Did early mathematics know about God: Harvard's Project 0

By Dawood MAMOON [†]

Abstract. A long history of conflict as is in detail covered by Huntington (2007) between religious thought among different cultures have created disenfranchisement to the concept of divinity and it is seen to be in contrast to modernism and science. The paper rectifies this conflict by suggesting early reference to God was the very outcome of a scientific mind not restricted to any one culture.
Keywords. Divinity, Cultural Exchange.
JEL. L24, N70, N75.

1. Introduction: A non linear understanding of God

Mathematical Paradox simply proves that God is '0' and 'infinity' or unknown till '1' can identify it to best of its qualitative observations par imagination: What can be a '0' and 'infinity' may also take the value '1', while that value '1' can only be fully realized when we either know '0' (the exact point of origin) or 'infinity' (the supposedly value of impossibility). Thus we cannot know God till we know it all and we can never know it all because the best science we know of is mathematics, which simply suggests that value of infinity can never be known. Thus we remain 3 dimensional space observations of ourselves and we are merely identifying God only through our own selves, while not capable of knowing what we just cannot know because of a 3 dimensional space limitations of our existence, though we can only imagine to recognize a set of such further but still limited possibilities to realize the authenticity of a simple law that God would remain as a singular identity of infinite possibilities. We at best try to understand some of relatively defined and logically perceived infinite possibilities of his existence by identifying some of the self relevant characteristics of God mostly for self correctness (please note that here 'his' is a practiced metaphor and can be switched by a 'her' but that in no way is to paint any kind of human color to God). In Arabic though, Allah has no gendered noun identification, and it's a limitation of English expressionism God is not the best of substitute of Allah as God is a linguistic cleche' in English language representing the ancient Roman practice to identify with their kings as Sons of God. In contrast, Allah in Arabic is an expression to identify with Al (what is) and Lah (What is not), an abstract but very logical understanding as to what God really is. Here for the simplification of English readership word God corresponds to Allah.

Following, I initiate a brief argumentation to identify the mathematical synonym to what it may mean by Allah or when Quran says Allah is a singular concept of infinite set of possibilities and characters. The argumentation carried out below is in context of finding the origin of a reality which existed before any thing known and perceived by humans today did exist and all that is to know what was the that '0' point from where all started. Following you would find a lucid

[†] World Economic Survey Expert Group, Pakistan.
☎. +0092 51 5730280 ext 258
✉. dawoodmamoon96@gmail.com

explanation that finding that origin, one may only just prove the singularity (oneness) of God (Allah/Ellah) and how infinitely beautiful the concept is even if you just play a numbers game.

'1' how we understand it in a simple counting practice has a value which corresponds to character differentiation of an observation relative to its original point of reference. '1' is an estimated observation for a deterministic or identifiable existence. To our cognition '0' can only be identifiable by '1', and that would be only if we know that there is an observable '1'. Thus '1' attests and identifies itself only through '0', whereas to think of it '0' is not dependable on '1', rather '1' is dependable on '0'. In mathematics of number identification plus (+) and minus (-) may only refer to qualitative directions of identifications. However in a series of whole numbers there are no minus (-) values, which suggest that the point of origin in nature would always remain '0' in its quantitative or qualitative and deterministic or abstract forms. Nevertheless, once '0' is deterministic, there cannot be negative values to a mathematical series of number identifications. Only that in most integrating or differentiating analysis of real life observations, '0' is not really deterministic but mostly relative to the very surroundings and thus we need to identify numbers with explanatory values of addition or subtraction by means of + and -. Hence we move to integers rather than whole numbers to solve qualitative and quantitative notions of various universal observations.

Above is 3 dimensional basis of mathematics. But if I say God takes the value 0, how should one may deduct the exact understanding of the expression? As we know the abstract majesty of God, well explained to us through qualitative and quantitative notions of human cognition over thousands of years of recorded human history, we are able to understand well that God with representation of '0' only refers towards an effort for our own identification as '1', may it be our own life if we think it is significantly different than others; 21st century if we think this time is significant than previous ones or coming ones; evolution of humanity till today if we think humans are the best natural outcome of life; evolution of life on earth if we identify biology with life; formation of our galaxy or others if we claim to understand as mentioned in Quran that even the stars and their derivatives dance on the set tunes to follow a set identified path of submission to the divine force; or the very initiation of this universe with a big bang if we think that universe must have a origin and thus entails some minimal of a multidimensional concept of existence as a 3 dimensional event of expansion. Thus we, who all contain a singular DNA characteristics and is '1' specie/creation of an abstract and also '1' God, are able to identify ourselves, yet still only be able to identify God through our own three dimensional understanding of the universe .

Interestingly in a three dimensional space where we exist, at one point in time to identify '0' or infinity, one may need a '1', while both '0' and infinity do not depend on '1' to take a certain value as '0' and infinity are both the same with values unknown to us in multidimensional space of qualitative identification of observations which should be true to a multidimensional universe utilized as a theoretical axiom in advance mathematics. The value of infinity is known if '1' is divided by that unknown number where it perfectly gives 0 for infinite iterations. Since simple additive counting of numbers suggests infinite or unknown possibilities of some infinite number solution may never be known to us as it is simply beyond our cognitive and spatial capacities. Thus, we only simplify to our best of knowledge and imagination as to convincingly assume to observe a '1' in a time sensitive three dimensional universe while making big bang our point of reference as the origin of the universe, while also knowing that the value of infinity can only be identified if we know what was '0', while also both being impossibilities as we neither know infinity and neither do we deterministically know what was before big bang initiated. Though one can question the validity of big bang by introducing a ring theory, where '0' and 'infinity' becomes same as the universe is moving in a time sensitive ring where even time takes the net change value of '0', here I would not challenge the larger wisdom in physics which

substantiates the expansion of the universe as well as a start of the universe from a certain point of reference, but simple present the following mathematical paradox to substantiate my line of argument.

if 1/infinity = 0
1/0=infinity
then 1=0 x infinity

Here, we know that anything multiplied by '0' is '0'. It only takes infinite products of '0s' to make a '1' or it takes just a product of single '0' to make infinity equal to '1'. Thus here knowing the value of 0 is to know the value of infinity and then also to know what '1' stands for. Thus above is the mathematical expression of God's singularity. A simple mathematical rule of division would introduce a paradox to mathematics, once it was considered what number if put in a denominator would make a '1 = 0', and a simple realization was that '1' has to be divided by infinity to have a perfect '0' even if iterations of division are undertaken for infinite times as,

1/infinity=0.0000.......infinite0s=0

In other words it is just all 0s here, which just substantiates the fact that '0' is the basic code of God which even beats the mathematics, as we know of.

To know God a bit better, one has to delve into randomness, where the possibilities of unknown beat best of the human and what is known to him. And we delve into randomness for every day we live, every word we speak, and for every thought we think.

The words we speak are just sounds, and thoughts we think are just images of our daily observations, while they all only matter to the time we live in, otherwise our imaginations or our newly developed linguistic expressions may just mean nothing for some one who is not familiar with our language and who would neither associate with our self defined, self composed or self learned colors of surroundings. If so then it would become all the more interesting that every one of us, who at one point in time, say today, are 6 billion in numbers, would still remain equally significant to God. And here, I am just talking about the Earth how we know it, then also why not to imagine what possibilities one may discover if the entire universe with varying time sensitive capacities is taken into account while also not going beyond what we just simply cannot know and that is the exact point of reference to '0' and an exact number value to 'infinity'? So let's imagine to our capacities to find God with a mathematical limitation of 'n' observable possibilities within multi dimension settings of the universe and once done, should we not also believe in our modest existence to only submit our ignorance against his majestic being?

References

Huntington, P.S. (2007). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, Simon and Schuster.