**A Falsifiable Ontological Argument for the Existence of (any) God(s) and Why the Universe Exists**

According to this thesis, Atheism, polytheism and monotheism are all correct in what they believe is the case (and disbelieve about others) in the broadest possible sense. Their conclusions applied to this universe are unknowable.

**Introduction**

Proofs for the existence of an omnipotent, omniscient and benevolent God have all fallen short from the ontological argument to the teleological argument. There are two explanations for these consistent failures, one is the well-known failings of every argument that has been put forward and the other is that a God of those characteristics who does not want to be found, will never be found. However, there is a way around both perspectives, but it does require sacrificing a level of certainty for our own universe.

The underlying reason that previous proofs for God’s existence have failed are not the logical failings of each argument but that they were all destined to fail because they argued for God’s existence without properly accounting for what the definition implies. Also, the definition has made us look for God in only the most likely places.

**Absolute nothing**

Absolute nothing is the absence of absolutely everything. Understanding this concept is particularly difficult given our perspective within our universe. There are two ways to describe this concept, from an external (to our universe) perspective and the more laborious internal perspective.

To start on the laborious path. We immediately conclude that the deepest vacuum of intergalactic space might fulfil this definition. However, this is not the case, while space is mostly empty, there is hydrogen and other clumps of atoms, photons and neutrinos. Even, somehow, removing these will not leave us with absolute nothing as there can still be strange quantum events potentially occurring in that empty space. Without these we would still need to remove the four fundamental forces of the universe itself, such as gravity. We would then also need to remove the dimensions of spacetime (And whatever other spacial dimensions may exist).

Even in this nonsensical ‘place’ we are yet to arrive at absolute nothing. Removing what remains becomes increasingly harder to imagine. We must now remove what laws of our universe remain. For example, simple reasoning like 1+1 no longer has 2 as a necessary answer. Even stranger, the concepts of 1, 2 or addition no longer have any meaning because the laws that permit their postulation do not apply. This is absolute nothing. From its definition, it does not ‘exist’ or cannot be ‘found’ within our universe. Wherever we may go, from the deepest space to the centre of a black hole, there is always something.

**The problem of existence**

Whether determining the velocity of a projectile or describing the Krebs cycle, it is assumed that the event is occurring within this universe. However, this is not the case for extra universal concepts or entities. Absolute nothing is the absence of everything, including any universe, extra universal objects, entities or concepts and any laws or logic.

Where there have been historical problems with understanding, using and accepting zero, minus numbers or imaginary numbers, there are issues with absolute nothing. Firstly, what does it mean? Is it real (can it exist)? Is it worth consideration? Absolute nothing is somewhat unique among extra universal concepts in that even among these concepts it appears to be the definition of something that isn’t. Therefore, what merit is there in tolerating this concept in serious discourse more than Middle Earth or other fictional concepts. I suggest that this problem isn’t an issue with absolute nothing but a problem with the definition of existence (a state of being in objective reality). Existence is an excellent concept when discussing objective properties of this universe, but becomes increasingly stretched when embarking beyond our universe, finally capsising upon the shallow waters of absolute nothing.

Not only does Absolute nothing not fit existence’s definition but by its own definition it cannot have the property of existence. However, it is debatable how relevant this issue is. Against the ontological argument, Immanuel Kant (1781) famously states that existence is not a real predicate because existence is a semantic label/concept that adds nothing to the ‘real’ thing in question. The concept of an object is separate to the object itself. Therefore, concerning ourselves with the existence of something is inherently unobjective because it is purely conceptual (and adds no valuable information about the thing in question). This is true of entities within our universe or that act within our universe.

Therefore, we can conclude that this means absolute nothing cannot be real or that our definition of real has not been stretched to sufficiently cover what we mean by real or ‘existence’. In its defence, from its definition, we know where to find absolute nothing. It is outside of our universe where nothing else at all is. We can define or derive absolute nothing to a certain extent using the objective properties of this universe. It is also a definable state in contrast to everything that is. Absolute nothing is an extra universal concept that can be objectively defined by what it isn’t and in comparison to other objective phenomena. I contend that this makes absolute nothing a valid concept. However, this does not overcome Kant’s contention that the existence of a concept is not a real predicate. While absolute nothing may be a valid concept, the only way to assure ourselves that it ‘exists’ are empirical phenomena. This thesis does predict that absolute nothing would affect our world in a way we can measure empirically, which is addressed later.

**The Essence of Absolute Nothing**

Absolute nothing is the absence of any laws of nature, spacetime, mathematics, grammar and everything. As absolute nothing has no laws to govern it (not even a law requiring that it has no laws), it has infinite potential.

Can absolute nothing be a sandwich? Technically, no it cannot. A sandwich, regardless of its filling, has space and mass, which voids our description of absolute nothing. However, what is to stop absolute nothing from ‘becoming’ or ‘producing’ a sandwich. There are no laws in absolute nothing, so it could produce a sandwich, for it is not illogical or unreasonable to do so (given that the implied temporal component in ‘becoming’ or ‘producing’ are not used in this statement). We could argue that time is a necessary component as change requires time, which is absent in absolute nothingness. However, this assumes that there are laws constricting absolute nothingness, which is not the case. That law does not exist, and it does not not-exist either as that would also be a law. Similarly, there is no rule to ensure that this sandwich is created. We could also argue that because absolute nothing has no laws or rules it is unable to ‘produce’ a sandwich because laws are not restraints on our universe but they provide our universe with the power to do things (such as where a government department relies on legislation to act rather than legislation restricting action). Therefore, without laws, absolute nothing cannot do anything because there is no law to say it can. However, if this applied to absolute nothing, that would be a law governing it, which it does not have.

I chose the example of a sandwich because it is a bad example. A sandwich is contingent upon many factors to exist, or at least a sandwich as we understand one. Our definition requires a universe that allows its parameters. Thus, declaring that absolute nothing could theoretically manifest a sandwich also implies the creation of a universe similar to our own where it could exist. So, when discussing what absolute nothing could or could not do, we must consider that anything within this universe is likely to imply a universe with these statistics (similar Planck's constant, sub-atomic forces, space-time etc).

Returning to the potential of absolute nothing, we can discover that it is reasonable for it to produce a metre wide universe containing just a sandwich. It is a consequence of absolute nothing being absolutely nothing that anything can happen. There are no laws in place to prevent it or maintain it, so the potential is infinity (given that time is not a variable in absolute nothing). Absolute nothing and absolute infinity (every possibility, however paradoxical, inconceivable and self-contradicting) can be synonymous. Similarly, there are no laws to ensure that this occurs (though without time as a variable, envisioning this is difficult). Absolute infinity here is the existence of every single possible and impossible (to our perception) ‘thing’.

There is a great leap between absolute nothing producing a universe containing a sandwich and being synonymous with absolute infinity. We can never truly envision absolute nothingness as we have conscious limits in our imagination, making it easy for misconceptions. This can be aided by looking at the problem from multiple perspectives. By definition, absolute nothing has no time and so thinking of something being created infers a time before it came into being. Instead, you may prefer to think of absolute nothing as an infinite mess of probabilities. Absolute nothing has no rules to prevent something or everything from occurring (as well as no rule to ensure that it does). A result of this is an infinite 'probability cloud'. Because there is no timeframe for this to occur within, it is meaningless to question the difference between the probability of something happening and the existence of something. The infinite probability cloud is effectively playing out every probability, including ones that seem impossible or paradoxical to us.

So, as absolute nothing has infinite possibilities because it has no constraints or attributes, including any logic to ensure that it has infinite potential, there are a lot of consequences. In addition, absolute nothing has no prerequisites, which results in infinite perpetuation. This is a core element of absolute nothingness, no matter how much it might ‘void’ itself with infinity or less, it will always continue because it has no pre-conditions to ‘exist’.

To truly understand this concept we can compare it with a classical idea of the Christian God. To the vast majority of believers, God is seen as a necessary being, upon whom all creation is contingent. That is to say everything that is not directly God (if you follow the chain of cause and effect) is eventually dependent on God for its existence. However, God is not dependent on anything else because God always was and is omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent. Everything in the universe and the universe itself is believed to be contingent on God, but God is necessary as it is ‘of itself’.

Absolute nothingness is both more necessary and more ‘resilient’ than a necessary God. Unlike absolute nothingness, an omnipotent, omniscient and necessary God has one weakness, itself. A perfect God’s existence is not contingent on anything external, but it is contingent on its own existence. If God didn’t exist, then God wouldn’t exist. In contrast, absolute nothingness does not have this tautological weakness. Absolute nothing has no prerequisites, no contingencies, nothing.

**The Consequences of Absolute Nothing and Our Position Within Them**

So, how is absolute infinity manifested? We can make a lot of progress with what we can infer using language and logic. Almost anything we can imagine requires a universe like ours in which to exist. So, we can suppose that an infinitely small portion of absolute infinity would be expressed through infinite universes containing infinite minuscule and massive variations and infinite exact copies of universes like ours. If that sentence was as awkward to read as it was to write, we can more simply state that the result of absolute infinity is that everything exists (this is a grossly simplified statement, which is expanded upon later).

 Now we can examine the results of this. The proposal that everything conceivable and inconceivable exists, does not mean that your phone should suddenly become an elephant because that is part of an infinite set of scenarios that should happen. It does not necessarily mean infinity should be visibly happening around us all the time. Absolute infinity is expressed through the creation of every potential, this universe is one of those infinite potentials, there will be one where a bloodthirsty, human eating elephant appears and devours you, but we can hope this isn’t that universe. It is also important to note that the sudden appearance of an elephant is possible but massively unlikely (with odds similar to a roulette table being used once a day since the beginning of time and landing on zero every time until the present, though this is probably more likely to happen than the elephant).

The elephant is another carefully chosen bad example. This is because an elephant is not an individual unit. For an elephant to appear it would require all the base particles of the elephant spontaneously appearing or reforming and bonding perfectly to form the elephant. In a multiverse of infinite variations on this universe, there would also be many more infinite, mostly incomplete and gruesome, variations of this elephant.

Then we must also consider the massiveness of the universe that the elephant could spontaneously spawn within. There will be infinite universes for each of these possibilities, even if the elephant is only an atom’s difference in distance (and equal variations in time).

The elephant explanation is not the simplest method to properly understand the depth of the mechanics that are actually occurring in this spontaneous creation. This is because it approaches the problem from a human perspective. A key bias of human perception is our understanding that the universe is a collection of individual things, items and stuff. While this is useful for everyday life, it is an unhelpful instinct for this level of thinking of the universe. The universe is the sum of its parts. It is misleading to think of the universe as a collection of rocks, metals and gases. These are constructs and formations of the universe and not its building blocks. The infinite variability is best thought of through that universe’s most basic parts. So, instead of elephants, we will concern ourselves with the universe’s most basic particles. Physicists may have identified these through these through the standard model. Given the uncertainty, we shall refer to base particles through the homogeneous term ‘vok’. Now, where absolute nothing expresses every possibility, in part, through a multiverse of infinite variations, there would be infinite universes that differ in only one (two, three etc.) spontaneously appearing voks in seemingly infinite different locations and time periods. This would produce a ‘fingerprint’ or ‘barcode’ that would identify our universe from infinite otherwise identical universes, which is a key concept of absolute infinity and will be built upon later.

The existence of absolute infinity also throws up some other interesting conundrums. The existence of every possibility and variation manifested within separate or joined universes (e.g. a pair of universes that are both affected by the same gravitational fields but nothing else) is just a fragment of something far greater. There is no logical reason against the existence of an all-cancelling power to erase all these universes as well as all preventing powers to stop this and further powers to stop that etc. As well as infinite different expressions of infinity, interacting with infinite others in infinite ways, this throws up its own paradoxes and infinite loops. However, these paradoxes are not an issue with the incoherence of infinity but the incoherence of our own logic when applied to the *omniverse*.

**The Universe, Multiverse, Polyverse and Omniverse**

Absolute infinity may be chaotic and limitless, but its totality can be categorised. The smallest category is that of a universe. A universe is something we are all familiar with, the only potential surprise here, is that the potential ‘quantum multiverse’ that may arise out of collapsing probability clouds will count as part of our universe given that all these universes are connected branches of the same universe. Alternatively, the multiverse is an infinite set of ‘conceivable’ or ‘possible’ universes like this one with all possible subtle or major variations (and it includes our universe). The other universes of the multiverse are different to our universe (and its near infinite branches) in that these are entirely unconnected to our universe.

Imagine that our universe and each of the different futures that emerge from probability clouds collapsing in different positions are a tree. All of these many worlds are connected through their branches and ultimately at the base of the tree’s trunk. Then if our universe is a tree, the multiverse is a surrounding forest of similar trees with the same physics constants but entirely separate trunks and branches, unconnected to our tree.

 

**Figure 1**: The omniverse’s structure from the perspective of our universe.

The polyverse is the next step up from the multiverse and it contains the multiverse as well as all variations of a universe (not just all ‘possible’ or ‘conceivable’ variations). As with the multiverse, the polyverse also contains infinite exact copies of each variation. This is because the polyverse is a result of the expression of absolute infinity. When we consider that the polyverse is the expression of all variations and not just all ‘possible’ variations of the universe, this includes the earlier one that is a sphere with a diameter of 1 metre containing a sandwich. This is distinct from our universe because our universe has a coherent development from an infinitely small point to everything we know today. The sandwich universe has no such ‘scientific’ explanation for its existence, other than it is, was and will continue to be. Anything that involves a universe is part of the polyverse.

It might be useful to divide the polyverse into two. There will be one infinite set of universes with different physics constants to our own and another that operate under entirely different assumptions that include what physics might consider nonsense like magic and miracles. Where the universe is a tree with many branching realities, the multiverse is a forest, then the polyverse is the surrounding fields hedges, forests and orchards. Some areas of the polyverse will be like their own forests while others will be intermingling hedges or like our sandwich universe, just short blades of grass.

Finally, the omniverse contains the polyverse and everything else in the expression of absolute infinity and is the most difficult to comprehend. This is the realm of the impossible (from our perspective), paradoxes, Gods and all other extra-universal forces. The separation of the multiverse, polyverse and omniverse into these definitions is purely a work of language and intended for simplicity. There will be points where they interact. These definitions are also borne out of our relative position within a universe in the omniverse. There could well be creatures in what we describe as the omniverse (but not classified within the multiverse or polyverse), whose description of the expressions of infinity would look quite different, where the concept of a universe would fall into the strange and abstract omniverse and they would break infinity down into their replacement for a universe and its infinite possible parallels.

**Pure Logic and Paradoxes**

The significance of the logic of absolute nothing and absolute infinity is that it can also help us gain another perspective of the logic within this universe. All logic must perfectly describe its context; if this is not the case then the logic is incorrect and requires adjustment. It is these principles of logic and its abstractness through language that allow logic to describe anything and nothing.

So, what new perspective does the logic of absolute nothing provide? Other than the lack of absurdity in the use of the definition of nothing, it illustrates the naturally occurring limits (perhaps imperfections) in this universe. It may seem unusual to suggest that our universe has imperfections, and this is a reasonable assumption as the path to this conclusion is not intuitive and it starts with paradoxes:

1. Tok is omnipotent.
2. Tok creates a sandwich so vast that Tok is unable to consume it.
3. Tok consumes the sandwich.

 In this example we shall make several assumptions. Initially, that omnipotence ascribes a level of power allowing its lucky controller to do absolutely anything. Secondly it is implied is that Tok is some sort of sentient entity.

 Within the three points of this example are two main paradoxes. The first paradox exists because the size of the sandwich is irrelevant when compared to Tok’s ability to eat it. Even when infinitely vast, Tok’s omnipotence allows Tok to consume the sandwich without issue. The second paradox is that once making the impossibly un-consumable sandwich Tok then eats it.

 This is seemingly nonsensical because staying within the assumed laws of this universe, it is impossible for contradictory actions to take place. However, when applying the same scenario through the logic of absolute nothing both contradictory actions can take place simultaneously as the ‘law’ preventing such a contradiction does not need to exist. This is one of the limits of this universe and, as a result, our minds.

 The other problem with this paradox is a problem contained within the definition of omnipotent. Omnipotent could mean the power to achieve anything consistent with the laws of logic of our universe or it could mean a power far beyond the limits of our reality. The former is not sufficient to fulfil the second premise of the above syllogism, because from our perspective it is non-sensical (and therefore impossible for this definition of omnipotent). Therefore, the later is the only definition of omnipotent that can resolve the paradox, because, by definition, it is not restricted by paradoxes.

**The Assumed Law of Linear Resolution**

 We are very used to living in a universe where we accept that paradoxes are entirely irresolvable, or reveal an error, when in actually this restraint is an oddity compared to the normal state of things extra to this universe. It is an assumed law in this universe that everything must conclude linearly. The universe finds a way to resolve any event with one particular answer. Whereas in a world generated by a modern computer, it might be possible to find a specific action that would end in a paradox and break the design of the code, causing the machine to stop. But our universe always resolves any instance and resolves it linearly (only one option observably occurs). There can never be a paradox within this universe. This limitation, and perhaps, imperfection (because it constrains what this universe is capable of) limits our thinking and perspective.

**Falsification, Verification** **and Conclusion**

We know that when attempting to formulate a theory it is useful to have something falsifiable. This is often something that can be observed under specific conditions and upon the absence of this predicted thing or event then the theory can be discarded. The primary source of falsifiable evidence in this paper is its internal logical validity. However, there is a route that is almost certainly falsifiable and absolutely verifiable.

 Unlike most other philosophical arguments on a cosmic scale, there are several potentially observable real-world effects. The first and most obvious of these is the existence of other universes or ‘omniverse phenomena’, however this is not yet observable, so we shall move on. Omniverse phenomena are events that arise from omniverse forces or entities interacting with this universe, which may or may not occur in this universe depending on which infinite permutation we exist in. In many ways these would only highlight that there is more to reality tha our universe and only serve to verify (not falisify) the theory.

 The better observable effect emerges from the expression of absolute infinity. There are two types of infinite expression, or from the perspective of our universe, the two types of apparently random occurrence we can observe. Our universe does not appear random to us, it has maintained stable expansion for over 13 billion years. However, from the perspective of the multiverse, our universe is one random potential playing out its probabilities. This is a direct analogy to ‘vok radiation’, which appears to be random to us but from the multiverse’s view, it is just part of a wider structure of infinity. Vok particles are the name we can give to our universe’s the most basic building blocks. These may well be the fundamental particles of the standard model or if modern physics is incomplete, they could be part of a wider range of particles or sub-particles of what we consider to be the universe’s fundamental particles. Reminiscent of the conclusions of our earlier elephant analogy, imagine an array of lightbulbs 1 billion lightbulbs tall and 1 billion lightbulbs wide. Now we create a universe for every different combination of these lights being on or off. If you picked one of these at random, or even a billion of these at random, the likelihood that any one of the universes you picked is the one universe with all the lightbulbs off is so small as to be essentially impossible.

 Now, if this universe is part of infinite similar and identical universes you would expect there to be infinite universes with every possible variation of fundamental particles ‘randomly’ appearing and disappearing. Very occasionally, some larger combination may appear or exist for slightly longer than the shortest possible time but otherwise it is fundamental particles appearing and immediately disappearing. Therefore, like the lightbulbs, the likelihood that we exist in a universe with all the lightbulbs off is incredibly close to zero. Therefore, we can predict that this must be happening in this universe, which would look remarkably similar to zero-point radiation or quantum fluctuations that have been predicted in physics. However, while they may look random to a physicist, in the bigger multiversal picture, they simply identify our universe. So, if you were to somehow take our universe and all of its many worlds quantum branches (if they exist) and precisely mapped this universe from the beginning of time to its end, the vok radiation would create a fingerprint or barcode that would identify it from other almost identical universes, which may only differ by just one vok particle 35 trillion years in the future (given that there will always be infinite absolutely identical universes).

 While failing to find these particles does not disprove the theory and is technically only verifiable, the likelihood that the theory is falsified is infinitely high. From the model presented in this section, it would seem so incredibly probable that there will be ‘vok’ radiation everywhere that it is almost indistinguishable from falsification at tackling the theory. Barring the possibilities that we are in the truly tiny (yet infinite) number of universes with no vok radiation or that by chance we do not see it wherever we look, there are still reasons why we may not find it, however unlikely.

 Therefore, I propose that our universe is a manifestation of absolute infinity, which in turn is a manifestation of absolute nothing. Considering that the universe may have been created by absolute nothing, it is possible that what humans are beginning to call the big bang of our universe was this event. Perhaps the big bang was responsible for the multiverse or even the polyverse. Alternatively, the event that spawned this universe may be in relative isolation and just relate to this universe and may not be part of the ‘initial’ absolute infinity and the ‘bigger bang’ that created it. Though time is somewhat irrelevant here as the multiverse would be as eternal as absolute nothing.

 This is where a priori logic moves from relative structure to the realm of uncertainty. While we can reason that infinity exists, we cannot reason where this universe sits within that superstructure. Was the big bang triggered by a realization of absolute nothing or a resulting internal development of the omniverse? We may well even be part of a joined multiverse and polyverse that could provide a new age of exploration and provide access to a portion of infinity (a portion of these universes and instances in infinity are going to be unreachable by nature of absolute infinity, which would be a problem if we are within one of those universes).

**Gods**

 This paper set out to prove the existence of all Gods. In this theory all Gods are an ironically unnecessary entity as this universe, multiverse, polyverse and omniverse require no first mover or designer. Similarly, this is also no disproof for a being supposed to be beyond the curious hand of the human intellect. However, the real issue with God is that there are far too many definitions for it to be a valid concept in any scientific sense. Even within each religion there are numerous denominations with their own unique interpretation. Then beyond that each believer often has a very personal interpretation of God, supported by, rather than dictated by scripture. Therefore, temporarily forgoing other difficulties, it is a problem with no panacea because it is impracticable to identify and evaluate every type of God’s abilities and criteria.

 On the other hand, an interesting phenomenon does appear within the construct presented above. So, when evaluating these phenomena, I shall not call them the God of any religion, as I feel this is a more personal interpretation and thus we shall work from what it is. The entity that comes through the logic is not a perfect fit for any current major world religion.

 To make your own decision, this logic consists of two main phenomena related to absolute infinity. The first of these is simply that everything exists. This includes an infinite array of ‘godlike beings’ of varying (and identical) levels of power and infinite variety of relationships with each other. Infinite of these beings will not have any influence over any universe or multiverse. Infinite of these beings will have their own universe or series of universes. There will also be infinite godlike beings with control over all universes and multiverses, however due to the nature of the omniverse, despite their omnipotence or omnipresence there will always be universes they don’t have control over by necessity of infinity resolving every possibility, despite the apparent paradox.

 This aspect of infinite different and identical deities existing within infinity is an interesting conundrum, especially as they will lie at all points along a human moral spectrum as well as entirely separate from it. The important problem is that despite this infinite array of infinitely powerful entities, there is no way of knowing if this universe is under the patronage of one or more of these entities and how far that influence would even extend.

 The second phenomena is simply a second perspective, when considering that absolutely everything is created by absolute nothing then absolute nothing essentially fulfils many of the roles of a creator god. Though it may be ironic that the entity responsible for everything is the purest definition of nothing, we can also remember that absolute nothing is synonymous with absolute infinity. Another way that a phenomenon could be associated with the title of God would be interpreting the omniverse itself as a god. It represents a consciousness is quite unlike anything we can comprehend. There is a link here with the fundamental philosophy behind some forms of Hinduism, in that it commonly represents its God as being one with the universe. As well as having infinite other Gods that are aspects of the one overall God (absolute infinity) as shown in the first phenomena. These infinite gods are supposed to represent different aspects of the universe, which seems to slot reasonably well into the model presented above. However, beyond these similarities there does not seem to be a great deal extra to draw from Hinduism (to my limited knowledge).

 Also, in a way, all religions are correct (as well as atheism as no god would also be a part of the absolute infinity), the key factor is whether they apply to this universe or not. Beyond the strenuous fit of Hinduism, there is no way of telling if this universe happens to be one with a god, and if so, what that god is and what influence it has. Or equally importantly, how many there are.

 A third perspective is that absolute nothing reveals a fundamental weakness, flaw or imperfection in the traditionally omnipotent, omniscient and benevolent god. This does not undermine the existence of such a being but rather that the historical vision that God has now been shown to be an insufficient description as that definition is still dependent on itself for its own existence, which absolute nothing does not. Perhaps a better definition of the traditional god of the Abrahamic faiths is that of absolute nothing.

**Hope and Horror**

This perspective also brings existential horror when considering the problem of evil, that an all-powerful and all loving God would not permit evil to exist. Absolute infinite, by definition, must paradoxically stretch infinitely further than any benevolent and omnipotent god can reach. It must also come up against infinite infinitely powerful forces trying to stop it. Therefore, evil may continue to exist or thrive in our universe because it is forever out of that God’s reach. Equally, a benevolent all-powerful God may realise that despite how much they act out of compassion to make the omniverse a better place it will always be in vain. Much like Sisyphus eternally pushing a boulder up a mountain. The God may realise that no matter how hard it works the universe will always be full of infinite evil and cruelty, so why bother? Carry on or not, the outcome is identical, absolute infinity demands it.

 But, from a certain point of view, there is still hope. If this universe was created by an all-powerful God that wanted to create a universe where the life it has created is always unable to know its creator (outside of ‘faith’). If so, then this universe is remarkably like that universe. No matter how far we strive and how close we come, we can never prove that God exists.

On a brief note, it is also worth considering that the afterlife, reincarnation or some alternate belief system all do occur somewhere in infinity but it is impossible to say whether it is this universe or not. A version of you living an identical life will cease to exist, reincarnate or go into many different types of afterlife for many different reasons. For example, in the universes with a heaven-like afterlife, there may be no barrier to entry, perhaps it would be based on strict muslim sharia or perhaps it requires punching a jellyfish when there is a full moon followed by your own death within the next 46 seconds. Good or evil play no role in the expression of infinity, where morality can come to mean anything. We can make some progress to the answer using a similar approach as we applied on vok radiation. If every possibility is occurring in the multiverse then this would most likely imply very arbitrary rules of entry that you could never predict because they would appear random from our perspective would be more a symptom of infinity than any innate justice or order in the universe. Equally, it would seem probable that if there is an afterlife there is no barrier to entry, but no guarantee that it would be forever, or somewhere you would want to be. Either way, there will be infinite copies of you with every form of afterlife awaiting them, but will it be this version of you?