

# The Resolution of Why There Is Something Rather Than Nothing

*Toward a Unification of Science, Religion, and Philosophy*

Mauro Alfonso Montenegro

September 2026

## Abstract

Why is there something rather than nothing? This paper argues that the question is often framed by a false symmetry. Absolute nothingness is not a state, cause, possibility space, probability distribution, or background; it contains no laws, powers, relations, time, or potentiality. By contrast, deprivation, destruction, falsehood, and death are intelligible only relative to positive realities that can be damaged, falsified, or lost. This paper distinguishes an epistemic asymmetry between construction and criticism from an ontological asymmetry between actuality and privation. The proposed resolution is that nothingness cannot stand as an ontological rival to being or generate being. The live question is instead what kind of actuality is non-derivative - brute actuality, necessary actuality, or an endless structure of dependence. Classical Christian metaphysics offers one coherent completion by identifying the non-derivative ground with God and evil with privation, but that identification requires further premises.

# Contents

|     |                                                              |    |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1   | The Question Hidden Inside the Question                      | 3  |
| 2   | Two Asymmetries: Epistemic and Ontological                   | 4  |
| 2.1 | Construction and criticism . . . . .                         | 4  |
| 2.2 | Actuality and privation . . . . .                            | 5  |
| 3   | The Positive Is Not Merely the Opposite of the Negative      | 6  |
| 4   | What Absolute Nothing Would Have to Mean                     | 8  |
| 5   | The False Symmetry in “Something Rather Than Nothing”        | 10 |
| 6   | Creation, Negation, and Explanatory Priority                 | 11 |
| 7   | Evil as Privation Rather Than a Rival Substance              | 13 |
| 8   | The Biblical Sequence: Creation Before Rebellion             | 14 |
| 9   | Consciousness, Value, and the Possibility of a Deeper Ground | 15 |
| 10  | Natural Evil and the Limits of the Argument                  | 16 |
| 11  | The Resolution                                               | 17 |
| 12  | Consequences for Inquiry, Creativity, and Human Meaning      | 19 |
| 13  | Conclusion: The Positive Is First                            | 21 |

# 1 The Question Hidden Inside the Question

Leibniz gave canonical form to one of philosophy's most radical questions: why is there something rather than nothing? [1] The force of the question is immediate. Every familiar explanation begins with something already present. A tree is explained by a seed, an organism by prior organisms and biochemical processes, a planet by matter, gravity, and a history of accretion. In each case the explanation moves from one existent condition to another. The question of why there is anything at all seems to ask for a reason that does not quietly borrow the existence it is meant to explain.

The difficulty is that the ordinary grammar of the question can mislead us. The phrase “something rather than nothing” places being and nothingness on opposite sides of a comparison. It suggests two candidate states, perhaps two possibilities in a cosmic lottery. One contains a universe; the other contains nothing. We then imagine asking why the first state obtained instead of the second. But as soon as absolute nothingness is treated as a candidate state, it has already been given more structure than absolute nothingness can contain.

A state is something. A possibility space is something. A law that selects among possibilities is something. A probability distribution is something. A temporal interval during which nothing persists is something. A transition rule capable of carrying a system from one condition to another is something. Even the bare distinction between “before” and “after” presupposes temporal or ordering structure. Absolute nothingness, if the phrase is to mean what it says, contains none of these.

This does not make the mystery of existence disappear. It changes its form. The mystery is not how an empty container suddenly produced contents. There would be no container. It is not why a zero-energy vacuum fluctuated. A physical vacuum already has a state space, fields, symmetries, dynamical rules, and measurable structure; it is not metaphysical nothingness. It is not why “nothing” failed to remain stable. Stability is a property of a system governed by constraints, and absolute nothing contains no system and no constraints.

The argument of this paper is therefore diagnostic before it is constructive. We first remove a false symmetry. Only then can we see what the original question is really asking. The deeper problem is the status of

actuality itself. Is there some reality that does not derive its existence from anything more fundamental? Is actuality brute? Is some actuality necessary? Is dependence infinitely extended without a first ground? Or is the very demand for a further explanation misplaced at the ultimate level?

The argument develops two complementary lines of reasoning. First, constructing a coherent idea generally carries a greater generative burden than merely rejecting one: creation supplies content, structure, relations, and consequences that criticism can then test. Second, at the ontological level, destruction presupposes something that can be destroyed, corruption presupposes a good that can be corrupted, falsehood presupposes truth-directed representation, and death presupposes life. The present paper connects these epistemic and ontological asymmetries and asks what they imply for the question of being itself.

The proposed resolution can be stated in advance. Absolute nothingness cannot explain, cause, select, generate, persist, fluctuate, or compete. It is not a positive alternative to actuality. Therefore “Why did something win over nothing?” is not the right ultimate question. Whatever final account we give must begin from actuality, because explanation is itself an actuality-involving relation. The task is to determine what kind of actuality, if any, can be non-derivative.

## **2 Two Asymmetries: Epistemic and Ontological**

### **2.1 Construction and criticism**

There is a familiar asymmetry between making and rejecting. To propose a serious theory, one must select relevant features, organize them, specify relations, define terms, derive consequences, and expose the resulting structure to possible failure. A critic may sometimes defeat the proposal by locating one contradiction, one counterexample, or one failed prediction. A bridge must satisfy many constraints at once; one broken critical support can bring it down. A mathematical proof must preserve validity through every inferential step; a single invalid step can defeat it.

This is an epistemic asymmetry. It concerns the burdens involved in producing and evaluating claims. It is not universal. Some negative claims

are extremely difficult to establish. To show that no object with a certain property exists can require the elimination of every candidate within a domain. Likewise some positive existential claims can be easy: one witness is enough. The relevant point is not that grammatical affirmation is always harder than grammatical negation. It is that comprehensive construction usually creates a larger target than local criticism needs to destroy.

That asymmetry explains why a wrong idea can still be productive. A definite proposal can organize evidence, reveal hidden assumptions, generate experiments, and fail in an informative way. An empty assertion that changes meaning whenever challenged cannot do this. Intellectual creativity earns value by accepting vulnerability. In that sense, creation and negation are not enemies. They form a cycle: conjecture, collision, revision. Construction gives criticism something to work on; criticism returns information to construction.

## 2.2 Actuality and privation

The second asymmetry is deeper. It does not concern how hard a thought is to produce. It concerns what one kind of reality depends on in order to be what it is. Destruction is intelligible only where there is something destructible. Betrayal presupposes a relation that can be violated. Blindness is a privation only in a kind of being for which sight is an appropriate capacity. A stone is not blind. Death is not an organism competing with life; it is the cessation of the organized processes of a living organism. A lie does not create the practices of language, assertion, trust, and truth-directed representation that make lying possible. It uses them.

This can be stated without the claim that all negative propositions depend on positive propositions. Formal logic allows basic negations, and ordinary description contains countless harmless negative predicates. The thesis concerns *privative* or destructive negation: loss, corruption, defect, failure, contradiction, deprivation, and breakdown relative to some determinate actuality.

Let  $S$  be a subject and  $G$  a good, capacity, form, or relation appropriate to  $S$ . Write

$$\text{Priv}(G, S) \tag{1}$$

for the privation of  $G$  in  $S$ . A genuine privation entails at least two positive

conditions:

$$\text{Priv}(G, S) \Rightarrow S \wedge \text{Due}(G, S), \quad (2)$$

where  $\text{Due}(G, S)$  means that  $G$  is the sort of feature whose possession, realization, or integrity is normatively or functionally relevant to  $S$ . Blindness therefore presupposes an organism of the relevant kind and the role of vision in that organism. Betrayal presupposes agents and a bond. Injustice presupposes persons, actions, expectations, claims, or institutions capable of being ordered justly or unjustly.

**Proposition 1** (Privative dependence). *If a negative condition is essentially the loss, corruption, or failure of a determinate positive feature, then the intelligibility of that negative condition depends on the actuality of a subject and on a positive structure relative to which the loss is defined.*

The proposition is modest but powerful. It does not say that the damaged subject must temporally exist before every defect. A congenital defect can be present from the beginning of an organism's life. The priority can be conceptual, ontological, or explanatory rather than temporal. Nor does the proposition say that the good and its privation are always morally opposed. A tumor is a positive biological growth in one sense and destructive relative to the organism in another. The point is that the description *as destructive* is relational: it is destructive of some positive organization.

The distinction between the two asymmetries is essential. A destructive act can require more intelligence than a constructive act. A master saboteur may plan more carefully than a careless builder. That does not erase the ontological dependence of destruction on a target. Conversely, an act of creation can be morally corrupt: one can create a prison, a weapon, or a fraudulent story. Creation is therefore not identical with moral goodness. The claim is about the order of dependence, not a simple moral slogan.

### 3 The Positive Is Not Merely the Opposite of the Negative

A common picture treats positive and negative realities as if they were balanced terms on a scale: life and death, truth and falsehood, order and

disorder, good and evil. The symmetry is useful in language, but it can conceal the structure of dependence. Death is meaningful because there are living systems that can cease to live. Falsehood is meaningful because representation can succeed or fail in relation to what is the case. Disorder is meaningful because some pattern, function, or constraint can be disrupted. The negative often receives its identity from the positive term it opposes.

The reverse dependence is weaker. Life can be described in terms of metabolism, reproduction, organization, responsiveness, and biological continuity without first defining death. Truth can be characterized by successful representation or disclosure without making falsehood constitutive of truth. A relation of trust can exist before betrayal occurs. A melody can be composed without requiring that it first be interrupted. One can imagine a world containing life without death more readily than one can imagine death in a reality in which nothing has ever lived.

This does not entail that positive terms are always conceptually simple. Nor does it entail that every good can be fully understood without reference to its failures. In practice, contrast often teaches us meaning. Disease can illuminate health, and error can clarify truth. Epistemic access can be contrastive even when ontological dependence is not symmetrical.

The most important consequence is that negation has no independent stock of being from which to operate. A hole in a ship can sink the ship, but the hole is not a second vessel. A computer virus can cripple a network, but its destructive capacity depends on hardware, energy, code, protocols, and machines already functioning well enough to be exploited. A counterfeit note can cause economic harm, but its success depends on a prior system of currency, trust, and representation. The counterfeit borrows the grammar of the real.

In classical metaphysics this pattern is captured by the language of privation. Augustine rejected the idea that evil is a substance existing alongside the good and described evil instead as a deprivation or corruption of good. [2] Aquinas developed the view by linking goodness to the actuality and perfection of a thing, while treating evil as a defect in a good subject. [3] The doctrine can be misunderstood if “privation” is heard as “unreal.” A missing bridge segment is a privation relative to the complete bridge, but the absence can kill travelers. A missing organ can be catastrophic. A missing commitment to truth can destroy an institution. Privations are

real as conditions of real subjects even though they are not self-subsisting positive essences.

This gives the asymmetry a metaphysical form:

$$\text{privation} \longrightarrow \text{requires a subject and a positive standard}, \quad (3)$$

whereas

$$\text{positive actuality} \not\rightarrow \text{requires its privation}. \quad (4)$$

The arrows are not causal arrows. They express dependence of intelligibility and being. A damaged form depends on there being a form to damage. The form does not, merely by existing, depend on the damage.

## 4 What Absolute Nothing Would Have to Mean

The word “nothing” is used loosely in ordinary speech. An empty room is called nothing, but it contains air, fields, geometry, thermal radiation, surfaces, and causal structure. A vacuum chamber is called empty, yet it has spacetime location, boundary conditions, quantum fields, and a well-defined physical state. In quantum field theory the vacuum is not the absence of all reality; it is a particular state of a theory. [5] Metaphysical nothingness must mean something far more radical.

Let  $\mathcal{N}_0$  denote absolute nothingness. Then, by definition,

$$\mathcal{N}_0 : \quad \neg \exists x, \quad (5)$$

with the understanding that the quantifier is intended to range over every entity, event, property-instance, law-like structure, field, spacetime region, power, relation, probability measure, and potentiality. This notation is only a linguistic aid. It does not turn  $\mathcal{N}_0$  into an object.

Several consequences follow immediately.

First,  $\mathcal{N}_0$  cannot be a cause. Causation requires at least enough structure for there to be a cause, an effect, and some relation connecting them. If there is literally nothing, there is no causal power waiting to be exercised.

Second,  $\mathcal{N}_0$  cannot evolve. Evolution presupposes a parameter or order and something whose condition changes. There can be no temporal duration

during which nothingness “remains” nothing, because duration is already a structure.

Third,  $\mathcal{N}_0$  cannot fluctuate. A fluctuation is a change in a state, variable, field, distribution, or system. The claim that a universe emerged from a quantum fluctuation may be meaningful within a physical theory, but the theory, its state space, and its dynamical resources are already something.

Fourth,  $\mathcal{N}_0$  cannot carry probability. A statement such as “nothing had probability  $p$  and a universe had probability  $1 - p$ ” presupposes a sample space, a measure, and a rule of assignment. Those are not nothing.

Fifth,  $\mathcal{N}_0$  cannot contain possibilities in the active metaphysical sense of unrealized powers. Potentiality belongs to a system capable of different actualizations. Aristotle’s distinction between actuality and potentiality already assumes being of some sort. [4] Absolute nothing has no latent capacity to become something, because a capacity would itself be something.

The point can be summarized as a constraint on explanation.

**Proposition 2** (No explanatory work by absolute nothing). *If  $\mathcal{N}_0$  is absolute nothingness, then  $\mathcal{N}_0$  cannot serve as a causal, probabilistic, nomological, temporal, dispositional, or material explanation of actuality.*

This proposition does not prove that actuality has a cause. It proves only that if actuality has an ultimate explanation, absolute nothingness cannot be the explaining term. Nor does the proposition prove that “nothingness is impossible” in every formal logical system. One may construct logics with empty domains or discuss the modal possibility of no concrete objects. But the moment a framework contains modal facts, logical truths, possible worlds, or abstract structure, the framework itself is no longer absolute nothing in the unrestricted sense relevant here.

The philosophical temptation is to reify absence. We imagine nothing as a black expanse, an empty stage, a silent eternity, or a blank page. But blackness, extension, time, silence, and pages are all somethings. The imagination cannot picture absolute nothing without replacing it with a sparse something. That difficulty is not itself a proof about reality, but it warns us that the grammar of “nothing” readily imports hidden ontology.

## 5 The False Symmetry in “Something Rather Than Nothing”

We can now identify the central mistake. The traditional question appears to place two terms into competition:

$$\{\text{something, nothing}\}. \quad (6)$$

But only the first term can be a state of affairs. The second is the denial that there is any state of affairs at all. Treating them as two members of the same ontological set smuggles the structure of the set into the term meant to exclude all structure.

The phrase “rather than” is therefore doing too much work. It suggests that there must be a selector whose job is to choose between being and nonbeing. But any selector - a law, necessity, chance process, principle, deity, mathematical rule, or modal fact - belongs on the side of something. The explanatory machine cannot stand outside actuality and then explain why actuality appeared, because the machine is already actual in the relevant broad sense.

This does not reduce the ultimate question to a verbal trick. There remains a profound explanatory demand. Contingent things seem to call for conditions, causes, or grounds. We can explain a galaxy by earlier matter and laws, an organism by evolutionary and developmental histories, and a thought by a brain and a life history. We are naturally led to ask whether the entire network of contingent dependence has a ground.

At this stage at least three broad positions remain open.

1. **Brute actuality.** Some fact or totality simply exists without a deeper reason. Explanation ends not because nothing caused something, but because not every fact has an external explanation.
2. **Necessary actuality.** Some reality exists non-contingently and grounds contingent realities. Classical theism, some forms of Platonism, and certain structural metaphysics occupy versions of this space, though they disagree radically about the nature of the necessary ground.

3. **Endless dependence.** Every actual condition depends on another actual condition, with no first member or terminating ground. The chain need not begin from nothing; it may be infinite or cyclic.

The present argument does not select among these simply by definition. It eliminates a fourth picture: that absolute nothingness stands as a positive explanatory source from which actuality emerged. In every live option, actuality is explanatorily prior to privation and to the notion of total absence.

**Corollary 1** (Reformulation of the ultimate question). *The question “Why is there something rather than nothing?” should be reformulated as: “What, if anything, accounts for non-derivative actuality, and what kind of actuality can occupy that role?”*

That reformulation is the heart of the proposed resolution. It does not pretend that the remaining problem is easy. It removes the pseudo-problem of how nothing did something.

## 6 Creation, Negation, and Explanatory Priority

The earlier distinction between creation and negation now acquires a broader role. Creation, in the relevant sense, is not restricted to production from absolute nothing. Human beings create by reorganizing prior materials: a composer arranges sound, an architect orders matter, a scientist organizes concepts and evidence, and a community creates institutions by establishing relations and norms. What these acts share is the production of determinate form.

Negation operates differently. It removes, contradicts, rejects, breaks, interrupts, or deprives. Yet even destructive negation must receive an object. A fire can destroy a manuscript only if there is a manuscript. A contradiction can defeat a theory only if the theory has enough determinate content to contradict. A critic can expose an error only if there is a claim whose inferential structure can be examined.

This is why the cycle of inquiry is best understood as

$$\text{conjecture} \longrightarrow \text{collision} \longrightarrow \text{revision}. \quad (7)$$

Construction is first in the limited sense that there must be some content before criticism can have a target. Negation then becomes generative when it informs revision. The best criticism participates in creation by identifying not merely that something failed but where, why, and what must be altered.

The same logic applies at an ontological level, though with stronger claims and greater caution. The actuality of a subject makes its damage possible. The organization of a living system makes disease and death possible. The existence of a relation makes betrayal possible. The presence of truth-directed practices makes falsehood possible. The negative is not an independent realm waiting beside the positive; it occurs within an already articulated field of actuality.

That point clarifies why “nothing” cannot be the primordial member of the cycle. Conjecture, collision, and revision all require agents, structures, or at minimum determinate states. Absolute nothing cannot enter the cycle because it supplies neither target nor constraint. It cannot be revised into being.

The relation between the epistemic and ontological arguments can therefore be summarized as follows. Epistemically, construction generates structured possibilities and criticism tests them. Ontologically, positive actuality supplies the subjects and forms relative to which privation and destruction become possible. In both cases negation can be indispensable without being self-grounding.

This is a more precise claim than “creation is good and destruction is bad.” Some creation is destructive in purpose. Some destruction is ordered toward repair. Surgery destroys tissue to preserve life; demolition can remove a dangerous building; criticism can eliminate a false theory; repentance negates a destructive habit. Moral evaluation concerns the goods toward which powers are ordered, not the bare grammatical sign of an action.

The deeper asymmetry survives these qualifications. Even morally justified destruction is typically intelligible through a positive end: health, safety, truth, freedom, justice, or renewed order. The negative can serve

the positive. Pure destruction for its own sake has no self-sufficient telos; it consumes conditions it did not originate.

## 7 Evil as Privation Rather Than a Rival Substance

The ontological argument has a natural application to the problem of evil. Classical Christian thought resists the picture of good and evil as two equally primordial substances. Augustine's mature account of evil as *privatio boni* was developed precisely to avoid metaphysical dualism. [2] If God is the source of all being and God is good, evil cannot be an independently created substance whose essence is evil. It must instead be understood as a defect, corruption, disorder, or loss in something that is positive insofar as it exists.

The idea becomes clearer when applied to powers. Intelligence is a positive capacity. It can be used to discover or deceive. Language is a positive capacity. It can promise or betray. Desire is a positive capacity. It can be ordered toward genuine flourishing or become disordered. Freedom is a positive capacity. It can be used to love, create, protect, dominate, or destroy. Evil action can therefore be real and causally powerful while still depending on capacities whose existence is not itself evil.

This explains the strange metaphysical poverty of evil. A lie needs a truth-directed practice in order to be believed. Theft needs possession. Oppression needs agents and freedoms that can be restricted. Cruelty needs beings capable of suffering. Betrayal needs trust. Hatred needs an object of attention. Even a destructive agent requires existence, power, and organization. Evil can be terrible in effect while lacking the independence of a first principle.

The thesis must not be diluted into the statement that evil is merely imaginary. Privation is not unreality. The absence of justice in a court is not a separate substance, yet it can ruin lives. The absence of oxygen is not a material object, yet it can kill. A hole is not a positive component of a hull in the same way as steel, but it can sink a ship. Privative descriptions identify real failures in real systems.

The biblical image of the Devil fits this asymmetry if interpreted within classical monotheism. God and Satan are not two gods occupying parallel

ontological positions. God is understood as uncreated source; Satan as creature. The titles traditionally associated with evil - accuser, tempter, deceiver, adversary - are relational and derivative. An accuser requires someone to accuse and some norm to invoke or manipulate. A deceiver requires truth and a mind capable of believing. A tempter requires goods that can be desired out of order.

This is one place where the argument of creation and negation connects with theology without becoming a proof of theology. If one already accepts classical Christian premises, the ontological priority of the positive explains why the Devil cannot be a metaphysical twin of God. If one does not accept those premises, the privation argument can still stand as an analysis of many forms of damage and defect. The theological conclusion is conditional on additional claims about God, creation, and value.

## **8 The Biblical Sequence: Creation Before Rebellion**

The literary structure of Genesis gives narrative form to the same asymmetry. The opening movement is creation: differentiation, life, relation, vocation, blessing. The world is presented as existing and ordered before moral rebellion enters the story. [6] Whatever position one takes on the genre or chronology of Genesis, this structural order is plain. Evil does not appear as co-creator.

The serpent enters an already articulated world. Temptation does not manufacture language, desire, freedom, or the object of desire. It works through reinterpretation and misordering. The drama presupposes goods. The possibility of disobedience depends on agency; the possibility of deception depends on communication; the possibility of loss depends on a world worth losing.

The pattern continues throughout biblical imagery. Cain does not create Abel's life; he takes it. Enslavement presupposes persons whose freedom can be denied. Idolatry redirects a capacity for worship. False prophecy abuses trust and the human expectation of truth. Exile presupposes a home. A broken covenant presupposes a covenant. A lost sheep presupposes a flock and a shepherd.

In this framework the biblical conflict between good and evil is not

a contest between equally fundamental cosmic materials. It is a conflict within creation. Evil is serious precisely because created goods are serious. Death matters because life matters. Betrayal wounds because trust matters. Grief has depth because attachment had depth. The negative acquires tragic force from the positive realities it destroys.

This same structure is visible at the far end of the biblical narrative. The final images are not of eternal metaphysical balance between creation and destruction, but of restoration, new creation, life, justice, and healing. [6] The telos is affirmative. Judgment is intelligible, at least in its constructive theological interpretation, as the removal of what destroys order so that right relation can be restored.

Again, none of this by itself establishes that the biblical worldview is true. The point is one of internal and metaphysical coherence. A worldview in which creation is first, evil is derivative, and redemption restores rather than abolishes the good maps naturally onto the dependency structure identified earlier. Good and evil are not required to be equal ontological poles simply because moral language places them in opposition.

## **9 Consciousness, Value, and the Possibility of a Deeper Ground**

The discussion becomes more difficult when value and consciousness enter the picture. Many moral realities are inseparable from conscious life. Cruelty requires beings capable of suffering. Betrayal requires minds capable of trust. Humiliation, love, promise, grief, and dignity are not rocks or electrons. Yet their dependence on minded beings does not make them unreal. Pain is mind-dependent in the sense that there is no pain without experience, but the fact that a person is in pain is not a fiction.

Several metaphysical positions are possible. A naturalist can argue that value emerges when organisms develop consciousness, sociality, foresight, vulnerability, and norm-governed behavior. A non-theistic moral realist can hold that there are objective reasons or values not reducible to preference. An idealist can regard mind as fundamental. A theist can hold that finite consciousness and value are grounded in an ultimate conscious reality.

The creation-negation argument does not decide among these by itself. It does, however, impose a structural constraint. Moral evil depends on

positive capacities and valued relations. If there is an ultimate ground of value, evil need not be co-original with it. The capacity for evil can arise from finite powers capable of defect, misuse, or disorder without requiring an independent substance of evil.

This is where the idea of a foundational consciousness or metaconsciousness can be introduced carefully. If ultimate reality were mind-like rather than mindless, then consciousness would not be a late accidental feature of an otherwise wholly non-conscious cosmos. Value could be rooted in the character of the foundational reality rather than invented by finite minds. But such a move requires arguments beyond the asymmetry developed here. One would need to explain why the ultimate ground is conscious, why value belongs to its nature, and why such a ground is better understood personally or theologically rather than abstractly.

The conclusion should therefore remain proportionate to the premises. The ontological priority of the positive makes a theistic account possible in a particularly coherent way: being, consciousness, and value can be unified in one ultimate ground, while evil is treated as derivative disorder. Yet the priority thesis does not force that completion. It narrows the field by showing what evil and nothingness cannot do as independent principles.

## **10 Natural Evil and the Limits of the Argument**

Any serious account of privation must confront natural suffering. Human wrongdoing can often be described as the misuse of positive capacities, but earthquakes, disease, predation, congenital disorders, and catastrophic accidents do not arise simply from wicked choices. Calling them privations does not by itself explain why they occur.

A disease can be described as a failure, invasion, or disorder of biological functioning. That tells us what sort of bad condition it is relative to the organism. It does not tell us why a world containing organisms is vulnerable to such failure. An earthquake is not morally evil in itself; it is a physical process whose consequences can be disastrous for conscious beings and human communities. The privation analysis therefore answers an ontological question - what the badness depends on - without automatically answering a theodicy question - why a good creator would permit the

conditions under which suffering occurs.

Traditional theological responses include appeals to stable natural law, creaturely freedom, soul-making, evolutionary development, and eschatological restoration. Each approach carries substantial philosophical burdens. The present paper does not attempt to resolve those debates. It makes a narrower observation: suffering does not require the postulation of a second primordial principle of evil. The tragedy of suffering is intelligible because positive goods exist that can be damaged.

Bereavement hurts because love was real. Disease is bad because living systems have forms of flourishing that disease frustrates. Oppression is evil because agency and dignity matter. If nothing were good, nothing could be lost. The depth of negative experience therefore testifies indirectly to the depth of the positive realities at stake.

There is a second limitation. Not every act of negation is morally wrong. A malignant growth may need to be destroyed. A false belief may need to be abandoned. An oppressive institution may need to be dismantled. A destructive power may need to be restrained. In each case negation can be morally necessary precisely because it serves a positive good. This prevents the metaphysics from collapsing into sentimentality.

The mature thesis is therefore twofold. Ontologically, privative destruction depends on a positive subject or order. Morally, actions are assessed by the goods they respect, promote, restore, or violate. Sometimes destruction is the condition of restoration. What the negative cannot do is become a self-sufficient first principle that supplies the actuality on which its own operation depends.

## 11 The Resolution

We can now return to the title question. The usual form is:

Why is there something rather than nothing? (8)

The proposed resolution begins by denying that “something” and “nothing” are comparable ontological alternatives of the same type.

Something is actuality. It can contain states, laws, relations, causes, possibilities, observers, fields, mathematics, or minds. Absolute nothing

is not a thinner state. It is the absence of any state, structure, law, relation, power, or potentiality. Therefore nothing cannot wait, cause, select, fluctuate, forbid, permit, or explain.

The phrase “why something rather than nothing” can nevertheless be retained if we understand it as shorthand for a different question: why is actuality non-derivative at some level? Here the answer is not supplied merely by definition. We face a genuine metaphysical choice among brute actuality, necessary actuality, or an indefinitely extended structure of dependence. What has been resolved is the apparent need to explain a transition from absolute nothing to being.

Put differently, the principle “from nothing, nothing comes” should not be imagined as a dynamical law imposed on an empty state. If absolute nothing obtained, there would be no law. Rather, the statement expresses a conceptual limit: causal production requires actuality on the side of the cause or explanatory structure. Nothing cannot do causal work because there is literally nothing there to do it.

This leads to a compact argument.

1. Absolute nothingness contains no entities, laws, powers, relations, times, possibilities, or measures.
2. Any causal, probabilistic, modal, nomological, or purposive explanation requires at least some such structure.
3. Therefore absolute nothingness cannot explain the existence of actuality.
4. Privation and destructive negation are intelligible only relative to positive subjects, forms, capacities, or norms.
5. Therefore the negative is not an ontological rival that can stand independently beside the positive.
6. The ultimate explanatory question must consequently concern the status of actuality itself, not a transition in which nothing becomes something.

The argument is intentionally restrained. It does not derive the attributes of God from the bare fact that something exists. It does not prove that every contingent fact has an explanation. It does not prove that an infinite regress is impossible. It does not identify mathematical necessity with metaphysical necessity. Those are further questions.

What it does accomplish is a conceptual reorientation. The universe need not be imagined as a victory of being over a rival nothingness. Nothingness has no resources with which to compete. The mystery of existence is therefore not the mystery of a forbidden transition. It is the mystery of why actuality has the ultimate structure it has, and whether some part or aspect of actuality is self-grounding, necessary, or brute.

Within classical Christianity, one may complete the argument by identifying the non-derivative actuality with God: not one object among others, but the uncreated source of created being. On that account, creation is not a process in which a pre-existing nothing is transformed into matter. “Creation from nothing” means that created reality does not arise from prior material independent of God. Nothingness is not an ingredient. God is the explanatory term. Evil is then derivative not because suffering is unreal, but because evil has no independent ontological source equal to the creator.

That completion is philosophically significant, but it must be kept distinct from the core resolution. The core resolution is available even to someone who rejects theism: absolute nothing cannot function as a causal or explanatory condition, and privation depends upon actuality. The theological question begins after this point, not before it.

## 12 Consequences for Inquiry, Creativity, and Human Meaning

The metaphysical conclusion has an epistemic echo. If actuality is primary relative to privation, inquiry should favor a discipline of constructive exposure. A serious proposal should be definite enough to be tested. A serious criticism should be specific enough to guide revision. The goal is neither blind affirmation nor sterile negation, but disciplined creation.

This matters in science. A theory that can accommodate every possible observation has protected itself from reality. It does not gain strength by

being impossible to defeat. Conversely, a culture that punishes every failed conjecture can become intellectually sterile. Progress requires proposals that are constrained enough to fail and critics willing to distinguish a fertile error from an empty invention.

It matters in philosophy. To say that an argument for God fails is not yet to show that every possible conception of ultimate reality fails. To say that current science does not require a hypothesis is not the same as proving that the referent of the hypothesis cannot exist. Methodological restraint and metaphysical denial are different acts. Good negation clears ground without pretending that clearing one structure proves no structure can ever be built.

It matters in personal and moral life. A plan is a constructive projection into a future that cannot be guaranteed. Reality may resist it. The mature response is neither to demand that the world obey the plan nor to abandon planning. It is to revise. In that sense the cycle of conjecture, collision, and revision is also a model of practical courage.

Creation involves exposure. A finished idea can be criticized; an unspoken one cannot. A declared love can be rejected; an undeclared one cannot. A built structure can fail; an imagined structure cannot. Vulnerability is therefore not evidence of truth, but it is often the cost of making something definite enough to matter.

Negation has courage of its own. The scientist who rejects a beloved theory, the witness who exposes corruption, and the person who abandons a destructive belief perform genuine acts of intellectual or moral strength. Yet the worth of such negation often derives from what it protects: truth, safety, freedom, dignity, justice, or a better construction.

The larger pattern is that participation in reality is generative. Human beings do not merely receive the world. They form explanations, institutions, works of art, promises, technologies, and communities. Those creations can be judged because reality pushes back. The positive gives criticism an object; criticism returns discipline to the positive.

This is why the question of why there is something rather than nothing is not only a remote metaphysical puzzle. It touches the structure of every act by which something determinate is made, tested, damaged, repaired, loved, or lost. The asymmetry between actuality and privation reappears at multiple levels because negation repeatedly inherits the field in which it

operates.

## 13 Conclusion: The Positive Is First

The question “Why is there something rather than nothing?” remains one of the deepest questions we can ask, but it is easily distorted by the picture of two symmetrical possibilities. Absolute nothingness is not an empty world, a vacuum, a silent duration, a field at zero energy, or a black background. It is not a state with hidden potential. If it is absolute, it has no laws, powers, relations, probability, temporality, or capacity to produce.

The first conclusion is therefore negative in form but positive in consequence: nothing cannot explain something. The demand for explanation must operate within actuality. If there is an ultimate explanation, the explaining term cannot be absolute nothingness.

The second conclusion is that many forms of negation are ontologically derivative. Destruction requires something destructible. Corruption requires a capacity or order that can be corrupted. Falsehood requires representation and a truth-directed standard. Betrayal requires relation. Death requires life. Privation is real, but it is real as the damage, disorder, loss, or failure of a positive subject.

The third conclusion is that the original question should be reformulated. The live metaphysical problem is not how nothing became something. It is what kind of actuality is non-derivative and what, if anything, explains the total structure of contingent reality. Brute fact, necessary being, and infinite dependence remain genuine alternatives requiring further argument.

The theological application follows conditionally. Classical Christianity identifies the non-derivative source with God and treats evil as privation rather than a rival substance. On that picture creation precedes rebellion, being precedes corruption, life precedes death, and the Devil can oppose the good morally without rivaling God ontologically. This structure coheres strongly with the positive-first thesis, though it is not logically forced by that thesis alone.

The deepest result can be stated in one sentence:

*Nothingness is not the competitor of being; it is the denial of any competitor, arena, rule, possibility, or event at all.*

There is something. Whatever ultimately explains that fact, the explanation will not be found by assigning causal powers to nothingness. The positive is first not because every act of making is morally superior to every act of breaking, but because negation requires a reality to negate. Being supplies the field in which absence, loss, failure, and destruction can occur. Absolute nothing supplies no field at all.

## References

- [1] G. W. Leibniz, “Principles of Nature and Grace, Based on Reason” (1714), in R. Ariew and D. Garber, eds., *Philosophical Essays*, Hackett Publishing, Indianapolis, 1989.
- [2] Augustine of Hippo, *Confessions*; *Enchiridion on Faith, Hope, and Love*; and *The City of God*.
- [3] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, Part I, Questions 48–49.
- [4] Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, especially Books IX and XII.
- [5] S. Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields, Vol. I: Foundations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [6] *The Holy Bible*, Genesis 1–3; John 1; Romans 8; 1 Corinthians 15; Revelation 21–22.