

A thought experiment...

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2007-02/msg03874.html>

- *From:* Jonathan Thiessen <jjthiessen@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 25 Feb 2007 17:09:30 -0500
-

Salutations,

I was thinking awhile back [as is customary], and I came up with a bit of a thought experiment. I'm not interested in getting into debates, and/or flame wars. Physics is my favourite science for the fact that it has the greatest tendency of the physical sciences to be [surprise :P] scientific [this is, methodical, and open/objective]. Mathematics is completely objective, however, in and of itself, I wouldn't really consider mathematics to be physical/tangible. But anyway... enough for precursory ramblings. If you find anything straight-up wrong, or otherwise questionable [that is phrased as being absolute], please bring it up so that it may be reconciled [ie so that I can fix it [including my understanding]].

Definitions:

D.1: Let the Universe be defined as being everything physical in existence [ie all matter, and energy]

Assumptions:

A.1: Assume that the Universe has always existed [ie an indefinite/infinite amount of time has already lapsed]

A.2: Assume that The Fundamental Laws of Thermodynamics are indeed correct

Implications:

I.1: By The First Law of Thermodynamics [A.2], there is nothing that is being created, nor destroyed

I.2: By D.1, and A.2/I.1, the total amount of "stuff" [sum of mass and energy] must be static throughout the Universe's existence [ie from "the beginning of time" until now]

I.3: By D.1, I.2, and The Second Law of Thermodynamics [A.2], the Universe must be in a state of maximal entropy, and therefore no more useful work can be accomplished

I.4: Since that which follows from I.3 is false, something is wrong with at least one of the foundational assumptions, or implications [Proof by contradiction].

A thought experiment...

As far as I can tell, A.1 seems to be the most likely flawed element of the argument. If A.1 is incorrect, then the Universe and everything in it [which is everything] has existed for a finite period of time [of course, it seems impossible to track time apart from physical interaction [since physical change can't happen when nothing exists]], and thus, the Universe must have come into existence by some means outside of the Universe's existence [so as to avoid a cyclical dependency]. It seems as though it is impossibly difficult to create one's self before one exists [although I could be missing something here].

If the Universe could be indefinitely old, then we would not need God in the context of this proof/experiment since the Universe could be its own preexistent entity [or rather, it would not need one], but, in accordance with thermodynamics, it is seemingly impossible to exist as the Universe presently exists if an infinite amount of time has passed with respect to the Universe. In other words, due to the nature of physical/finite existence, such an existence requires a non-physical/infinite counterpart.

I probably made a mistake somewhere [as it is not far from my nature to be at least somewhat imperfect :P], but if I did not, then it would seem as though thermodynamics implies God. So it would seem that at least one of: 1) There's a problem with the proof logic/a hole in my understanding of thermodynamics; 2) God exists; or 3) The laws of thermodynamics aren't quite seemingly correct.

Anyway... Sorry for parts of this getting a little wordy [I really did try to clean it up a bit after writing it]. Thanks for your time, and I look forward to hearing from any of you [if possible]. Have a good one ;)

Jonathan Thiessen

.