

The Point Of It All

*At the Big Bang, the Universe, everything, was created out of nothing - so we're told.
Alien Angel argues: how could it be otherwise?*

It now appears to be generally accepted throughout the scientific community that the universe did indeed grow out of a Big Bang, and that the general public is consequently being asked to accept, at face value, that we were therefore all created out of nothing

In trying to figure out exactly what this means, we come face to face with similar dilemmas that preoccupied the minds of Men when the revelations of quantum mechanics and special relativity ran into direct conflict with common sense, but which ultimately gave birth to Modern Physics.

Our present dilemma is - how can something come out of nothing? It just does not make sense, however hard we try to believe it. Not only that, but we realize, on closer examination, that there are a number of keywords which, when taken together, only serve to confuse us further, and so make the task of unravelling the puzzle that much more perplexing.

Those words are: existence, non-existence, space, nothing. Force is another word that makes us go dry at the mouth, and all the physics in the world still fails to throw essential light on precisely what force really is, only how it manifests itself

Let us turn our question around, and instead of asking: can something be created out of nothing, to ask: can nothing to be created out of something?

Or is it more likely that both questions are really the two sides of the same coin?

Consider a coin spinning on its axis. Viewed from the side, the coin alternately disappears, immediately reappears, grows to a maximum size, then shrinks again to nothing and so on.

Of course, it hasn't shrunk at all. It merely looks as if it has

We ask ourselves: are there ultimate, fundamental truths that cannot be created, or thought up, designed or conceived, and that sit at the top, as it were, above which nothing can position itself as somehow more fundamental or essential to, or required for, the existence of anything else?

The universe, and everything contained in it, can be construed as a consequence of the wavelike interaction between existence and non-existence, an interaction that is governed by the rules of Boolean algebra – a system of symbolic logic devised to codify nonmathematical logical operations. A boundary separates the Universe from whatever lies the other side of the boundary. Nothing?

Existence is energy - but energy facing a particular direction [for want of a better term]. Non-existence is energy facing in the opposite direction [whatever that might mean]

Non-existence of itself has no tangible properties. Of itself, non-existence has need of neither space nor time. It is only when non-existence presents itself to existence that it then takes on properties with which we are familiar.

So what is it that pits existence against non-existence? The answer has to be contained in a simple, underlying fundamental truth that can neither be created, designed, thought up, conceived, postulated nor theorized.

There is no in-between stage; energy is either one or the other. The universe is a vibration with an upper and a lower value. As more vibrations come into being during the phase change, so the Boolean logic operations ensure that expansion occurs to make room for these new vibrations in accordance with its rules.

These binary logic operations are the modus operandi [raison d'etre] of multiverses, and are all present simultaneously.

Immediately following the big bang [which is a nodal peak/trough of the primary vibration], more and more secondary and tertiary vibrations etc. came into play to take on a life and meaning in accordance with Boolean logic. All subsequent vibrations stem from the fundamental vibration.

Simple, inevitable, and totally outside the control of anything. Everything - fundamental particles, atoms, molecules, cells, DNA, life, free will, intelligence - you name it - everything is explained by the interaction between energy which is polarized in equal and opposite directions, and which has no alternative but to obey the rules of Boolean logic and, in due course, the other numbering systems [quantum and magic numbers] and the fact that there are lots of occurrences of these.

Thus, the universe is one gigantic wave undergoing a phase change between non-existence and existence; i.e. it is making the transition from a trough to a peak. The big bang is the trough and so the universe is, for that point, one hundred percent non-existence [potential], but this is just as real as one hundred percent existence [complete]. The only thing that is not real is Nothing and that is the boundary enclosing the universe and whatever might lie the other side of it..

The vibration makes its way towards its peak, because existence is all the while pulling at non-existence until, at its peak, the universe is again one hundred percent existence. It is potential energy hurtling itself into kinetic energy and beyond, to once again become potential energy.

The flip from trough to peak is supposed to be instantaneous, because you can only have one or the other. And from the point of view of this single primal vibration, it surely is. The phase change should theoretically take place instantaneously without recourse to space or time. For one thing, the vibration itself knows nothing about either. But these things do become a feature of the universe, and that is due to the

spawning of all the little vibrations that get created, and the fact that their interference must comply with the rules imposed by Boolean logic.

Existence and non-existence are the two sides of the same coin. The next question is: why are the two in contention? The reason is due to the relationship between potential and kinetic energy.

Potential energy is energy in waiting. It is inert energy hanging around waiting for Nothing in particular. Think of a ball in your hand. It contains potential energy i.e. energy waiting to be converted into kinetic energy. When the ball is released, it falls. Finally, when it hits the earth, all its energy has been converted into kinetic energy which it hands straight back to the earth.

So potential energy is, in a sense, no energy. But what are its features when it isn't being contained within matter to give it form or substance? It is energy which, if you like, has been taken from the central pool. That central pool would like it back when it gets the chance. As if it is borrowed energy. The ball hangs on to it, but it can't do very much with it.

That's potential energy for you. But the ball only got this energy in the first place because something took the energy away from where it originally came from i.e. the earth. So the ball builds up a memory [more like a resentment] (or perhaps it's the earth that remains possessive) and wishes it to return from whence it came [back to the womb?].

Since everything originally came from the same zero point source, so some kind of memory of this is probably retained by everything, one manifestation of which is in the form of potential energy. Also, force enters the arena to impose its will and keep a lid on things, to stop things from getting away. So, everything has hooks into everything else. Or rather Mummy vibration is keeping a check on all her child vibrations. A bit like the umbilical cord, except that no cords are ever cut. Superstrings stretching the width of the universe? No longer a flight of fancy all of a sudden. Existence (or is it non-existence) simply keeping a tab on itself, keeping it all in the family. So when the first bits of matter [quarks] came into being, gluons, superstrings and gravitons all make sure they don't ever escape from each other's clutches

Having said all this, we now run into a few dilemmas that must have faced the universe prior to the moment of the Big Bang when it was one hundred percent non-existence. It is considered axiomatic that energy can neither be created nor destroyed. So much better if the energy does not exist in the first place, which would be true of a universe that is one hundred percent non-existence.

Unless of course?

Now, it is at this point that we take a few degrees north of centre and reorientate our discourse. What if it really is true that nothing can be created, and nothing can be destroyed? What does this say about the total energy content of the universe?

The point of it all is a universe having no mass and no energy. A positive mass this side of the origin would therefore mean an equivalent negative mass the other side of the origin. Positive mass, positive energy. Negative mass, negative energy.

Tachyon energy. Negative energy that the heavier it got, would hurtle ever faster and faster into itself until the crucial moment when it finally weighed nothing, but with infinite energy and so became one hundred percent non-existence; and which was feeling very pleased with itself.

And this essay will not be much appreciated by readers whose sense of humour has long disappeared down a black hole; like my Dad for instance.

In the beginning was Consciousness.

In the days when Consciousness ruled the far end of its spectrum as the only entity, and peace, solitude and tranquillity reigned, Consciousness had a thought. Not a big thought mind you, just a little one. What kind of a thought?

Well, Consciousness had a thought about Nothing in particular, actually.

But a thought nonetheless. And in the interval between thinking the thought and wondering what had just taken place, consciousness had another thought.

About Something else.

And this bothered Consciousness a little, because it hadn't until this moment conceptualised a means by which the two thoughts could be separated.

Consciousness suddenly realised it knew two things with absolute certainty. The first thing it realised it knew with absolute certainty was its position, and that was that it had no position. No position at all. The second thing it realised it knew with absolute certainty was when it was in that position – which was no time. No time at all.

But if this was true, then what could possibly serve to define the distinction between the two thoughts? At the moment of conceptualising the Great Paradox, consciousness realised it to be an impossible situation which can't be Nothing. It must therefore be Something.

In other words, there was Something in existence other than Consciousness.

‘oooooooooooooh!’ cried out Consciousness as the enormity of its predicament very quickly tightened its grip.

Consciousness had panicked. Furthermore, Nothing had suddenly become Something having as much uncertainty in the magnitude of its energy content as the certainty of its position which, in a space of Nothing, was absolute uncertainty, and therefore the magnitude of the energy content had to fluctuate somewhere between absolute certainty and absolute uncertainty.

Consciousness believed at the time, and with absolute certainty, that it had no energy (wrongly as it turned out), and having no energy served only to add further to the confusion, because it knew precisely when it had no energy. It was, however, impossible to know this with absolute certainty because consciousness had not yet defined the interval between its two thoughts, so time had not yet come into being.

Thus consciousness was now confronted with the realisation that there was absolute uncertainty in the extent of the timelessness. Thus, consciousness reasoned that it must have some energy, but precisely how much it could never know, only that it was probably no energy at all, since energy can neither be created nor destroyed, only you can never be too sure.

In summary, we can conclude that non-existence in the form of a very confused consciousness gave birth to existence, the primal vibration being a quantum fluctuation with a lifetime as enormous as its total energy was zero.

So it's not too difficult to form a mental picture of how one hundred percent non-existence and zero percent existence are going to behave in each other's company. In this case, however, there is Nothing between the two to get in the way. And since they both cancel each other out to give you Nothing, the scene is set for the perfect creation, but one with attitude.

More thoughts

We might ask ourselves, what kind of thought must Consciousness have had?

Well, it was nothing in particular actually.

No Thing. In particle You Are. (Yeh? Got it?)

At the time, Consciousness would not have known it was nothing more than a wave of probability. And what is this about particles? It is also possible that he was mourning the loss of his mother at the time; though at the time He would have had absolutely no idea what this meant.

We can however, safely assume that his field of vision would be darting from side to side like a crazy person trying to figure out what was going on and whether or not anyone was watching him. Consciousness had an observer.

And to all those non-believers who claim there is no God because how could an all loving, all powerful God create a world where there was so much misery. Well, let me tell you that God actually needs quite a bit of help in this area.

At the moment of realisation, He was not in the best of spirits, himself being pre-occupied with his new thoughts. In fact Consciousness was becoming conscious that he was awash with thoughts. In particular, that these thoughts may not necessarily be coming from his own consciousness.

Perhaps there was something else out there, something that He was not necessarily aware of. Was he becoming paranoid by any stretch of the imagination? Consciousness very quickly dismissed this one. 'I am the Supreme Being' countenanced Consciousness, 'and if anyone is going to be observing me, it is going to be me. I am quite capable of folding myself inside out, outside in,

Before anything can get done, we have to think it. It is all very well proclaiming that consciousness is the source rather than the end product of evolution, but we are talking about the dawn of creation and such an event must be treated with the respect it deserves. Our view of consciousness must embrace a cosmic landscape and introduces and absorbs that which so far no one has even dreamed of writing about.

Possibilities do not exist and as such can be viewed as non-existent. Moreover, possibilities that don't exist inside a region having no spatial or temporal dimensions do actually preclude impossibilities that simultaneously also don't exist which means that a real situation does exist.

Given this scenario, the question still arises, how can a particle actuality arise? Of course, once you have one single particular, the rest becomes history. To begin with what will distinguish the emergence of a particle actuality (existence) from a non-existent possibility as opposed to from a non-existent impossibility? After all, when one is talking about the creation or emergence of something from nothing, one has to conceptualise that which is capable of existing from that which is incapable of existing.

What does intelligence look like? Why is it innate? Why should intelligence or consciousness or being be the chosen words for the beginning of all that is? What hits our own minds with these words? What are we comparing them to? We seem to be living in a sea of consciousness. I can almost feel it. My body – the top of my brain – moving from the here and the now to the before and the beyond and if I am conscious at the level of the photon or of a superstring in a universe that is almost, but not quite, devoid of dimension, I can still look out and comprehend wonderment and awe and joy.

The poetry of life and existence suggests that this is possibly what always existed. Existence itself is awestruck with itself. It holds itself to be cosmically and

cosmologically complete. It must have said to itself – once many eons and epochs ago – how to contain the infinite universe in a finger tip, or in the look a beautiful woman might give you – just to let you know that you could be the centre of her Universe if you want to take the risk of discovering God but also of dying in the meantime.

And when was this beginning? Perhaps it was just a microsecond ago in the world of imagination and a sense that we each of us could live forever if only we could find the courage to look deep into our own subconscious where there is no time, no space, no boundaries. Perhaps we can feel or sense how Consciousness might have felt back in time before it too came into being, or rather came out of being.

Time and space came out of Being, did it not? Nothing came into being. It has all come out of Being. Now there's a revelation.

What is existence without space or time? It exists inside my head, but there is this boundary known as my head in which consciousness is confined and within which it is empowered to operate and alert me to its presence. No getting away from that. We conceptualise consciousness – intelligence - Being in the absence of boundary. How can this be so?

Thus we can move to a string or a photon and imagine consciousness as somehow embedded in the tiniest of tiny entities. What is it doing there? Why is it there? What does it hope to gain? Does consciousness have a choice? Can it cease to exist? Why do we insist that Consciousness never had a beginning which would hold true if time and space (which are the sides of the same coin) once did not exist?

Consciousness exists as a possibility rather than a non-possibility in a region or a boundless domain having no dimension. Boundaries are crucial to the material world. Without them, everything collapses into a state of total chaos. The Universe exists for us as humans, and humans need a world that makes sense and is the right size and everything.

In the absence of a boundary, consciousness only exists as a possibility and is therefore non-existent. It does however have the potential for actuality. The thought process must cause the impossible to become possible. At the moment, the thinking does not exist either. Something has to happen that brings about this movement.

If a computer program is presented with a 1 or a 0, it can ask the question: are you a 1 or a 0? Or the programmer can create a two dimensional array and extract the contents of the correct element by using the data as the subscript. In other words, it saves having to ask the question.

Therefore we can ask, what clever trick did consciousness employ to avoid asking any awkward questions that presume or require the existence of thought? Self reflection is in my view the same side of the coin and does not answer the conundrum. At some stage consciousness must have realised it was conscious this being the springboard and starting point for self-reflection. But before then?

What was the trump card held by a Universe that is 100% non-existence contained inside a region without boundaries having no dimensions that made me and you possible? What was the catalyst?

If we stand beside a bonfire and watch it burn, how can anyone in their right mind even suggest that God – or Consciousness – is in some strange and mystical way contained inside the fire? Somewhere along the line, humans lost sight of the obvious and attributed existence or whatever to the machinations and proclivities of an intelligent being. That God – or intelligence – or consciousness somehow came before all else! The Universe has done quite nicely thank you very much without any hint that a God might have had a hand in nuclear fusion or fission or in the births and deaths of stars or development of stars and galaxies.

Absolute conviction on the part of certain people that consciousness came before all else is no guarantee that these convictions are anything more than wishful thinking, no matter how intelligent or clever they may believe themselves to be.

For example, all intelligent people know that there is absolutely no relationship between lottery results, but millions of people weekly reckon they can predict the lottery numbers based on previous turn outs by reference to some form of statistical probability. They might say – the ‘3’ has turned up 4 times in the past 9 weeks; therefore it could well turn up again next week – or some such rubbish. Any one atom or molecule in any one lottery ball knows nothing about anything, and for anyone to even think that it knows more about that molecule and where or how it might face relative to the positions and locations of countless millions and billions and trillions of other atoms and molecules in the other lottery balls is madness. But still people will insist that they can devise systems to predict the outcome of next week’s lottery ball selection.

Everything that we can know or predict about the Universe is in a Universe that already exists. Wavelike possibilities transforming into particle actualities can only occur in a Universe that already exists; and even then the reality of wavelike possibilities only has meaning because the world already exists in order that it can happen.

We must not make the mistake of flying in the face of reason and jumping to what are in fact absurd conclusions because it happens to feel right at the time.

In other words, ‘Being’ cannot in the first instance be blessed with consciousness or intelligence. That really can only have come about when consciousness is allowed to meet intelligence that only exists inside our brains.

How can anyone in their right mind associate consciousness with a bonfire? Because standing next to the burning fire is a sentient, conscious and intelligent human being. The bonfire cannot exist of itself. But without the human being, the bonfire could not exist in the first place. The bonfire exhibits the properties of a material universe; the human being embodies the properties of a spiritual universe.

Perhaps it is true. God said ‘Let There Be Light’

And may it shine on each and every one of us.

My view of consciousness compels the existence of negative energy particles that are capable of travelling back in time – tachyons, but string theory denies their existence. I think this cannot be.

Why do physicists always only ever think of time in one dimension? Did physicists never have a childhood? Did physicists never embrace the significance of Arthur Janov's primal therapy? Did physicists never listen to Mahler's 8th symphony? Did physicists never have love affairs and fall deeply and passionately in love with the wrong women? Did they not have fathers who totally and utterly deny the existence of anything that is not backed up with evidence that allows them to retain in perpetuity an inflexible and arrogant view of their own pathetic lives?

Physics needs to dig deep into the emotions. We need the best and brightest of our scientific thinkers and minds to face up to their own existences and lives. They need to explore their feelings to the root and core of their being. They need to go where mortal men dare not go. They need to understand individual human evolution through primal confrontation. They need to understand and feel and get through Primal Pain.

Physics needs to explore the concept of individual human evolution. Physics needs to embrace and understand the need for three time dimensions.

Physicists and philosophers cannot blandly say – consciousness came first as if they have in some strange way hit upon a fundamental truth. It is not enough to refer to it as 'being'. The play on words will sooner or later reduce it something else. We need to be much cleverer in our perception of language and interpret what language has to say about our perception of existence. It seems to me that language itself holds so many secrets about what we are doing and why we are here.

Our existence is central to the motivation and reason we exist. How we came into being or existence depends on us. Is that not the truth? We can determine how we came into existence. All we have to do is think it. At the moment no one knows. I mean to say no one ever did know. It just happened.

Consciousness never figured out why we exist. Even in the act of collapsing from a wave of probability to a particle of actuality, Consciousness could not know what was taking place. Only we can now reflect on what must have happened.

But to do that requires moving into areas that thus far mankind has been petrified about confronting. My book reveals the whole truth.

When moving from nothing to something, we move an infinite order of ten to the power of infinity. Isn't that the truth! Even strings that are ten to the power minus thirty three centimetres in length are infinitely long compared to nothing. And any one of those strings surely embraces consciousness which is timeless and dimensionless.

The beauty of space and time is no matter how big or how small, it is still only a fraction of what it could be or infinitely greater than nothing.

As consciousness becomes existence, there is an infinite amount of time and space waiting to shine forth, all of which can be reduced to no more than the twinkling of an eyelid and the touch of a child's finger tip, when you look into your baby daughter's eyes and you see the whole of the Universe contained in her warm and loving, but above all, trusting gaze. Trust! We must build our universe around trust.