

## Essay

# Something versus Nothing

Himangsu S. Pal\*

### ABSTRACT

In this essay, I argue that even if the Universe started from nothing as claimed by some scientists and not from something as claimed by the believers, the inevitable conclusion is that in both cases there must have to be some sort of Consciousness at the beginning. I will also argue that if Universal Consciousness (God) created this Universe and if It wanted man to be the master of Its creation, then Universal Consciousness would willingly choose to be the “God of the Gaps”. So it is quite logical that Universal Consciousness which created man with some purpose will always prefer to be the God of the Gaps.

**Keywords:** Universal Consciousness, something, nothing, light, spaceless, timeless, origin, Universe, God.

## 1. Something versus Nothing

I argued previously that The Whole will be spaceless and timeless by logical necessity alone. This idea has been caricatured by someone by showing that nothing is also spaceless and timeless. But there is a difference between nothing being spaceless and timeless and something being the same. For nothing it is quite obvious and self-explanatory that it will be spaceless and timeless; because in nothing there will be simply nothing, no space and no time. But when we say that something is spaceless and timeless, it is not so obvious. We will have to give adequate reason as to why it is spaceless and timeless. The reason that I have given is that if this something is The Whole, then it will be spaceless and timeless by logical necessity. So we cannot equate a nothing that is spaceless and timeless by virtue of it being nothing with a something that is spaceless and timeless by virtue of it being The Whole.

Still, let us agree that nothing can also be spaceless and timeless, and that the person who has said this has not said it with any bad intension, that is, there was no mockery. Now I will proceed with this nothing and show that if the universe has started from nothing, then also this initial nothing must have to have consciousness.

We have seen that not only The Whole, but nothing as well will have the properties of spacelessness and timelessness. So instead of saying that the Universe has started from The Whole we can as well say that it has started from nothing. But still there will be a difference. First I will repeat my old arguments here in a slightly new form:

1. In this universe nothing as well as The Whole will have the properties of spacelessness and timelessness by logical necessity alone.

---

\* Correspondence: Himangsu S. Pal, Independent Researcher, India. E-Mail: [sekharpal@rediffmail.com](mailto:sekharpal@rediffmail.com)

2. If the universe has started from nothing, then nothing other than the initial nothing will have the properties of spacelessness and timelessness.
3. But in this universe we find that light, in spite of it not being nothing, is still having the properties of spacelessness and timelessness.
4. This can only happen if, and only if, the initial nothing itself has purposefully given its own properties to light, in order to make its presence known to us through light.
5. But for that the initial nothing must have to have consciousness.
6. From above, we can come to the following conclusion: the fact that light, in spite of it not being nothing, still possesses the properties of spacelessness and timelessness, is itself a sufficient proof for the fact that the universe has started from a conscious nothing, and that this conscious nothing is none other than Universal Consciousness.

So, even if it is claimed by some scientists that the Universe actually started from nothing, and not from something as claimed by the believers, the inevitable conclusion is that in both the cases there must have to be some sort of Consciousness at the beginning.

But there is a slight difference here. Properties of light can be far better explained in a Universe that has started from a conscious TW, but not so easily in a universe originated from a conscious nothing. This is only due to the fact that light has got some baffling properties. It is beyond our comprehension as to why even an infinite distance will have to be reduced to zero for anything at all. But for light this infinite distance is actually reduced to zero. This incomprehensible thing becomes quite comprehensible if we come to know that there is a Being who is infinite in extension and all-pervading. For such a Being no distance, however great, is at all a distance, because that Being is not only everywhere, but equally everywhere. For this Being even infinite distance is zero, because being present equally everywhere at the same time It cannot feel this distance at all. One cannot be distant from its own self. Our consciousness is not all-pervading within our body; that is why we feel that there is a distance between our head and other parts of our body. The infinite Being can be accommodated easily within a conscious something, but not at all within a conscious nothing.

Another point to be noted here is that, since in nothing there is nothing, it cannot have any consciousness. So the inevitable conclusion is that the universe can in no way originate from a conscious nothing, but only from a conscious something.

Therefore, we have seen that light is having some most uncommon properties that cannot be found in anything at all other than light. One such property I have already mentioned above (infinite distance becoming zero for light). And we have shown that these uncommon properties of light cannot be explained properly until and unless we posit some sort of consciousness at the beginning of the universe. But atheistic scientists may not agree. They will say, as they have said earlier in many other cases also, and demonstrated as well, that instead of having a supernatural explanation, properties of light might have some natural explanation that they will be able to give

in near future. But there is a proverb in English: Nothing succeeds like success. So let them first successfully demonstrate that there is really such an explanation. Then only we will stop arguing for Universal Consciousness.

The person who has written that nothing is spaceless and timeless has also written that it is not the case that anything is timeless, and that there is no Universal Consciousness. If science shows that at the speed of light time becomes unreal, then it is quite natural for us to think that time is perhaps unreal somewhere, and that perhaps due to that reason scientists have shown as to how time can become unreal. But he is saying that that is not the case at all. Time becoming unreal at light speed does not mean that time is unreal somewhere. Nothing is timeless, and there is no Universal Consciousness. So I think that I should add some more lines to my above article, and it is here:

So far as I can remember, I list below two relations in special theory of relativity:

$$l_1 = l(1-v^2/c^2)^{1/2} \dots\dots (1)$$

$$t_1 = t((1-v^2/c^2)^{1/2} \dots\dots (2)$$

From the above two relations, two conclusions can be drawn that are as follows:

- 1) Time and distance are not absolute, they are relative;
- 2) At light speed, both time and distance become unreal.

Now reality may be such that:

- 1) Time and distance are only relative, but nowhere unreal (A),
- 2) Time and distance are relative as well as unreal (somewhere) (B).

If reality is A, then the above two equations are not at all required to represent that reality; it may be equally represented by the following two relations:

$$l_1 = l(1-v^2/xc^2)^{1/2} \dots\dots (3)$$

$$t_1 = t((1-v^2/xc^2)^{1/2} \dots\dots (4)$$

In (3) and (4) above, x will have a value greater than one but less than infinity. But it cannot have a value equal to one or infinity. If value of x is one, then we will go back to Einstein's equations, whereas if its value equals infinity, then we will have Newton's equations instead. From (3) and (4) above, it can clearly be seen that time and distance will be relative as before, but they will never be unreal even at the speed of light due to the presence of the factor 1/x in the equations. Newton's equations have been rejected because now we have come to realize that there are no such things as absolute space or absolute time. If reality is A, but not B, then time has also come to reject Einstein's equations as well, and to replace them with (3) and (4) above. Einstein's

equations will be required if, and only if, it is agreed upon that somewhere out there there is a region where space and time are unreal (an ideal abode for a spaceless and timeless Universal Consciousness).

My comments here are:

1) Instead of being vague, scientists should be more specific. If they want to convey to us that space and time are only relative, but nowhere unreal, then scientists should know how to convey only that much information to us, and nothing more than that. After so many years of its genuine crusade against all sorts of religions, why should science transform itself to a new kind of esoteric religion now, requiring its own high priests for its proper interpretation to others?

2) Scientists should clarify things. Its job is not to create confusion. But by showing that a massless being can be immortal, science has only created unnecessary confusion amongst us.

3) If time is not really unreal anywhere and nothing is timeless, why was it necessary for scientists to show how time could be really unreal? But these types of questions could no longer be asked. Instead we should blindly follow the dictum of science.

4) If we live in a Universe in which time is nowhere unreal, then how does it become imperative for us to know as to how time can become unreal? How does our knowledge of the external world increase by that tiny bit of knowledge provided by the scientists when at the same time we are told by the same scientists that time is actually nowhere unreal?

## **2. Some Thoughts on Universal Consciousness**

In this section, I argue that starting from Copernicus up to the present day science has not conclusively proven that there is no Universal Consciousness.

Before I start, I will have to settle another matter. We can remember well what Laplace had said to Napoleon when he was asked by the emperor as to why he had not mentioned God in his book. His answer was: *Je n'avais pas besoin de cette hypothese* (I had no need of that hypothesis). Paul Davies had written that this is still scientists' stand on God, that is, they are in no need of any God-hypothesis.

But why will scientists need any God-hypothesis at all? Obviously in order to explain certain things. When some scientists say that they do not need any God-hypothesis, they are actually saying that Universal Consciousness (God) is not the explanation for the things we find in nature, and that Universal Consciousness is not the explanation for the origin of the Universe as well. By openly admitting that they do not need any God-hypothesis for explaining things, they are admitting that they are actually making Universal Consciousness jobless. If Universal Consciousness does exist, It definitely would have done something. Definitely It would have created the Universe, and after its creation, perhaps would have intervened as well. It cannot be the case that Universal Consciousness will be simply there as a mere Observer, and that the Universe will run its course on its own. But if it can be shown that everything in this Universe,

including its coming into existence also, can be explained without invoking Universal Consciousness, then that will simply prove that Universal Consciousness has done nothing.

But as per an atheist philosopher, a nothing-doing Universal Consciousness is a non-existent Universal Consciousness. As scientists are trying to prove that this Universal Consciousness is a nothing-doing Universal Consciousness, therefore it can safely be said that they are actually trying to prove that Universal Consciousness does not exist. So if I have said that scientists' ultimate aim is to prove that there is no Universal Consciousness, then I have said nothing wrong. As this is their ultimate aim, so in none of their endeavors can they take it for granted that Universal Consciousness's non-existence is a well-established and proven fact, and then make that their basis for proving something else. Because then the whole thing will boil down to this: scientists are trying to prove that Universal Consciousness does not exist on the basis of their assumption that Universal Consciousness does not exist. Perhaps even a horse will laugh on hearing this if it can somehow come to understand our language.

This much being said I will now proceed further to show that the only proof that can be given for Universal Consciousness's non-existence is a natural explanation for the origin of the universe (NEFOU). We can never think of a Universal Consciousness who is also not the creator of the universe. Here I have used the word 'never' for one time only. But I could have used that word for billion times as well. Universal Consciousness will never be a proper Universal Consciousness if He has not actually created the universe. We can even say that the word 'Universal Consciousness' is a synonym for the word 'creation'. So we can with absolute certainty say that Universal Consciousness means creation. But we cannot with equal certainty say that Universal Consciousness means divine intervention also. Because Universal Consciousness could have created the universe in such a manner that no further divine intervention in the created world would be needed at all. We do not know, and we can never know. There is no way to ascertain the truth-value of the following statement:

“Universal Consciousness, if He is really Universal Consciousness, will not only create a universe, but also poke His nose into His creation without fail.”

So we can always be sure that if there is a Universal Consciousness, then this universe will definitely be His creation. But we can never be sure as to whether there will be divine intervention as well in the universe after its creation. Or, if there was intervention at all, then in which particular cases were those interventions. Did He intervene for creating life from non-life? Did He intervene for separating human species from chimpanzees? We do not know. We can never know. As there will always be some uncertainty regarding Universal Consciousness's intervention in the created world, therefore no natural explanation of any phenomenon, any fact or any event in the created world can prove with absolute certainty that there is no Universal Consciousness. Therefore if somebody claims that Darwin's theory of evolution has proved that Universal Consciousness does not exist, or that Crick-Watson's discovery of double helix has proved that Universal Consciousness does not exist, or that some other scientific discovery has proved beyond any reasonable doubt that Universal Consciousness does not exist, then I will only say that these are all nonsensical arguments that have been put forward so far as genuine proof for Universal Consciousness's non-existence. But, if we find that scientists have been able to give a NEFOU, we will have to reckon it as a genuine and conclusive proof for Universal

Consciousness's non-existence, because we have already said that Universal Consciousness means creation. Scientists have already given a theory that states that the universe has originated from nothing due to the vacuum energy fluctuation in a void but we cannot accept it as a genuine scientific theory, because here what is intended to be proved has been proved based on the assumption that it has already been proved. The assumption by the scientists that the void is a real void only means that. As scientists have not yet been able to give any alternative theory for the origin of the universe in which Universal Consciousness will have no part to play, therefore we are of the opinion that scientists have done nothing so far that can conclusively prove that Universal Consciousness does not exist.

### **3. Universal Consciousness of the Gaps**

I will begin this essay with two postulates: 1) Universal Consciousness has created this universe; 2) He has brought man in this universe with some purpose.

I am not claiming here that these two postulates are true, or that I can prove them to be true. But I want to show here that if these two postulates are true, then Universal Consciousness will always be the Universal Consciousness of the gaps. Anyone who will be reading this essay should not forget that there is an "if" clause in the last sentence.

Now I will begin with the supposition that Universal Consciousness has created this universe. If Universal Consciousness has created this universe, then He could have created it in four different ways: 1) He created it in such a way that there was no necessity for Him to intervene in it after creation, 2) After creation He intervened in it, but these interventions were a bare minimum, that is, He intervened only when these were absolutely necessary. In order to clarify my point here, I will say that He intervened only when He found that without His intervention the universe would come to a standstill, 3) He created the universe in such a way that in order to keep it going He had to make very frequent interventions in it, 4) Universal Consciousness's total intervention after creation.

If it was the purpose of Universal Consciousness to keep mankind crippled in every possible way, then He would have adopted either the third or the fourth way while creating the universe. This is because in these two cases man, in spite of his having sufficient intelligence and reasoning power, will fail to unveil the secrets of nature, because in almost every phenomenon of nature that he will decide to study he will ultimately find that there always remains an unknown factor, for which he will have no explanation. For him the book of nature will thus remain closed for ever. But if it were Universal Consciousness's purpose that man be master of His creation, then it is quite natural for Him that He would try to keep the book of nature as much open to him as possible, so that with the little intelligence he has been endowed with man will be able to decipher the language of nature, and with that acquired knowledge he will also be able to improve the material conditions of his life. In that case Universal Consciousness will try to adopt the policy of maximum withdrawal from His creation. He will create the universe in such a way that without His intervention the created world will be able to unfold itself. However, that does not mean that He will never intervene. He will definitely intervene when without His intervention the created world would become stagnant. In such a scenario man will be able to give an

explanation of almost all physical events in scientific language. But in those cases where Universal Consciousness has actually intervened, he will fail to do so.

So I think there is no reason for us to be ashamed of the "Universal Consciousness of the gaps" hypothesis. Yes, if Universal Consciousness has created the universe, and if Universal Consciousness's purpose was that man be master of His creation, then He would try to keep as little gap in His creation as possible. But the minimum gap that would be ultimately left can never be bridged by any sort of scientific explanation. Universal Consciousness will also reside in that gap. Why should we be ashamed of that?

The whole matter can be seen from another angle. Those who strongly believe that Universal Consciousness has created this universe also believe that He has created it alone. Now is it believable that a Universal Consciousness, who is capable of creating such a vast universe alone, is not capable enough to keep a proof of His existence in the created world? So I think it is more reasonable to believe that while creating the universe Universal Consciousness has also kept a proof of His existence in something created. This proof is open to us all, but we have not found it, because we have not searched for it. So even if it is the case that Universal Consciousness has never intervened in the created world after its creation, still then there will be a gap in this natural world, purposefully left by Universal Consciousness, for which science will find no explanation. This will be the ultimate gap that can only be filled up by invoking Universal Consciousness.

So it is quite logical that a Universal Consciousness who will create man with some purpose will always prefer to be the Universal Consciousness of the gaps. Yes, if we were really created by some Universal Consciousness, and if it was not Universal Consciousness's desire that we be some sort of semi-savage beast, then it makes quite a good sense if I say that in that case Universal Consciousness would try to keep the book of nature as much open to us as possible (policy of maximum withdrawal). In such a case man will also be able to explain almost everything of nature without invoking Universal Consciousness. But then this "ability to explain almost everything of nature without invoking Universal Consciousness" will not prove that there is no Universal Consciousness, because it might also be the case that this ability itself is Universal Consciousness's design, Universal Consciousness's plan.

Let me give one example. Let A be one most obvious fact of nature, and let D be one natural phenomenon that follows from A. Let us also suppose that D does not directly follow from A, but there are some intermediate steps. A causes B, then B causes C, then C causes D. In order to be more precise here let us say that A means dark clouds gathering in the sky, and that D means lightning. We know very well that lightning does not always take place whenever there are dark clouds in the sky. So we will modify the above chain from A to D in this way: A causes B, but B does not always cause C. Instead of C, it sometimes causes C1. When B causes C1, there is no lightning. But when B causes C, in that case only lightning occurs.

Now it might be the case that there is a Universal Consciousness, and that after creating the universe He has not intervened in it at all. So, all the processes from A to D will be natural. In that case if man wills then one day he will be able to understand the whole natural process here. He will understand what lightning is, how and when it occurs, and with that knowledge it can be hoped that one day he will also be able to protect himself and his property from lightning.

Now let us suppose that after creation Universal Consciousness has frequently intervened in his creation, but his intervention is not total, but only partial. Let us also suppose that Universal Consciousness has chosen the above case of lightning for His intervention. That means lightning can never take place unless He wills. When He decides to punish mankind by sending lightning, then only B can cause C, otherwise in every other case B causes C1. In this case the whole chain from A to D will be broken at B. Man will never understand how B can naturally cause C, and so he will never understand how D naturally follows from A. So lightning will forever remain a mystery to him.

Now let us suppose that Universal Consciousness's intervention in this universe is total, that is, behind every natural phenomenon there is the hand of Universal Consciousness. In that case man will understand nothing of nature, and he will remain as ignorant as a savage. In this world his fate will be no better than birds and beasts, and his condition will remain as miserable and helpless as those birds and beasts in front of natural calamities.

But if Universal Consciousness wills that man be almost equal to Him in the knowledge of things in nature, and if He also wills that man live in this world with some dignity and not like birds and beasts, then He will create the universe in such a way that almost all the phenomena in nature can take place naturally without His intervention. In that case He will adopt the policy of maximum withdrawal. He will intervene only in those cases where His intervention is absolutely necessary. One such case is genetic code. Genetic code is information code, and those who believe that there is a Universal Consciousness try to make a point here.

It is said that information code cannot naturally arise from space, time, force, field, matter and energy. Some intelligence is required, and nature does not possess that intelligence. Only Universal Consciousness possesses that intelligence, and therefore only Universal Consciousness can generate information code. If what is said is true, then I will say that man will never understand how information code can arise from space, time, force, field, matter and energy. It will forever remain a mystery to him.

My thesis presented here has at least one merit. It can successfully explain as to why nature has opened her secrets to man, whereas proponents of accidental origin of man cannot give any reason as to why nature has done so. If their theory was correct, then man also could have led a life just like other higher primates; chimpanzees, bonobos, gorillas and orangutangs. That man has not done so and that instead he has been able to raise a civilization and lead a life with some dignity and self-respect shows that nature has taken a special care for us and equipped our brain accordingly.



## References

Pal, H. S. (2010), Timeless & Climax. Scientific God Journal, V1(7): pp. 492-496.