On the Ontological Prerequisites of Initial Cosmological Conditions and the Limits of Physicalist Causality

Isaac Cohan

2026

Abstract

Modern cosmological models frequently posit that the universe emerged from a quantum vacuum or a zero-energy state, effectively asserting that the cosmos originated from "nothing." This paper examines the logical, statistical, and informational limitations of such physicalist models. By analyzing the informational prerequisites of quantum fluctuations, energy conservation, the statistical probability of universal metaphysical intuition, and the hard problem of consciousness, we argue that physical laws are non-contingent informational boundaries that cannot account for their own existence. The invocation of mathematical laws to explain the origin of the universe therefore necessitates a pre-existing, non-contingent source of that information. We further address prominent objections from evolutionary psychology, animal cognition research, the philosophy of information, and the neuroscience of consciousness to strengthen the case that a purely physicalist framework provides an incomplete accounting of reality.

---

1 Introduction: The Redefinition of Nothing

The prevailing consensus in theoretical physics attempts to resolve the initial singularity problem by invoking quantum mechanics, specifically the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle. Frameworks such as the Zero-Energy Universe hypothesis (Tryon, 1973) suggest that the total energy of the universe is precisely zero, with positive matter-energy balanced against negative gravitational potential energy. More recently, it has been argued that the laws of quantum mechanics permit a universe to emerge spontaneously from "nothing" (Krauss, 2012).

While mathematically elegant, these models commit a categorical error by conflating a quantum vacuum with absolute non-being. A quantum vacuum is not the absence of all things; it is a physical state defined within the framework of quantum field theory, possessing a specific mathematical structure, obeying invariant laws, and exhibiting measurable properties such as vacuum energy and virtual particle fluctuations (Davies, 1982). As Albert has observed, the quantum-mechanical vacuum is emphatically not nothing—it is a particular configuration of fields (Albert, 2012).

To claim that the universe emerged from such a state does not answer the question of ultimate origins; it merely redefines the starting material. The question remains: why does this structured quantum state, governed by precise mathematical laws, exist at all? This is not a question that any future refinement of quantum field theory can answer, because any such refinement will itself presuppose a mathematical framework whose existence demands

explanation.

2 The Formal Limits of Causal Loops

In attempts to avoid positing a First Cause, several cosmological models deploy retro-causality, self-causation, or closed timelike curves. The Hartle–Hawking No-Boundary Proposal, for instance, treats the time dimension as imaginary near the initial singularity, yielding a geometry in which the universe has no temporal boundary (Hartle & Hawking, 1983).

However, the fundamental law of causality can be expressed in standard predicate logic:

$$\forall x(B(x) \rightarrow \exists y(C(y, x)))$$

That is: for all entities x, if x begins to exist, there exists a state y such that y is causally sufficient for x.

If we apply this principle to the universe as a totality, the proposition that the universe is self-caused introduces a logical paradox. For the universe to cause itself, it must exist prior to its own existence—a violation of the law of non-contradiction. Even if time is reconceived as a spatial dimension (imaginary time), the resulting closed geometry of spacetime is itself a contingent physical state: it possesses specific topological properties, obeys particular field equations, and could in principle have been otherwise.

A geometric loop or closed manifold does not explain its own existence any more than a straight line does. The topology may eliminate a temporal boundary, but it does not eliminate the question of ontological contingency. The Hartle–Hawking geometry answers the question *what is the shape of the beginning?* but not *why does this shape exist rather than nothing at all?*

3 Energy Conservation and the Boundary-Condition Problem

The First Law of Thermodynamics dictates that energy cannot be created or destroyed within an isolated system:

$$\Delta U = Q - W$$

Cosmologists sometimes argue that if total energy is conserved and equals zero, the energy of the universe has simply always existed or requires no external cause (Vilenkin, 1982). However, this reasoning elides a crucial distinction between the quantity of energy and the structure of the laws governing it.

Energy possesses the capacity to do work, change state, and manifest as mass, radiation, or heat. These capacities are not self-assigning; they are determined by the specific values of physical constants—the gravitational constant G, the fine-structure constant α, the cosmological constant Λ, and others. These constants define invariant boundary conditions within which all physical processes operate.

A property cannot assign itself a parameter. The specific values that permit a life-bearing universe require an explanation. Fine-tuning estimates for the cosmological constant alone

suggest a precision on the order of 1 part in 10^{120}; Weinberg's anthropic bound demonstrates that a cosmological constant much larger than the observed value would prevent gravitational structure formation entirely (Weinberg, 1989).

The multiverse hypothesis is sometimes invoked to neutralize this improbability by positing an ensemble of universes with varying constants (Susskind, 2003). However, this hypothesis is empirically unverifiable and merely pushes the explanatory burden back one level: one must then account for the existence of the multiverse-generating mechanism and the meta-laws governing it. A mechanism that generates universes according to a probability distribution over physical constants is itself a structured, informationally rich system—precisely the kind of system whose existence demands explanation.

4 The Statistical Anomaly of Universal Metaphysical Intuition

A purely materialist model of the universe relies on statistical probability and natural selection to explain the emergence of complex cognitive systems. We propose that this same analytical framework should be applied to the near-universal human intuition of a transcendent, non-contingent ground of being.

Throughout recorded history, across geographically and culturally isolated civilizations, an overwhelming majority of the human population has exhibited an inherent intuition or yearning for a Creator, a teleological purpose, or a transcendent reality (Barrett, 2004). In physicalist models, all widespread biological and cognitive traits are interpreted as products of evolutionary algorithms optimized for reproductive fitness.

4.1 The Adaptive Explanation and Its Limits

Evolutionary psychologists have proposed adaptive explanations for religious cognition. The Hyperactive Agency Detection Device (HADD) hypothesis suggests that humans are cognitively biased toward detecting intentional agents, even where none exist, as a survival mechanism (Barrett, 2000). Terror Management Theory posits that religious belief buffers against existential anxiety produced by awareness of mortality (Greenberg et al., 1986).

These models explain why humans might generate religious concepts, but they face two significant limitations. First, they do not explain the remarkable convergence of those concepts across isolated populations—not merely belief in agents, but the formulation of abstract monotheistic theology, cosmological reasoning, and the experience of the numinous. HADD explains false positives in agent detection; it does not explain the Rig Veda, the Psalms, or the philosophical theology of Aristotle arising independently from entirely unconnected civilizations. Second, they do not address why the cognitive architecture capable of abstract metaphysical reasoning exists in the first place, given that such reasoning provides no obvious reproductive advantage over simpler heuristics.

4.2 A Bayesian Framework for Intuition

We can evaluate the evidential weight of this phenomenon using Bayes' Theorem:

$$P(H|E) = P(E|H) \cdot P(H) / P(E)$$

Let *H* represent the hypothesis that a non-contingent, conscious ground of being exists, and let *E* represent the evidence of a universal, cross-cultural human intuition for such a being.

We should be explicit about the nature of this argument: it is a qualitative likelihood comparison, not a quantitative calculation. The formal apparatus of Bayes' Theorem is employed here to structure the reasoning, not to generate a numerical posterior. The central claim is that the likelihood ratio $P(E|H)/P(E|\neg H)$ favors the theistic hypothesis—that is, the observed data (universal metaphysical intuition) is more expected under theism than under unguided naturalism. The magnitude of this ratio depends on one's assessment of how well byproduct theories account for the convergent specificity of the phenomenon, but the direction of the ratio is robust across a wide range of reasonable assumptions.

The critical observation is that human sensory inputs and basic drives universally map to corresponding external realities: thirst maps to the existence of water; hunger maps to the existence of food; fear maps to the existence of danger; sexual desire maps to the existence of a mate. We acknowledge that this analogy is imperfect: biological drives evolved under direct selective pressure from their physical referents, and metaphysical yearning has no equivalent survival-feedback mechanism.

The argument, therefore, is not that metaphysical yearning evolved *in response to* a transcendent referent the way thirst evolved in response to water. Rather, it is that the universal emergence of a sophisticated cognitive orientation—one that generates abstract theology, cosmological reasoning, and experiences of the numinous across isolated civilizations—with no clear survival payoff and no adequate byproduct explanation for its convergent specificity, is itself a surprising datum under unguided naturalism and a less surprising one under theism. This is an inference to the best explanation, not an argument from direct analogy.

This argument does not claim deductive certainty. It claims that dismissing universal metaphysical intuition as mere evolutionary noise requires a higher explanatory burden than is commonly acknowledged.

5 The Explanatory Gap of Human Consciousness

If humans are merely advanced physical systems responding to environmental stimuli, our internal cognitive states should be strictly utilitarian—optimized for survival and reproduction and nothing more. However, human consciousness exhibits properties that represent a qualitative discontinuity from the biological baseline of the animal kingdom.

5.1 Distinguishing the Claim

We must be precise about what constitutes this discontinuity. Research in comparative cognition has demonstrated that great apes exhibit rudimentary tool use, cetaceans display grief-like behaviors, and corvids demonstrate problem-solving and possible metacognition (Emery & Clayton, 2004; King, 2013). We do not deny these findings.

The ontological break we identify is narrower and more specific: no non-human species formulates abstract mathematics, constructs formal logical systems, develops theoretical physics, composes symphonies, writes poetry about its own mortality, or engages in

metaphysical reasoning about the nature of existence. The gap is not one of degree but of kind. A chimpanzee that uses a stick to extract termites and a human who derives the field equations of general relativity are not performing the same cognitive operation at different levels of complexity; they are performing qualitatively different operations.

5.2 Two Distinct Arguments from Consciousness

We must distinguish two separable claims. The first is that human cognitive capacities—abstract mathematics, theoretical physics, moral philosophy, aesthetic creation—represent a qualitative leap from anything observed in the rest of the animal kingdom. This leap is surprising under unguided naturalism, but not inexplicable: a physicalist may attribute it to the emergent properties of increased neural complexity, even if the specific mechanism remains uncharacterized.

The second and stronger claim concerns the existence of subjective experience itself—qualia, the first-person character of consciousness. This is the "hard problem" identified by Chalmers (1995), and it poses a deeper challenge. Humans possess qualia—subjective, first-person conscious experiences—whose existence is acknowledged even by physicalist philosophers as resisting reduction to neural correlates. The hard problem is not an empirical gap awaiting future data; it is a conceptual obstacle: no amount of third-person neurological description can, even in principle, explain *why there is something it is like* to be a conscious subject.

5.3 The Structural Argument from Ontological Mismatch

A strictly deterministic, mathematical universe generated by an unguided quantum fluctuation provides no known mechanism for the emergence of subjective teleology, aesthetic experience, or moral reasoning. Matter contains no inherent emotion; energy contains no inherent logic; physical law contains no inherent purpose.

The claim is structural: the human mind possesses capacities—the apprehension of abstract mathematical truths, moral obligations, aesthetic experience—that have no causal antecedent in a purely physical ontology. If matter is causally closed (if every physical event has a sufficient physical cause), then the emergence of subjective experience from non-experiential matter faces a deep structural obstacle within physicalism: one cannot derive the subjective from premises that contain nothing subjective.

The underlying logic is that an effect (consciousness, teleological awareness) that possesses properties entirely absent from its putative cause (blind physical law) requires an external source of those properties—or, at minimum, a revision of what "physical" means so radical as to collapse the distinction between physicalism and its alternatives.

5.4 Panpsychism and Neutral Monism

We acknowledge that strict physicalism and theism do not exhaust the available positions. Panpsychism—the view that experiential properties are fundamental features of matter—and neutral monism—the view that both mental and physical properties emerge from a more basic substrate—represent attempts to resolve the hard problem without invoking a transcendent

source. Nagel's *Mind and Cosmos* (2012), for instance, argues that physicalism cannot account for consciousness, reason, or value, and proposes a teleological naturalism as an alternative to both orthodox Darwinism and theism.

These positions share our diagnosis of physicalism's limitations but differ in their proposed resolution. We note that panpsychism, by attributing proto-experiential properties to fundamental matter, implicitly concedes the central premise of our argument: that subjective experience cannot be derived from purely non-experiential constituents. The disagreement then becomes whether these proto-experiential properties are brute features of reality or themselves require explanation—a question that returns us to the problem of ontological contingency addressed in Sections 1–3.

6 Algorithmic Information as the Substrate

If the universe is entirely describable by mathematics, then reality is fundamentally informational. In statistical mechanics, entropy (S) and the number of accessible microstates (Ω) are related by Boltzmann's equation:

$$S = k_B \ln \Omega$$

6.1 Shannon Information vs. Functional Information

A crucial distinction must be drawn between Shannon information and functional information. Shannon information (Shannon, 1948) measures the reduction of uncertainty in a communication channel and is indifferent to semantic content: a random string of characters has higher Shannon entropy than a meaningful sentence of equal length.

The type of information relevant to our argument is functional information—information that is both complex (possessing high Kolmogorov complexity or low probability of random generation) and specified (conforming to an independently identifiable pattern or function). The genetic code, the laws of physics, and the architecture of the human brain are instances of functional information: they are not merely improbable configurations, but improbable configurations that perform functions.

The intuition underlying this concept—that there is a meaningful distinction between unstructured randomness and functional, patterned complexity—is broadly accepted even by those who contest specific formalizations of it. Our argument depends on the observation that the laws of physics and the structure of consciousness exhibit the kind of functional organization that, in every other domain of human experience, is associated with intentional design.

6.2 Computational Bounds and Physical Constraints

It is sometimes objected that given sufficient time, random processes can generate any pattern—an appeal to the infinite monkey theorem. This objection, while formally correct in the limit of infinite time, is physically irrelevant. The observable universe contains approximately 10^{80} atoms and has existed for approximately 4.3×10^{17} seconds. As Lloyd (2002) has calculated, the total number of elementary logical operations that could have been

performed by the universe since the Big Bang is bounded above by approximately 10^{120}. This represents the ultimate computational capacity of the observable universe.

The functional state space of even a single self-replicating molecule vastly exceeds this computational horizon. A random process operating within the physical constraints of our universe cannot explore a sufficient fraction of the relevant state space to produce functional information by chance. This is not a claim that it is unlikely; it is a claim that the expected time exceeds the physical age of the universe by many orders of magnitude.

The human mind is the most complex informational structure in the known universe. To argue that this structure—and the mathematical laws governing the cosmos it observes—arose from an unguided fluctuation of a quantum vacuum is to assert a mathematical near-impossibility. Physical laws are not the ultimate First Cause; they are the governing algorithm. An algorithm requires a rational source.

7 Objections and Responses

7.1 The God-of-the-Gaps Fallacy

Objection: This argument merely inserts God into current gaps in scientific understanding, gaps that future discoveries may close.

Response: The argument presented here is not based on empirical gaps but on logical and ontological constraints. The claim is not that science cannot yet explain *X*; the claim is that a purely physicalist framework is in principle incapable of explaining the existence of the framework itself. No future empirical discovery within physics can explain why physics exists, because any such discovery would presuppose the framework it seeks to explain. This is a structural limitation, not a temporary deficit of data.

7.2 The Multiverse Renders Fine-Tuning Moot

Objection: If an infinite ensemble of universes exists with varying constants, our universe's fine-tuning requires no special explanation.

Response: The multiverse hypothesis replaces one explanatory demand with another of equal or greater magnitude. A universe-generating mechanism operating according to meta-laws that permit variation of constants is itself a highly structured, informationally rich system. The question *why do these meta-laws exist?* is identical in form to the original question. Furthermore, the multiverse is empirically unverifiable and therefore functions as a metaphysical commitment, not a scientific explanation—precisely the kind of commitment its proponents claim to avoid.

7.3 Evolution Fully Explains Religious Cognition

Objection: HADD and Terror Management Theory provide sufficient evolutionary explanations for religious belief without requiring a real referent.

Response: These theories explain the mechanism by which religious cognition might have been selected, but they do not explain the convergent content of that cognition across isolated

civilizations, nor do they address why the cognitive architecture capable of abstract metaphysical reasoning exists at all. Moreover, if evolutionary explanations fully debunk religious intuition, they equally debunk all human cognitive faculties—including the capacity for scientific reasoning itself—since all are products of the same evolutionary process. This is the force of the evolutionary argument against naturalism (Plantinga, 1993): if unguided evolution selects for survival rather than truth, then the naturalist has no grounds for trusting the cognitive faculties that produced naturalism. The argument is self-defeating.[1]

[1] Fitelson and Sober (1998) have objected that natural selection can track truth in domains directly relevant to survival, and that Plantinga's blanket skepticism about naturalistic cognitive faculties is therefore too broad. We grant this point for survival-relevant domains but note that it actually strengthens our argument: abstract metaphysical reasoning, cosmological speculation, and the experience of the numinous are precisely *not* in survival-relevant domains, and therefore fall outside the scope of the selection-for-truth mechanism that Fitelson and Sober invoke. The evolutionary argument against naturalism may not apply to perceptual beliefs about predators, but it applies with full force to the cognitive faculties that produce theology, mathematics, and philosophy of mind.

7.4 Consciousness Will Eventually Be Reduced to Neuroscience

Objection: The hard problem of consciousness is merely a temporary scientific puzzle that will yield to future neuroscientific research.

Response: The hard problem is not an empirical gap but a conceptual one. No amount of third-person neurological data can, even in principle, explain *why there is something it is like* to be a conscious subject. As Chalmers (1995) argues, explaining the neural correlates of consciousness addresses the "easy problems" (behavior, reportability, cognitive integration) but leaves the existence of subjective experience itself entirely unaddressed. A complete map of every neuron, synapse, and electrochemical process in the brain would tell us everything about the mechanism of cognition and nothing about why that mechanism is accompanied by inner experience. This is a structural limitation of third-person explanation applied to first-person phenomena, not a temporary deficit of data.

8 Conclusion

Mathematical models that describe the universe's origin do not solve the problem of the First Cause; they obscure it behind infinite regressions, geometric loops, or redefinitions of the vacuum state. By analyzing both the macro-structure of the cosmos (thermodynamic boundary conditions, the invariance of physical law, the fine-tuning of constants) and the micro-structure of the human observer (the statistical universality of metaphysical intuition, the ontological uniqueness of consciousness, the functional complexity of cognitive architecture), we have argued that a purely physicalist model provides an incomplete accounting of reality.

Logic, probability, and information theory jointly indicate that a highly ordered, mathematically precise system populated by conscious, teleologically aware beings requires a source that possesses both rationality and consciousness. The evidence, considered cumulatively, points not to an eternal, blind quantum vacuum but to a non-contingent, immaterial ground of being—a *Logos*: a rational substrate, a Legislator of the laws, a Source of

the signal that the human mind is uniquely equipped to receive.

References

Albert, D. Z. (2012). On the origin of everything: Review of *A Universe from Nothing* by Lawrence M. Krauss. *The New York Times*, March 23, 2012.

Barrett, J. L. (2000). Exploring the natural foundations of religion. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 4(1), 29–34.

Barrett, J. L. (2004). *Why Would Anyone Believe in God?* AltaMira Press.

Chalmers, D. J. (1995). Facing up to the problem of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 2(3), 200–219.

Davies, P. C. W. (1982). *The Accidental Universe*. Cambridge University Press.

Emery, N. J. & Clayton, N. S. (2004). The mentality of crows: Convergent evolution of intelligence in corvids and apes. *Science*, 306(5703), 1903–1907.

Fitelson, B. & Sober, E. (1998). Plantinga's probability argument against evolutionary naturalism. *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly*, 79(2), 115–129.

Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., & Solomon, S. (1986). The causes and consequences of a need for self-esteem: A terror management theory. In *Public Self and Private Self*, pp. 189–212. Springer.

Hartle, J. B. & Hawking, S. W. (1983). Wave function of the universe. *Physical Review D*, 28(12), 2960–2975.

King, B. J. (2013). *How Animals Grieve*. University of Chicago Press.

Krauss, L. M. (2012). *A Universe from Nothing: Why There Is Something Rather Than Nothing*. Free Press.

Lloyd, S. (2002). Computational capacity of the universe. *Physical Review Letters*, 88(23), 237901.

Nagel, T. (2012). *Mind and Cosmos: Why the Materialist Neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature Is Almost Certainly False*. Oxford University Press.

Plantinga, A. (1993). *Warrant and Proper Function*. Oxford University Press.

Shannon, C. E. (1948). A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3), 379–423.

Susskind, L. (2003). The anthropic landscape of string theory. arXiv preprint, hep-th/0302219.

Tryon, E. P. (1973). Is the universe a vacuum fluctuation? *Nature*, 246(5433), 396–397.

Vilenkin, A. (1982). Creation of universes from nothing. *Physics Letters B*, 117(1–2), 25–28.

Weinberg, S. (1989). The cosmological constant problem. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 61(1), 1–23.