. If you are not changeable to begin with, then it does not matter whether a trillion years or a minute passes, you would always be what you have always been. Time cannot add anything to what the eternal already is. Time cannot take away anything from what the eternal is. Thus, the passage of time cannot in of itself make any difference in the eternal state. So, whether time passes or not, the eternal continues to be unchanged and unmoved. But then if the eternal cannot change, where do all the changes in space come from? Or more appropriately, what is the nature of all the changes that we see?

As I mentioned earlier a temporary reality that springs out of nothing is nonsense. No object can arise from nothing. Every emergence requires a precedence. So, on the question of how changes arise in a mindless reality, there are two answers. The first is that the temporal is no more than the manifestation of the potential of the eternal. At this point we are assuming that reality is mindless. If this were so, then at some point, reality had no choice but to change. The problem is that change requires time. It is time that makes for change. But there can be no such thing as time unless you have events. However, time itself is no more than the passage of events. So where we are talking about pre-events or a moment before the first event, there can be no time. But then if there is no time, how do you explain how change, namely, the emergence of time, arises from the eternal where there is no time in the first place to allow for any change whatsoever?

You might reply that the first event was unique and that the first change occurred spontaneously. The problem is that 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 enabled the eternal to break away from its “resting” position at a given moment. The fact that time represents a break away from the eternal implies that at least in its manifest state as a number of events, time was not a part of the eternal. If time, namely, events, were not occurring eternally, then time itself must also be temporal. It had to be born or originated by the eternal. We have already

established that reality is not temporal. Therefore, since reality cannot subsequently get what it did not always have, time must have been a potential of reality forever.

So, how did time arise? The answer cannot obviously be that at some point the eternal became temporal. For to be eternal, is to be whatever you have been, forever. In order to change into something, you must give up what you are before the change. Where do you suppose that the unchangeable reality could go in order for the temporal to appear? Where would the temporary come from, if not from the eternal? And if the temporal comes from the eternal, how can it displace the eternal? On the other hand, it is nonsensical to say that perhaps time existed in eternity but that it was not moving. If it does not move, it is not time. Besides, if time was always a part of the eternal, how come that time did not emerge forever, but came into being at a particular moment? You can see how impossible it would be for a mindless reality to originate time.

The only way out of this impossibility is that time was always a potential of reality, but that reality had a *choice* as to the moment of the birth of time. Once you introduce choice, however, you imply will, desire, wish or voluntariness. This necessarily speaks to God. But of this, more later. Let us continue with the mindless reality argument. You may say that time is simply a manifestation of the potential of the eternal. What this means is that the eternal could always have manifested time, but it did not do so until later. That is one possible answer. But it is not a good answer. The problem is that there is no “later” until time is born. While we temporal beings need time in order to have changes, the eternal, being the thing that gives rise to time, cannot be said to need time in order to change. Or to put it another way, the eternal cannot be said to need change in order to cause the first change. Remember that the change that we are interested in is the moment that creates time. We are talking about the change that happens before time and that gives rise to time. But where the eternal is mindless and without access to any external or other power or event, there can be no reason, force or event other than itself, to cause it to change.

You may reply that there could have been something else besides the eternal that caused the eternal to change. But 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 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 to change. If one eternal cannot account for the birth of time, the trillion of them cannot.

It is the nature of the eternal that it is not missing any steps, processes, forces or events to make it what it is and that it has always been. Nevertheless, even if it were missing anything, the eternal could not get it from anywhere else. So, even if everything comes from the eternal, they must have always been a part of the eternal. However you look at it we are only left with two possibilities. Change must have occurred in the eternal as a necessity or it must have occurred voluntarily. When I talk about necessity what I mean is that the change was inevitable as a result of continuing processes or events in the eternal. In order for this to work however, we must think that before the first change occurred, one thing added up to another; this moved here and that moved there until when it was all ready, boom! time was born.

This situation is much like what happens when water keeping 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 keep on loading straws unto a camel until you break its back from overload. The problem with this explanation however, is that it too requires time. All processes require time. In fact, the processes themselves are time. Unless time is involved, no processes can begin and continue so as to result in change. So, given that we are talking about a situation before time, this argument of necessity cannot apply. There can be no processes before time. There can be no development or accumulation of any kind so as to give rise to a critical mass or a manifest boom.

Another problem is that there has been a delay in our births. We know that because the eternal has existed forever, whenever the first change occurred, it could have occurred much, much earlier than it did. 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? One reply is that we were not born earlier because it was not yet time. This argument would proceed that we couldn't have been born earlier, because the processes and ingredients that were needed to make us, were incomplete. Our births occurred then when all the pieces came together. This however, cannot be right because of the reasons mentioned earlier.

In any event, when we are talking about the eternal, all the pieces that were needed to make us must have been there forever. If something was missing before we were born, 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.

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 nor time can explain why changes occur in the eternal, it must follow that as long as the eternal is mindless it can never account for change and it can never account for the delays in our births.

The Will As The Unstillness

Earlier on I stated that we had only two options, necessity or voluntariness. Since the argument of necessity cannot; and does not apply, we are only left with voluntariness. The answer is that the temporal arise from the eternal in the same way that in the human realm new work arises from creativity. That is, through imagination. As I have explained elsewhere in “Unstupid”, through “lies, fiction and imagination” we can escape the clutches of nature somewhat and to that extent be said to be free. The reason we are able to do that is that we have minds that can willfully fabricate “unreality” and extend or change our real limits. The interesting thing is that although the imagined or the fictional may not be a part of reality to begin with, they can become temporarily real when we real beings pay *attention* to it. It is our willful construction of the forms and our attentiveness to the subject that takes something from potential to manifestation or from “non-existence” to reality.

Similarly, the temporary can arise from the eternal only when the eternal has the capacity to imagine something other than its eternal self. The break that we call change can only arise as a result of will in the eternal itself. Only this will can explain the break in the eternal. In order for this to happen, the will must be eternal. This way, the temporary can become “real” when from one state of willed stillness, the eternal wills to another state of unstillness. When you look at things this way, you can see that the timing of this or the delay in our births is no more than the prerogative of the eternal will. It wills what it wants when it wants. In this respect, even though the eternal, does not change before time, 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?

The Nature of The Eternal Will

The imagination of the eternal is the same as its will. The eternal will 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. With respect to the eternal, when the

will in 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, object or motions, 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. But of this, more below.

Whenever the will kicks in, there is “fullness”. Again this is a relative term to mean the presence of those things that were not eternal present in the emptiness. Because this emptiness is eternal, you should know that having creatures cannot add any lasting thing to the nature of the eternal. That which t changes when creatures are born is not so much the eternal itself as much as it its *attention*. The creatures are like guests. Before the creatures come, the attention of the eternal is of itself. When the creatures come, the attention shifts to the creatures, to the extent of their presence in the eternal presence.

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 its being 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 that 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. At the same time, the thoughts do not exist until they are “thought” of. When the thoughts cease or when the imagination stops, like characters in the eternal dream, we all disappear just as were before the imagination.

What The Eternal Does Before Time

What kind of existence is this, you ask, if it does not do anything before time? The short answer is that you and I cannot imagine how it must feel like. We can never be eternal. We can never be an emptiness. Nevertheless, “doing” something always involves a

change or the pursuit of a goal. If you can pursue a goal but choose not to, then not doing anything in itself becomes the “do”. For the maintenance of a fixed position out of many equally possible positions requires an effort or a will to do so. This is why when the eternal can act in a certain way but chooses not to do so, the “non action” is another form of doing. Be that as it may be, all rational actors do things in order to get this and that. When you do not want to get anything, it is perfectly alright to do “nothing”. Sometimes, it is enough to be where you are and not to change seats or move at all. There could be many reasons for this. But it is obvious that a rational and free person does not have to be doing different stuff all the time. A similar thing applies to the eternal. It does what it wills when it wills.

Clearly, that which is eternal does not need the temporary for its being. It is the other way around. It is the temporary that requires the eternal in order to become. The temporary can never add or take away anything from the eternal. If therefore, you think of the temporary as the creation, you can see how the eternal does not need to create. It can only want to create. When the eternal does not want to create, it does not. But even more so, when you have everything that you will ever have, you can afford to be “alone” sometimes without the noise and demands of others. This explains why you and I appeared “just like that.” We appear when the eternal deems it good to have others.

What is remarkable about the will is 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 differently, continuously or in a rigid way. This explains why there can be a moment where there are no objects, action or time at all. But given that the presence or absence of time is subject to the eternal will, phenomena are elastic so that we 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 God’s wishes. In effect then all creatures exist at the pleasure of God.

As we noted earlier, there are only two possibilities for the origin of things. One is a mindless everlasting reality and the second is a wishful everlasting reality. We have eliminated the mindless possibility. Many people may not like to know what I am saying. But it doesn't matter. The fact is that nothing can explain change in an eternal reality except a reality that has willful imagination. This eternal being that wishes things into being is what we refer to as our God. But since I asked the question of "where does the evolution come from", we may also ask the same question about God. It is only fair, isn't it? I am going to answer this in a moment. But note that I have not prevented you from asking any question about God. This is very important. If you cannot ask the question, you cannot know the answer. Only those who do not know the answer or those who do not want to give the answer, prevent people from asking questions. Back to the question. Where does God come from?

Where Does God Come From

Because God is the everlasting reality from which all things come, the question of where He comes from is of the same order as "where does everlasting reality come from? Do you see the unreasonableness of the question? Because God is everlasting, He cannot come from anywhere. Everlasting means forever. 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. We have already seen that God is everlasting. The consequence of this is that God need not come from anywhere. The only thing that needs to come and go is something that is not everlasting. But of course, you are amazed at a being that does not come from anywhere, right? Yes, we all are. If you think that this is amazing, what about us? Aren't you amazed that some time ago, you were not here and then one day, boom! here you are and tomorrow you may be gone like a dream? Just like that?

Of The Unity, Limitlessness and Uniqueness of God

As you probably know, many people quarrel and sometimes, wars have broken out over different descriptions of God. Some say He is like this and some say He is not like this. Anyway, I am going to show you where God is; where He is "from" and what He is.

Everything that begins in time must begin somewhere. This is because to be a “thing” is to be a certain quantity or quality in space. So, a thing cannot be said to begin if there is no point in space where it is at. Now, everything that begins somewhere, is by definition, limited. Beginning things are in the very least, limited by all the possible positions that they did not occupy before the beginning. Beginning things are also limited by all possible positions that can only be reached in time, that is, in the future.

When we say that something such as the eternal, did not begin at a given moment, we are also saying that it did not begin at a certain position. If you don’t begin at all in time, you cannot begin in space. This is because if a thing begins at a certain position, it must necessarily do so in a given moment. If the eternal has no moment of birth it can have no place of birth. And if it has no place or time where it begins, then by the same token the eternal can have no place where it ends. If you don’t begin, you cannot end. The thing is that that which neither begins nor ends in space cannot a part of space. For every thing in space has a beginning and an end. Now space is endless. You cannot imagine a limit to space. Whatever you posit as limiting space, would itself need some space to be in. This defeats the argument that space can be limited. Because space is limitless, there is no such thing as “outside” of space. Given that the eternal is not in space and cannot be outside of space, the only other option is that the eternal is? Try to answer this.

Here is another way of looking at the same thing. Space has a number of things in it. Because it has more than one thing in it, it is not possible for a thing to be in space and be limitless. Multiplicity is possible in space only because everything in it has a beginning and an end. Therefore, if the eternal has no end or beginning in time and has no end or beginning in space, then it is not in space. If not in, then out? No. Space is not an object or a quantity. Do not confuse space with positions in space or with the sky. Space simply refers to that possibility in which everything moves and is contained. It is that which you can never imagine as ever being absent but is everywhere. Because space is not an object, it does not have an edge or barrier so that you can have an “outside”. There is no such thing as beyond or outside space. You cannot logically or scientifically posit or even a spaceless place, point or position. Every place or position or even any number that you

can think of calculate or imagine, must be present in some space somewhere. No limited thing is present or possible without space. Therefore, if the eternal is real and can neither be inside nor outside of space; and cannot also be any one of the limited things in space, then the only other option is that the eternal is space itself.

This limitless space can only be one. Therefore, since the eternal is God and since this God is this limitless space, God must be one. Since everything is contained in this space but it is itself contained by none, this God is unique. This is also consistent with what I mentioned earlier about the eternal being “emptiness”. Since this space is everywhere, God is everywhere. There are many other conclusions that you can draw from this, but for these you may read your scriptures, read my other or similar books or just figure them out yourself.

Another way of looking at the issue is this. Before the very first move that created everything, the position of the eternal was one (of eternity). Multiplicities arise only when you have movements. This is true, whether these motions be of addition, multiplication, subtractions or of divisions. Where there is no movement, there cannot be more than a unity or oneness. This means that before the very first change, the eternal must have existed in absolute indivisibility, as singular presence or as a singular stillness. What is there that is (a) immovable, (b) one, (c) limitless and (d) which is absolutely necessary to all motions, all changes and to every existence? The only answer is space.

Or you can still look at the same argument is this. To begin is to move from one position to another. When therefore, we say that something does not begin or end, that is just another way of saying that it maintains the same position, nature or function forever. In space, however, because of the limits and the interconnectedness of things, nothing stays forever in the same in space. Everything changes willingly or unwillingly. The only thing that can maintain its position forever is something that is so different from everything else that it cannot be induced or forced by anything to leave its nature, position or function. You can think about this until the mountains begin to fly, but the only thing that is unique, absolutely necessary for every existence but which does not need anything in

order to be and that cannot be moved or dislodged at all, is space. We can summarize the foregoing this way:

no moment of birth,

no place of birth.

no beginning moment,

no beginning place.

no ending moment,

no ending place.

This space is the first and the last. If everything were destroyed, space would not be destroyed. Of course, if everything remains, space remains. Before everything came, space was and there and it will always be space. Keep in mind that it is not possible to be eternal one moment and temporary the next. The eternal is and must be forever. This space is that in which we move and have our being. It is our God. Unless you subscribe to the idea of a temporary reality arising out of another temporary reality which in turn is based upon endless temporary realities, you must accept the truth that only God could have made a world such as our own. This brings us to the end of one proof. Here is another one below.

THE STOP ARGUMENT

Argument by Design

If you ask most people why they believe that this world was made by God, they might reply that it is because they see order and complexity; and just as ordered and complex things in factories need designers, so too must this world come from a designer called God. This answer is intuitive. It takes a special kind of thinker to reject it. But the philosophers are right when they say that what may be true in our experiences in our factories may not hold true for the whole of reality. "Like" is not "is". We know that an airplane requires a manufacturer because all airplanes that we have seen are made by manufacturers. Because we haven't seen universes made before our eyes, it is a long stretch to use the analogy of our human made products as the rule. The problem however does not lie in the comparison itself

as much as the fact that the analogy is not conclusive. There is nothing inherently wrong with argument by analogy. The only problem is that it often leaves other doors open.

The universe may be like our factories but then it may not. It may be unique. It is only in this respect that we cannot logically state that the bird in the air must have been made like the airplane and must therefore have a manufacturer like the airplane's manufacturer. We can say, but it does not necessarily follow, that because there is order, the world must have been designed by God. Thus those who say that the world must have been made by God the Designer, may be right but those who say the opposite too may be right. The conclusion does not necessarily follow either way. "God" does not necessarily jump out when you put the equations together. All that this means however, is that when it comes to the issue of whether or not because of the complexity and orderliness of things this world was designed, logic does not necessarily say yes. But we will soon see below that the question of God cannot be limited to design, order and complexity. There are much more simpler questions that can lead us there. Please, follow me.

The Sesamatic¹ 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.

¹ "Sesa" is an Ashanti word for change.

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.

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 new comers 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 begun. 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, 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

every thing in space moves, proves that every thing 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 from a state of rest or a from 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 de-accelerate from that position. Acceleration, de-acceleration, 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”, “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 de-acceleration 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.

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.²

² 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 or 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 of matter had been forever, its “forever” state of 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

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.

The only relevant observation about this is that prior to the move, there was a gap between position “2” and M. As 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

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.

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 every thing 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?

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 every body'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 is not enough events to give as 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 don't 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.

Another Angle: If You Are Not Moving, You Don't 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 "from"s "to"s 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, every thing 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.

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, any time, is the creator, container, mover, organizer and planner behind everything. In one of my previous books³, I showed that Albert Einstein was wrong in talking about the "curvature" of space. Only a limited thing curves. This confusion has had the effect of giving people the idea that space is matter. Nor 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.

³ Muslim, M. and Haque, M., *From Microbits to Everything*, (2001), Optagon, Toronto, Canada

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 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. But of this, more at another place.

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.

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 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!

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.

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 willful 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 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. But 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 to change. If one eternal cannot account for the birth of time, the trillionth of them cannot.

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.

Voluntariness As The Only Correct Answer

Since we have eliminated the mindless as a possibility, the only answer is voluntariness. The temporal arise 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 temporary escape the clutches of nature without changing our nature. The reason we are able to do that is that we have minds that can willfully "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 willful 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, willfulness 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?

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.

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.

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? Yes, we all are. But if you think that this is amazing, what about us? Aren't you 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.

-

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. He is God. As for God, He is irrefutable as the everlasting source of all things that exist through His will and imagination. We have proved all this logically. Oh, Most Glorious God, Your servant! Thank You so much!

<http://www.biblequran.com/greatbooks.htm#b4>