

Why a Supreme Being has to exist.

Problem:

I note that in our worldview we make a radical distinction between science, the Laws of our consciousness and a possible existence of God. It would be more logical if we were to discover a connection. Let us see what a number of leading thinkers say about this.

Substantiation:

On the one hand there is the finding that the Laws of Physics do not lead to the Laws of consciousness¹. That is what David Chalmers notes in his book "The Conscious Mind". During his search for artificial intelligence he discovered that the Laws of Consciousness cannot be deduced from the Laws of Physics. Only if one supplements the Laws of Physics with a completely independent set of Laws of Consciousness one can arrive at a Theory that explains Everything. This means that the Laws of Consciousness cannot come from an evolved form of natural Law. A clear link lacks between the two sets of Laws (the first missing link).

On the other hand there are sources who say that science does not allow God to the Laws of Nature². If Nature was created by a God then it is not logical that in Nature's Laws we find no traces of that God (second missing link). When the lack of any trace of a God makes us conclude that he does not exist, we create a new question: where does Everything come from?

Physics itself is in the dark about any Origin: Matter, Consciousness and let's certainly not forget that of coherence that led to the emergence of Organisms and Life. This observation we find among others in the work of Nobel laureate Martin Veltman³ 1999. He writes it in the following quotes:

- *"To us space-time and the laws of quantum mechanics are like the decor, the setting of a play. The elementary particles are the actors, and physics is what they do. A door that we see on the stage is not a door until we see an actor going through it. Else it might be fake, just painted on."*
- *"You cannot explain the existence of certain particles much as you cannot explain the existence of the Universe."*

Also in Chemistry had a well-known representative, Ylia Prigogine, who in his last interview in June 2003 in Metro produced the following quote: "I do not think there are limitations to science. I'm more inclined to think that science is in its prehistory. Our researchers are still working on the analysis of the simplest phenomena. On the origin of gravity and light, we have no clue. "

¹ David Chalmers, 'The Conscious Mind' 1996, <http://consc.net/book/tcm.html>

² Herman De Dijn, 'The Way to Wisdom' 1996 and <http://www.hermandedijn.be/viewpic.php?LAN=N&TABLE=PUB&ID=1452>

³ Martin Veltman, 'Facts and Mysteries in Elementary Particle Physics', 2004.

We base our worldview on the insights of science. We don't always realize that this knowledge is incomplete. This may signify that the conclusions we draw are completely wrong.

Let's see what ones happened to Jan van Helmont⁴. This renowned Flemish physician, chemist and esotericus lived about 400 years ago. He wrote an essay that dealt with the Generatio Spontanae. Herein he described how life could arise spontaneously from disordered Matter and he illustrated this with an example. He described that a nest of young mice could emerge from a lot of dirty linen that was thrown into a corner after just a few weeks could. And this without any outside influence. Van Helmont clearly believed in what is called "creationism". According to this view, it is possible that some higher ranked animals may arise from lifeless Matter in a relatively short time and under ordinary circumstances. Only 150 years ago Charles Darwin discovered the Theory of Evolution. Apparently now certain prejudices about a possible creation no longer exist. One prejudice gone, how many more to go? It may indeed be that we still have prejudices concerning the creation or existence. We don't know or realize that. The ambition of this essay can not be that we are going to make a representation of what is there. The ambition is to question blind atheism.

Some examples that illustrate what could be wrong:

Physics doesn't understand the Origin of Matter. It can only describe the behavior of Matter. Because we can convert the behavior of Matter into formulas and thereby predict the behavior, we pretend that we fully understand Matter in its entirety and. When Physics has to serve as a basis for the building of a worldview it must also succeed in discovering the Origin of Matter. Some practitioners of Quantum Theory, including R. Feynman, claim that it is impossible for the Physics to understand⁵ the real Nature of Matter.

Cosmology assumes an Origin at the hands of a Big Bang. We nearly don't realize that the accuracy of such an event is so unlikely that it is conceivable that it never occurred. To build a Universe like ours, the constants⁶ of Nature have to match perfectly. When this alignment would be the result of chance than the odds that we will win the Euro Millions every week for fifty years is 14,000 times higher. The probability that the Universe is created is $1/10^{50}$ and the chance of once winning the Euro Millions is $1/76.000.000$.

Also, the theoretical support for the Big Bang leans on quicksand support, ie it contains a lot of unproven hypotheses. The theory talks about other kinds of Matter that we do not know. Our Matter, which emits light, is called Radiant Matter. It represents only 4% of the Matter content of the Universe. In addition, 23% Dark Matter should exist. That kind of Matter controls the rotation speed of Galaxies. The main problem with this type of Matter is that we cannot perceive it. The light passes through it without reacting with it. That makes it difficult for us to understand its existence. Even more difficult is it to understand Dark Energy. That

⁴ Jan van Helmont, http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jan_Baptista_van_Helmont

⁵ Richard Feynman, QED (quantum-electro-dynamics), 1988

⁶ Interaction constant, speed of light, Planck's constant, etc.

would represent 73% of the Matter content of the Universe and it ensures the accelerated expansion⁷ of the Universe.

Please note: these assumptions are necessary to explain the movements within and from the Universe. Understand who can understand but it does provide the necessary questions. Is our vision on the Origin correct?

Biology does not explain the Origin of DNA, let alone life. The Theory of Evolution is based on coincidence and selection. When we look closer at a number of phenomena, we see that not only coincidence can be responsible for diverting development. An example: in the US there exist a kind of frogs that freeze completely during severe and prolonged winters. In its cells glycol is formed which protects its cells from crystallization during freezing. At the same time they are equipped with a fully automatic reanimation system. It is a neural network around the heart that produces electric shocks due to the rising temperature in spring. Thereby the heart of the frog start beating again and life goes on. It is impossible to explain the co-occurrence of these two qualities by evolution. How was Evolution aware of a potential such as the possible resurrection from the dead? The mutations necessary for this should show a relationship with a transcendental genetic engineering capacity. It must indeed feel the Future. This consideration leads us to the essence of this paper: Is God dispensable?

Conclusion:

Maybe we need to omit the religious aspects of the concept of God and talk about a Supreme Being. Maybe we should go further and not speak of a Being but of a superior Quality that is called Being. Being has always been and always will be⁸. If we see it as the acausal Origin of our existence we need only to know how our Universe and ourselves became. In other words, how did the Becoming arise from the Being? We don't know because so far through Science we find no answers. Perhaps the quote of Prigogine is very true: "Science has not progressed far enough to give reliable answers". In any case, it is quite justified to say that our Consciousness contains a remnant of the original Being. Because Being gave rise to Everything our Consciousness, in time, will find out how that happened.

⁷ Alan Guth, The expanding Universe, 1998.

⁸ Mark Eyskens, 'De oude prof en de zee', 2005