

Proof Of God Disproved

The KALM Cosmological Argument

[Kevin Aylward B.Sc.](#)

[Contents](#)

Overview

Well, this is part of my take on the "how are we here" problem. The main point being, what does physics have to say about creation of the universe from zilch. The motivation identified here, says that almost anything is possible and that there is nothing in physics to prevent the spontaneous creation of mass-energy from nothing, somewhat surprisingly for those that might not have really thought about the problem.

Introduction

The religious view on this, not surprisingly, is that there is a can do anything, knows everything, superduper intelligent, conscious creator that just, well, did it all, created the universe. Clearly this is just code for, "we have no idea whatsoever how we are here, so we just invent an infinite being to solve the problem". As is well known, once infinities are introduced into the pie, anything is possible. These deluded individuals even constructed an alleged proof for this supreme creator, named the KALAM Cosmological Argument.

Statements of KALAM

The kalam argument is one of the most trivially easy arguments to disprove as an alleged proof for a god. It is thus stunningly unexplainable as to why so much credence is given to it by theists.

As a refresher, it should be noted that a key part of any proof, is that every single step must be proven as true, with no other possible explanations being possible, even in principal. Any single alternative falsifies the proof, although it does not in of itself falsify the claim. It just proves that the proof fails.

The argument goes like this:

- 1 Everything that has a beginning of its existence, has a cause of its existence.
- 2 The universe has a beginning to its existence.
- 3 Thus (from 1 and 2), the universe has a cause for its existence.

- 4 This first uncaused cause must transcend physical reality.
 5. This uncaused cause that transcends physical reality is the description of God.
 6. Therefore God exists.
-

Statements of KALAM Refutation

Some of the statements that disprove the KALAM argument above are:

- 1 It can not be proven that "1" is true. It is shown in this paper that spontaneous creation from nothing is possible.
- 2 It can not be proven that "2" is true. There is no proof that the universe has a beginning to its existence.
- 3 It can not be proved that "5" is true. There is no proof that a creation object is necessarily conscious.

I just can't be bothered with refuting the nonsense claim 4.

KALAM 1 - Something From Nothing

Physical laws, i.e. laws of physics are simply relations between objects of mass-energy. It is only physical laws that make statements and give any rational as to why actions of mass-energy objects are actually restricted at all. For example, conservation of energy, conservation of momentum, invariance of the speed of light. Physical laws can only be defined with reference to mass-energy.

In a truly empty universe, without mass-energy, laws of physics simply do not exist.

The question to ask is, "In an empty universe, what is it that can prevent something happening" not "why should something happen in an empty universe". Asking why something should happen is just a prejudice created from existing in a universe with mass-energy in it. In our universe, the only logical rational for denying anything can happen, is because some law prevents it. In an empty universe there can be no logical reason to deny anything. This is discussed in depth in [Something From Nothing](#)

So, without an actual proof that an empty universe can *not* spontaneously produce mass-energy, KALAM statement 1 is not proven, therefore the KALAM conjecture is falsified.

KALAM 2 - The Universe May Have Always Existed

Current physics theories break down at the suggested singularity apparently predicted by General Relativity. It is generally argued that General Relativity is false at small distances. Efforts to construct a consistent, and acceptable theory of Quantum Gravity, to date, have failed. It is not proven as to whether or not mass-energy physics exist prior to the Big Bang. It is currently quite possible that the mass-energy of the universe has always existed.

So, without an actual proof that the mass-energy of the universe was created at the apparent Big Bang singularity, KALAM statement 2 is not proven, therefore the KALAM conjecture is falsified.

KALAM 5 - There May Be A Non Conscious Creation Machine

Kalam statement 5 simply and unilaterally declares that any "creator" *must* be god. This is a non sequitur (does not follow). It is clearly logically possible that a non-conscious, transcendental machine is the alleged creator. Indeed, it is a debatable problem in evolution theory as to why consciousness exists at all. It doesn't seem to be a requirement to explain any observed action.

An argument that *proves* that any creator *must* be conscious is therefore required. In my opinion, this is actually impossible, as I purport a proof that consciousness is inherently [unprovable](#).

So, without an actual proof that the alleged creator is necessarily conscious, KALAM statement 5 is not proven, therefore the KALAM conjecture is falsified.

Discussion

This bit is the bit that shouldn't be required. It is, because "Billions and Billions" of individuals cannot identify with the clear illogicality of their reason to their belief in an invisible, unmeasurable supreme creator.

1 It is alleged that existence of the universe, and quite specifically our consciousness is simply to complex to be explained by any natural process.

2 *Because* our complex consciousness is deemed to be not explainable, it is deemed necessary that an even more complex consciousness is required to explain our consciousness.

You have to be a ROM (read only memory) to not see the obvious, trivial issue with 2. It is 3.

3 If our consciousness does not have an acceptable natural explanation, then why is it *more* reasonable to accept an even *more complex* consciousness as an explanation?

Summary

The KALAM Cosmological conjecture of proof of God is refuted.

These papers may be freely copied,
provided its source here is referenced.
© Kevin Aylward 2015 - all rights reserved
Send comments or corrections to
kevinEXTRACT@kevinaylward.co.uk
(remove EXTRACT from the email address)
