

God cannot even exist!

Gabriel Vacariu (September 2015)

We have to change our oldest paradigm of thinking about the existence of the “world” and God. In my books and articles, I have showed that the “world”/“universe” does not exist but “epistemologically different worlds” (EDWs) exist/are. Within the EDWs, God cannot exist because of this reason: God cannot exist in all EDWs since one EDW does not exist for all EDWs. God cannot be present in all EDWs, therefore, God cannot even exist.

(This essay can be found at my webpage: <http://filosofie.unibuc.ro/wp-admin/post.php?post=2718&action=edit>)

Introduction

Nietzsche claimed that God is dead. For Nietzsche, the superman/Overman/Übermensch is necessary, a superbeing that replaces God. Nietzsche knew that the only possibility is that the genius has to replace God. Nevertheless, Nietzsche declared the only person who influenced him was Dostoyevsky. We have to remember about *Crime and Punishment* in which the main hero wants to replace God but he is not able to succeed this goal. In fact, from Dostoyevsky's viewpoint, even if the temptation is quite strong in the 19th Century, no man could replace God. For Nietzsche, God is dead, so he needs “superman”, he needs to be the first “superman”. Ironically, Nietzsche is mentally strongly affected by seeing a man bitten and killing a horse! This *contrarium oppositorium* mirrors directly the human condition in the “modern period”. Inevitably, this condition reflected the next movement, the post-modern condition of human being. Why post-modern? The main cause is that human being cannot deal with the fantastic jump realized by science and technology in the end of 19th Century and beginning of 20th Century. But science or technology does not exist, there are people who create science and technology. The problem is that there is no “superman” in science or technology. Probably the most important scientist in all time is Albert Einstein, but anyway he does not look like “God on Earth”.

In this context, the question is: is it necessary for a human being to replace God? I do not believe somebody has to replace God. Let us start investigating the conditions of possibility of God's existence in more details. Kant explored the conditions of possibility of existence of any object. He showed that the existence of God can only be postulated but not proved. However, we

have to remember that Kant was working within the unicorn world. On the contrary, within the EDWs perspective, in this essay, I will show very shortly that the “conditions of possibility” of God indicate that God cannot exist. More exactly, we will see that in reality the question “Does God exist?” is a pseudo-question. The matter at stake is not whether a supreme being (God, for instance) *exists or not*, but within the EDWs, God (or any supreme being) *cannot really exist!* Again, I investigating the *conditions of possible experience* of God (a supreme being), I will show that it is really impossible for God to exist/be. Within the EDWs perspective, it will be very clear that the conditions of possible experience for God (supreme being) are meaningless.¹ Again, it means that the existence (the being) of God is not possible to exist within the EDWs. In this essay is *the first in the history of human thinking in which it is showed that a supreme being cannot even exist.*²

2.1 Various ideas about a supreme being until the appearance of my EDWs perspective

Probably the most famous proofs for God's existence are the five ways of St. Thomas Aquinas' first proof: If a thing is in motion, something else produced this motion. However, we have to avoid the regression *ad infinitum*, therefore we have to stop this regression through introducing God (the first mover) in this equation. From my viewpoint, we have to make an analogy between the existence of God and the mind-body problem. (See all my works) However, Descartes' verdict is available today: “The union of mind and body is a reality which escapes philosophical discourse”, (Descartes to Elisabeth, 21 May 1643 in Fowler, p. 385). For avoiding this problem, Descartes introduces God in his equation. From my viewpoint, the mind-body problem is a pseudo-problem. Later, Newton, a true believer, discovered the laws of physics but used absolute space and time (Einstein rejected these notions). However, with Newton, God started to be pushed in the corner of the “universe”.³ Thus, the only place left for God was the realm of ethics. For Kant, the “representation of ideas of the soul, the world, and God” are not “constitutive” but “regulative”. From my viewpoint, regulative principles do not offer any ontological foundations,

¹ The correct phrasing is: “Supreme being cannot be” but this expression would be much more complicated than “Supreme being cannot exist”.

² Reading this statement, somebody replied to me that a religious person would be in an awful state. “If I am a believer, how would I feel hearing that God does not exist? Do you want to tell me that I am alone in this awful life?” My answer is: “You, your mind/self is an EW, so anyway you are ‘alone’, no other entity (or EW) exist/is for you; you (mind/self) are a world, i.e., an EW!”

³ Napoleon Bonaparte asked French philosopher Laplace (who presented his philosophical deterministic system): “But where is God in your philosophical approach?” Laplace answered: “I don't need this hypothesis in my philosophical approach!” I will show that God cannot exist even as an “unnecessary hypothesis”.

so we do not need them. We do not to “deny knowledge” for making “room” for faith since God does not exist. Nowadays, it is quite hilarious to believe in the “immortality of the soul”!)

“Nothing is more seductive for man than his freedom of conscience. But nothing is a greater cause of suffering.” (The Brothers Karamazov, 1880) Dostoyevsky in a letter: ... the work around a question “with which I have been tormented, consciously or unconsciously all my life--that is, the existence of God”. “Russian Utopian Socialists” and Durov circle: socialist destroy Christianity. (Elissa Kiskaddon on Internet) “He knew that the revolution must necessarily begin with atheism”. Arrested, in prison (where the only book allowed was The Bible), Dostoyevsky became a believer. Ivan Karamazov said that “It's not God I don't accept, understand this, I do not accept *the world*, that He created, this *world of God's*, and cannot agree with it.” (my italics) We have to pay attention that Dostoyevsky was working within the unicorn world! The “*superman theory*” for Raskolnikov (“Crime and Punishment”) is “the result of doubt expressed in the existence of God” and the “immense pride”. This position pushes the hero to committing crime, thus killing two women. “Using the same justification, Kirillov issues a form of challenge to God, and in preparing to take his life explains, ‘If God exists, then everything is His will, and I can do nothing of my own apart from His will. If there's no God, then everything is my will, and I'm bound to express my will.’ ‘If you shoot yourself, you'll become God, isn't that right?’ ‘Yes, I'll become God.’” From my viewpoint, I do not need to become God. I just proved that within the hyperverses, the Supreme being has no place!

Nietzsche claimed that God is dead (“The gay science”). For avoiding nihilism, he promoted the superman/Overman/Übermensch.

“Where has God gone?” he cried. “I shall tell you. We have killed him – you and I. We are his murderers. But how have we done this? How were we able to drink up the sea? Who gave us the sponge to wipe away the entire horizon? What did we do when we unchained the earth from its sun? Whither are we moving now? Away from all suns? Are we not perpetually falling? Backward, sideward, forward, in all directions? Is there any up or down left? Are we not straying as through an *infinite* nothing? Do we not feel the breath of empty space? Has it not become colder? Is it not more and more night coming on all the time? Must not lanterns be lit in the morning? Do we not hear anything yet of the noise of the gravediggers who are burying God? Do we not smell anything yet of God's decomposition? God too decomposed. God is dead. God remains dead. And we have killed him. How shall we comfort ourselves, the murderers of all murderers? What was holiest and mightiest of all that the world has yet owned has bled [loose blood] to death under our knives: who will wipe [clean] this blood off us? What water is there for us to clean ourselves? What festivals of atonement [penitence], what sacred games shall we have to invent? Is not the greatness

of this deed [action, endeavor] too great for us? Must we ourselves not become God simply to appear worthy of it?
(Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*, Section 125, tr. Walter Kaufmann)

In the 20th Century, any supreme being is outside the realm of science (and morality), but nobody could have proved that a supreme being does not really exist. In this appendix, I provide the first proof of inexistence of a supreme being. In *Time* journal, I introduce the main ideas (from the Internet)

Today, *science does not exclude the existence of any supreme being*: too many completely unexplained notions, too many mysteries in the world.¹ (Tegmark, Max and Wheeler, John Archibald: February 2001, “100 years of quantum mysteries”, *Scientific American*) In biology, the notion of “life” with Kauffman’s theory of complexity (a believer). In cognitive neuroscience, there was the unsolved mind-brain relationship (ontology-epistemology distinction). In quantum mechanics, there has been quite strange notions and empirical data: Young’s experiment and Wheelers’ delayed-choice experiment (1980), Feynman’s “sum over histories” framework, Heisenberg’s uncertainty principle, Schrödinger’s cat, decoherence and the multiverse, Born’s probability and de Broglie’s duality of wave and particle, Pauli’s wave function as the “probability amplitude” for the positions or momentum of the particle: “the appearance of a definite position of an electron during an observation is a *creation* outside the laws of nature” (Pauli in Zeh, his translation and italics), Bohm’s perspective (both electron and wave exist) and Bell’s approach (the global wave function has to be regarded as real); the “entanglement” (according to Schrödinger, “the greatest mystery of quantum theory”) involves the “superposition” of different quantum states; Einstein’s spooky action at a distance, etc. The framework has been grounded the wrong unicorn world! (see Vacariu 2008, Vacariu and Vacariu 2010) In Vacariu 2008 and Vacariu and Vacariu 2010, I clearly proved that quantum mechanics is a pseudo-theory explaining the mixture of wave-EW and particle-EW.

In one world, there is the “Theory of Everything” (quantum mechanics + Einstein’s general theory of relativity) that accumulates some great theories but produces great problems: the problem of gravity and Newton vs. Einstein theories (Newton’s absolute space and time vs. Einstein’s relativity theory), the relationship between the general theory of relativity and quantum mechanics (mainly the problems of infinities produced by the unification of these

¹ See my presentation “God died long time ago. How can we rule out the infinite today?” at my webpage.

theories), quantum gravity (the problem of space), black holes, and holographic principle. When we try to relate the theory of general relativity and the quantum theory, infinitesimal points create the infinities. In Vacariu and Vacariu (2010), we showed that superstring theory with 10 or 11 dimensions is a pseudo-theory that has no value in explaining the EDWs.

Krauss introduced “nothing”, i.e., the universe is from “nothing”. (Krauss 2012) (see our future work) It seems quite difficult to accept the universe appeared from “nothing”, but Krauss indicates that this “nothing is unstable” and because of this reason, the “universe appeared from nothing”. From our viewpoint, before Big Bang it was an EDW (even if this EW have not existed for our “universe”) and before this EW another EW and so one. However, we stop the regress *ad infinitum* of EDWs if thinking about the EW0 that had no spatio-temporal framework! I repeat that this EW0 can exist because there is another EW without space (the mind-EW) and there are some entities without time (the photons) that belong to a particular EW (the micro-EW). Again, having an EW without space and time, the question “What was before a particular EW?” is meaningless in that chain of EDWs since there is the EW0 that has no time and space. If we talk about the EW0, the questions referring to the spatio-temporal framework of the entities that belong to this EW are meaningless. The notions of “world”, “infinity”, supreme being and many other notions have been created by the human mind within the unicorn world. It is time now to give up on such invented notions that have always created great problems for the human being. Any EW appears “spontaneously” from *hyper-nothing*. “Before” Big Bang or earlier there was hypernothing. Also, there was an EW without the dimensions of space and/or time. Therefore it is meaningless to ask “What was before that EW?” and/or “What is the spatial end of that EW?” Thus, within such EW, the “first engine” has to be eliminated without falling into a regress *ad infinitum* and without postulating the existence of any supra-entity or a primordial process. The “supreme being” and the “infinite” are surrogate notions created by believers and scientists for many pseudo-problems within the unicorn world!

Since the beginning, thinking in one world, the human being needed a supreme being, a “starting point” (Aristotle) or a Big Bang (actual physics). In general thinking, without the existence of a supreme being in one world, many fundamental just human ideas lose their ground. In science, we have to recognize the limits of human knowledge because of the infinite (micro- and macro-space or temporal dimension of the world) vs. Kant. Big Bang replaced God as the first “movement” of the actual world. Big Bang partially replaces the need of God. In

2014, the Pope asked “What was before Big Bang?” Obviously, from his viewpoint, it is God. Krauss argues, scientifically, that the universe is from nothing, and thus the existence of God is a human illusion. Let me quote some paragraphs that refer to God from Krauss’ book:

Lack of comfort means we are on the threshold of new insights. Surely, invoking “God” to avoid difficult questions of “how” is merely intellectually lazy. After all, if there were no potential for creation, then God couldn't have created anything. It would be semantic hocus-pocus to assert that the potentially infinite regression is avoided because God exists outside nature and, therefore, the “potential” for existence itself is not a part of the nothingness from which existence arose. (p. 20)

Newton's work dramatically reduced the possible domain of God's actions, whether or not you attribute any inherent rationality to the universe. Not only did Newton's laws severely constrain the freedom of action of a deity, they dispensed with various requirements for supernatural intervention. Newton discovered that the motion of planets around the Sun does not require them to be continually pushed along their paths, but rather, and highly nonintuitively, requires them to be pulled by a force acting toward the Sun, thus dispensing of the need for the angels who were often previously invoked as guiding the planets on their way. (p. 147)

Just as Darwin, albeit reluctantly, removed the need for divine intervention in the evolution of the modern world, teeming with diverse life throughout the planet (though he left the door open to the possibility that God helped breathe life into the first forms), our current understanding of the universe, its past, and its future make it more plausible that “something” can arise out of nothing without the need for any divine guidance. (p. 149)

Einstein once asked a question that, he said, was the one thing he really wanted to know about nature. I admit it is the most profound and fundamental question that many of us would like answered. He put it as follows: “What I want to know is whether God [sic] had any choice in the creation of the universe.”

I have annotated this because Einstein’s God was not the God of the Bible. For Einstein, the existence of order in the universe provided a sense of such profound wonder that he felt a spiritual attachment to it, which he labeled, motivated by Spinoza, with the moniker “God”. (p. 160)

The problem with God determining the rules is that you can at least ask what, or who, determined God's rules. Traditionally the response to this is to say that God is , among the Creator ' s many other spectacular attributes, the cause of all causes, in the language of the Roman Catholic Church, or the First Cause (as per Aquinas), or in the language of Aristotle, moving the prime mover. Interestingly, Aristotle recognized the problem of a first cause, and decided that for this reason the universe must be eternal. Moreover, God himself, whom he identified as pure self-absorbed thought, the love of which motivated the prime mover to move, had to be eternal, not causing motion by

creating it, but rather by establishing the end purpose of motion, which itself Aristotle deemed had to be eternal. (p. 171)

In any case, to posit a God who could resolve this conundrum, as I have emphasized numerous times thus far, often is claimed to require that God exists outside the universe and is either timeless or eternal. (p. 173)

In this sense, science, as physicist Steven Weinberg has emphasized, does not make it impossible to believe in God, but rather makes it possible to not believe in God. Without science, everything is a miracle. With science, there remains the possibility that nothing is. Religious belief in this case becomes less and less necessary, and also less and less relevant. (p. 181)

I find oddly satisfying the possibility that, in either scenario, even a seemingly omnipotent God would have no freedom in the creation of our universe. No doubt because it further suggests that God is unnecessary-or at best redundant. (p. 182)

In *Afterword* of Krauss's book, Richard Dawkins writes:

If you ask religious believers why they believe, you may find a few "sophisticated" theologians who will talk about God as the "Ground of all Isness", or as "a metaphor for interpersonal fellowship" or some such evasion. But the majority of believers leap, more honestly and vulnerably, to a version of the argument from design or the argument from first cause. Philosophers of the caliber of David Hume didn't need to rise from their armchairs to demonstrate the fatal weakness of all such arguments: they beg the question of the Creator's origin. But it took Charles Darwin, out in the real world on HMS Beagle, to discover the brilliantly simple-and non-question-begging-alternative to design. In the field of biology, that is. Biology was always the favorite hunting ground for natural theologians until Darwin-not deliberately, for he was the kindest and gentlest of men-chased them off. They fled to the rarefied pastures of physics and the origins of the universe, only to find Lawrence Krauss and his predecessors waiting for them.

Even if Krauss furnishes arguments for showing that the "universe" appears from "nothing" through the process of Big Bang, and pleads for the inexistence of God, however, he does not offer a real argument for this inexistence. In this essay, I proved that there are no conditions of possibility for a supreme being and therefore the supreme being cannot exist. In other words, (hyper)ontologically, a supreme being cannot be/exist. A "supreme being" is simply a mental notion created by human beings since the beginning of human species.

2. 2 Within the EDWs perspective, the main argument against the existence of God

The reader has to pay attention to the following statement: the “existence of supreme being” (a perfect being) in the “universe” (that is, within the unicorn world) is very similar to the mind-brain problem: the nature of the supreme being cannot be material or physical, a supreme being has to be somehow *immaterial (spiritual)* with all its properties (omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, and other supreme powers). Therefore, the main problem would be the *interactions* between God (a supreme being) and all the other epistemologically different entities, (human beings (their minds), all human bodies (that are all within the macro-EW), all electro-magnetic waves, microparticles, planets, etc.) that belong to EDWs. Being omnipotent, a supreme being has to interact with all entities that belong to EDWs, otherwise it would not be the supreme being. Exactly as I showed, in my previous works, that the mind-brain is a pseudo-problem, I will indicate here that the existence of God (the supreme being) is a pseudo-problem, therefore God cannot even exist. Again, for a supreme being to exist, the main condition must be met: a supreme being is present everywhere (omnipotent), i.e., from my viewpoint, a supreme being *interacts* with everything (all ED entities that belong to EDWs). It does not matter the ontological substance of the supreme being (as entity or process or whatever you want), but it is impossible that an entity interacts with all ED entities that belong to EDWs. *The main point is that for any EW all the other EDW do not exist! Therefore, it is impossible for God to be present in all EDWs!* If God were present in all EDWs, it would mean that any part of God that exists in a particular EW does not exist for all his other parts. This state of affair is quite absurd. If God is not present in all EDWs, then we cannot talk about God. If God is present in all the EDWs, then God is nothing more than an ontological contradiction. Either it would be an ontological contradiction for such entity to exist and not to exist or it would mean an entity that interacts with all ED entities from all EDWs and this is not possible. God would be present in all EDWs and according to the EDWs perspective, it is impossible for an entity to exist/be in all the EDWs. An entity could not exist only in the “world”, the unicorn world: as I showed in all our previous books/articles, the world/universe does not exist. The ontological substance of God has to be something completely different than any known substance. God can be an EDW but in this case this entity is not God. The conclusion is the following: it is impossible for God to exist/be!

The conditions of possible existence of a supreme being are identical with the condition of possible existence of mind and matter! So, the problem of the existence of a supreme being is identical with the mind-brain/body problem; in other words, if a supreme being exists, what are the conditions of its existence, i.e., what is the nature of a supreme being, the ontological status of supreme being? Is its nature quite similar to the ontological status of mind? In this case, the nature of the supreme being-nature would reflect directly the mind-body problem. Is a supreme being a kind of “energy”? Then the dichotomy supreme being-nature would reflect the dichotomy wave-particle problem from quantum mechanics. As I showed in my previous works, all these problems are pseudo-problems. We know that the wave and the particle both exist but in EDWs. We know that mind and matter (brain, body) exist, but they cannot exist both within the same EW. The mind is an EW, the brain (body) belongs to the macro-EW. The same hold for a supreme being and “nature” (i.e., EDWs): If a supreme being is within a particular EW, then the supreme being cannot exist for all other entities that belong to EDWs. If a supreme being is an EW, then the supreme being does not exist for entities that belong to EDWs. So, within the EDWs perspective, there are several reasons that prove directly that a supreme being cannot exist.

(1) Since the world does not exist, we can immediately infer that a supreme being does not exist. In what EW does a supreme being exist? A supreme being has to be present everywhere but according to the EDWs perspective, nothing (no entity) can be present in more than one EW or can be an EW. Therefore, a supreme being cannot be everywhere, i.e., in any EW. There are two alternatives:

(a) If a supreme being is an EW, this EW does not exist for any other EDW, that is, supreme being does not exist for any self (that is an EW). However, such a supreme being would not have powers recognized by religious people, so this entity is not the supreme entity. A supreme being as an EW is a contradiction of the supreme being’s definition.

(b) If a supreme being is an entity/process in one particular EW, than we cannot talk about the “real supreme being” (that has to be present anywhere, i.e., in all the EDWs). It would be a contradiction of a supreme being’s powers.

(2) The nature of a supreme being has to be different from any other substance (even if it can be somehow related to the “soul”, that is, the mind or the I). However, the contacts between any

soul/mind and the supreme being or between our body and the supreme being would require exactly the infamous Cartesian contact between mind and body. The mind-body problem is a pseudo-problem, therefore, the contact between a supreme being and our mind or body is a pseudo-problem. If a supreme being can contact the “soul” (the mind), then the supreme being cannot contact the brain and body just because the mind does not exist for the body. It would be a contradiction of a supreme being’s powers that has to be present everywhere.

(3) Within any EW, space is not infinite.¹ More exactly, “infinite” does not exist, it is just a mathematical notion invented by humans. The self (the mind) has no spatial dimensions, the macro-EW has some limits because of the existence of Big Bang. Therefore, the infinite (and space) is ruled out with the hyperverses (Σ all EDWs). If space does not exist, then the presence of a supreme being (everywhere) is meaningless. But even space exists, it would be impossible to localize the supreme being somewhere in the “world”. To localize a supreme being somewhere would be a contradiction of the supreme being’s nature.

(4) We can talk about *hypernothing* as something that has no space and time, there are no interactions and no determinations. If any EW is indeterminate, hyper-nothing is non-determinate (not even potential determination). Hyperverses = Σ EDWs and therefore the hyperverses is an abstract notion, ontologically-epistemologically speaking: ontologically, since the entities from a particular EW do not interact with entities from another EW; epistemologically, since the human being cannot observe (through correspondence) the entities that belong to two or more EDWs at the same time. Hyperverses has no ontological status, one needs an entity to interact with (observe) the entities from EDWs (at the same time). Such an entity would be a hyperentity, i.e., supreme being. However, human being is not a hyperentity: a human being cannot perceive two EDWs at the same time because the human attention (probably consciousness) is a serial process. A hyperentity needs two minds to observe two EDWs. Since the mind is being, a hyperentity would be two beings and this is a hyperontological contradiction! A supreme being with two minds is simply a contradiction.

(5) Does the first EW (or “first movement” or the “first engine”) exist? As Krauss (2012) and other people showed, Big Bang is really a physical phenomenon. Krauss illustrates a common reasoning for people who work in physics that the “*universe*” appeared from nothing 13.72 billions years ago. In fact, in his book, Krauss argues scientifically many times that God does not

¹ As I will show in my next book, the infinite and the space do not exist.

exist but he cannot prove completely (ontologically-epistemologically) that God cannot exist. In this essay, it is the first demonstration of the fact that a supreme being cannot exist. Anyway, to prove or disprove a supreme being exists is a philosophical and not a scientific judgment.

2.3 What was before Big Bang?

In my book from 2014, I wrote about “What was before the Big Bang?”: there was an EDW (or maybe that EW still exists), that I called “pre-Big Bang EW”. (See also Vacariu 2014) Moreover, the micro-EW or the macro-EW did not “appear” from the “pre-Big Bang EW”. There are no causalities between any two EDWs since an EW does not exist (more correctly, “is not”) for any other EW. Therefore, I repeat that the causality of any kind between ED entities that belong to EDWs is meaningless. There are only some *correspondences* but not causalities. Any EW appears from and disappears in the *hypernothing*. There are some correspondences between ED entities and processes that belong to the pre-Big Bang EW and the micro-EW (this is allegedly the EW that appears first after the Big Bang). In that section, I showed that with the EDWs we can stop all infinities since infinity does not exist, it is just a human mind creation. (See my next work) It was Supreme being introduced as the answer to the question “What was before the beginning of the world?” for Aristotle and “What was before the Big Bang?” for Pope Pius XII (in 1951)¹.

The condition of the possibility of existence of a supreme being is identical with the mind-brain problem. That is, just as the interaction (communication) between the mind and the body (brain) was the main problem for Descartes (and any philosopher in the history of human thinking and Descartes needed to introduce God in this equation), the interactions between a supreme being and the mind (an EW) or the body (entity within the macro-EW) of any person is the main problem! If we believe that any supreme being is absolute power (present everywhere, knowing everything, etc.), then the supreme being has to be in contact with our mind and our body. However, each mind is an EW and nothing can be in contact with any EW. Any EW is, but

¹ “Pope Pius XII heralded it in 1951 as evidence for Genesis. As he put it: It would seem that present-day science, with one sweep back across the centuries, has succeeded in bearing witness to the august instant of the primordial Fiat Lux [Let there be Light], when along with matter, there burst forth from nothing a sea of light and radiation, and the elements split and churned and formed into millions of galaxies. Thus, with that concreteness which is characteristic of physical proofs, [science] has confirmed the contingency of the universe and also the well-founded deduction as to the epoch when the world came forth from the hands of the Creator. Hence, creation took place. We say: ‘Therefore, there is a Creator. Therefore, Supreme being exists!’” For me, the priests always created the “Big-Mafia” for manipulating people in order to flourish their conditions of living in the entire history of human being.

it is not for any other EW. So, a supreme being is either inside an EW (than it is not the supreme being), or is an EW (that it does not exist for any other EW, that is, the supreme being does not exist for any self, body, and any other entity/process that belongs to any EDW).

If I showed that the mind-brain problem is a pseudo-problem, I proved that a supreme being cannot be (exist). As an entity within an EW, the supreme entity is not a supreme entity (having all powers/attributes). As an EW, the supreme being does not exist for any self (an EW) or for any entity/process that belongs to an EDW. It is not that “supreme being does not exist”; the situation is much worse: a “supreme being cannot even exist”! In this appendix, I throw to the garbage the most serious notion, supreme being, from the entire history of human thinking. With my philosophical system, you, scientist or philosopher, will feel like taking drugs: all problems of the “world” will disappear since even the “world” does not exist. However, I reject Berkeley’s idea of self/supreme being as being everything. Self is just an EW and many EDWs are.

Conclusion

Within the EDWs, God cannot even exist. Either God is an EW (and in this case, God does not exist for any other EDW, so God is not the supreme being) or God is part of an EW (in this case, God can be the supreme being for all entities that belong to the same EW, but God does not exist for any other EDWs). God is impossible to be present in all EDWs (if God is present in all EDWs and one EW does not exist for any other EDW, then God would be composed of parts that exist and parts that not exist, and this is an ontological contradiction. Therefore God cannot even exist! It seems that, within the EDWs perspective, the most important notion during more than 4000 years, God, have become useless. For the first time in the history of human thinking, it has been showed that God cannot even exist.

I am convinced that without this notion, “God”, dominating the human thinking, the progress would have been much better than the real progress. The EDWs perspective draws a new line of progress for science and technology because of these reasons:

- It changed completely the wrong frameworks of thinking in particular sciences (physics, biology, cognitive (neuro)science).
- It changed completely the framework of thinking in philosophy and human thinking in general.

- It showed that that God cannot even exist, so religion becomes a futile domain, an impediment for the progress in science and technology.

In these conditions, the only alternative that exists for human thinkers is the EDWs perspective. Having the ability of thinking (at least as a presupposition), each human being has the potentiality of choosing either to remain in the unicorn world or to switch to EDWs, i.e., either to remain in “obscurity of God” or to forge ahead for progress of science and technology. What a shame for so many people to die “in the name of God” during the history of human beings... In this essay, it is for the first time in the history of human thinking when, within the new paradigm of thinking, the EDWs, somebody (myself) clearly shows that God cannot even exist!¹

¹ I am sure that, as usually, some people (the same who plagiarized already my ideas, see my webpage, or others) will plagiarize the ideas from this essay.