

## WHY IS THERE SOMETHING RATHER THAN NOTHING ?

### Main Points:

Why is there something rather than nothing? This question is used by religion preachers to push you towards belief in God which they assume is the explanation, the answer.

Nothing by definition is the complete opposite of something. Nothing is by definition that which cannot become something by itself or if anything works on it.

Something cannot come from nothing for there is nothing there for it to come from. Thus nothing cannot become something by itself or if anything works on it.

If God exists, he cannot make something except from something.

If God exists, he had nothing to do with our existence! But then would God really be God for God is all-powerful? No.

To say God can make things out of nothing is to say that if something external to nothing works on it it can change into something. But nothing needs to have the power to become something. It needs to have the power to respond to God ordering it to become something. It cannot have for then it wouldn't be nothing.

To say nothing has the power to respond to God's power to change it into something is to deny that God created all things. He did not and could not create the power to respond.

Why is there something rather than nothing seeks the answer: "its created - made but not out of anything." But that tells us nothing about whether the cause of this knew what it was doing. So we have a spectrum between something of infinite intelligence to something that acts blindly. The question pushes you to accept a blind cause for that is all you need. It could be more akin to computer software than a person.

How comes first. If there is no how then why ask why? So change the question to the more important: How is there something rather than nothing? The Church admits that this cannot be understood. It says you cannot understand God. If we don't understand the how then we there is no point in asking the why.

God has no relevance to the existence of the universe.

Another reason he has no relevance to answering why there is something rather than nothing is that there is no evidence that a mind without a body can exist. That is why you cannot say that God is the answer to why something and not nothing for he is claimed to be that sort of mind.

A person is supposedly more important than the whole universe. So why not ask then, "Why does this person exist and not nothing? Why this person and not another?" There is something dehumanising in asking the question of why anything exists. Trying to say that God solves the puzzle of why there is anything is basically not about ethics or morals. If God is morality as religion says then what is going on? Religion is giving a scientific theory: "God made it all". While there is controversy about the difference between religion and science, anything that leaves out the morality is incontestably about science.

Religion is more interested in why the universe exists for it wants to undercut science.

What if he made a universe that will never hold life? Would the question of why something instead of nothing be a sane question then? It is not intrinsically a question that makes sense.

Whatever the reason or reasons for why there is something rather than nothing, God is not the answer. We don't need to be specific. We have no duty to be.

Why is There Something Rather than Nothing?

We know that God believers argue that God is the reason all things exist, he is the reason movement exists, he is the first cause and he is the reason we see design. All these arguments can be summarised like this, "Why is there something rather

than nothing? The answer is God."

The question fails in the search for a proof for God. Here are some proofs for God. Nothing causes itself. There must be a cause of all things that has no cause itself and that can only be God. Nothing moves itself. There must be a mover of all things that never moves.

You can reformulate the question as, "Why is there movement when there might have been no movement?" "Why is there cause when there might have been no cause?" These questions are still asking the same thing, "Why is there this instead of nothing?" Therefore every single proof for God is a failure.

Each individual argument for God is useless. They are based on the absurdity of creation out of nothing. So the question cannot really lead you to God. It is a trick to mask the stupidity of the case for God as a major and clever question.

### A Quick Refutation of God as the Answer

If nothing causes something that is unintelligible. It does not make sense. There is nothing there. There is no cause there. God did not make anything from himself. That would be transformation not creation. So the Church says God created all things from nothing. Creation by God from nothing tells us that God is able to make nothing cause something. That is nonsense. They are saying that something cannot come from nothing and then they say it did after all!

Christianity says it does not believe God made all things out of nothing like nothing was some kind of material to make all things from. It says nothing is not a material. God simply made all things but he didn't use anything to make them. That is what it says it means by God making all things out of nothing.

There are two options if all things came to be without coming out of anything.

One is that all things were made out of nothing as if nothing were a material. This view denies that nothing really is nothing. It denies that God need be the only explanation for the existence of all things.

The other option is that there is no connection between something and nothing so whatever exists just popped into existence out of nowhere, out of nothing.

It seems foolish and counter-intuitive to say that something can pop out of nothing. You can't imagine a hundred dollar bill doing it. So some then wonder how the universe could simply pop into existence. The suggestion that nothing can be used like an ingredient to make something is far worse. The reality is that in physics, things are observed coming into being from nowhere.

Philosophers might say, "If you think something popping into existence is stupid then you are right. But you overlooking the uniqueness of the Big Bang so it is not stupid in that case. The Big Bang started off the universe as a whole. It cannot be compared with a banknote popping into existence." Actually the Big Bang produced chaos and a great deal of matter and energy. A Big Bang that creates a banknote would have less work to do! The talk about the uniqueness of the Big Bang is irrelevant for the only thing really unique about it is the scale of the power and energy that appeared.

And the Big Bang theory is not about creation. It supposes that there was already something there to explode.

If there is no logical contradiction in God making the universe out of nothing, then it is said that there is no logical contradiction in the idea of the universe popping into existence without a maker. But even if there is a God it still must have popped out of nothing. So the first suggestion is illogical in the sense that it introduces God unnecessarily.

If creation is illogical, then it is more illogical to bring God into it. It makes a stupid theory far worse.