

**FROM MICROBITS TO EVERYTHING**



**FROM MICROBITS TO EVERYTHING  
UNIVERSE OF THE IMAGINATOR**

**Volume 2: The Philosophical Implications**

**Nadeem Haque  
M. Muslim**

**Optagon Publications Ltd.  
2007**

**From Microbits to Everything: Universe of the Imaginator**  
**Volume 2: Philosophical Implications**

First Edition

All rights reserved under the International Copyright Convention. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in reviews, articles and books.

Copyright ©2007 by Nadeem Haque and M. Muslim  
Published by Optagon Publications Ltd., Toronto.

Author contact e-mail: haque\_nadeem@hotmail.com

**Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication**

**Muslim, M., 1966-**

**From microbits to everything : a new unified view of physics and cosmology / M. Muslim, Nadeem Haque. -- 1st ed.**

**Vol. 2, by Nadeem Haque and M. Muslim, has subtitle: Universe of the imaginator.**

**Includes bibliographical references and index.**

**Contents: v. 1. The cosmological implications - v. 2. The philosophical implications.**

**ISBN 0-9699605-1-4 (v. 1).--ISBN 0-9699605-3-0 (v. 2)**

**1. Cosmology. 2. Relativity (Physics) 3. Particles (Nuclear physics)**

**I. Haque, Nadeem, 1960- II. Title.**

**QC28.M88 2001 523.1 C2001-901287-X**

*This book is dedicated to all those, throughout the ages,  
and in all places, who have challenged irrational ideas.*



## CONTENTS

### Chapter 1

#### Holiest God: Saying Goodbye Forever to Atheism, Mysticism and Polytheism

*M. Muslim*

13

There has always been something – The Eternal must be limitless – The Eternal must be unmovable or unchangeable – Plausible answers – Chance, Process or Evolution as the Eternal –Eternal Natural Selection or Evolution – Process: The Wave FunctionWave Function Theory – Answer Number Two: Matter is Eternal – If matter were limitless, eternal there could be no multiplicity of things – If matter were eternal, we would never have been born – The status of the argument by design (*M. Muslim/Nadeem Haque*) – The Sesamatic or Relatiological Proof of God – Has matter been changing forever? – Another take: Send matter back and see – Oscillating Universe debunked (*Nadeem Haque*) – Could matter on its own have “caused” its beginning changes? – It is all temporary – Space as the creator of matter and the infinite enabler of change – Wilful and imaginative space as reason for delay in changes – Solving the puzzle of the Eternal: God as the Answer! – A mind can transcend itself – Where is God? – Multiplicity and limitations as additional proof for God – Who Made God? Why there cannot be infinite regress – God’s attributes – The meaning of all this for human beings – A second new proof of God’s existence from the Big-Bang Origin – Preamble: Before the Big Bang? (*Nadeem Haque*) – The Origin-Force Proof of God (*M. Muslim/Nadeem Haque*) – Change and the STOP-analysis (*Nadeem Haque*) – Conclusion

## Chapter 2

### Human Belief Systems

59

***Part 1: Critiquing the philosophies of Socrates, Democritus, Plato, Aristotle, Diogenes, Zeno, Epicurus, Pyrrho, Carneades, Plotinus, Cicero, Lucretius, Ibn al-Rawandi, Abu Bakr al-Razi, Al-Warraq, Al-Tauhidi, Al-Ma'ari, Hume, Kant, etc.***

*M. Muslim*

61

Of David Hume – Review 1: The distinction between reasoning and experience – Review 2: Experience of particulars and the absence of cause – Summary – Emmanuel Kant – Causes as objective necessities – A note on indeterminacy – Gödel's Theorem and the problem of the paradoxical self referential – A. This sentence is false – B. This statement is not provable – Gödel's version of "This statement is not provable" – What is knowledge? – The mind issue – Empiricism, etc. – The measure of truth

***Part 2: World Religions: A New Perspective***

*Nadeem Haque*

93

## Chapter 3

### Where does 'God' fit in?

*Nadeem Haque*

103

The Mind of God – On the issue of the proof of God's Existence –



Christianity vs. the imagination of God – God’s imagination and the invalidation of pantheism and monism – What is the ‘face’ of God? – Could 3D space itself be a created dimension? – The Psychology of Understanding the Objectless Space of God – Conflating and confusing objectless space with a mindless void – Approaching objectless space from another angle – What is the AWE? (*M. Muslim/ Nadeem Haque*) – The Answer – The main goal – Type of universe – Consciousness as the property of absolute objectless space – Imagination of God and free-will – Non-Anthropomorphic definition of ‘need’ – Witness! – Is punishment in hell forever according to the Quran? – The finite nature of all punishment

#### **Chapter 4**

##### **Solving the Problem of Evil**

*M. Muslim*

147

Evil as a prerequisite to goodness and pleasure – But there is relief – Differences in human experience and God’s justice

#### **Chapter 5**

##### **The Human Mind and the Issue of the ‘Soul: The Solution to the Mind and Body Problem**

*Nadeem Haque*

161

Contemporary Views – The Physicalist Trap – Microbits and absolute objectless space as a new overall view to explain consciousness – How exactly does consciousness/will arise? – The brain as

switchgear: Why memory is not stored on carbon based bodies

## Chapter 6

### General Rate of Consciousness (GRC) and Reality 177

#### ***Part 1: Quantum Lights: Life as fractions of time***

*M. Muslim* 179

Introduction – What is life? – The real difference between the living and the dead – The speed of life – Lifeness – Is awareness the same as life? – We are fractions of time – GRCs – The Mechanics of Consciousness: When  $GRP = GRC$  – Universal IDs – The discontinuity of consciousness – GRCs and the relativity of the present – Consciousness as a property of space – Proving that consciousness is independent of matter – Expanding the number and variety of the conscious – On the issue of the Self – Self as Body (SAB) model – Self as Driver (SAD) model – The Self Outside the Body model – The Self Inside the Body model – Self as Space (SAS) model – Death as an opportunity for a different GRC – GRCs and the relativity of the present – On seeing the past after death – Conclusion

#### ***Part 2: GRCs and the Scriptural Evidence:***

*Nadeem Haque* 215

Introduction – GRC and the Quran – Another meaning of the word *Kitaab* – How GRC works: the cognitive mechanism – The significance of numbering – Speed of Angels and GRC: the Quranic evidence

### **Part 3: The Quran and Life after Life**

*Nadeem Haque*

225

The Quran on 'Soul' and consciousness – What exactly happens upon death: The physics of it all (*Nadeem Haque/M. Muslim*) – Telemorphogenesis (*Nadeem Haque/M. Muslim*) – Automatic and seamless continuity of consciousness – The mechanics of life after this life – Deeper meanings of the words 'death' and 'grave' – Further proof of a parallel Universe of Paradise and Hell – Coma, unconsciousness and non-REM sleep – 'Artificial Intelligence' and the 'creation' of new forms of life – Stepping outside the 'Reverse Dream' (*Nadeem Haque/M. Muslim*) – Secret of the Universe

### **Appendix: Resolving the 'paradox' of 'free-will'**

*Nadeem Haque and M. Muslim*

267

The 'paradox' of free-will – A more formal proof for the non-existence of commonly inferred 'free-will' – Changing the script – Foundational problems with the standard interpretation of free-will

### **Bibliography**

279

### **Index**

283



## **Chapter 1**

### **Holiest God: Saying Goodbye Forever to Atheism, Mysticism and Polytheism**



## Chapter 1

### **Holiest God: Saying Goodbye Forever to Atheism, Mysticism and Polytheism**

In this chapter, it is demonstrated that everything originates from one Everlasting and Intelligent Being, called God. The argument is that there must have been something always. Let us call this the eternal. The eternal is the one and only source of all things. The thesis is that the eternal must be Intelligent or imaginative, for if it were mindless or unintelligent, it could never account for change.

#### **There has always been something**

*From nothing, nothing comes.*

By definition, “nothing” is the opposite of some thing. It is therefore, not possible to get a thing out of nothing. “Nothing” added to or multiplied endlessly is still nothing.

Now it is a fact that in the very least, the reader of this piece is some thing. In other words, there is something now. Since that thing could not have come from nothing, it must have always been, or it must have come from something that had always been. Either way, the conclusion must follow that there has always been something. Let us call that thing the eternal.

## **From Microbits to Everything**

### **The Eternal must be limitless**

Because no thing could arise from nothing, all things that arise must do so only from that which has always been. Therefore, since the eternal cannot produce something out of nothing, whatever the eternal produces must be something that the eternal could always have produced. All changing things, therefore, have always been possibilities of the eternal. Now whatever the nature of things may be, reality can be no more than the eternal and its possibilities. The combination of that which has yet to be born, and that which has been born, must make up the whole of that somethingness that we call reality. Given that there is no other thing apart from these two, it must follow that there is nothing to limit the eternal and its possibilities. That is to say, that which is neither eternal nor a possibility of the eternal is nothing. Nothing, of course, cannot limit something. Therefore, the eternal and its possibilities together must form a limitless reality. But given that all non-eternal things arise strictly and solely out of the eternal, to state that the possibilities and the eternal form a limitless reality is to state in effect that the eternal is the limitless reality. Where there is nothing else apart from the eternal, there is nothing else to limit the eternal. Without anything to limit the eternal, the eternal must be limitless.

### **The Eternal must be unmovable or unchangeable**

It is true that in reality there are many things, every one of which is limited. This may lead some people to think that perhaps the eternal is the sum of, or the combination of, all these limited things. That conclusion, however, is an error and cannot be true. The eternal is neither limited nor the sum of any limited things. Let me explain. First of all, keep in mind that a multiplicity of



## Holiest God

things has been possible only because each thing is limited. There are two or more things instead of one, only because one does not occupy all the room or reality. If “1” took all the room, and filled it up, there will be only “1” in that room. Reality is the room and we are the “1s” and “2s”. Also keep in mind that every one of us moves only because, again, we are each limited. If you occupied the whole room, you could not move in that room. You move only because you do not occupy the whole of space. All limited things are movable or divisible. Because all limited things are movable, they cannot be the eternal. This is because in terms of positions, in space, at least, a changing or moving thing is, by definition, the opposite of the eternal. To be eternal is to have been what or where you have been forever. The thing that can be dislodged cannot be eternal. This is because that which dislodges a thing is either itself eternal or temporary. If the dislodger is temporary, it cannot dislodge the eternal. On the other hand, if the dislodger were eternal, it could only dislodge the temporary and not another eternal. No eternal can dislodge another eternal, either in its space or quality. In order to dislodge anything, the dislodger must move from its everlasting position and move the other from the other’s everlasting position. Now keep in mind that you have one or more things only because they are distinct from each other, either in space or in time. Thus to state that there are two eternals is to state that there are two eternal distinctions between eternal “one” and eternal “two”. Given that the eternal cannot subsequently acquire any quality that it did not always have, it must follow that eternal “one”, for example, cannot subsequently lose its distinct separation from eternal “two”. In order to move or to dislodge another, one must lose one’s state to another; and in order to move another, that thing too must be capable of losing its state and acquiring another state. But the eternal cannot gain anything that it did not always have. It cannot gain another position or quality that it did not always have. What I am saying is

## From Microbits to Everything

that things which are eternally separate remain eternally separate. Things eternally separate cannot move each other. Therefore, the conclusion must follow that the eternal can neither be moved nor does it move. Consequentially, if a thing moves or can be moved, it is not eternal. Since every limited thing is motion and movable, it must follow that no limited thing is eternal. Every limited or movable thing, therefore, is temporary. Therefore, the conclusion must follow that the eternal reality is not a number of limited things. We know that there has always been something and that it is limitless. We also know that there are many limited things that are non-eternal. An example is a human being.<sup>1</sup> The fundamental question, therefore, is: “What is it that is eternal, limitless and unmovable?”<sup>2</sup>

### Plausible answers

1. Chance, Process or Evolution.
2. Matter.
3. God.

### Chance, Process or Evolution as the Eternal

If you ask some people about the ultimate origin of things, they would say

- 
1. Indeed, if, as some current wisdom scientific wisdom suggests, our world or the universe has a beginning, then it certainly is not eternal and this makes the search for the eternal much easier. Furthermore, it is clear that the universe itself is moving. This means that it is limited and again, not the eternal.
  2. The correct answer is easy from this point on because the question eliminates all movable, moving and limited things.

## Holiest God

“chance”. Logically, however, “chance” must be the wrong answer. Here is why. There are two possible meanings of the term chance. One meaning is that of “disorder”. Now, as it has been explained earlier, the eternal must be limitless. So, if the answer to the question is “disorder”, that would be the same as saying that in the beginning there was an eternal and a limitless disorder. Given that disorder is the opposite of order, a limitless and an eternal disorder could never give rise to any order. Now we know as a fact that there is order in reality. An example of order is life. Therefore, it must follow that the eternal could not have been disorder.<sup>3</sup> *Disorder*  $\times$  *disorder* = *disorder*. So chance, as disorder, is out of the question.

Another group of people hold a different definition of chance. To them, chance stands for “reasonlessness” or without reason. But to say that something is without a reason, is to state that “it is just there” as a matter of fact and no more. This however, does not answer the question. That the goat, for example, is here as a matter of fact, is true. But where does it come from? The answer obviously cannot be “it is just there”, for we know that the goat was not always here. The fundamental problem with putting forward “chance” as the answer is this: Probability is a function of ignorance and it has relevance only as a means of determining the reasonableness of two or more mutually exclusive *speculative* propositions. What is it that is eternal and limitless? Do not say “chance”, because there is no thing or animal known as chance. The correct answer must refer to an animal, thing or identifiable reality.

---

3. Indeed, if disorder were the eternal reality, none of us one would have been able to say so as a fact, since knowledge arises only from order.

## From Microbits to Everything

### Natural Selection or Evolution

Other people's answer to the question of the eternal and the limitless is "natural selection" or evolution. Unfortunately, "natural selection" has the same problem as that of "chance" discussed earlier. It is not possible to have any "selection" unless there are:

- (a) things to select;
- (b) differences between the things to select;
- (c) criteria for selection and
- (d) time or space to allow for the selection.

All of the above imply that natural selection describes a mature or ordered activity that takes place only after things are already originated and after the rules for the relationships between things are established. Natural selection or evolution is a process between things already there.

The process itself is not a thing which one can point to as being independent of things. A process is no more than a summary or description of how things work. The question of course is not how things work, but what, of all things, is limitless and eternal. The answer cannot be evolution, for evolution is neither limitless nor is it eternal. It does not exist independently of things and it is no more than a summary or a description of the activities of things and their interactions with one another. Therefore, in a reply to the question of what it is that is eternal, the activities and interactions of things cannot be a good reply. To be a thing is to act and to react in a specific or certain way. Things are not independent of their actions and reactions. In order for evolution to be eternal, the things that make up evolution must be eternal. If the things that act and react are not eternal, then their actions and reactions cannot be eternal either. If a thing is not

## Holiest God

eternal, neither can its actions and reactions be. Now if evolution has any relevance, it is only this: that present things are the result of the actions and reactions of other things. Present things are the result of change. Clearly, that which is the result of change is not, and cannot be, eternal.

### Process: The Wave Function Theory

There is a theory of process apparently advanced by Stephen Hawking and others, which states that our world or the universe could have arisen spontaneously on its own based, upon what is called the “Wave Function of the Universe”. In the beginning, according to Stephen Hawking:

There will be no singularities at which the laws of science broke down and no edge of space-time at which one would have to appeal to God or some new law to set the boundary conditions for space-time.... The universe would be completely self-contained and not affected by anything outside itself. It would neither be created nor destroyed. It would just BE.<sup>4</sup>

How exactly does the wave-function law work? Smith Quentin explains it this way: He supposes that there is a timeless space, a four dimensional hypersphere, near the beginning of the universe. It is smaller than the

---

4. Hawking, Stephen, (1988), *A Brief History of Time*, p. 136. This is similar to the inflationary universe idea, where many physicists think that the universe came from a bubble that comprised all matter and energy. But if nothing comes from nothing, whence this tiny bubble that grew into such a large universe, with not just matter, but life. A bubble is a bubble. Since from nothing, nothing comes, if the thing that had always been were a bubble, it would forever have remained a bubble.

## From Microbits to Everything

nucleus of an atom. It is smaller than  $10^{-33}$  centimetres in radius. Since it was timeless, it no more needs a cause than the timeless god of theism. This timeless hypersphere is connected to our expanding universe. Our universe begins smaller than an atom and explodes in a and here we are today in a universe that is still expanding. Is it nonetheless possible that God could have caused the universe? No. For the wave function of the universe implies that there is a 95% probability that the universe came into existence uncaused. If God created the universe he would contradict this scientific law in two ways. First the scientific law says that the universe would come into existence because of its natural, mathematical properties, not because of any supernatural forces. Second, if God created the universe, the probability would be 100% that it would come into existence because God is all-powerful. If God wills the universe to come into existence, his will is guaranteed to be 100% effective.<sup>5</sup>

“Hawking’s theory”, Quentin writes, “is confirmed by observational evidence. This theory predicts our universe has evenly-distributed matter on a large scale, which would be on scales of super-clusters of galaxies. It predicts that the expansion rate of our universe – our universe has been expanding since – would be almost exactly between the rate of the universe expanding forever and the rate where it expands and then collapses. It also predicts the very early area of rapid expansion near the beginning of the universe called inflation. Hawking’s theory exactly predicted what the COBE satellite discovered about the irregularities of background radiation in the universe. So a scientific theory that is confirmed by observational evidence tells us that the universe began without being caused. So if you want to be a rational person and accept the results of

---

5. Smith Quentin, *Two Ways To Prove Atheism*, speech Delivered before the Atheist Alliance Convention in Minneapolis, MN on April 6, 1996: Text found at the “Secular Web” on the Internet [hereinafter, *Quentin*], pp.2-3.

## Holiest God

rational inquiry into nature, then we must accept the fact that God did not cause the universe to exist. The universe exists because of this wave-function law.”<sup>6</sup>

What is the relevance of the confirmation of some of Hawking’s predictions? Very little. To see what I mean, ask yourself this: Would you consider the theory of the Weather Person at your local TV station on any issue, say “how many angels can roller-skate on a pin”, proven, simply because he or she announces that it is going to rain at a certain time and it rains? If you have answered “yes”, then tomorrow, accept everything I say here as proven, because I predict that tomorrow at exactly 12 noon and if you want, for hundreds of years to come, millions of people will eat pasta! What I am driving at is that if in fact some of Hawking’s predictions have come true, they do not necessarily prove that everything else that he says is true. It is probable that some part of the theory is true and other parts are false. The true part of course may yield correct predictions. But then who says that three, four or even ten thousand predictions prove the entirety of a theory? For every prediction made by a theory, there may be a thousand and one other things that it does not predict. When a theory predicts something, it suggests to researchers that it may have *some* truth in it and it is therefore something that might be worth looking into. That is all. Fundamentally though, the theory itself fails as the correct answer for the following reason. The theory simply jumps into the expansion of the universe from a particular point and then proceeds to discuss “mathematical” spheres and so forth. The question is not how the universe came to expand from a particular point; nor is the question about how things have been working since the beginning; we are not interested in things which begin, but in the thing which did not begin. If this so-called

---

6. *Quentin*, p. 2.

## From Microbits to Everything

nucleus of an atom were the thing that had been always, we would never have been born. This is because since from nothing, nothing comes, that nucleus could never have given birth to more than itself. Reality would have forever remained “a timeless space, a four dimensional hypersphere ... smaller than the nucleus of an atom.” Have you seen an elephant lately?

### Answer Number Two: Matter is Eternal

There are many people who believe that there has always been matter and that only matter accounts for itself or reality. George Smith, for example, writes that matter is “metaphysical primary” and that: “On the contrary, the existence of matter is unconditional – there is nothing else for it to depend on.”<sup>7</sup> Apparently St. Thomas Aquinas “was not concerned with establishing a first cause of the universe in the distant past. Indeed, he believed that one could not demonstrate by philosophical argument that the universe had a beginning although he believed that it did... Thus he was not opposed on *philosophical* grounds to the universe’s having no beginning”<sup>8</sup> As for Martin, he posits that it is not necessarily true that “contingent” beings must be caused “whereas such beings might simply occur; some contingent beings might have no cause.”<sup>9</sup> He continues that “it may be the case that some contingent beings exist for *no reason at all* (italics in the original), that they are not produced by themselves or by another.”<sup>10</sup> I am not

---

7. George Smith, *Atheism: The Case Against God*, (1979) Prometheus Books, New York, p.250.

8. (Michael Martin, *Atheism: A Philosophical Justification* (1990) Temple University Press, Philadelphia [hereinafter, Martin], p.98.

9. Martin p.119.

10. Ibid., p.120.



## Holiest God

accustomed to making such distinctions as “contingent” and “necessary beings”. It is, however, illogical to state that a thing is neither produced by itself nor by another. These are the only two logical possibilities.

### **If matter were limitless, there could be no multiplicity of things**

Smith’s position, however, is simply not true and is untenable. Matter is not completely independent. To be matter is to move or to be movable. Matter is not one thing but a number of limited things which move or can be moved. Multiplicity and resulting uniqueness arise only because each thing is separated in space from another by space. There is space between you and me and there is space between all possible things, regardless of how microbitic, they may be. That is to say that there are “spaces” without matter. Matter, is therefore limited. Besides, we have already seen that the limited and the movable are not eternal. Reality is Limitless. So, it is clear that matter is not eternal. Given that matter is limited, it cannot account for all reality.<sup>11</sup>

---

11. As for Martin, he posits that it is not necessarily true that “contingent” beings must be caused “whereas such beings might simply occur; some contingent beings might have no cause”(Martin p.119). He continues that “it may be the case that some contingent beings exist for *no reason at all* [italics in the original], that they are not produced by themselves or by another” (Ibid., p.120). I am not accustomed to making such distinctions as “contingent” and “necessary beings”. It is, however, illogical to state that a thing is neither produced by itself nor by another. These are the only two logical possibilities. Keep in mind that it is not possible for matter to have been eternal once and then to be non-eternal at another moment. Once eternal, forever lasting; once temporary, forever temporary.

## From Microbits to Everything

### **If matter were eternal, we would never have been born**

Remember that because from nothing, nothing comes, matter could never get or subsequently acquire anything that it did not always have. Therefore, if matter had been everlasting, every possible thing that makes up reality must have been inherent in matter at all times. That is to say, for example, since we human beings are alive today, it must follow that we must have been a possibility of reality at all times. But if we have always been a possibility of reality, why were we born only recently rather than forever in the past? There are only two possible answers to this: One answer is that we were born only recently because matter did not have the ability to produce us until now. The other answer is that matter did always have the ability to produce human beings and that the actual birth or change is simply an actualization of the potential of eternal matter. It is clear that if the eternal did not have the ability to produce human beings at all times, it could not subsequently acquire this ability, since there would be no other thing to give matter this ability to do so. Therefore, the only answer worthy of discussion is the other one, namely, that change is simply an actualization of the potential of eternal matter. The problem, however, is this: By definition, that which is eternal cannot change. A potential is something you are not, which you could have, or become, provided *another* thing, condition, event, or thing different, separate and apart from you was obtained. But with the eternal or the everlasting which accounts for all reality, where is the “other” coming from? The answer is “nowhere.” The eternal is at once the “from” and the “to”. In its eternity, it has no other. The eternal represents the whole of all reality and so it goes nowhere. Because there is no other, the eternal reality must forever remain itself.

To simplify matters and to illustrate the foregoing, imagine eternal reality as a limitless carpet with endless spots of the colour green. This is the

## **Holiest God**

world that has been always and there is no other. Let us say that the human being is a spot of the colour red. How would the eternal reality obtain a spot of red from this everlasting green? It cannot. The reason is that the green spots are everlasting. The everlasting of course, last forever; they do not come from, or go, anywhere. This is what I call the problem of the eternal. That which is everlasting cannot become temporal. Reality cannot just disappear. Reality is like a knife; it cannot cut itself. The thing cannot destroy itself since it cannot unbecome and be at the same time. In order for a thing to become something which it is not at the present, it must give up what it is at the present. There is an opportunity cost in every action or motion. If you think that one green spot could change into one red spot, think again because there is nowhere else for the everlasting green spot to go in order to make room for the red spot. There is no other place for reality to shed, as it were, its present self. The eternal cannot make room for another, because by definition, there is no other and there is no room for another. On its own, therefore, if matter were eternal and limitless, it could never change or become anything else other than that which it had always been. If matter were eternal, it could never give rise to change, or to births. We would never have been born. We have been born, therefore ...

### **The status of the argument by design**

If you ask most people why they believe that this world was made by God, they might reply that it is because they see order and complexity; and just as ordered and complex things in factories need designers, so too, must this world come from a designer called God. This answer is intuitive and takes a special kind of thinker to reject it. But many philosophers are right when they say that what may be true in our experiences in our factories may

## From Microbits to Everything

not hold true for the whole of reality *in terms of process*. We know that an airplane requires a manufacturer because all airplanes that we have seen are made by manufacturers. Such thinkers claim that because we have not seen universes made before our eyes, we cannot say for sure that the universe is the same as our human made products. “Like” is not “is”. This has led some thinkers to argue that design does not prove a Creator. The universe may be like our factories but then it may not, for it may be unique. Thus those who say that the world must have been made by God the Designer, are focusing on the origin of existence (a mind behind the processes as the only logical possibility); however, those who say the opposite, escape such an absolute conclusion, by resorting to the processes of an already existent universe. They concentrate on a critique of the ascription as to the cause of the processes and structure. The atheists thus evade “God” by focusing on processes (i.e. evolution etc.) and de-focusing on issues such as actual origination and the problem of infinite regress (other than to lambaste the cosmological argument).

In “From Facts to Values”, co-authored by one of the writers of this book, several other aspects were brought into discussion, as this evasion tactic, that is, shifting the argument from the indivisibility of origin and design, to only design, was noted, in order close the gaps brought about by using only the argument from design and prove the *actuality* of God. These gaps identified and discussed were centred around the issue of eternity (infinite regress) and intelligence, and were: the *fact* of the Big Bang origin, where it was also proven why it is a fact and not a theory; the automaticity of man-made design approaching the automaticity of design of nature, such as evolving systems, and hence proving the need for greater intelligence behind design than the human, rather than a blind process, if we consider evolution as well; the strong anthropic principle, which postulates the pre-adaptation and pre-planning of the universe’s parts precisely to bring about

## Holiest God

human existence, and finally, the connected new discoveries in astrophysics, all adding to teleology backed, at its basis, by cosmology. These evidences were discussed in a seamless and indivisible fashion, and were then compared to an eternity that was synonymous to and was 'full', embraced with intelligence, as opposed to the contending view of an 'empty' eternity without the intelligence, that was to be accounted for, as the only other alternative. This argumentation procedure resulted in an entirely new proof for the existence of God, rather than the conventional unrealistically compartmentalized teleological, cosmological and ontological proofs. The first two are in and of themselves, inconclusive, whereas the ontological proof is fallacious, since the mere assumption that the ability to imagine the highest good, which is God, does not mean that the highest good exists. The cosmological and teleological arguments, therefore, were restructured as a *unit* in this new proof, using new evidence from nature, the whole of which could be dubbed the *teleogenical proof* (origin of design, purpose), though such a name was not applied to that proof in "From Facts to Values". Essentially, the elaborate and intricate proof showed that design implies an intelligence greater than that of human intelligence and that intelligence must be one, creative and eternal, the universe having been originated. It was stated in "From Facts to Values" that design has to do with "how" the universe was created and not whether it was by a singular non-spatio-temporal dependent entity, but that the "how" question has been converted into the "if/whether" question and then attacked by the atheists, inordinately, in that, in their stating that 'like' is not is, they dismiss the whole argument. What is forgotten, firstly, is that "design" only refers to the structuring of the existent elements, and that their origin has to be accounted for; and, secondly, that although it may be true that "like" is not "is", such a fact of design may *reinforce* the idea of a higher intelligence, rather than diminish it.

## From Microbits to Everything

Despite the new, teleogenic argument, purported to conclusively prove the existence of God, we will soon see below that the question of God cannot be limited to design, order and complexity, as its foundational construct, and that there is proof from an even more fundamental level. In fact, there are much more simpler questions that can lead us to God's existence. It is simpler in that one needs only pure logic to realize the truth of God's existence as opposed to drawing evidence empirically and from inferences on design, despite the fact that the steps in the logic are greater. Please do follow on!

### The Sesamatic<sup>12</sup> or Relatiological Proof of God

How do things come into being? By things coming into being what is meant is that the way in which children, for example, are born for the first time into the world. Prior to my birth, something was here. For the sake of simplicity let us say that my parents caused me to be here. And continuing with that logic let us say that my parents' parents caused them too to be here. Let us also take the position that it has always been like this, namely, one or more things uniting to cause another thing to come into being; and that thing too, causing something else to come into being and so forth. When it comes to the question of the origin of all these changes, there are only two possibilities. One is that matter has been changing forever and there is no beginning point or time for this change. The other possibility is that change has not been forever and that it was God who made and makes all changes possible. It is not necessary to go into definitions of God at this point. For

---

12. *Sesa* means 'change' in the African language, Ashanti. Why *Relatiological*? Because the proof is based on comparing the relations between matter, change and eternity.

## **Holiest God**

now, though, it is important to keep in mind that the philosophers have not proved that change is eternal. What they have said is that it is possible that matter is eternal and has been changing forever. If matter has been changing forever, then obviously, there is no need for a God.

### **Has matter been changing forever?**

One undeniable thing about reality is change. For example, you and I were not here before our births. We also know that there were millions before we came here and these are no longer here. Every day, more new comers are added to the mix. More may come after we are gone. Where do all these people come from? From the logic of the philosophers the only answer must be that we all come from changing matter. According to this position, everything that is happening is simply matter changing from one state to another. But is it? When the philosophers say that matter has been moving forever, they imply that the changes or movements of matter have no beginning. There is no point in space or time where these changes began. The fact, however, is that changes, are by definition, successive. In this world, all things or changes do not come at once. This comes before that. That comes after this and so forth. But then if as the philosophers say, changes of matter have no beginning or a first step, how can they explain the successions that are all over the place?

To get a subsequent step, you require a prior step. Without a first change, there can never be a subsequent change. The simplest way to think about this is that every changing thing is limited in space and time. Matter is a collection of limited things. On this note, the fact that we are each able to move from one position to another shows clearly that we are each limited. For if you are endless, you cannot fit into any place and so you move not. It

## From Microbits to Everything

is a thing's position in space that defines its presence or existence. It does not matter how long matter has been around; therefore, if it is limited, it must always have had a specific position in space. But let us assume for a moment with the philosophers, that matter had been here forever. There are only two ways by which matter could have been present or occupied positions in space. One is what we call rest without motion and the other is what we call motions. Whether it had been here forever or not, matter has either been moving or resting forever. To change, however, is to move from one position to the other. If you are moving or resting at a constant rate and you continue that way, there can be no change. A change only occurs when a thing accelerates or de-accelerates from a rate of rest or a constant rate of motion in space. When matter is at a constant rate of *rest*, the manner in which it changes is to *accelerate* from that position. On the other hand, when matter is at a constant rate of *motion*, the way on which it changes is to rest from that speed or to *de-accelerate*. Acceleration, deceleration, divisions and multiplications are the only things that define change. A change happens when matter moves "from" "to". If there is no "from" there can never be a "to". The "from" is where the thing was before it moved. The "to" is what we call change. So, unless one were to say that matter never had any position in space, an impossibility, then we are left with the fact that even if matter had been around forever, matter could have changed only by shifting its eternal "from" position to another position. Here is the crux of the matter. Since matter cannot be said to change before it changes, its "from" must necessarily be its position of "rest". It does not matter whether the "from" position is one of rest without motion or motion. What is important to know is that the acceleration or de-acceleration is *always subsequent* to the "from" position. Now clearly, since matter cannot change unless it accelerates or de-accelerates; divides or multiplies from the "from" position", it follows that the original point at



## Holiest God

which matter rests from its motion or moves from its rest is the *beginning* of change. Thus, however long matter has been around, its changes had a beginning. Contrary to what the philosophers have said then, matter has not been changing forever. So, clearly, this shows without a doubt then that this world as we know it, had a beginning.

### **Another take: Send matter back and see**

One of the easiest way of figuring out that matter has not been changing forever is this. Let us convert time into distance so that matter's changes would be the same as if it had been travelling from one point in space to another forever. Remember that changes are movements from one position to another. Changing forever, therefore, is the same as moving from one position to another, forever. Using distance for time, we would see that there can be no beginning point for matter's travels. If we assume with the philosophers that the changes had no beginning, then no one can point to any point in space and say "here is where it started". Now we all know that matter is here in the present but it was not always like this. You and this page were not here until very recently. Matter has come from far. So, continuing with the exercise, let us build a STOP for matter in the "now" and let us see whether, if we were to send matter back to where it came from, it could return. Do you think that if matter started returning to where it came from it would ever arrive or reach the end? The answer is absolutely not. No matter how far and how long it goes, there could never be an end position for matter. This is because, according to the philosophers, its changes did not start anywhere. But the fact is that if you don't start anywhere, you don't end anywhere. The problem is that the distance between our STOP and where matter came from is the same for

## From Microbits to Everything

matter, whether it is coming or going. Thus if it is impossible for matter to reach home or to any beginning point of its changes, it must follow that matter could never have arrived at this present STOP from there. If matter is here, therefore, that must show that matter has not been changing forever. It had to start somewhere. Once again, we show that matter's changes had a beginning.<sup>13</sup>

### The Oscillating Universe debunked

One can apply the 'STOP-analysis' of the previous section to the oscillating universe model in which it is theorized that no beginning existed, to see if it is valid. The Oscillating Universe theory was developed in 1934, by Richard Tolman. In an oscillating scenario, since the series of big-bangs and big-crunches have gone on forever, the regress is infinite, with no beginning; hence, it would take an infinite time for the universe to get here,

13. As I mentioned before, an object in a constant state of rest is said to change only when it decreases or increases its speed. An object that increases its speed expands its positions in space or reaches more of its possibilities. The opposite is also true: An object that decreases its speed contracts its positions and reaches less of its possibilities. Hence, if the original state of matter was that of constant rate of the highest motion, then the type of change that we would have seen in this world would have been one of contraction or of de-acceleration. Contraction, however, is the opposite of births and growths. The type of changes that we see in this world are expansive rather than contracting. If matter had been de-accelerating (decelerating) from an original state of motion, we would not have had an expansion but the contraction of the universe or of life. For birth or growth is result of an acceleration from a position of no birth (rest) to a position of birth (motion). It represents a grab of one or more of matter's possibilities. This, therefore, shows that the "forever" state of matter was not one of highest motion but that of rest. It has been accelerating from a "forever" position of rest.

## Holiest God

to the present STOP. An infinite time to get here, is another way to say that it will never get here, as per the STOP-analysis. However, the universe *is* here. Therefore, it would not take an infinite time to get here. If it does not take an infinite time to get here, then it started somewhere, at a particular STOP in the past. Therefore, there is no infinite regress and hence no oscillating universe, but either the one and sole origin of our universe, or a *finite* number of connected cycles, the latter which we can eliminate using Ockham's Razor.

### Could matter on its own have "caused" its beginning changes?

Again, let us assume with the philosophers that matter has been around forever. Since reality is all there is, there can be nothing else outside matter to add to, or to help, matter to change. Every change that we see in matter today, therefore, must always have been a possibility of matter. That is, matter should always have had all that it needed to make human beings, for example. The question then is, if all that was needed to make a human being always existed in matter, why did we only arrive recently? Why weren't we born before? What's with the delay? Let us say that a quality or quantity "x" is what is needed to finalize the making of a human being. If this "x" were not a part of eternal matter, matter could not subsequently acquire it. This is because matter, according to the philosophers, is reality. If reality didn't have this "x", then "x" did not exist and there is no other place to get "x" from. On the other hand, if this "x" was eternally present in matter then changes should have occurred long before they did. Let's say that a thing, say "M" is at position "1". Let's call it "M1". When M moves to position "2" it becomes "M2". It has changed from M1 to M2. Clearly, before M moved to position "2", position "2" already existed. The only relevant

## From Microbits to Everything

observation is that prior to the move there was a gap between position “2” and M. As M is complete at position “1”, position “2” is not M but M+ or M- depending on the situation. Let us say that “x” is the quality whose presence necessarily enables movement from position “1” to position “2”. If “x” was a part of M before the move, then M could not have rested at position “1” since “x” necessarily results in movement from position “1” to position “2”. Thus, if “x” or position “2” is the facilitator of the change from M1 to M2, it must be external to M. Where M stands for matter, this clearly shows that “x” was not eternally present in matter. It is only when the “x” is not inherently present in matter that we can explain the delay in the actualization of matter’s possibilities. Also, as I mentioned before, to be a thing is to be a fixed position in space. As a thing is, by necessity, neither less nor more than its position in space, whatever quantity or quality a thing is in space at any time is the totality of that thing. This is true of every thing in space. This explains why uninfluenced or undisturbed by external forces or relationships, every thing remains as it is. In itself alone, nothing in space has the power to be less or more than it is. But then to change is to be less or more than you previously were. Since no particular piece of matter can do this on its own, it must follow that every change is by necessity, the result of relationships or positions external to the subject of that change. Variety of things is proof of the individualistic nature of changes. The variety of things proves that collective matter is a number of things. Because matter is no more than a collection of changing things, the need for an external “x” for change applies to all matter as a whole. Another fact that shows that the “x” of changes is external to matter is this. Before each change occurs, it is preceded by the possibility of the change. Before a child is born, children must be possibilities, outside of and independent of a particular parent. It is neither the parent nor the child’s state of matter that makes the child possible but “childrenability”

## Holiest God

independent of the parents. It is only when the parents participate or fulfil the conditions of this “childrenability” that a child can be born. But then you must agree that these conditions are not something that the parent dreamed of. Nor is it possible for the parent to fulfil the conditions and not have the child. Similarly, a car moves, but it is not the car that makes motion possible. Motion, in general, exists as possibility in space, independent of, and external to, the car. The car moves only when it fulfils certain conditions for motion. A particular function is always subsequent and external to an independent antecedent possibility of the general function. This is true of everything or function in space. No individual thing makes any of the relationships or positions that define, limit and shape its presence. As matter is no more than these individual things in relationships, it follows that neither matter as individual pieces nor matter collectively as a whole has anything to do with the very positions or “principles” in space that enable matter to be, move and change. It is never our quantities that change us but our relationships in space. And each one of us is helpless to refuse to change as soon as we change positions. In the same vein, each one of us is helpless to start any change as long as we are in the same position. If we can never start or stop any change as long as we are in the same position, that must clearly show that it is not us that cause changes but the positions that are *apart* from us. To firm this up, I note that the same possible relationships that result in changes continue to apply in space even after a given quantity of matter leaves any particular position in space. We can imagine the continuing possibility of the relationships or “principles” with or without actual matter being present in a given space. But we cannot imagine the presence of change without the applicability of the relationships or principles of space. To change is to divide, add or multiply the relationships or positions of a given thing. And, if for example, we replace matter with numbers, we can still divide, add and multiply

## **From Microbits to Everything**

without any problems whatsoever. In other words, that which enables changes is not so much particular pieces of matter as much as the fact that: 1. the pieces are limited and: 2. the relationships exist as possibilities in space. These again go to show, therefore, that the relationships or principles that enable change are external to and independent of matter. Matter, then cannot be the “cause” of its changes. So what causes changes in matter?

### **It is all temporary**

Before I answer the question of what it is that causes changes, I think that this is the right time to answer a question that is probably on everybody's mind and that is, whether matter itself is eternal. The answer is: not a chance. Time is a measure of events in sequence. Where there are no events, there is no time. Forever then, means endless events. But the only events that are relevant are those that are in sequence. This is because time is sequential. Where all the events happen at the same time without any sequence, those events are, for all purposes, one, constant or in a state of rest. There can be no time then. As you are aware there are two kinds of rest. One is by constant motion without rest. And the second is rest without motion. The problem is that a limited thing cannot move without rest. This is because being limited, its continuity of motion is a function of the rate of repetition of its position in space. The position of a thing, however, is its rest factor. If you move a hundred times, that must mean that you must stop a hundred times. Therefore, no matter how fast a limited thing moves in space, it rests. But motions and rests are the things that we call changes. And as we have already seen, matter has not been changing forever. That means that matter has not been moving and resting forever. The only other

## **Holiest God**

alternative for matter is rest without motion. But it is impossible for matter to rest without motion. This is because the only thing that does not move is that which is resting on something or is being prevented from moving by something else. Nothing that is limited in space can rest on itself. Try it for yourself. This is true of all limited things, big and small. Let us not forget that even the biggest thing in space is still limited. And not only that, all bigger things are just a bunch of smaller things together. In the beginning there were small things and they got bigger by joining hands or changing positions. If this is correct, then matter did not know such a thing as rest without motion. But let us continue. Even if we say that the small things rest on the bigger things and so forth and that the biggest things were always there and not the result of changes and therefore, of motions, still, the biggest thing cannot have nothing to rest on. In any event, rest without motion is a fiction. We don't see matter at rest anywhere. So that must mean that matter has never rested without motion. On the other hand, we have already agreed that being limited, matter cannot move without rest. The only thing that matter can do, and cannot help but must do, is to move and rest; that is, change. So, in short, wherever matter is, it changes. Had matter been around forever, it would have been changing forever. Since matter has not been changing forever and in fact, its changes had a beginning, it must follow that matter has not been around forever. Matter was born at the moment when motion or change was born!

### **Space as the creator of matter and the infinite enabler of change**

If matter was not always here and if matter is not responsible for change, what is the obvious and the only alternative? The answer is "space"; that limitless, indivisible eternity in which everything is and which is the

## From Microbits to Everything

prerequisite for every presence, movement, division, multiplication and change. That ever present space which you can never imagine as being absent anywhere, any time, is the creator, container, mover, organizer and planner behind everything. In some of my previous books<sup>14</sup>, I show that Albert Einstein was wrong in talking about the “curvature” of space. Only a limited thing curves. But this confusion has had the effect of giving people the idea that space is matter. Nor was Descartes right when he talked about space as an “extension” of matter. Space is not a shadow and does not extend from anything. Space is independent of matter and it is, and can be, without matter. It is matter that needs space. But space itself does not need matter. We can imagine a matterless space but not a spaceless matter. But by space what is being referred to is not positions or areas. These are fractions in space. Space itself is that objectless constant without which no limited thing can be. It is that vast expanse through which we move but cannot sense, limit, divide or grasp in any manner. Matter is derivative from space as music is a derivative of plays. The best analogy of the relationship between matter and space is between the singer and song. We are the music and space is the musician. When the singing stops, the music stops. But although the song is from the player, the musician is not the music and the music is not the musician. But of this, more at another place. It is the positioning in space, and not just the presence of matter, that is the cause of changes. As I mentioned earlier, a change is no more than the division, addition or multiplication of positions in space. When we say that something has changed, all that we are saying is that its position in space is now different than it was before. The real thing that causes changes is the re-arrangement of relationships. So, change is another word for

---

14. Muslim, M., and Haque, Nadeem, (2001), *From Microbits to Everything: A New Unified View Physics and Cosmology: The Cosmological Implications: Volume 1*



## Holiest God

“relationizing”. But the relations between things is just a code word for the possibilities of infinite space. It is space that allows for movement or change. The nature of the change of course depends upon the limits of the thing and what it is that it has added or subtracted from itself. But clearly, positioning and the ability to move are the result of a constant and a limitless space. It is the constancy of space that gives each thing, its presence and stability. It is also the limitlessness of space that allows for that ‘extra’ room that enables all possible movement. A full space has no new tenants. But then when you think about it, you would see that all changes are mathematical propositions of pluses, divisions and multiplications. These are all functions of *limits*. And these limits are divisible or multipliable as a result of *infinity*. It is the logic of this infinity that gives us the logic of all relationships, mathematics included. We do not change then because we are a given quantity: we change only because there is space to move into, and what is in that space is what we become. Two units of hydrogen and oxygen become water only when one or both move into the “same” space. If either element remained in its place, we would not see any water. But then even when they meet, still, each element retains its quantity and thus again proving that their “wateriness” resulted from their positions in space. At any time, any of us has only two choices: movement or rest, expansion or contraction. And all of these require and are dependent upon space. All changes in matter result from this “relationizing” in space. Without space, nothing can move, be or change. It is space, therefore, that enables change and nothing else.

### Wilful and imaginative space as reason for delay in changes

But then we must ask, if all changes were always possibilities of space and if

## From Microbits to Everything

space has always been around forever, then how can we explain the delays in changes? We pose the same question that we gave to matter, to space. And if space is like matter, namely, mindless, it too can never explain the delay in the changes for the same reasons that a mindless matter cannot explain the delays. If space and matter had been around forever, then between the two of them, changes should have occurred long before they did. This is because between the two of them they should have all that they needed to make changes. The only explanation that the human mind can give for delay in changes is planning or purposeful delay. Nothing else can explain delay in the actualization of possibilities except will. Think about it. A non-wilful or mindless reality cannot maintain a distance between its possibilities and actualities. With the mindless, what can be is what is. It is only a wilful, imaginative, singular space that can delay the actualization of its potential. Nothing else can do it. Only a reality that has wishes can say for example, “I want humans now” or “I can have humans but not yet”. We come to this conclusion because there can be no other reasonable alternative for explaining how the eternal gives rise to the temporal except where the eternal is imaginative so that changes occur, not as changes of the eternal itself, but as the manifestations of the eternal imagination or will. If you think that this is not true, try coming up with the temporary from a mindless eternity! This imaginative space then is what we call God. We are all the imagined or the desired beings of God.<sup>15</sup>

---

15. All this is spelled out in *God For Everyone*, by M. Muslim.

## Holiest God

### Solving the puzzle of the Eternal: God as the Answer!

Where the eternal is intelligent or a mind, it possesses a special capacity which nothing else has: It can transcend itself through its wishes, desires or the imagination.

#### A mind can transcend itself

It was stated previously that a potential is something you are not at present, but which you could become, provided another thing or condition was obtained. It was then argued that given that there is no other thing or event apart from the eternal, the eternal could not have a potential and must, for that matter, forever remain what it has always been. The eternal could never give rise to the temporal. This is what can be called the problem of the eternal. The everlasting must forever remain so. However, when the eternal is intelligent or mindful, the problem of the eternal disappears. The reason is that while the eternal cannot add or take away from itself, if it is intelligent, conscious or a mind, the condition or event that is necessary for the actualization of a potential, could arise without changing the eternal self. The conscious or intelligent eternal is not a mere quantity; it is by nature, reflective. To be intelligent, conscious or mindful is to *continuously* or *unceasingly* reflect, envision, imagine, desire or think wishfully.<sup>16</sup> It has been shown that the eternal must forever remain eternal. Since the temporal must come from the eternal, the natural question, of course, is: How then

---

16. An imagination is an active form of a wish, desire, or will. God's imagination is God's wish or will. But God's will or imagination is unlike anyone else's because He has the infinite power to make His will as real, sustained and as varied as possible.

## From Microbits to Everything

does the temporal arise where reality is eternal? The answer is that the temporal does arise where and only where the eternal is Conscious, Intelligent or Mindful.<sup>17</sup>

In the imagination, one can add to or subtract from oneself without necessarily changing one's limitations or reality. The imagination allows for qualitative transcendence: a capacity not open to any dumb or non-imaginative being. It is the ability to imagine, wish or to desire that provides the possibility of the potential to the otherwise unchanging eternal. As long as the eternal can desire or imagine, it can imagine or desire other than itself. The temporal, therefore, arises, not as a changing reality, but as the changing wish, desire, the reflection or the imagination of reality. The potential or the temporal, therefore, does not inhere in the eternal as part of itself, but rather, arises and departs as desired. Change is not therefore of the eternal, but solely of the desires of the eternal. Because the eternal is limitless, there is no other power apart from itself; it is therefore, all-powerful. This imaginative, all-powerful, limitless and everlasting being is what I call "God."

### Where is God?

God is everywhere and He is the ultimate "space" in which every possible

---

17. By a mind what is being referred to is not a large-sized brain. The mind simply stands for the capacity to order, reflect, and to will or imagine. It is not necessary that this capacity be housed in, or result from, a brain. We know that human beings have a mind by virtue of the brain. But it does not necessarily follow that without a brain such as ours there can be no mind. It is rather, the internal integrity of the thing and its orderliness that makes for intelligence. We cannot say about a thing that it is not intelligent because it has no brain. We can only say that it has no intelligence because it has no order.

## Holiest God

thing moves. By “space” I do not refer to any physical thing, object or place. No, not at all. I am using the word space in this context simply to stand for the limitless, indivisible, non-material ground or medium in which every possible thing is situated and contained, but which of itself is contained in nothing.<sup>18</sup>

The bases of this conclusion are as follows. I have already shown that matter is limited. Therefore, there must be part of reality where there is no matter. Now every piece of matter is in space. Every limited being or object, whether it is material, angelic or otherwise, must occupy some space. Nothing sits in itself. Besides, the law of opportunity cost applies to all possibilities. It is not possible to have limited things or worlds unless they are situated in, and separated by, space. So, wherever there is a countable or limited thing, there must be space. If there is an objectless part of reality, there must be space at that part of reality. Nothing else is conceivable as present where there are no objects. There cannot be spaceless nothing. Thus both at the material and non-material parts of reality there must be some space. Reality consists only of the material and the non-material. Therefore, if there is space at both the material and the non-material parts of

---

18. Many people might feel discomforted about the statement that God is the Ultimate Space of the world. However, it must be repeated that by space what is being referred to is nothing physical, limited, created, material, or movable. Space is not a thing and it is unlike anything at all. It cannot be smelled, seen, touched, heard, sensed or grasped in any way. It is not measurable or divisible and it is limitless. God is One, the Eternal, Absolute, Everlasting, Unique, Mindful and the Source of all things. The essence of being Mindful is that God is a Person. But He is a person without the limitations of legs, ears, and so forth. If God is the Space of your being, you move in His presence and His Being and He is the closest to you. The lack of limitations in Him does not make God any less personable. To know that God is that close and that He is with you always, must bring forth the most awesome possibilities for relating to Him. What is required is not condemnation and anger but a revision of one’s very concept of reality.

## **From Microbits to Everything**

reality, it must follow that there must be space everywhere.

Now space must be indivisible because in order to have any difference between things, or, in order to divide anything at all, one needs space. One cannot logically demonstrate the possibility of multiple “spaces” separate or distinct from one another. Space is not an object. It is not countable. If you could “add” trillion spaces to a trillion spaces you would end up with only one Space. Consequently, there is only one indivisible space that situates all things. Everything must be in some type of space; whatever world you conceive cannot be but in some type of space. But space itself need not be in anything and is not contained in anything. Since this “Space” is everywhere, it must be limitless. We have already seen that the eternal is limitless. Clearly, there cannot be two limitless things. So, if Space is limitless, it follows that it must be eternal. Since God is eternal “and” Space is eternal, God and Space must be one and the same. God is One, non-material, non-divisible, unique, and limitless. He is present everywhere and surrounds, limits and contains all possible worlds, but God Himself is surrounded or contained by nothing. God is not in “Space”, but rather, every thing is carried by God and God is the ultimate “Space” of all possible worlds.

### **Multiplicity and limitations as additional proof for God**

In this world, there are many things with different limitations, capacities and functions. In addition, we are not all born at the same time. The sun, for example, was here before you and I were born and certainly, some people are older than others. If we wished to trace the ancestors of things, two possibilities could come to mind. One could argue that different things come from different ancestors and that we do not all come from one, but from many different ancestors. One could postulate

## Holiest God

that the first event that resulted in the earth, for example, was eternally different from the first event that resulted in the sun. If then one were asked as to how the sun and the earth work together as a system, one could reply that each thing possess a certain fixed capacity or limitation and that what we see as a system is no more than a coincidence of limitations. If this argument were valid, there would not be only one God but a number of Gods. The argument, however, fails. Here is why. As already shown, in order to have a number of things, one needs space. Therefore, whatever the number of ancestors may be, the space that contains and separates them must also be eternal. But to be a thing is to be a fixed quantity and quality. A thing does not “possess” a limitation or capacity. Rather, to be a thing is to *be* that limitation and capacity. Clearly, if there were many ancestors, each would be limited. The limited, of course, can only account for itself. But we know that there is no such thing as a thing arising out of and existing in isolation. Every thing is either a part of, or the result of very wide relationships. The earth, for example, is what it is because of its precise relationship to the sun and to other things *ad infinitum*. You are a human being only because such things as air, food, acceptable weather, etc., exist and relate to you in a defined way. You do not exist apart from the earth and the earth does not exist apart from the sun and so forth. The same is true of every possible limited thing. All things interrelate and interdepend. Given that the ancestors could not subsequently acquire what they did not have eternally, it must follow that if there were multiple ancestors, their interrelationships must be also be eternal. Given that each ancestor is limited, it must follow that for each thing there could be no infinite regress as we trace back but must end in that particular ancestor. Now reality consists of only space and a number of things, each limited to its position, quantity and quality in space. So, what, for example, is the ancestor of say, the sun? Whatever the name may be, the sun’s ancestor could not be

## **From Microbits to Everything**

more than this: a limited thing. But where is this ancestor now? All things exist in fixed quantities and in interrelationships of dependence. Every thing is a composite of a given quantity and of a given neighbourhood in space. Given that the position and quantity of that ancestor is fixed eternally, it could not make the sun and then go somewhere else intact. But every thing that one can point to in space is itself limited and dependent upon its relationships with others. If the ancestors are in space, they too interrelate and interdepend. One could not say that the sun is the cause of the earth any more than one can say that the earth is the cause of the sun. No one thing in space is the cause of another. Where in space do you think that the eternal ancestor of the sun is sitting? There is no such animal. Everything in space is itself limited, moving, changing or, in other words, temporal. Now reality consists of only a number of things and space. Given that the things in space are temporal, the conclusion must follow that the things, at least as they exist in time, are caused by space. So, once again we show clearly that space is the creator.

### **Who Made God? Why there cannot be infinite regress**

Interestingly, the conclusion that all things come from one everlasting, unmoveable God, could also be arrived at even by way of the problematic proposition that “everything has a cause”. The traditional problem, of course, has been that if one says that everything has a cause, and that God caused all things, then one must answer the question: “Who caused God?” One cannot then justifiably say that God has no cause. St. Thomas Aquinas is quoted as stating that God must be the First Cause, for otherwise the causes would be infinite and the universe could never<sup>19</sup> start. But that answer has not been satisfactory. John Mackie, for example, asks: “Why



## Holiest God

must the regress terminate at all? Why, if it terminates, must it lead to a single termination, to one first cause, rather than to a number – perhaps an indefinitely large number – of distinct uncaused causes?”<sup>20</sup>

Here is the answer: When we talk about an “infinite regress”, what we really mean is an infinity of causes. The regress is simply another way of referring to one’s ancestry. The origin of a thing is the sum of its ancestors. To posit an infinity of regress is the same as saying that a thing’s ancestry or predecessors are unlimited. But we have already seen that only space is limitless. So while the ultimate ancestor must be infinite, His infinity cannot arise from any motions or causes but only in His being as limitless and eternal by nature. Another way to look at it is this. If a thing is a result of change or if it is caused by another, then when you trace back its roots, where you stop, is the beginning of the event. The ultimate cause of the thing becomes the end as you trace back. However, when you say that the number of causes must be endless, you in effect state that there is no place to stop or that there no end. But to say that there is no place to stop or no end, is the same as saying that there is no one ancestor or group of ancestors that is the ultimate cause or the beginning of the subsequent events. But then if there is no beginning cause, there could not be a subsequent effect or change. If one posits change, one must necessarily posit a beginning cause or an end. Since there is change, it must necessarily follow that there was a beginning. In other words, the regress must end. It has already been shown that it ends in God. Furthermore, and for the sake of argument, if one were to eliminate space as the fundamental ancestor, then what one would have would be a number of ancestors. Since the regress must be infinite, the number of ancestors must be infinite. But we have

---

19. *Martin*, pp. 97-99.

20. Mackie, J.L., (1982), *The Miracle of Theism*, p.87.

## **From Microbits to Everything**

already seen that things are limited and that the very possibility of motion arises only because of the limited number of things in space. Where one's ancestors are limited, one cannot trace one's origin forever; one has to end at the limited number. So, here again, there can be no infinite regress.

With respect to the issue of God's cause, the answer is that births, changes, causation, take place and are possible only in and because of space. A change is a form of motion from one position or relationship in space to another. The question of who caused what is, therefore, the same as who moved what. The question of who caused God is the same question as "who moved God?" But in order to move anything at all, one needs space. One needs space as a pre-condition to motion. God is space. It is God that makes motion or causation possible. Therefore, the "mover" of God needs God to be present or existing as a precondition to causing or moving God. In other words, God must be existing before He is born or simply put, He is the fundamental necessity for any births or causation. Causation applies only to positions *in* space. Because God is not in space but He is space, God is beyond causation. God is His own "cause" or in other words, simply everlasting. Again, there can be no problem of infinite regress here, because there is no possibility of any motion at all beyond or outside of space. God is eternal.

### **God's attributes**

Is God Intelligent? Yes, He is. We have shown that He must be imaginative in order to be able to account for change. However, I could also easily demonstrate God's intelligence by just pointing towards the things that He has done. You are aware that this world is orderly. While it is true that much of the stuff of life is unpleasant and sometimes extremely

## Holiest God

painful, things are ordered nevertheless. Here, things are appropriately matched to sustain life, beauty and consciousness. When we look round us, we see water for the thirsty and food for the hungry. We have taste buds that delight in the variety of delicious foods available. There is a male for a female and many beautiful things for the eyes to behold. We each have the ability to understand, and a world that can be understood. If one were to carefully observe oneself, examine a grain of sand or a single leaf and the delicate balance of the ecosystem, watch ants move and rivers flow, examine, listen, look, feel and think, one would see the organisation, complexity, order and the creativity inherent in all things. Every day the soft and mysterious winds effortlessly rise from the free and the blessed waters to blend in with the vast and awe-inspiring sky and the beautiful earth to sing a living song of community, order and power. We feel so much at home and are glad to be here that almost all of us would rather be than not be. Now of course the author of these must be orderly, because from disorder, no order comes. A disorderly eternal cannot give rise to an orderly temporal world. So, God must be intelligent. Indeed, it would be illogical for the human being, who merely follows the patterns of the things in the world to be called intelligent while stating that the source of the things that makes for intelligence cannot be intelligent!

Can God communicate? Of course He can. The ability to communicate is a part or a function of intelligence. A thing cannot be shown to be intelligent if it cannot communicate. We all represent the communication of God's wish or imagination. Communication is the orderly arrangement of things or symbols to express a desire, a wish or thought. And the world is just that: all of it is an orderly arrangement of God's wish. But don't ask me whether God has ears or eyes like us, for no one can demonstrate logically that one needs only ears and eyes to communicate. These things are limitations to communication and are necessary only to beings who have no

## From Microbits to Everything

means of co-ordinating multiplicity or without means of accessing order without processing. God does not need ears because every thing is the result of order and He makes order. He does not need eyes and ears in order to know or relate to what He Himself makes.

How close is God? There is no distance between God and any of us, for He represents the very possibility or ground of our being. This also means that He is never absent but always present. Wherever you turn is the face of God and He is with you wherever you may be. Is God all knowing? Yes, He could not be otherwise. He is the very ground or the ultimate space upon which *every* thing happens. He is Presence itself and as such, nothing escapes Him. God does not need to make any effort to know things. But by the logic of His relationship to all things, He knows all. Is God Just? Certainly. God cannot be said to be unjust because justice is the giving to each of what it deserves. And it is God that determines what a thing deserves. God, therefore, is Just.

Is God greater than His creation or all the possible worlds? Yes, God makes all worlds possible and all worlds are contained by Him. So all the worlds are necessarily less than Him and are contained by Him. Besides, in reality or in eternity, there is no other than God and therefore, it is He who gives every possible world its name, form and content. To give you an idea of God's greatness, albeit in a poor and woefully inadequate manner, try to imagine the magnitude of Space: It goes up forever, without limit; down forever without limit and in every direction, it is spread limitlessly going on forever. God is the Greatest. This space is not made of any parts and there are no gaps or spaces between the Space; this makes the 'substance' of God truly unique, in that it is a non-substance, as we usually define substance, in terms of matter and energy.

## Holiest God

### The meaning of all this for human beings

Many people may find it difficult to accept the proposition that none of us is eternal; that our existence is not necessary and that we each exist simply at the Pleasure of God. Discomfort however, is not the measure of truth. We all come from God and we are very close and dear to Him. But none of us is God and none of us will ever become God. Therefore, all those who seek to shed their humanity and to become God, or all those who claim that one can cease to be human and to become God, are wrong. If someone feels God-like or claims to be God-like, that claim can only arise as a result of either error or hallucination. One can certainly get very close to God and be blessed by Him with all sorts of extraordinary things. But to be close is not to become. None of us can ever become God. There is a barrier between the created and the Creator. This barrier is eternal. In fact, it is this very barrier, that makes for the “*other*” between us and God. If we were not different in kind from God, the whole creation would have been a silly play on the part of the One and Only. But it is not. Our “*otherness*” is necessary and would forever be maintained in order to make it possible for us and God to relate as strangers and as friends, for discourse, for company and for embrace.

That God can easily destroy us and replace us with whatever He desires, is a conclusion which may be true but that need not lead one to despair. The proposition of the ultimate unreality of the created is merely academic in the sense that it is only from God’s perspective. From any other perspective, things can get no more real and permanent than we are. We are not an illusion, but only that we exist and die simply at the pleasure of God. That things represent the imagination or the will of God seems extraordinary, but to be alive and to be conscious, when you were previously non-existent, is the most extraordinary thing. What are the

## **From Microbits to Everything**

implications then for human beings? We live and will continue to live only in so far as God wishes that we do so. If God wished to be without us, we would all be destroyed and only He would remain. He, in this sense, is the First and the Last. On the other hand, what the foregoing implies is that since it costs God nothing to make and to keep us, each one of us has the possibility of being sustained forever. We are the result of the most profound thought, will or wish: of the desire of the everlasting to be with the temporary; of the powerful to be with the powerless, of the unchanging to be with change, of the One to be with many. The God that permits us the space to be in His reality, must mean that He loves us, for after all, to love is to desire to have or to be with someone; and the desire of the one and only God to be with human beings is the most profound of all desires. If we represent God's imagination, we are loved because the desire is His own. Besides, now that we have come and God has "known" imperfection and company, it will not be the same for Him to be without us. He could of course, if He wanted to, but if He liked us, that would be a great loss! So then, it all depends upon whether we make it worth God's while to keep us. If you make your presence pleasant to God, you may last forever, in His company!

### **A second new proof of God's existence from the Big-Bang origin**

We now know for a fact that the universe came from an origin, commonly referred to as the Big Bang. According to the standard explanation of contemporary physics, in terms of how space and time are viewed, this is thought to have been a point of infinite density, around fifteen billion years ago, where all energy and space itself originated. Now this singularity existed in the past. The obvious question that can be posed is: Why would

## Holiest God

the singularity not continue to be in the state it always ever was? What caused the singularly compressed energy to explode!? If the force that caused it to 'explode' was inanimate then could it have come from 'outside' the singularity, to cause a change in its latent dormancy?

### Preamble: Before the Big Bang?

Those physicists who try to circumvent what was before the Big Bang claim that it is meaningless to discuss what happened before (outside) the Big Bang, for there was no such thing as time or space (or as they would say: spacetime); there was no "before". This, however, is a highly problematic conclusion arrived at by faulty assumptions. The flawed assumptions are based on a lack of understanding of what time and space really are. Time is nothing but a measure of motion of particles that comprise the universe (see, *From Microbits to Everything*, Volume 1). Since time is nothing but a measure of motion by counting repetitive regularly spaced motion, at the singularity, the motion ceases as there is no distance between the particles, but such a cessation is only the cessation of the motion of the constituents *within* the singularity. If this point is understood, the issue of the infinity of time, or whether that which gave rise to the universe existed in time or was not in time etc., becomes utterly irrelevant. Logically speaking, the singularity has to be embedded in something. And if so, how can it be stated that the thing/realm that the singularity is embedded in, call it Realm 1, cannot have any other thing in it that can give rise to the motion of the singularity in Realm 1. The question of 'outside' is synonymous with the question of 'before'. If all we have is the motion of particles and all of them were coalesced at some point in the past, i.e. the singularity, then it means that there has to be an outside. It is not a question of whether there is

## From Microbits to Everything

an outside, but rather, what is the true nature of that ‘outside’. First of all, one has to realize that there is no such thing as curved space. Curved space is a ‘device’ that is useful only for calculational purposes, as it forms a geometrical substrate for the motion of particles which are in reality moving in actual absolute space. This has become a problematical issue partly due to conceptual reasons as a result of a misconception of the true nature of time and space, thanks to Einstein. Such a misconception gives rise to the faulty statements such as “We cannot even talk about what came before the Big Bang?” We are consequentially forced with a scenario where we have to answer the very legitimate and most profound question: What was before? What forced the Big Bang?

### The Origin-Force Proof of God

Let us concentrate, for a change, not on how and why the ‘singularity existed’, but, rather, how we get the universe from the ‘singularity’? In other words, what forced the Big Bang? Let us postulate an inanimate force  $F_i^1$  to have caused the Big Bang. It will be recalled in basic physics, thanks to Newton, this time, that “an object will remain at rest unless acted upon by an external unbalanced force”; this principle can be applied to the so called singularity too, given the logical considerations in the last section. If we postulate another external *inanimate* force  $F_i^2$  to explain this first force  $F_i^1$  of the Big Bang that we have initially postulated, we are getting into the usual type of escapism of infinite regress, because if we can somehow explain the existence of such an inanimate force,  $F_i^2$ , we will be forced to explain how this force came into being, and so on, *ad infinitum*, i.e. we will have to have  $F_i^2, F_i^3$  etc., unto infinity. As a result, the ‘singularity’ would have just



## Holiest God

remained in existence as a perennial lump, as there would have been no origin-force that could reach from infinite regress to ‘punch’ it into expansional action. However, the singularity did not just remain. We are here. Therefore, the pre-Big Bang force could not have been an *inanimate* force at infinite regress. It had to have been *animate*, in the sense of being a conscious force, or a force that was caused by some type of consciousness (where the force and consciousness that produce the force are terms that are to be taken as being synonymous). In other words, it must have been a force caused by a conscious agent, call this force  $F_c$ , where the agent of that force has always been there as absolute objectless space, precluding the existence of anything inanimate. It is  $F_c$  that must have caused  $F_i^1$ . Furthermore, the force  $F_i^1$  is precisely set, given the preciseness of the expansion of the universe, and that which is precisely set, cannot be other than intentioned. That which is intentioned must necessarily have the components of consciousness and intelligence of some type. In the context we are analysing, this  $F_c$  is God, as we have defined in Chapter 1!

### Change and the STOP-analysis

Another way to summarize the proof that matter-cum-energy could not be the starting point and cause of the universe is as follows: Matter is limited. A limited thing moves. So matter moves. A move is a change. *Why would a change occur now rather than not before?* Any ‘before point’ one picks though, can be subject to the same question, *ad infinitum*. So, one would be forced to say, if defending this position, that the starting point is at negative infinity, or at infinity in the past. But if this is so, change could never have started, as per the STOP-analysis. If one never had a starting point, one never had

## From Microbits to Everything

subsequent change. But there is the *fact* of change, so matter/energy was not the starting point, or cause of the change. This again leads to immoveable, objectless space, the space of infinite intelligence, that is, God as *the* cause of change.

### Conclusion

To conclude, it has been argued that all things come from one mindful and everlasting reality. It has been shown that this reality must be mindful, because only the mindful can account for change in an eternal reality. This being has been named God. It has further been shown that God Himself does not change but that all possible worlds and beings arise only as the desires or the imagination of God. Change, is not therefore, of the eternal, but of the desires of the eternal. As for God, it has been demonstrated that He is the ultimate Space of all things and that He is in fact the only Reality. God is one, everlasting, imaginative, just, all-powerful, all-knowing, ever-present, the first and the last and the greatest. All things come from God and ultimately return to Him.

## **Chapter 2**

### **Human Belief Systems**



## **Chapter 2**

### **Human Belief Systems**

**Part 1: Critiquing the philosophies of Socrates, Democritus, Plato, Aristotle, Diogenes, Zeno, Epicurus, Pyrrho, Carneades, Plotinus, Cicero, Lucretius, Ibn al-Rawandi, Abu Bakr al-Razi, Al-Warraq, Al-Tauhidi, Al-Ma'ari, Hume, Kant, etc.**

In arguing that the universe is God's imagination, we are not resorting to philosophical idealism, relativism or indeterminism. There is indeed an objective world out there that has cause and effect relationships. To establish this 'ground of reality', albeit as an imagination and creation of God, many are the brilliant minds whose works are going to be discussed here. There was a temptation to name all of them, but they are far too many to mention here. So, for the sake of brevity, they will simply be called "the philosophers". There will, however, be a discussion in detail of the works of two philosophers whose views in a way summarize almost all of the arguments of the philosophers and who have greatly influenced modern thinking on the matters at hand. The important issue here is: "what is truth and how do we know it?" The philosophers' reply is to show us that in the first place, we have some serious shortcomings. As human beings, we perceive the world only through our senses and minds. These senses are limited and so too is the mind. This explains why we cannot sense or experience many things without the help of aiding instruments. Our minds, argue the philosophers, acts as a sort of sieve, filter or mediator between us and what is out there. Therefore, argue the philosophers, we cannot say that what we get through our sense and minds is what is out there in reality.

## From Microbits to Everything

Furthermore, they continue, we live for only a very short period of time on a little planet in a vast cosmos. It is illogical, therefore, to generalize our very limited experience unto the whole. What may be true here may not hold elsewhere. We over generalize then when we move from so-called truths on earth to truths about reality as a whole. Enter David Hume.

### Of David Hume

Hume was an 18th Century British philosopher and his ideas have greatly influenced the course of Western, and for that matter, world philosophy and scholarship. On the question of the source of knowledge Hume's answer was that it was upon "experience and from experience only". To clarify his positions, Hume divided all perceptions into two classes: impressions and ideas. "By the term impression," Hume explained, "I mean all our more lively perceptions when we hear, or see, or feel, or love, or hate, or desire or will."<sup>21</sup> According to Hume: "Every idea is copied from some preceding impression and sentiment; and where we cannot find any impression, we may be certain that there is no idea."<sup>22</sup> And because the ideas are mere copies of impressions: "No object ever discovered, by the qualities which appear to the senses, either its cause which produced it or the effects which will arise from it; nor can reason unassisted by experience ever draw any inference concerning real existence and matter of fact."<sup>23</sup> So in effect, Hume's position was that there are only sensory impressions. Our so-called ideas are simply copies of these perceptions. The idea of sweetness, for

---

21. Hume, David (1988), *An Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, p. 21.

22. Hume, p. 73.

23. Hume, p. 30.

## Human Belief Systems

example, is based upon one's experience of sugary taste and no more. The test of knowledge is therefore: "show me the impression"<sup>24</sup> to which it relates. An idea that has no grounding in a sensory impression was thus for Hume, baseless: When we run over libraries, persuaded of these principles, what havoc must we make? If we take in our hands any volume; of divinity or school of metaphysics, for instance; let us ask, Does it contain any abstract reasoning concerning quantity or number? No. Does it contain any experimental reasoning concerning matters of fact and existence? No. Commit it then to flames, for it can contain nothing but sophistry and illusion.<sup>25</sup>

Hume, in effect, denies the possibility of knowledge through reasoning alone, since reason cannot operate without ideas that are mere copies of sensory impressions. For Hume then, what makes a belief valid is not reason but experientiality. Now, the individual's experience is limited to that individual's experience. As no person can escape himself to validate his or her perceptions, no one individual then can justifiably state that his or her knowledge necessarily reflects reality. So, knowledge, in Hume's view, remains entirely subjective and personal. Furthermore, Hume posits that perception is of particulars and not of generalities or connections. The connections that we make are, according to Hume, not given to us by the things themselves, but flow from our habits.<sup>26</sup> The mind may see that one event is followed regularly by another and as a matter of habit the mind concludes that the one causes the other. But, he believes, all that has happened in fact is that one event has been experienced to be closely

---

24. Hume states that: "But if you cannot point out any such impression, you may be certain you are mistaken when you imagine you have any such idea." (*An Introduction To Modern Philosophy*, pp. 579-80.)

25. See Hume, p. 149

26. Hume, p. 43

## From Microbits to Everything

associated with another. Now since only experience gives knowledge, “cause”, not borne out of experience, is a mere fact of psychology and therefore has no basis in reality. “Causes and effects”, Hume states, “are discoverable, not by reason, but by experience.”<sup>27</sup>

In summary, Hume’s corollary is that there is no necessary connection in our experience of any particular cause and effect. One thing may regularly follow another and based upon this, we may conclude that the one is the cause and the other is the effect. This is not true. “All events seem entirely loose and separate; one event follows another; but we can never observe any tie between them. They seem conjoined but never connected.”<sup>28</sup> Every effect, according to Hume is different from its cause and therefore, without an experience of the cause and the effect one could not state which was the cause of what. “Hence we may discover the reason why no philosopher who is rational and modest, has ever pretended to assign the ultimate cause of any natural operation. Ultimate springs and principles (causes) are totally shut off from human curiosity and enquiry.”<sup>29</sup>

### Review 1: The distinction between reasoning and experience

Is there a distinction between experience and reason? And are sensory impressions the only sources of knowledge? It is indisputable that

27. Hume, p. 30. In this respect he further writes that: “Let an object be presented to a man of ever so strong natural reason and abilities; if that object were entirely new to him, he will not be able by the most accurate examination of its sensible qualities to discover any of its causes or effects” (Ibid). He also states that: “All inferences from experience, therefore, are effects of custom, not of reasoning”(Hume, p.44).

28. Hume, p. 70.

29. Hume, pp. 32-33.



## Human Belief Systems

experience is all there is. But experience cannot be narrowly defined as “sensory impression”. Experience also includes “intellectual” and “emotional” or if you will, “spiritual” impression. As human beings, we experience this world only through the medium of our minds. Never has any one had any experience without the use of the mind or reason. It is reason that interprets sensations and gives us what we call experience. Consequently, there is neither an experienceless reason nor a reasonless experience. The result of this is that the test for the validity of knowledge or for reality cannot be based solely upon the arbitrary “show me the sensory impression” of Hume. That uninterpreted impression is meaningless to the human being. To be useful, the impression must be subject to reason. It is reason that provides the criteria for identifying, judging and determining meaning. Thus the fundamental issue is not “experience” vs. “reason” or of “facts” vs. “psychology,” but what reason is and what reason demands. By failing to base knowledge upon reason, Hume fails in his attempt to ground knowledge in “experience.” An interesting note to remember is that Hume had said that any proposition that does not state quantities or conduct experiments should, in his words, be committed to flames. Now we note that Hume’s essay was not on quantities, nor was his conclusion the result of any experiments. Hence, if we were to employ Hume’s criteria above to his very own essay, we should commit it then to flames! The fundamental problem with Hume’s argument position, however, is that it is contradictory. As we have seen, Hume said that if one cannot point to the sensory impression to which a thing refers, that thing is not true. But ask this: “Where in the world can we find the sensory impressions of Hume’s arguments? Who has ever experienced a sensory impression of Hume’s arguments?” Have you? So Hume’s project fails.

## **From Microbits to Everything**

### **Review 2: Experience of particulars and the absence of cause**

The next problem with Hume's position is that even within his own arguments, he jumps to conclusions too readily. Hume had argued that human beings experience "particulars" and not generalities or connectivity. Therefore, the connections that we call causes do not obtain in reality but only in psychology. The fact, however, is that even if the human notion of "cause" or connectivity between things were a mere mental habit, it does not necessarily follow that the habit is entirely subjective. The test for the validity or invalidity of the habit cannot simply be the fact that it is a habit, for that is no argument but a mere assertion. Rather, the test in this context, is the relationship between the habit and the world. Hume failed to establish that the so-called habit itself was not the product of knowledge or that it was not necessitated by the nature of reality. What is even more significant is that the distinction Hume makes between "particulars" and generalities does not apply in reality. In fact, there are no particulars to be found in human experience. No human being, Hume included, has ever experienced anything as a "particular." We are made up of composites and relationships. We are born into a complex world of one thing relating to the other; nothing is or comes as an independent unit but is itself connected to or situated in another. Even the atom is a composite of parts in space, in time, in relation to something else. If there are "particulars" they are not found anywhere in experience. We connect one thing to another, not because of so-called habit, but because we cannot do otherwise: that is the way the world is. Hume's conclusion that our notion of cause as a mere mental habit is not supported, and it is at best, an unwarranted assertion. Hume is, however, correct in his critique of a certain notion of "cause." He writes that:

## Human Belief Systems

If you see a house, you can conclude it had an architect or builder because such effects, you have experienced, proceed from such causes. But does the universe resemble a house so closely that we can with the same certainty infer a similar cause? To ascertain such reasoning, it were necessary that you have had experience in the origin of the world. Have worlds ever been formed under your eye? Have you experienced the generation of the universe as you have experienced the building of a house?<sup>30</sup>

I have to make it clear that there can be no dispute that in language a “cause” is the manifest parent of the child or phenomenon. What Hume is right about is that similarity does not equal identity. “It is like this” does not necessarily mean that “it must be this”. So far, so good. But in talking about causes, we are not limited by analogies. For example, where the possible answers to a question are closed and examinable, one may arrive at the “cause” by eliminating all but one of the possibilities. The test is not “where is the sensory impression of its regular association” but rather, “is there any other possible explanation?” Thus on the issue of God, if indeed the argument proceeded merely from an analogy of human manufacturing, then the strength of the argument would be directly proportional to the degree of similarity between the two. But as we will see, this is not necessarily the case. It is not necessary that we begin the argument about

---

30. Castell, Alburey and Borchert, M., (1983), *An Introduction To Modern Philosophy (4th edition)* [hereinafter, *An Introduction To Modern Philosophy*], p. 194. In the same vein, Hume further writes that: "The existence, therefore, of any being can only be proved by arguments from its cause or its effect; and these are founded entirely on experience" (Hume, p. 148).

## From Microbits to Everything

God by pointing to human artefacts or analogies. We all find ourselves in a world that is not of our making. We come for a very brief period and then leave forever. It is only natural that we ask, as we have minds and are able to “create” things, whether whatever the originator of our being is, also has a mind, wishes and the ability to choose. In answering this question, all that we are looking for is whether our experiences, through our reasoning, yields any other conclusion than God. Even if the best argument that could be put forward is by analogy only, still, the strongest objection to that analogy could only be that the answer is not conclusive. The objection still leaves the God-hypothesis, proceeding from analogy, as probably true. Furthermore, it is no answer to the question about “cause” to show that the whole may be unique. Uniqueness in and of itself is not an obstacle. In space and time, every thing is unique. Every position; every time, every number and every sequence is unique. Reality is nothing more than a collection of the unique. So, it’s no answer to the question of cause to say “but you can’t say that because it is unique”. The issue is better framed as one of proportionality. The more there is to something, the harder it is to know it. The less we know of something the farther we are from understanding its source. Implicit in all this is that we obviously cannot judge what we don’t comprehend. The problem of the origin of the whole is a subset of the problem of induction. As long as the possibilities are not closed, it would be premature to finalize the conclusion. That’s all. Besides, the issue is not what is the cause of the “unique”, but rather what is the cause of the familiar. The fact that the answer may be unique is irrelevant to its validity. Nine hundred and ninety nine-trillion times seven hundred and thirty five billion, plus ninety nine trillion squared multiplied by nine hundred and ninety nine trillion squared, is unique, but that is no argument for stating that there is no answer. From the above, it is clear that the reason why the inductive process is limited is only because of the possibility of

## Human Belief Systems

multiple plausible answers. This possibility of other factors not taken into account by the generalization is the central limitation of the inductive process. We shall call any situation with a possibility of indefinite or endless alternate solutions an “open factual.” If other possibilities make the inductive process limited, then it would follow that where there are no such possibilities, the same limitation does not apply. If one has a limited number of facts and a similarly limited number of mutually exclusive solutions, say two or three, the ascertainment that two options are false, necessarily leads to the validity of the unexcluded or remaining option. Let’s call this a “closed factual”. The answer to the question of the “cause” of the world is a closed factual and presents only a few possible answers. There are no endless logical possibilities but: God or not-God. Provided each of these is clearly defined, then their validity or the lack thereof can be proven upon analysis.

### Summary

David Hume narrowly defined experience as sensory impression and sought to establish that human knowledge was limited to this “experience.” But while life is indeed experience, this experience is not limited to mere sensory impressions. The impressions become meaningful only when filtered through reason. Knowledge is not gained by merely being impressed by the senses. You might as well go press your head against an encyclopaedia and let it soak into your head. Knowledge is gained only when we name and establish relationships in a logical manner. Both the misled and the guided may obtain the same sensory impressions but they may arrive at contradictory conclusions. One may be right or both wrong. And it is reason, not the sensory impression, that determines this. The funny thing is

## From Microbits to Everything

that Hume was using reasoning to persuade us that reasoning does not give us truths and that this is true!

We created not the heavens and the earth and all that is between them except with and for a limited term. (Quran 46:3; 44:39).

### Emmanuel Kant

Emmanuel Kant was born in the 18th Century in Germany and like Hume, his ideas have also greatly influenced the course of Western intellectual tradition. Kant's philosophy was an attempt to solve some of the problems raised by Hume. Concerning Hume, Kant wrote that: "Since the origin of metaphysics nothing has ever happened which was more decisive to its fate than the attack made upon it by David Hume. He started from a single, but important concept, namely causal connection. He challenged reason, which pretends to have given birth to this idea, to tell him by what right she thinks anything to be so constituted that it is necessarily connected with something else; for that is the meaning of causal connection. He demonstrated, beyond refutation, that it is impossible for us to see why, in consequence of the existence or occurrence of one thing, another thing must necessarily exist or occur also. Hence he inferred that reason was deluded with reference to this conception of causal connection ... that in reality it was nothing but a bastard child of imagination impregnated by experience; that a subjective necessity of habit was mistaken for an objective necessity arising from insight."<sup>31</sup>

---

31. *An Introduction to Modern Philosophy*, pp. 591-2.

## Human Belief Systems

### Causes as objective necessities

If cause is defined as that “in consequence of the existence or occurrence of one thing, another thing must necessarily exist or occur also” without qualification as to the circumstances, in which the associations must occur, then Hume and Kant are right. However, they are both dead wrong when they teach that in consequence of one, another cannot necessarily occur. Reality is not composed of causes but *changes*. But as I will show below, changes are no more than movement from one relationship to another. These movements are only of two kinds: that is, of accelerations or decelerations and of divisions or multiplications. What we call changes are consequences of repositionings in space. Once a thing repositions, it necessarily changes. As a result, of the repositioning, a “new” thing necessarily occurs. So when we say that in consequence of the existence or occurrence of one thing, say repositioning, another thing, say newness, must necessarily exist or occur also, this is beyond habit. It is a question of mathematics. That is, of divisions and multiplications. If you add one orange to two oranges, the answer “three” is not a question of habit but of necessity. Habit or not, the alternative answer “not three” is not a possibility. All changes or events are in the nature of these divisions and multiplications and it is this repositioning that is the cause of all things in space. Therefore, contrary to what Hume and Kant proposed, causes are objective necessities. But I understand why they came to their conclusions. It appears then, even as now, that causes were described by pointing to pieces of matter without reference to positions in space. Because Kant believed Hume’s arguments to be valid, he built upon them. As Hume’s arguments crumble, therefore, so too do Kant’s. If we recall from the discussion on Hume previously, he had stated that what we call cause and the connections between things are not part of “experience” but are

## From Microbits to Everything

mere habits of the mind. And since we could not escape from the mind, idealism or scepticism was Hume's conclusion. Kant's response to this was simply, yes indeed, that causation is not a matter of experience and Hume was right. But here is Kant's contribution: The idea of cause is not just a matter of mere mental habit; the notion is built into human nature itself.<sup>32</sup> Of note is that Kant's position, in effect, reinforces the distinction made by Hume between reason and experience. Kant argued that the human mind is not a passive thing that merely receives data unprocessed. The mind, according to Kant, is active and it is already pre-programmed at birth to shape the data it receives in accordance with what he called the "intuitions". The mind has intuitive knowledge of certain concepts such as space, causality (or substance) time, etc. These are not given by experience but are the basis for experience or for understanding. The world gives us sensations but it is the intuitions that give us the ability to unify, discriminate, synthesize and classify and in effect obtain knowledge. In effect, the intuitions mediate between the impressions and the human being. The degree to which this occurs is the degree to which we gather knowledge. "Our intellect, says Kant, does not draw its laws from nature but it imposes its laws on nature."<sup>33</sup>

Kant argues that because human beings are dependent upon the intuitions for knowledge, we cannot know the degree to which its mediation or sifting process affects the quality of the knowledge that we possess. For this reason, there can be no certainty as to whether human knowledge

32. One can see that Kant's response does not in any way undermine Hume's skepticism at all. For Hume was not concerned with the source of what he called the habit, but with the conclusion that the "cause" was not part of the nature of things and hence necessarily subjective. Kant did not answer, but only explained Hume.

33. Kline, Morris (1985), *Mathematics and the Search for Knowledge*, Oxford University Press, [hereinafter, Morris], p.16.



## Human Belief Systems

has some fundamental relationship to ultimate reality. It is possible, says Kant, that what we know, is different from what is. Kant then draws a distinction between what is known through the intuitions (phenomena) and things in themselves (noumena). In this respect he writes that:

The things which we intuit are not in themselves the same as our representations of them in intuition, nor are their relations in themselves so constituted as they appear to us. And that if we take away the subject or even the subjective constitution of our senses in general, then not only the nature and relations of objects in space and time, but even space and time themselves disappear; and that these as phenomena, cannot exist in themselves but only in us. What may be the nature of objects considered as things in themselves, without reference to the receptivity of our sensibility, is quite unknown to us. We know nothing more than our mode of perceiving them...<sup>34</sup>

Kant's conclusion, therefore, was that knowledge of ultimate reality is impossible.<sup>35</sup> This led Kant to idealism, and not surprisingly, he wrote: "It remains a scandal for philosophy and human reason in general that the existence of things outside us ... must be taken only on faith, and that if it occurs to someone to doubt it, we can produce no counter-argument sufficient to prove it."<sup>36</sup> What Kant failed to see is that since each person is stuck, as it were, in his or her own mind, doubt about things existing outside of us, must include doubt about everyone and everything.

---

34. Kant, Emmanuel, translated by J.M.D. Meiklejohn, (1990), *The Critique of Pure Reason*, p. 35, [hereinafter, *The Critique*]. Again, Kant states that: "Such properties as belong to objects as things in themselves, never can be represented to us through the medium of the senses", (Ibid., pp. 31-32).

## From Microbits to Everything

Everything includes rules of construction, logic, etc. But in order to doubt, one needs to think about things that come from one's experiences. These are the things that exist outside the person. Thinking is possible only with objects, propositions and motions in space. All these exist outside the person. But if the very things that make doubt possible, namely, thinking about relationships between things, is doubtful, then doubt itself is doubtful and hence, meaningless as a position. Those who assert meaningless propositions need not be responded to. Had Kant looked at things this way, he may not have given up on the skeptics as he did. Be that as it may, that Kant became an idealist followed logically from the fact that he believed what Hume said about particulars and the lack of necessary connections between things in reality. The fact that Kant grounded the source of the connections in human intuitions was not a counter argument, but a more precise way of saying the same thing. The criticisms that apply to Hume's arguments, therefore, apply to Kant's arguments as well, in so far as they follow from the unfounded distinction between reason and experience. If, according to Kant, all we can know, and have known, is phenomena, then the question is, how did Kant get his idea of noumena? Do phenomena give

---

35. Kant states elsewhere that by making the distinction between phenomena and things in themselves he was not suggesting that phenomena were "mere illusory appearances". He sought only to establish that "in so far as this or that property depends upon the mode of intuition of the subject, in the relation of the given object to the subject, the object as phenomenon is to be distinguished from the object as a thing in itself" (*The Critique*, p.410). The problem is that regardless of his statements to the contrary, by positing the distinction, Kant creates doubt about the possibility of the thing in itself being different from phenomena and hence the possibility of human knowledge as transcendental ignorance or illusion. This, we will soon show, cannot be.

36. Kant's preface to the second edition of *The Critique of Pure Reason: Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol.3, p. 23.

## Human Belief Systems

insight into the real nature of things so as to enable Kant to state that there is such a thing as noumena? If yes, then Kant contradicts himself. If no, then we need not take his position seriously. Second, even if Kant had established that there were such things as things in themselves as opposed to phenomena, that in itself would not be a valid reason to move from the alleged phenomenality of things to the proposition that therefore their ultimate natures may not be known. That is simply a jump to conclusions. Furthermore, in so far as following Kant, in that, we cannot experience the “noumena”, the question about ultimate causes and origins can only be questions about phenomena. As such, responding to the question of “what is the cause of phenomena?” with “we cannot know the cause of phenomena because we do not know noumena” is the same as saying that “we cannot know... because we do not have an answer”. Forget noumena. What is the cause of phenomena? Besides, how is it that this unknowable is able to give birth to this knowable phenomena? From where did the unknowable get the knowable? Like Hume, Kant also wrote that: “Secondly an empirical judgement never exhibits strict and absolute, but only assumed and comparative universality (by induction); therefore, the most we can say is that so far as we have hitherto observed, there is no exception to this or that rule.

If on the other hand, a judgement carries with it strict and absolute universality that is, admits of no possible exception, it is not derived from experience, but is valid absolutely a priori.”<sup>37</sup>

What is interesting about the above is that Kant’s statement purports to be strict and absolutely universal on the subject matter. Yet Kant failed to establish that this universality of his position was derived from the intuitions

---

37. *The Critique*, pp.2-3.

## From Microbits to Everything

or valid *a priori*. The fact is that neither Kant nor anybody else can make an argument “valid absolutely *a priori*”. An argument is valid only when it cannot be refuted without self-contradiction or disorder. Now we note that Kant failed to provide an irrefutable base for this proposition about the limits of empirical judgements. The point is that if this proposition is not intuitive, but is of itself empirical, then in so far as it is a universal statement or judgement, Kant contradicts himself. On the other hand, if it is intuitive, it is not proven. As for the so-called intuitions, they are more imaginary than real. We all know that the rules of valid reasoning have to be learnt. Sure, we have in built capacities to learn. But evidence that we can learn wrong thinking is demonstrated every day by fallacious and superstitious conversations around us. If logical thinking were intuitive, all of us at every time would have had no fallacies and superstitions. To think aright is to recognize the proper positions of things in space. For this we don't need intuitions but perception and the ability to differentiate between this and that. If these are the intuitions, they are only a fraction of what is required to think properly. The rest falls outside ourselves and impinge themselves on us by necessity. If we were to place this same mind in a world without events except for the mind only; or if we were to place the mind, in a chaotic world of non-repeating events that disappear as soon as they appear, what reasoning would the intuitions come up with? None. Kant's intuitions are problematic not only because of what I have shown above, but also because they lead to incurable idealism.

In any event, the universality of a given statement must not depend upon whether or not it is intuitive or empirical, for these are problematic and vague terms. The test is whether or not reason can yield exceptions to that proposition. For example, we are persuaded that  $1+1=2$ . But this does not necessarily imply that the proposition is valid intuitively or *a priori*.  $1+1=2$  is universal only because the human mind cannot come up with any

## Human Belief Systems

circumstance where  $1+1 =$  other than two. A thing becomes a universal only when we cannot logically think of anytime or anywhere in the world that it does not apply. A thing either is or it is not. If it is, it has a specific position in space. It is not possible for a limited thing to be, and to be nowhere at the same time. Indeterminism is nonsense if it is taken to mean that a limited thing can be said to exist and not have any position in space at any time. To be, is to be present. And that presence for a limited thing is a function of positions in space. And once a thing's presence or position in space is defined or grasped, it is. "I am writing these words". I don't need to make an exception to that. If you are "so and so", that's what you are. There is no need for an exception to that. Universal statements become problematic only when we don't know all the variables or where there are alternative conclusions equally consistent with the given explanation. That's all. In the end, both Hume and Kant fail because they did not prove what they sought to prove. More importantly though, they fail because they use their minds to tell us that what comes from the mind is not to be trusted. So why should we take what they are saying as true? This takes us to indeterminism.

### A note on indeterminacy

You have probably guessed it, but we will see over and over again that it is impossible for human beings to construct logical arguments to establish that the world is indeterminate, or that knowledge or truth is not possible. Any attempt to do so results in self-contradiction. This is how order works. If the world is indeterminate, the proposition or statement coming from a mouth in that world must also be indeterminate. But then if the proposition too is indeterminate; it does not thereby establish any lasting truths. This is the problem for all idealism, relativism and indeterminism.

## From Microbits to Everything

Their propositions are contradictory at the core. It is not possible to be in two different places at the same time. We cannot justifiably refer to that which can be in two different places at the same time as one thing. That which is at different places at the same time, must be two or more things in the plural. The indeterminate plus the indeterminate plus the indeterminate = indeterminate. This takes us to Werner Heisenberg. He is credited with the “uncertainty” principle:

According to the most commonly accepted interpretation, Heisenberg’s Uncertainty Principle implies that quantum particle does not possess a definite position and a definite momentum at the same time. It can have one or the other, but not both. In other words, a subatomic particle does not behave like a macroscopic object for which position and momentum can be simultaneously defined.<sup>38</sup>

The problem is that uncertainty is a function of ignorance and not of the real world. The real world does not divide into “microscopic” and “macroscopic”; these are mere abstract concepts. The world is a continuum. The macroscopic is nothing more than the microscopic multiplied. The largest thing is the sum of many tiny parts. If a quantum field truly exists, it is everywhere, in every thing and in each one of us. How indeterminate is the slice of bread travelling to nourish your indeterminate body? Look at things this way. The tiny particle either has a position and momentum or it does not. If it has only a position and not a momentum, there is nothing indeterminate about it. If it has both, that is the way it is and there is nothing indeterminate about that. The fundamental refutation of the uncertainty

---

38. Morris, (1987), p.52.

## Human Belief Systems

principle however is this. Momentum can never be measured of something which does not exist. If it does exist it must have a place or a position. Nothing can be said to be present in space that has no position in it. So, if scientists can't find it, it is not because it is not anywhere. It is just that they do not know how to look for or to capture it. That's all. If not so, how does a positioned scientist with a positioned instrument in a positioned lab measure a positionless object? The structure of the world does not allow for indeterminate or endless possibilities when it comes to a thing in space. Any statement to the effect that nothing can be justified without infinite or indefinite regress is necessarily contradictory and false. If the assertion purports to be true, then by its own logic, it is itself indeterminate. But then if the principle is itself indeterminate, it cannot be reliable.

### Gödel's Theorem and the problem of the paradoxical self referential

Here is a supposed paradox: "The village barber shaves all those in the village who do not shave themselves. Who shaves the barber? But within the framework of classical logic, the Barber Paradox is just plain undecidable."<sup>39</sup> This is because: "Tracing through the logical possibilities, we find that if the barber shaves himself, then he doesn't shave himself – and vice versa."<sup>40</sup> This paradox is an attempt to illustrate the alleged problems that exist in logic and hence, problems that are present in proof and in knowledge itself. My position is that there are no unsolvable propositions and that paradoxes are not logical problems but games without

---

39. Casti, John L., (1990), *Searching for Certainty: What Scientists Can Know About the Future* p. 362.

40. Casti, p. 361.

## From Microbits to Everything

reality. Let me illustrate. Does the barber shave himself? Yes. But how? First, let us de-artificialize the proposition by situating it in the world of real relations and then proceed from reality. Who does the barber shave in the village? According to the proposition, he shaves “those who do not shave themselves”. This implies that he does not shave those who do shave themselves. But in order to shave those who do not shave themselves, he must determine that they have not shaved themselves. The barber’s reasoning is as follows: “Hey, villager, because you have not in the past shaved yourself and you do not now shave yourself, I will shave you.” Keep in mind that distinction has been made in the paradox between the barber and the villagers. The paradox is that the barber shaves “everybody” who does not shave himself. Therefore, the barber’s reasoning must apply to barber as well. It goes like this: “I the barber must shave myself now because I have not in the past shaved myself and I do not now shave myself, so I shave myself.” He shaves himself after this reasoning. Once the barber shaves himself, he is one who shaves. It is no argument to state, as Casti does, that if he shaves himself he does not shave himself. That confusion occurs only when that proposition is viewed in the abstract or remains artificialized. Logic is a property of reality and works only with real things. Enter Kurt Gödel.

### **A. This sentence is false**

All paradoxes can be solved in the following manner: Above all, naturalize it or place it within time and space and the necessary limitations that these impose on things and then proceed as follows:

1. Pinpoint, isolate or eliminate the empties or artificialities in the



## Human Belief Systems

alleged paradox. That is, break the proposition down into things, events, rules, etc.

2. If after analysis you find that the proposition refers to no thing, that is, if the proposition or representation is meaningless or objectless, your logical task is finished. For you enter the realm not of logic, but of the imagination where there are no rules of logic except as determined by the writer. In the imagination of course, there are no puzzles or logical problems at all, but only play or fantasy.
3. Where the proposition refers to real objects or events, simply apply the deductive reasoning of “if...then...” and solve the problem. The answer should be either true or false and nothing in between, for a logical premise necessarily must lead to a logical conclusion unless there is a jump or an error in the argument. There are no gaps in logic.

### **B. This statement is not provable**

This is the Epimenides paradox and it is apparently one of the most difficult. It is described by Casti as the “granddaddy of all such conundrums.”<sup>41</sup> The reason given for this difficulty is explained by Casti as follows:

If the statement is provable, then it’s true; hence, what it says must be true and it’s not provable. Thus, the statement and its negation are both provable, implying an inconsistency. On the other hand, if the statement is not provable then what it

---

41. Casti, p.379.

## From Microbits to Everything

asserts is true. In this case the statement is true but unprovable, implying that the formal system is incomplete. Gödel was able to show that for any consistent formal system powerful enough to allow us to express all statements of ordinary arithmetic, such a Gödel sentence must exist; consequently, the formalization must be incomplete. The bottom line then turns out to be that in every consistent formal system powerful enough to express all relationships among the whole numbers, there exists a statement that cannot be proved using the rules of the system.”<sup>42</sup>

According to Casti, Kurt Gödel sought to “express such paradoxical self-referential statements within the framework of arithmetic.” and so he constructed his famous mathematical theorem expressed in formal logic as follows: “For every consistent formalization of arithmetic, there exist arithmetic truths that are not provable within that formal system.”<sup>43</sup> Since there is only one world, it would follow that if indeed Gödel’s theorem were right, this indeterminacy of formal mathematical systems would apply to all things. But could there be paradoxes in an orderly world, and is Gödel’s theorem valid? First of all, everything in space is a composite and consists of an internal integrity formed out of relationships between its parts and with other elements. Nothing in reality relates only to itself. The

---

42. Casti, p. 380. See also *Gödel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid* by Douglas R. Hofstadter (1980). About the proposition “this statement is false”, Hofstadter explains that: “It is a statement which rudely violates the usually assumed dichotomy of statements into true and false, because if you tentatively think that it is true, then it immediately backfires on you and makes you think it is false. But once you’ve decided it is false, a similar backfiring returns you to the idea that it must be true. Try it.” p. 17.

## Human Belief Systems

indeterminate is only a function only of the artificial or the imaginary. In nature, no single thing is self-referenced. All are interconnected, interdependent and subject to the same laws in space. It is no wonder then, that self-referencing systems can give rise to illogical propositions. A “thing” that is self-referential, is nothing at all. It is fiction. Now how can logic be applied to nothing? In any event, let us analyse Gödel’s paradox.

### Gödel’s version of “This statement is not provable”

The “this” merely refers to the “statement” and the “provable” is not part of the statement but describes what can be done to that statement. Thus what we have to define is the word “statement.” But how can one prove or disprove a mere word? One can logically validate or dispute only real relationships. The word “statement” stands for no thing and describes no thing. Much of the perplexity about this problem results from confusing the word as an abstraction with real relationships that the word ordinarily represents in a dictionary. A logical statement, as opposed to its mere spelling, is composed of symbols depicting real events and relationships in the world. In reality, something either obtains or it does not. All statements

---

43. Casti, pp. 380-381. The standard explanation of Gödel’s Theorem is that: it is impossible to prove that any mathematical system which has the complexity at least that of the level of arithmetic is consistent. It is not possible to prove that the system will not be brought down by contradictions, for if such a system is consistent then it is *incomplete*. In other words, true statements would exist within that system which cannot be proved within it and these are denoted as *undecidable*. The problem is that one cannot validly state that a statement is true if it cannot be proved within the system that gives rise to it. And if it is true, then it cannot be incomplete.

## From Microbits to Everything

about real things are necessarily provable, for how can that thing be real if there exists no means of proving it? If something could exist in space and was unprovable, one could not logically demonstrate its relationship to anything. It could not, therefore, be represented as a logical proposition. The second problem with Gödel's theorem is that it is contradictory. This is because the theorem itself is a formal system. Gödel states that no formal system is complete<sup>44</sup>. This must apply to his formal system as well. Hence, in the final analysis, the theorem which states that no formal system is complete, must also be incomplete. What meaning can be taken from such a confusing proposition? So the theorem fails. The fact is that no human being can deny the possibility of truth and universals except by contradicting himself. Every attempt to logically deny the possibility of truth or order fails because logical argument is impossible unless it is based upon them. Is the statement which represents that human beings "cannot know...", itself a statement of knowledge or of ignorance? If one argues that knowledge is not possible, either that statement is of truth or it is of falsehood. If it purports

---

44. At the most, Gödel showed, in an ingenious way, and for that he deserves great credit, how one can construct self-referential statements in arithmetic that would then be addressed by a formal axiomatic system. The theorem does not prove that we will not be able to prove God's existence, or discover useful practical relationships between pure and applied mathematics and hence physics backed by experimental evidences. Many theorists (physicists and mathematicians) and even theologians are extrapolating wrong ideas from Gödel's result. The fact is as follows: Mathematics is subservient to actual existence and relations between objects in space, where there is no self-referentiality and contradiction. The simple fact which has been overlooked is that, in any language, one can come up with self-referential statements. Mathematics is a language, be it a special language; therefore, one can come up with self-referential statements in it as well. When the theorem was realized in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, the mathematicians should not have been so surprised at the result. It is because most of them had an incorrect and overblown view of their profession that the result seemed so devastating.

## Human Belief Systems

to be true, it contradicts itself by the attempt to deny the possibility of truth. And if it is false, it fails as a meaningful proposition. This applies to all questions as well. Every question is a statement or a proposition. Consequently, all meaningful questions affirm the meaningfulness of the world.

### What is knowledge?

Despite all the complicated language and syllogisms of the learned men and women to the contrary, knowledge is no more than our awareness of that which is. All debates about knowledge are simply debates about “it is” and “it is not”. What we mean when we say something is true is simply that it has a presence at a given point in space. It does not matter where you are in the universe, there is only one way of finding out if something exists. It is only through in “your face” undeniable presence that you can say that something exists or not. Everything else is hearsay. There is no question that what you know depends upon your capacities. The blind do not know what the seeing know. Things in far away places may exist for only those who have the means to travel there or summon the things to their presence. But it is only when something is present to your presence that you can say that it exists. I am not saying that a thing does not exist until we meet it; only that, *for us*, we say it exists only when, whether we like it or not, it continues to be present in our presence. In this respect then, knowledge is a relatively simple issue. When we talk about knowledge, we are only interested in that which is present to our presence. If a thing is solid at a given time, it is solid at that place and time. The possibility that it might be a vapour or gas at another time is irrelevant to what it is in that particular place and time in question. If at another place and time, the thing becomes a

## **From Microbits to Everything**

liquid, that does not mean that it was not once a solid. All that this means is that we learn about the changing nature of things in different spaces and in different relationships. Our previous witness of the solid does not become erroneous simply because at another place and in a different circumstance, the solid is no more. If the nature of a thing depends upon its position and relationships in space, then it stands to reason that different positions and different relationships result in different manifestations. To say from this observation that, therefore, the ultimate nature of things cannot be known, is to jump to unwarranted conclusions. Who said that there is an ultimate nature to things and how does one know? If reason is the only way to find this out, then how can we prove these oxymoronic propositions, namely, that through reason we know that there is an ultimate nature to things but further that through this same reason we cannot know the ultimate nature of things? If we cannot know the ultimate nature of things, we cannot even say it exists, for knowledge of a thing begins with its existence. If we say it exists, we can know it. This is because existence implies a given reality. And that which is real enough to us, must be capable of being present to our presence. Conversely, if we cannot know it, it does not exist. If it exists we can know it. Let the philosophers choose one.

### **The mind issue**

As we have seen the philosophers are right that we cannot escape from our minds and that it is possible that what we perceive through the mind is not how things really are. This problem is atomic as well as collective. Individually, we are all prisoners of our single minds and cannot really know how it feels to another person. We can guess. But that is all. Collectively, to

## Human Belief Systems

paraphrase the philosophers, the entire human experience could be likened to the experience of a drugged group. We may all feel a certain way because of the drugs. But because everyone is feeling the same way, there is no way to tell that we are drugged up. Having said all this, the analogy must stop. The philosophers' go too far, when they say that because we perceive through our brains, that therefore, the brain must act as a distorter. This is only a guess on their part. None of the philosophers has pretended to have exited his or her mind to confirm that the brain is a distorter. Even if they could do so, they themselves would agree that their lone experiences would be too few to prove anything universally. Nevertheless, even if they could exit their minds, still, upon their return, the philosophers could not prove that their theory is the case, as they would still have to use their minds to explain things to our minds. Just because we need the mind and perceive through it does not necessarily mean that it is a distorter. Who is to say that the mind does not mirror reality? Of course it is possible for someone to doubt the validity of the mind itself. But in that event, the doubt would be tantamount to no doubt at all because it would simply be a doubt based upon a doubting or unsure mind. All we know is that we perceive because of our minds. If the mind could not give us truth about reality, then how do the philosophers get the idea that mind does not give us true knowledge about reality? Do the philosophers' minds give them true insight into the real nature of things so as to enable them to state that we do not know the real nature of things? If so, they are mad. If what they are saying, by using the mind is true, then it means that the mind does give us truths about reality. On the other hand, if what they are saying is not true, still, that must mean that the mind gives us truths about reality. If the mind cannot know truths, then how do they know, using their minds, that reality itself is forever inaccessible to us? So either way, the philosophers are wrong when they use their minds to make allegedly true statements and then say that the mind

## From Microbits to Everything

cannot give us truths. If we are all born drunk, who is talking about sobriety: one who is himself drunk? The only reasonable conclusion that can be reached from knowing that we perceive the world through our minds is to say that we don't know how the world is without our minds. But this is no big deal. It is like saying "I don't know how the world is to a rock or to the dead". Any other conclusion is unwarranted and does not necessarily follow.

So what is the relevance of knowing that we cannot perceive except through our minds? We can say that it remains a possibility that the world may not be as it appears to us. But this is clearly speculation. If the world were different than it appears, nobody using the mind could know it. So, why waste our time? If there were a fundamentally different and incompatible order than that which makes the human mind and knowledge possible, no human mind could understand it. The mind can only make sense out of organized patterns. Where there is chaos, the mind would not be: it would be insane. The insane would not be able to prove or challenge the foregoing proposition about order. It is impossible for the human being to logically demonstrate the invalidity of, or the lack of organization in the world or any part of the universe. This is because all demonstrations require order. No logical argument can be constructed to demonstrate that there is a place in space with two or more events, that is not subject to certain rules. The very existence of multiplicity is a function of multipliability and for this reason of relationality. The point of all this is that nothing proves that the fact that we perceive other than through our minds. When I slip and fall on an icy pavement and seriously hurt my knee, I do not care that in *nuomena* I am not hurt and the ice may not be slippery. To me, the ice is slippery and I am hurt. And that's all that matters. It is only in this broken and bloody world that we ask the question about God. Perhaps, if we were stones, these questions would not matter. But we are not stones. So it matters to us. Okay, the question is "whether we are drugged or not,



## Human Belief Systems

who made this world?” In reply to this question, the possibility that without our minds, the world may not be as we see it, is totally irrelevant and useless as long as we are stuck in our minds and are only asking about what we perceive through our mind.

### **Empiricism, etc.**

In addition to knowledge that we get through our senses, we also have another way through which we meet things. This is through reasoning. This is how, for example, we conclude that a trillion times a trillion must be a certain number even though we may never have met that number. Although, it may seem different from sensual knowledge, it is important to note that logical knowing can be the same as sensual knowing in that in both cases, the subject can become undeniably present to us. It is the continuing presence of a thing to us that makes us say that it exists and nothing else. Thus, when something becomes present to us, whether through reasoning or through smelling it, it does not matter. It is. Logically, something is said to be true only when from sense data or premises, no other conclusion is possible without self contradiction. That is another way of saying that no matter who looks at it, the thing, that is, the conclusion, remains present. But we should remember that some of the philosophers have concluded that that reason is not a valid guide to truth and that the only measure of truth is the empirical. These people’s answer to every question of truth is let’s go to the lab. But then they narrowly define the lab to exclude the lab of reason so that if you cannot show it with chemicals, wires and metals they say that you have not proved a thing. The irony is that their very stand that only the experimental is truthful itself is not experimental. Thus these philosophers contradict themselves when they say that the only truths are those which are

## From Microbits to Everything

subject to experiments. Because we learn all things through our minds, and because the mind learns only when things are in order, the judge of truth can never be the empirical but only the logical. Experiments mirror reality. As we have seen, we can only know things through our minds. Now our minds require order and memory in order to know things. Things brought in front of us without any order do not tell us anything. It is only when things are in an orderly relationship that our minds recognize and use them. But for the purpose of recognizing the relationships between things, actual apples and oranges are not necessary. Their representations are enough. What matters for human purposes is the logical relationships between them. The experimental is a subset of the logical and not the other way round. An experience requires logic to validate it and not vice versa. An experiment is nothing more than a logical argument made practical. The things known are themselves akin to propositions. Without more, they prove nothing more than that they are there.

One cannot plan or do experiments except through the use of logic. Nor can one determine the validity of the results of an experiment except in accordance with logic. No experiment is needed to determine the truth of a thing if that thing could be clearly expressed as a logical proposition for which the conclusion follows. One does experiments only because one desires the outcome for utilitarian purposes or only where one is uncertain of the logical argument that makes up the proposition. Once the logical irrefutability of a thing is grasped, no experiment need be conducted on the matter. If a person understands that a number of oranges:  $(2 - 1 + 1) \times 2 = 4$ , one need not bring two oranges take away one, add one and then double the sum of oranges. The validity of the sum does not lie in the assembly of physical objects expressing the same picture; but rather in their relationality or order between the propositions. In this world no thing can be meaningfully thought of, represented, moved, constructed, denied,

## Human Belief Systems

affirmed, understood or communicated expect through reasoning. To illustrate, let us say you get into an argument with someone who refuses to exercise his logical capacities and you seek to establish what the sum of the figures  $(2 \times 1 \times 31 + 137 \times 1997) \times 0$  will be. You say that it is zero and your opponent says that it is not 0. What should be done? Is it possible to offer a better proof and arrive at zero by bringing in, say apples and adding, multiplying and subtracting them? No, aside from the fact that the mathematical concept of zero is nonsensical with real apples and oranges in reality and therefore, likely to confuse even yourself, the experiment or attempt at an empirical demonstration would simply be the statement above repeated in perhaps a more visible manner. That is all. By making them more visible however, you have not advanced a proof even one bit. This is because it is not the seeing that gives understanding but the organization that gives knowledge. When we understand something, the experiment becomes a confirmation; and when we don't, the experiment becomes magic. An experiment is an attempt to argue from a given premise to a conclusion by positioning the objects of the experiment in the stipulated relationship. It is the logicity of the subject, not its experientiality or experimentability which determines its validity. Thus all scientific propositions are logical propositions and can be invalidated or proven strictly through logic. That which is not logically sound cannot be meaningful to us, and hence cannot be scientific. Consequently, there can be no arbitrary gradation of one type of demonstration over another. That which we see is no more validated because it is in our view than another that we do not see. It would indeed be a fallacy to state that the test of truth is only that which is borne out of experiments, for the statement requiring an experiment itself cannot be borne out of any truthful experiment as a universal conclusion. So-called empirical knowledge is no more paramount than the so-called non-empirical knowledge. One need not

## From Microbits to Everything

therefore do science in order to arrive at the truth; one need only do reason. In either case, the test is: let it make sense.

### The measure of truth

The truthfulness of a statement depends completely upon whether or not reason can yield exceptions to it. We are persuaded that  $1+1=2$  only because the human mind cannot come up with any circumstance where  $1+1$ =other than two. A thing becomes true when one cannot logically think of anytime or anywhere in the world that it does not apply. A thing either is or it is not. If it is, it is in a particular space and time. Once its position in space is grasped, it is not necessary that exceptions be found to it. Every question is a statement or a proposition. Consequently, the same rules that make a proposition true or false apply to questions as well. Any given statement or proposition is either meaningful, orderly and true, or it is not. Every reasonable question presupposes order. If the order or structure giving rise to the question were not real or true, the question or statement too would be unreliable. If the order that gives rise to the question were invalid or did not give genuine knowledge, it could not give rise to a genuine question. If, therefore, the philosophers have posed genuine questions, it must follow that the structures of our world as we experience it, give rise to genuine knowledge. In effect, if the skeptics' questions purport to be genuine and therefore relevant, they confirm the validity of the very thing which they seek to deny.

It is a remarkable thing that every proposition of doubt or of scepticism about the mind, knowledge or truth defeats itself. In a similar vein, every attempt to disprove order also disproves itself. This is because meaning only comes from order as seen through the mind. You can only make sense

## **Human Belief Systems**

when you put words in an orderly relationship. It does not matter whether the statement is put in the form of a question or of an answer. A statement is a bunch of words put together. Thus no matter what may be claimed, if it makes sense, it necessarily proves order. And order as we all know is perceived only because we have minds. If a statement is sensible, it is so only because it springs from a given order. If that structure is itself suspect, then so too must be that statement. If that order is problematic, then so is the question that results from it. If that question is meaningful, then the order that gives rise to it is also reliable. If genuine knowledge is not possible, then neither is a genuine or an authentic question. If a genuine question is impossible then, true scepticism is impossible. All that this means is that no one can deny the possibility of truth without confusion. No one can deny the validity of reason without using reason and thereby contradicting himself. Truths abound everywhere. It is, consequentially, very important to ask what we are searching for as a goal in our lives. How do various belief systems approach the truth and what are they focused on: The glory of 'God; establishing 'morality' and a just society; establishing some 'spiritual' contact with angels and other experiences; wanting just to get to paradise? In the next few chapters, we shall be exploring this question so that by the end of the book, the reader will have a clear conception on what the proper goal ought to be, and if and how these categories of goals are related.

### **Part 2: World Religions: A New Perspective**

Most major belief systems express the uniqueness of the creator, the God of absolute monotheism in which no partnership can be ascribed, the type of God concluded in the last chapter; however, this message has become

## From Microbits to Everything

hidden and camouflaged. Such belief systems indeed, at their true core, are not mystical because of the rationality of the existence of one God, but over time, have become accreted with illogical notions. We shall look at four belief systems to prove our case. Though the Quran (of Islam) seems to be clearer than the rest, we firmly believe that a linguistic/historical and basic beliefs' analyses of the other three would point to the fact that they are referring to the same concept. The problem is that the original teachings have been misconstrued by many of the adherents and scholars.

The philosophy of Taoism, for instance, expresses that some entity existed before the creation of the Universe. This entity is not identical or co-eternal eternal with creation, but is above, separate and ultimately not definable in human terms, as stated in the Tao Te Ching, the main source of Taoism:

There is a thing-kind made up of a mix.  
It emerges before the cosmos.  
Solitary! Inchoate!  
Self grounded and unchanging.  
Permeating all processes without extremity.  
We can deem it the mother of the social world.  
I don't know its name. When put in characters we say *dao*.  
Forced to deem it as named, we say 'great.'  
Being great, we say 'comprehensive.'  
Being comprehensive, we say 'far reaching.'  
Being far reaching, we say 'reverting.'  
So our *dao* is great;  
Nature (heaven) is great,  
Earth is great,  
And kings are also great. Within a region are four

## Human Belief Systems

‘greats.’

And the King occupies one of those [lofty] statuses.

Humans treat earth as a standard.

Earth treats constant nature as a standard. Constant nature treats *dao* as a standard.

*Dao* treats being so of itself as a standard. (Chapter 25)<sup>45</sup>

When we probe into the Bhagavad Gita<sup>46</sup> (of the Hindus), we see that it espouses a singular intelligent Creator who has no partners – and a Creator that creates things from His mind. In the Bhagavad Gita, we see, at the kernel of the text, the concept of One Creator and *not* idolatry or pantheism, and rationalism, not mysticism:

He who remembers the Poet, the Creator, who rules all things from all time, smaller than the smallest atom, but upholding this vast universe ... he goes to that Supreme Spirit, the Supreme Spirit of Light. 8: 9

But beyond this creation, visible and invisible, there is an invisible, higher, Eternal; and when all things pass away, this remains forever and ever. 8:20

This Invisible is called the Everlasting and is the highest End supreme. Those who reach him never return. This is my

---

45. Refer to: <http://www.clas.ufl.edu/users/gthursby/taoism/ttc-list.htm>. Translation in progress of *Tao Te Ching*, Chapter 25, by Chad Hansen, The University of Hong Kong.

46. Mascaro, Juan (Translator), (1962), *The Bhagavad Gita*.

## From Microbits to Everything

supreme abode. 8:21

I am the One source of all: the evolution of this all comes from me. The wise think this and they worship me in adoration and love. 10:8

But those who worship the imperishable, the Infinite, the Transcendent unmanifested; the Omnipresent, the beyond all thought, the Immutable, the Neverchanging, the ever One. 12:3

A spark of my eternaleternal Spirit becomes in this world a living soul; and this draws around its centre the five senses and the mind resting in nature. 15:7

Most strikingly, the Bhagavad Gita is against worshipping more than one god:

Even those who in faith worship other gods, because of their love they worship me, although not in the right way. (9:23)

For I accept every sacrifice, and I am their Lord supreme. But they know not my supreme being, and because of this they fall. (9:24)

For those who worship the gods go to the gods, and those who worship the fathers go to the fathers. Those who worship the lower spirits go to the lower spirits; but those who worship me come to me. (9:25)

Are most Hindus oblivious to this? There is a reform movement



## Human Belief Systems

called Arya Samaj, who, have tried to reform Hinduism by drawing attention to the uniqueness of the Creator. For example, on the website, [www.aryasamaj.com](http://www.aryasamaj.com), they describe God as:

God is existent, intelligent and blissful. He is formless, omniscient, just, merciful, unborn, endless, unchangeable, beginning-less, unequalled, the support of all, the master of all, omnipresent, immanent, un-aging, immortal, fearless, eternal and holy, and the maker of all. He alone is worthy of being worshiped.

Even within Buddhism, in the most famous of its scriptures, the Dhammapada<sup>47</sup>, the Buddha clearly espouses a belief in a supreme Creator. Buddha, contrary to being an atheist or a person who never answered or avoided answering the question of God's existence, as present day Buddhist sects and most Western and Eastern scholars portray, also believed in One God:

Who is capable of praising one like a coin of finest gold, one whom the knowing praise after finding him impeccable, controlled, intelligent, insightful, ethical, and composed day in and day out? Even the gods<sup>48</sup> praise such a one, **even the Creator** [*brahmuna*].(17:9,10)<sup>49</sup>

---

47. Thomas Cleary (Translator), (1995), *Dhammapada: The Sayings of Buddha*.

48. *Deva* in the original Pali; this likely refers to the created angels or the good spirit entities.

49. Thomas Cleary (Translator), (1995), *Dhammapada: The Sayings of Buddha*.

## From Microbits to Everything

In the *Sutta-Pitaka* which is part of the *Tripitaka* texts, translated by T.W. R. Davids of the Buddhist Pali Text Society, the Buddha has categorically stated, in the *Tevigga Sutta*, that he had a relationship with the Creator and they should listen to him and follow his ways, since they too want to know how to relate to the Creator.

... to the Tathagat [the fully enlightened person] when asked touching the path which leads to the world of Brahma [the Creator], there can be neither doubt nor difficulty. For Brahma I [do] know Vashetta [the young Brahmin the Buddha was addressing], and the world of Brahma and the path that leads to it. Yes, I know it ever as one who has entered the Brahma world, and has been born within it!<sup>50</sup>

To paraphrase, Buddha is saying that: “Vashetta, I know, as an enlightened person that the path to God has certainty and is easy. I know God and the path that leads to God, since I am part of God’s creation.”

Buddha also believed in hell, a paradisiacal state in the next life, and the accountability of deeds in the hereafter:

One who speaks untruth goes to hell, as does one who claims not to have done what he has in fact done. Both become equal after death, people of base deeds in the hereafter. (22:1)

When a person long absent from home returns safely from

---

50. Muller, F. Max, (1881), *The Sacred Books of the East*, p. 186.

## Human Belief Systems

afar, relatives, friends, and well-wishers rejoice at his return. In the same way, when one who has done good is gone from this world to the beyond, his good deeds receive him, like relatives receiving a returning loved one. (16:11, 12)

In the book *Outline of Mahayana* (Chapter IX) D.T. Suzuki explains that God is referred to by the term *Dharmakaya-Buddha* or the religious object of Buddhism. In fact in a Tibetan text, the *Dharmakaya* is described with eight attributes, which are: Sameness, Depth, Everlastingness, Oneness, Harmony, Purity, Radiance, and Enjoyment [some of which are explained as]:

Sameness, because the Dharmakayas of all Buddhas are not different.

Depth, because it is ineffable.

Everlastingness, because it has no beginning or end.

Oneness, because the Dharmadhatu (Absolute Reality) and Transcendent Awareness (are not different).

Harmony, because it is beyond positive and negative poles

Purity, because it is free from the three taints of hatred, greed, and delusion.

Possessing enjoyment, because with its wealth of qualities it is the basis of all enjoyment.<sup>51</sup>

Suzuki elaborates that “The Dharmakaya assumes three essential aspects: intelligence (*prajna*), love (*karuna*) and will (*pranidhanabala*).” In fact,

---

51. Guenther, Herbet (Translator), (1970), *The Jewel Ornament of Liberation*, pp.264-5.<http://www.kheper.net/topics/Buddhism/dharmakaya.htm>

## From Microbits to Everything

Professor Robert F. Thurman, Columbia University, who is also a Buddhist monk, passionately emphasizes that: “Buddha not only believed in God, he knew God. There were numerous atheists in Buddha’s time – the Charvaka materialists – and the Buddha specifically critiqued their lack of belief in any spiritual reality.”<sup>52</sup> In a chapter entitled: “The Differing Viewpoints of Buddhism and the Other World Religions regarding Ultimate Reality” William Stoddart, in his book *Outline of Buddhism*, explains that the true Buddhist belief is really theistic, but that the existence of Ultimate Reality (i.e. God) who is both immanent and transcendent, has been misunderstood because of the emphasis of the immanence component. In fact, Thurman emphasizes that Islam clearly depicts the physical inconceivability of God, in that there is nothing like God and that Buddhism, if understood correctly, has one and the same goal. It is easy to see how the emphasis of the Buddha on the non-corporeality of God has led to many erroneously believing that there is no God in Buddhism. In fact, the Dharmakaya is a formless infinite intelligent entity that we have described as being Objectless Space, and that this is what Buddha was referring to as God. Yet at the same time, this immanent notion has ironically tended to permeate into perception of the visage of the Buddha himself as an object of inordinate veneration through which Nirvana can be obtained, by creating statues of him; he, himself, would have never approved of this and to a large extent, defeats his whole life’s work. On the contrary, in the Quran, the clearest expression of the Oneness of the Creator is given, and of the fact that this Creator has produced things from His mind, i.e. His will. It also states that God is the Innermost and the Outermost, on the basis that He is the First and the Last (57:3) In other words, all existence and possibilities are

---

52. Henry, Gray (Editor), (1997), *Islam in Tibet and the Illustrated Narrative: Tibetan Caravans*, pp. 35-37.

## Human Belief Systems

contained within His mind. He is the innermost because He is the basis for all our consciousness and is therefore also closest to us. He is the outermost, because nothing can be outside Him and His thoughts. He is the First and Last, because all creation must come after Him and nothing can arise without Him. Indeed, nothing can fall outside God, as He is all-encompassing (*al-Waasi*) and He is the Incomparable (*al-Badi*). Such a view is anti-mystical in the sense that we are nothing like the Creator, for we cannot merge into Him etc. However, as mentioned in Chapter 1, we cannot imagine how it is to be in God's space and in this sense we seem cognitively to be outside Him. We are in a sense then, cognitively outside God, but logically in Him, because we are part of His thoughts that have been turned into an order of reality.

The closest we come to a non-spatio-temporal creator is where God is described, in the Quran as being a Person who is completely non-anthropomorphic:

Say: He God is One, Absolutely Unique and Indivisible. God is He upon whom all depend for their existence and sustenance, that is, He is the one upon whom everything depends, but He is completely independent of all. He does not beget offspring, nor is He the offspring of anyone. And there is nothing like Him, or even anything like the likeness of Him. (Chapter 112).

From this analysis, the focus of these belief systems was on 'God' and the nature of God, but that along the way, myriad confusions have arisen. The most pristine, in terms of God as being One and unique and in agreement with objectless space, is found in the Quran. In this discussion, we noticed that some of the other belief systems, have anthropomorphic

## From Microbits to Everything

ideas in them. For example, in the advanced and abstract concept of *Dharmakaya*, there is, nonetheless, the attribute of enjoyment, which, the way it has been mentioned can be mistakenly anthropomorphized. The Quran dispels all anthropomorphic projections and truly is a clarifier of the true nature of God. We shall be exploring this true nature in the next chapter. The main trap that pantheists (including Sufi pantheists who believe in *wahdatal wujud* – Unity of Being) fall into is: that which is formless cannot become a form. Secondly, the human being, as a finite entity, cannot merge into the infinite entity and lose the self, through total annihilation, as such mystics claim. If you truly lose your self, you cannot return, unless the Creator recreates you, which logically means that the Creator is separate from you in being. Thirdly, the fact of the Big Bang has not only destroyed the false fortress of atheism but so too pantheistic mysticism. Such mystics have to make a decision: Since matter/universe began and if the universe and ‘God’ are one, then God began, i.e. once God did not exist. If God did not exist, then how did the universe arise in the first place? If on the other hand, God predates the universe then pantheism cannot be true. If the mystics do not want to deal with scientific matters and facts, then what is all their talk about unity, when they do not even see the unity of knowledge about the universe, where spirituality is not separate from materiality. If they do accept the Big Bang but, like many atheists, resort to the Oscillating Universe hypothesis, then this has been debunked, once and for all by the STOP-analysis on pages 34 to 35 of this book. Let the mystics therefore decide and not be confused by muddled thinking. The vision and nature of ‘God’ and the fellowship of all beings is much, much greater than that which has been, or is, espoused by their recalcitrant and self-aggrandizing gurus.

## **Chapter 3**

**Where does 'God' fit in?**





## Chapter 3

### Where does 'God' fit in?

#### The Mind of God

Microbits reveal an origin of the Universe, precisely set and designed at the beginning. It points to an Infinite Intelligence. One may call this intelligence 'God', but we must remember that this God is not made of microbits and hence unlike the universe and its constituents that *are* made of microbits (or atoms, if you go to a higher level!). So much for this Creator's existence.<sup>53</sup> But how does God create, where is He, and can we describe His nature further? Can we indeed say more about what He is, rather than what He cannot be?

God, His Mind, and His dimension are one and indistinguishable. When He wills, God's thoughts become reality. Since this reality is indeed Real, objects exist only because of His imagination. The consequence is that we are not sustained by the thoughts of God outside the edge of the expanding universe, which is like a bubble of self-contained imagined reality. Indeed, we are not sustainable outside of it, because the laws of physics, which are nothing but an interplay of microbits at various levels, do not exist there. Nothing is sustainable unless it was willed to exist outside the bubble of our created 'three-dimensional world'. At the edge of the universe no particles exist, but only objectless space. The edge is like a wall or like a point of obliteration from existence. This universe then, has an edge, in the sense that since it is expanding, it must be expanding into something. It is expanding in

---

53. For a detailed proof for the *existence* of God, based on *design*, refer to Mehran Benaei's and Nadeem Haque's, *From Facts to Values: Certainty, Order, Balance and their Universal Implications*, pp. 64-108.

## From Microbits to Everything

and due to God's mind. It is in this sense that we are *in* God. As a result, the interrelationships that we experience in the Universe are real and concrete only in the sense that God's imagination lets them seem real. We experience things due to the *interactable* nature of microbits; furthermore, the interactability is itself imagined by God, out of which all things have evolved. Therefore, in one respect, the difference between God and us is that God is the *unimagined real*, whereas we are the *imagined real*. Consequentially, we can see why and how God must therefore be the Ultimate Reality, or as He is described in the Quran: *al-Haq*. In fact, the Quranic concepts appear to accord directly with our conclusions on this matter. But before we examine these issues further, it is fascinating to see that the God of the Quran also relates the origin and evolution of the Universe, in perfect agreement with modern day scientific facts. This offers further credence to the Quran as worthy of greater scrutiny, by any thinking and searching person, for these facts were unknowable to an illiterate desert Arab about 1,400 years ago, during the Dark Ages. Muhammad's claim that the book was a divine revelation diminishes the likelihood of human ascription to it, to the vanishing point. For instance, in the Quran it is stated that: it is God who has created the universe with the Big Bang:

Do those who cover the truth not see that the universe, inclusive of the earth, were joined together as one piece, which We then ripped apart? And that We made every corporeal creature [carbon-based/dense microbitic type] out of water? Will they [even] then not believe? (21:30)

is expanding it:

We have built this universe with a force; We are most certainly

## Where does 'God' fit in?

expanding it. (51:47)

and has evolved it in stages:

Moreover, He [God] turned to that which is above [the universe] when it was smoke and said to it and to the earth: Come [into existence/together] voluntarily or involuntarily. They responded: "We come, voluntarily."(41:11)

will end the Universe in some type of a Big-Crunch:

And the Day when we shall roll up the universe like a scroll rolled up for books – as We began the first creation, We shall repeat it; a promise binding on Us. Truly, We shall do it. (21:104)

after which another universe will be created with different properties:

... on the Day when the earth shall be changed into another earth, as shall the rest of the universe. (14:48)

### **On the issue of the proof of God's existence**

There is a striking similarity between the proof for God's existence as formulated in Chapter 1, that is, the Sesamatic Proof, by M. Muslim and a tract of verses in the Quran. In fact, the *outline* of a proof of God's existence and whereabouts (objectless space) from Prophet Abraham's (Ibrahim) is given in the Quran itself: The story of Prophet Abraham is one in which Muslims are shown how to attain certainty (6:75), by the process of

## From Microbits to Everything

elimination, the methodology by which Prophet Abraham arrived at the confirmation of the existence of God. Indeed, Abraham rejected the star, moon and sun as God<sup>54</sup> because they were in relative motion and hence ‘changing’. In order to reject something you must have an ‘idea’ that you are comparing candidates with, for the possible rejection or acceptance of the idea. Prophet Abraham did not look at these processes and structures in the universe with a blank mind. In fact, he had already concluded that a *single* sustainer must exist; hence his analysis of *singular* objects and not multiplicities, these numerically singular objects being the sun, moon and one star, one by one. Abraham had in mind that whatever it is that sustains all must have the property of changlessness of form, and no motion either in relation to our movement, or to the motion of the object itself. This is because *that which sustains us must have power over us*, and if it is not present before us because of its limited spatial nature, then there will be a time, due to our motion, or of the object’s motion, when that object being considered for devotion will not be there. Hence, if it is not there, it cannot sustain us or have power over us. The key point to note is that that which cannot sustain us or be in our presence has no power. So when these celestial bodies are rising, they are deemed to be in power, and when they set, they are inferred to lose their power. The hypothesized single sustaining entity must not be subject to motion if it is to retain that power. However, if that entity were all-encompassing *and* motionless then it would fulfil the dominant criteria of power and sustenance because of its omnipresence. Finally, if you combine the initial starting conclusion that there is only one such entity, it means that all other entities must be creations and hence that the all-pervasive immoveable entity (akin to objectless space) must perforce be the Originator. Abraham, according to the account in the

---

54. 6:76 to 6:78

## Where does 'God' fit in?

Quran, indeed concludes that the Sustainer must be Immovable and therefore that *there can be only one infinite Mover and Power*.<sup>55</sup> This is the real reason why, after going through his reflections on the heavenly bodies, Abraham discloses himself as believing in an *originator* for the entire system of cosmic objects in space, as can be gleaned from his statement; “Lo! [having rejected, the star, moon and sun] I have turned my face towards Him who *originated* the celestial systems and the earth...”, in the Quran 6:80. This is how Abraham moves from the notion of singular sustainer to originator for those things which comprise particle based structures, i.e. the entire created universe.

The basic logic used by Abraham is: power implies the ability to sustain and vice-versa, which implies spatial infinity (objectless space); spatial infinity implies an originator. This can be extended to the logical corollaries that: an originator implies a creator; a creator implies intelligence; intelligence implies intention and intention implies purpose.

### Christianity vs. the imagination of God

For Christianity, in general, the Old Testament emphasizes the transcendence and oneness of the Creator, but at the same time, many parts of the Old Testament contain the worst offences against God. However, the fact that the universe is the imagination of the Creator, has not been either realized, emphasized, discussed or researched deeply by most Christian scholars because it leaves absolutely no room for Trinity: Imagine: If all creation is an imagined *reality*, then there must be one, and only one

---

55. This ‘proof’ of the existence and nature of God, actually coincides with the proof of God’s existence as outlined in Chapter 1 by M.Muslim.

## From Microbits to Everything

imaginators for that one reality, and since only one reality exists, only one web of cause and effect exists, and vice-versa. In other words, One and only One Mind must be operating the universe, not two or three. The only way to escape this, is to posit no single web, or chain, of cause and effect that encompasses events in the universe, which is utterly impossible. Remarkably, and most interestingly, Isaac Newton, the pioneering physicist extraordinaire, who was a Unitarian and not a Trinitarian, at a time when it was a capital offence in England to publicly propagate the doctrines of Unitarianism, wrote that: “Artic. 5. The father is immovable no place being capable of becoming emptier or fuller of him than it is by the eternal necessity of nature: all other beings are moveable from place to place.” Here, Newton regards absolute objectless space as the space of God, who is a singular intelligent being.<sup>56</sup>

### God’s imagination and the invalidation of pantheism and monism<sup>57</sup>

In the Quran, the mutual consonance, acceptance and recognition, between the Creator and the Created are echoed by these verses:

O you tranquil soul, Return to your Sustainer, well-pleased and well-pleasing Him. (89:27,28)

---

56. This quotation is from the King’s College Library, Cambridge, England, Keynes Manuscript. 8: *Twelve articles on religion* (transcribed by Stephen Snoblen, April, 1998; see [www.newtonproject.ic.ac.uk](http://www.newtonproject.ic.ac.uk)).

57. Monism is: The view that mind and matter are developed from, and are reducible to, the same fundamental substance or being.

## Where does 'God' fit in?

We return to God, in that, when we die, we are brought before Him. He is pleased with us and we with Him, if we have followed His fundamental precepts and have not deviated enormously, where any such deviations are the subject of His mercy. We are in awe of Him and He is pleased with us. In fact, ultimately His reflection on our awe, generates a unique and quantitatively different type of awe for God for own abilities for having created conscious entities who have lived a proper life and communicate with Him in acknowledgement of His greatness (more on this later). Yet although we return to Him and hence develop further as individuals unto infinity, we are always nothing compared to the creator because we are always finite and He is always the Infinite. The issue of merging with God, as is the foundation of mysticism, is totally moot; it cannot happen because we are nothing but the thoughts of the Creator. It is not that God is *in* everything as the mystics say; rather, everything is in the imagination of God. The distinction between the two concepts, one being mystical and fundamentally irrational and the other being wholly rational, incontrovertibly logical and based on the evidence, is indeed profound and must never ever be confused. The mystical view is fundamentally irrational because an infinite being can never be present in that which is finite. The finite cannot contain the infinite.

The remarkableness about this realization that we are nothing but the imagination of God is that in one respect, we are not separate from Him and no distance prevails between God and man. This is because no separation can arise between the thinker and his/her thought. At the same time, however, there can be nothing so different as thought and its thinker. Consequently, in this vein, we are infinitely separate from, and different than God in type. God is truly one, because His thoughts, that become imagined non-god-like realities, are still imagined and not ultimately absolutely real. This view resolves the question posed by mystics, as to the origin of the

## From Microbits to Everything

multiplicity of things, for they enquire what the source of multiplicity is, that is, if there was only one singular entity as maker. Those non-mystics who oppose the mystics, and rightly so, say that the Creator and created cannot be of the same substance as the mystics imply. However, in order to show exactly where the mystics are going wrong, more focus needs to be paid to what creation means. This is where the view of God as the imaginator of all that exists helps to resolve the issue and puts to rest mystical claims such as “we are in God”, that is, part of God in the sense of being at the same plenum of His existence and hence the erroneous corollary that God is in us. It also debunks the incarnational corollary that God is *in* some special human beings, and that those human beings are gods or part of God, because they have realized this through various mystical exercises. Needless to say, this mystical notion is used to justify that we must abandon our minds to follow them; indeed, the savannah of the history of the world, from the dawn of so-called human civilization, to the present day, is filled with the carcasses of spiritual charlatans, bogus-messiahs, new-age gurus, and “human demi-gods”. At the same time, the universe being the imagination of God explains why and how God’s reality must be different than the reality of creation. These two realities, that is, ours and God’s are certainly not on the same plane. If we do not acknowledge this point, which in fact is clear in the Quran, since God and only God is *Al-Haq*, then we are falling into the same type of trap as the mystics who see us as fragments of a greater being seeking to merge into Him as droplets want to merge into the vast ocean. The reality of our existence is not at the same level as the reality of the existence of God, but it is nonetheless real and not illusory, as mystics would have it; in other words, God’s imagination is a real *creation*.

In the Quran, the clearest expression of the Oneness of the Creator is given, compared to all other scriptures, and also of the fact that this Creator has created things from His mind, i.e. His will. As mentioned previously, in



## Where does 'God' fit in?

the Quran, it is stated that God is the Innermost and the Outermost (i.e. nothing can be outside God), and also the First and the Last. (57:3) In other words, all existence and possibilities must necessarily be contained inside His mind. Such a view is anti-mystical. We are nothing like the Creator; we cannot merge into Him etc. We are always less than Him, since our bodies are created of a substance that He has imagined – a microbit, or subatomic particles and not from His 'substance'. The human mind too is of His will. This view of the universe is counter to mysticism, in the sense that the mystics who espouse a 'God' are ultimately pantheistic because they feel that we are the substance of God and will merge into Him, as we are of the same essence. Such a pantheistic view – neo-platonic or otherwise – is extremely naïve, limited, misguided and misdirectional.<sup>58</sup>

In summation: Our view is that God is a living Being and that we, in both our mind and bodies, are only a part of His imagination. God is not only different from us in degree, but also in kind, and unimaginably so! His thoughts truly *sustain* us and if He were to stop thinking of the Universe as existing, we would certainly perish. This would add further meaning to the already several complementary meanings of the rich Arabic word *Rabb*, in the Quran, which means *Sustainer*.

---

58. Note that if the universe is the Imagination of God, then God's Oneness and Absolute Uniqueness (*tawbeed*) is upheld as God is separate from His creation-cum-imagination; creation does not surround Him, nor is it above Him in any manner and He is above all things, in conjunction with the tenets of *tawbeed* as discussed by Abu Ameenah Bilal Philips in his book *The Fundamentals of Tawbeed (Islamic Monotheism)*.

## From Microbits to Everything

### What is the 'face' of God?

In the Quran, there are other verses which point to God as being the objectless space that M. Muslim discussed:

Wherever you turn you see the face of God everywhere.  
All-pervading is He and all-knowing. (2:115)

Now this is normally understood by many as meaning that wherever you turn you see the signs of God and hence God through His signs. However, when we view this verse in conjunction with the following passage:

And invoke not any other deity along with God – none has the right to be worshiped but He. Everything will perish except His Face. His is the Decision, and to Him you (all) shall be returned.(28:88)

we see that this interpretation of 'face' as meaning the signs of God cannot be the case. For when the universe is destroyed there are no signs and if there are no signs then there is no 'face' and the Quran 28:88 would be contradicted. Precisely speaking, the logic is as follows:

Let F=Face, S=Signs. If F=S, and S becomes extinct at some point, S=0 (zero). If S=0, then F=0. But according to the Quran 28:88, 'F' will still exist. In other words F cannot equal 0. If F cannot equal 0, then F cannot equal S, that is, the Face (of God) cannot equal Signs.

## Where does 'God' fit in?

From this it is easily deducible that 'face of God' represents something else, something imperishable. Face really means mind, that is, 'the space of God in which all resides', or the focus of His attention: imagination is nothing but a sustained focus that exhibits creativity. So no matter where you turn you are in His realm, in His space, in His attention, by which and only which, everything is sustained. However, this is space that cannot be felt by any of our senses, for it is indivisible, absolute and cannot be more than or less than one. Note that we are not saying that God is *in* all things, for this would be the illogical doctrine of pantheism hitherto debunked. What we are saying, instead, is that all these signs in the universe, which are comprised of microbit particles (see Volume 1, or if you have not read this, you can substitute the word 'elementary particles' for microbits), do not have any existence save by the continual sustenance by the Creator, specifically, by that Creator's thoughts. There is no 'other place' other than the mind of God, in which all activity occurs and nothing can be outside God. Any 'thing' must be God's thoughts turned into structures, that are sustained by His thought or Imagination. Remarkably, it becomes indubitable that Face means, mind, focus, attention when we read other verses in the Quran, when the word 'face' is applied to human beings. For example:

So turn your face towards God, the nature of God on which He has created the nature of man; there is no alteration in God's creation; this is the proper way of life, but most human beings believe not. (30:30).

And similarly:

Lo! [having rejected, the star, moon and sun] I have turned my

## From Microbits to Everything

face towards Him who *originated* the celestial systems and the earth... (6:79).

When we face God's Face, that is, His attention, we realize that He is perennially attentive. In other words, we become conscious of His existence behind the forms of this universe. We realize that these forms exist only because of His attention and sustenance. The circuit and link between the Creator and created is therefore complete. It is we, however, who have to turn our face and not God, for He is always facing us. It is *we* who have to seek His Face.

In the Quran then, the word face is used in the sense of attention, focus and direction of your mind, aside from the literal use of the word face as meaning a physical object.<sup>59</sup> The Quran speaks of those on the correct path as those who submit their face unto God<sup>60</sup> and those who seek His (God's) face.<sup>61</sup> These people are the ones who are seeking the approving attention of God and desire to become more attentive to Him. In this way, God, in turn would positively reciprocate.

### Could 3D space itself be a created dimension?

The interesting question which arises is the possibility that the 'space' in which we reside was also created, though it still be resident in the mind of God. In other words, what is being referred to here is the hypothesis that the 3D space that we reside in, is also a creation of His mind. However, this

---

59. For focus see 10:105; for physical object see 30:43; 2:150 and many other such verses.

60. 3:20; 31:22; 4:125.

61. 30:38 and many other such verses.

## Where does 'God' fit in?

idea is ruled out by both pure logic and by studying some verses in the Quran very closely. First, the pure logic: If it is purported that God is some type of other higher space-cum-mind that generates so called 3 D space, then if we call the higher space Infinity 1 (God) and the generated space Infinity 2 (the imagination-cum-creation of God), if Infinity 1 supposedly generates Infinity 2, then Infinity 1 must be the same thing as Infinity 2, because Infinity 2, by nature being timeless, cannot be created and, furthermore, there is no room for two infinities. Let us prove this: Infinity 2 cannot be spatially limited and grow to the size of infinity, since infinity by definition cannot be reached. If it cannot be reached it is not infinite but if it reaches infinity, it means it was infinite in extent, and therefore, it has no movement; it has to just always be existent. In short, since Infinity 2 is infinite it had to have been always present. If it was always present then it could not have been generated. If cannot be generated (or imagined to exist at some point) and was always present, then it is one and the same as Infinity 1, which was also never generated and was also always present. In other words Infinity 1 and 2 are 'colinear' or synonymous. The nature of Infinity 1 then, cannot be some type of abstract higher dimensional space; rather it is like Infinity 2, i.e. objectless space, that we can glean by abstracting away all particles (objects, energy, matter). In other words, Infinity 1 = Infinity 2 = objectless space = the mind of God = ground of all generated limited things = the Infinite Intelligence. Remember, in the Quran it does not say that God is Inconceivable, but Incomparable. Moreover, there cannot be two Incomparables. If God is Incomparable, which is basically what it states in the last verse of the Quran, Chapter 112, since Infinity 1 and Infinity 2 are both infinite, they are comparable in their properties of infiniteness. So they cannot be Incomparable<sup>62</sup>. Indeed, they are comparable from many aspects. As an exercise, the reader should go through Surah *Ikhlās* and ask himself/herself, if *both* Infinity 1 and 2 satisfy the all attributes of God mentioned.

## From Microbits to Everything

For example, it states that God is He upon who all depend; we would depend on both Infinity 1 and 2 equally, if either one of these infinities was generating us, for we would be wholly dependent on that type of 'space', higher dimensional or not! Therefore, by force of logic, Infinity 1 and Infinity 2 *are* comparable! As they say: "This town ain't big enough for the both of us". You can only have one Incomparable; so someone has to leave town!

Secondly, from the Quran: it is often stated that God created the heavens, the earth and that which is in between. "The heavens" refers to all celestial bodies where the root meaning of 'heaven' (*sama*) is 'that which is above'. 'The things in between' therefore refers to space or distance, plus anything particle-based that lies in that space that is not yet known or not visible to us, which we keep discovering or may yet discover. This becomes clearer when we read the following passages:

... To Him belongs whatever lies before us, and the [space] in between, your Sustainer never forgets; Sustainer of the heavens and the earth and all that lies between them. (19:64)

However, the following verses do *not* speak of three categories, namely, the creation of the heavens, the earth and also that which lies in between, but only two:

Do those who cover the truth not see that the heavens and the earth were one piece which We then ripped apart, and made every living thing from water? Will they [even] then not believe?  
(21:30)

---

62. As pointed out by fellow researcher, Zeshan Shahbaz, as was his recognition of the distinction between Inconcievable and Incomparable.

## Where does 'God' fit in?

This makes it clear that 'space' was not created with the Big Bang, for if space were an object then all three categories would have been included in the Big Bang verse (21:30). In other words, in the Quran it does *not* state, as shown in the square brackets below, that:

Do those who cover the truth not see that the heavens and the earth [*and all that which is in between*] were one piece which We then ripped apart, and made every living thing from water? Will they [even] then not believe? (21:30)

Also note that in the nebulaic formation of the universe, the term 'that which is in between' is not used either. It is noteworthy that when the universe was joined together, *all* forms of matter and energy, that is, all presently unknown forms as well, were coalesced together and there is no "that which is in between". The fact that God "ripped" the one piece, shows that the piece was limited. Every limited thing, must be in a pre-existent space.

## The Psychology of Understanding the Objectless Space of God

The creation of microbits and the evolution of them into myriad structures forming the universe means that there must be a distance or space between things by the very definition of what it means to be a thing. This is why distance is one of the things that has been objectified in the Quran by the words "that which is in between". Given all this, we can conclude that 3D space itself was not created; there always was the objectless space or mind of God that had always existed as *the* Existence. Indeed when one thinks about it further, if there were absolutely no objects of any kind, there would

## **From Microbits to Everything**

be no distance and no concept of 3D. The spatial concept of 3D only arises because we have distance and distinction between objects, and of our existence as conscious entities observing that. We may thus fool ourselves into thinking that were we to remove all particles from space we would have empty space. This is erroneous for we would not have a concept of 3D space without anything whatsoever. What one has, in reality, is the boundless, infinite consciousness of the Creator. There is, therefore, no space in the normal sense of space. But this realm is not that of nothing; it is a singular entity – absolute and infinitely omnipresent. It is a conscious non-microbitic reality – *the* conscious ground of all that exists.

When we view things in this manner, we begin to see how indescribably great the Creator is, being the one who has created everything through sheer will. We begin to see how He has created countless forms that we observe from a single type of particle: The most complex from the simplest, the many structures from only one type. Indeed, the Creator is truly the greatest and there is no better way by which He can show His greatness for the purpose for which He has created the universe.

### **Conflating and confusing objectless space with a mindless void**

One of the confusions that occurs when we state that God is absolute “objectless space” or simply “space” for short is that in the minds of 99.99999...% of human beings, ‘space’ is seen to be the distance between objects and a void. This is because it has not been realized that a true void cannot produce anything unless it has intelligence and consciousness, but if it does have these properties then it is not a true void or a consciousnessless void. Besides that, everyone would agree that a void is some thing, but not a particle based thing. It is a thing that is infinite and does not move, and as



## Where does 'God' fit in?

has been shown, possesses infinite intelligence. In that vein, it is not a thing in the sense of being like any other thing, which is particle based, moves and is limited, or has limited consciousness like human minds. Note: If a 'void' was truly nothing then what space are we in? Indeed, this 'void' is something. The purported 'void' exists. The most interesting question then is: what is the true nature of the purported 'void'? In reality, there is no such thing as absolutely nothing, for even an atheist has to believe that a consciousnessless void would be some thing. Since matter has not forever been (as proven in Chapter 1), the atheist, if rational, is forced to confront this issue head on, if his/her thinking on this issue is to be completed and is to be *de-atheisized* by logicity.

### Approaching objectless space from another angle

In Chapter 112, within the Quran, there is a definition of the essence of the Creator. However, let us examine the notion of 'objectless space' in light of this chapter.

In these verses it is stated that God is indivisibly One:

*Absolute objectless space is indivisibly One.*

God is He upon whom all depend:

*Everything depends on this space.*

He does not beget:

*Space does not beget.*

Nor is it begotten:

## From Microbits to Everything

*Space is not begotten*

And there is nothing like anything like Him:

*There is indeed nothing like objectless space.*

However, all of this leads to a seemingly paradoxical conclusion: are there two gods, that is, God and Absolute Objectless Space? The obvious answer is a: No! Objectless space is a space of intelligence and is one and the same. God is not some type of entity walking in a bigger space, for then that space would be bigger than Him, He would be dependent on that space for His existence, and it would have preceded Him in existence, which is ridiculous and silly! Hence, there is and can be nothing outside God, and everything is created within His mind, or space of intelligence as imagination.<sup>63</sup>

### What is the AWE?

A true belief system is one in which there is recognition of the Creator and gratefulness to Him. One must therefore firstly Acknowledge the Creator, Welcome Him and Embrace Him. This leads to the AWE: **A**cknowledge, **W**elcome and **E**mbrace. One Acknowledges the Creator by the signs of design in this universe, for example, and welcomes Him when

---

63. Note the following three names of God: “1. *Al-Baaqi* (The Everlasting): Objectless space has no bounds and is therefore Everlasting; 2. *Al-Waasi* (The All-Encompassing and All-Pervading): no thing encompasses objectless space but objectless space encompasses everything and is therefore All-Encompassing and All-Pervading; 3. *Al-Badi* (The Incomparable): Objectless space cannot be compared to anything and therefore is Incomparable.” A note from Zeshan Shahbaz (researcher for this book).

## Where does 'God' fit in?

we submit to His Will, and when we embrace Him, He is our close friend. At the same time, the AWE (call it AWE 1) is reciprocated by the fact that God is in AWE of His own creation (call this AWE 2) which includes the universe and all that there is in it of matter and also conscious beings. Unfortunately, to illustrate this point of reciprocation, I cannot use any other word other than AWE 2, but it must be stressed that the type of AWE God has for us is different both quantitatively and qualitatively than that which we have for Him (AWE 1). AWE 2 has to do with God's reflection of His own unsurpassable abilities. From all this creation, the greatest AWE is the creation of choice-making entities (who have the converse ability *not* to praise the Creator) and end up praising and following the Creator and truly become His friends. There is a direct relationship between the AWE 1 and AWE 2. When our AWE (AWE 1) increases, so does God's AWE (AWE 2) in terms of the reference frame of the created entities who are less than God. As for God, since He sees all past, present and future as one point, the point is full of AWE, and as such there is no change. From our reference frame, however, where we see ourselves moving into the future, one can perceive that the universe has been created for the increase towards infinity of AWE 2, ultimately for the Creator, each time things unfold, in the causal nexus of this universe. God, indeed, possesses infinite knowledge and power and He is certainly infinite, in the sense that He is the infinite absolute space in which His creation is *willed* to exist; but He does not have infinite AWE 2, in the reference frame of created beings, since to possess AWE 2 is the result of reflecting on some activity and appreciating it. God has chosen to increase this AWE 2 within Himself; it has no limit, for it keeps increasing within Himself, simultaneously as He keeps creating (where "keeps creating", has to do with the pre-existence of past and future as a point, which is analysed further in Chapter 5). *The ultimate purpose of all creation, be it this universe, or another, is therefore the unfolding of the divine awe (AWE*

## From Microbits to Everything

2). Interestingly, it states in the Quran that the purpose of creation is the AWE:

And I [God] have not created the jinn and the humans except that they should worship Me. (51:56)

The word for worship is *ibadat*, used in the above-referenced verse, and only those who perform *ibadat* in its true sense are those who praise God, for if one does not praise God, then one is not worshipping Him. This subrogation of worship being connected to and being a subset of praise can be evinced from Chapter 1, in the Quran (*Surah al-Faatihah*: The Opening) where it is stated that: “All praise belongs to God”, mentioned in verse 1, and in verse 4: “You alone do we worship”. Similarly, only those who praise God are in awe of Him. To illustrate this connection, awe and praise are mentioned together in the following Quranic verse:

And the thunder declares His glory with His praise, and the angel too for awe [*kbeefatibi*] of Him;...(13:13)

These entities praise God since they have awe for Him. In other words, AWE (precautionary fear *and* wonderment-based feeling due to recognition of power) is the basis for praising God and if one does not have the AWE, one cannot truly praise God. To understand “*kbeefatibi*” when used in conjunction with God, imagine, as an illustration, that you have never seen a tornado before, and it is one thousand feet away from you. You are dreading it and are also in fear of it, lest it crosses your path. At the same time, you are amazed by its power and beauty. This is what *kbeefatibi* denotes here; you fear God, lest you transgress His precepts for human conduct, yet at the same time, you are amazed by His power: *kbeefatibi* is a fusion of these

## Where does 'God' fit in?

concepts that cannot be conveyed by one word in the English language. The remarkable fact is that the very first word in the Quran, of the first chapter of the Quran (aside from the standard opener: "*Bismillah bir rabmaan...*") is "praise": "Praise be to God, Lord of the Worlds." The more fundamental implicative statement behind this is: "One must be in AWE of God, Sustainer of the Worlds", but since the AWE encompasses many aspects of thought, it was not used for cognitive and pedagogical reasons in the introduction by God, leaving the more derivative concomitant term "praise". The opener can be rendered into a more foundational subtext as follows:

Praise be to God, since we **A**cknowledge, **W**elcome and **E**mbrace Him and, as a result, have of **AWE** of Him, since He is the Sustainer, because He is the Imaginator, of all groupings of creation, that is, the whole of created Existence.

Another reason why the AWE is a more foundational concept than "Praise" is because one can fake praises verbally, but AWE is that which resides within us as a feeling which either does or does not exist, and if it does, it would to various degrees. *You cannot fake the AWE.*

The fact that this universe has been created for the desire of God with respect to the AWE has not been realized in general is because there has been a misunderstanding of the issue with respect to the difference between being *self-sufficient* and *self-fulfilled*. One may be self-sufficient in terms of not depending on something for existence, but that does not mean that one is as self-gratified as one wants to be. When we discuss this notion with respect to the Creator *some* parallels do indeed apply. God is self-sufficient and does not need anyone for His existence. He is also self-satisfied and self-fulfilled; however, one can increase the type of fulfillment

## From Microbits to Everything

and satisfaction and this is what the Creator has *chosen* to do. In fact, many of His attributes feed into increasing the AWE (from the created beings 'time-unfolding' perspective), such as the attribute of mercy or beneficence etc., because through these, we are in AWE of Him and, likewise, this increases AWE 2. However, since the past, present and future are all present before Him, the increase in self-fulfillment is only an increase from our perspective as we move from the 'present' to the 'future', but is always there for the Creator. However, if He did not create, such fulfillment would have been absent.

The purpose of creation then is for the development of self-conscious entities by the ultimately self-conscious Creator who can evolve or develop their finite created capacities. These capacities mirror the infinite and eternal attributes of the Creator, so that the Creator can have higher company, which is advantageous to the created evolving thought structure (the human consciousness) and an existence worthy for the Creator in which the AWE is increased into perpetuity, when viewed from the temporal human reference frame.<sup>64</sup> No doubt, such a Creator would be content within Himself, not to have created anything and neither needs, nor is dependent on our worshiping Him, whatsoever. However, the universe is a natural outcome of the nature of God. God desires to create, but not out of a shortcoming; rather, the desire is a type of fulfillment that has no parallel in human terms or conceptions; it is incredibly and indelibly sublime and unimaginably great, involving the concept of the AWE as has just been discussed. Indeed, God does not create without need and is not wasteful.

---

64. In the Quran, such human beings who become the foremost are known as the friends of God. It is the ideal goal for all of us to become the friends of God. This is an achievable ideal and not limited to some so-called special people, but is open for *all* humanity. See verses: 4:119; 5:55,56; 45:19 and many other similar verses.

## Where does 'God' fit in?

The universe was thus necessary and is purposeful. It was necessary to create such a universe, for only in such a universe could entities develop and enter higher company. These created entities, such as human beings, would go through experiences where they could develop attributes that would relate to the creator in a meaningful way, first and foremost of which are the attributes of higher self-consciousness and choice-operationality. A universe with a definite purpose necessitates creatures who praise the creator through the AWE 1, through taking the proper choices, which thereby unfolds the Sustainer's AWE 2, reflexively. The following passages in the Quran, help to add to this point:

We did not create the celestial systems, the earth and what lies between them for play! If it had been Our wish to indulge in such pastime, We would surely have derived it from that which is near Us (or from Us, or from Our presence), if We would ever do such a thing! (21:16,17)

We did not create the celestial systems, the earth and what lies between them for play! We created them for a definite purpose, but most of them do not comprehend this. (44:38, 39)

The meaning of this verse is that the purpose for creation is not a joke or for frivolous amusement. Creation is for a higher purpose, that engenders company among the intelligent and sublime; the created intelligences and the uncreated originative intelligence; a dialogue and connection made for eternity, ingeniously planned by the Creator. For superficial entertainment, God Himself could utilize beings created for that very purpose that would be closer to Him, such as the automaton angels, but for elevated intelligent company, based on the positive development, He

## From Microbits to Everything

had a wish or desire to create the type of universe we reside in. Here, entities develop using their will, elevating themselves to higher levels, so that those who advance sufficiently may be in the Creator's close company, as guests, for eternity. This is because in order to have meaningful and intelligent company, God cannot create another God; He has to create beings lesser than Himself who are imperfect and limited, yet use their choices to enhance themselves.

The above-cited verses 21:16,17 state that the universe was not created for mere *amusement*, for if it had been so, God would have chosen *something near at hand* – from that which is with Him or near Him. However, the obvious question which arises is: What could be that which is near to Him, for if everything is part of His imagination, then is not everything near Him? The resolution to this question is as follows: If we take the *opposites* of the key words of the verse, we realize that God made this universe for a *serious purpose*, because God wanted *something far from Him*, that is, that which is not with Him (or not from His presence – see Quran 28:57 for a similar construction of 'from near Him'). Going even deeper now, we may pose the next logical question: What is that which can be far from Him, for, if everything is His Imagination and hence in His mind, then how can anything be far from Him?

### The Answer

Before we answer the question in the above section directly, there is an issue that must be dealt with, at the very outset, once and for all: The main purpose for creation cannot be the generosity of God, as is usually argued by some Islamic scholars and philosophers, but must be some type of sublime desire. Generosity can only come into play as a secondary reason, once there



## Where does 'God' fit in?

is creation. If there is nothing, then to 'whom' is God going to be generous? And if He chooses not to create, the issue of generosity as the cause for creation does not arise, nor indeed meanness. But once He creates, He truly is generous and merciful to His creation, which are necessary pre-conditions for the development of sentient entities so that they may relate to Him. God needed to create an 'other' to have dialogue with, that is, one who could have AWE of Him; and since He cannot create something outside of Himself and outside His mind, the utmost He can do is to create entities that have a high level of consciousness *and* ability to choose. These entities can, by observing the universe, by using reason, evidences, and by passion based on such foundations, come close to Him, and move towards Him. They can come close to Him, from a position which is both 'other' and far. 'Other' in the sense of being other intelligences like Him, albeit very limited, and 'far' in the sense that they are shielded from God, in that they cannot experience the existence of the Creator in terms of seeing Him, physically feeling and touching Him etc. So, being far removed from God has two complementary aspects: Firstly, by creating imagined characters or personalities within His own mind and by giving them limited wills, just as God has a will, God separates such imagined-cum-created entities from His own personality and makes them distant. They cannot see, smell, feel, hear or touch God, unless He communicates to them by some indirect means, and being embedded in a microbitic (particle-based universe) most of these entities start thinking of themselves as absolutely free-willed and independent creatures, forgetting that, ultimately, they are sustained and controlled by the ultimate will of God. However, these separate wills, as it were, are given a degree of autonomy in that God fractionalizes multiple wills as His thought products. This issue of 'free-will' is discussed in great depth in the Appendix, for those who choose to dig deeper. Since God is one (as in the Quran it says that He is *Abad* (indivisible in His being))

## From Microbits to Everything

this fractionalization does not mean, of course that God splits Himself into many. The fractionalization is in terms of imagining a scenario in which He basically commands other entities to come into existence in His space, on the imaginational level, whilst He is still the ever-present One.

Secondly, the separateness that this magisterial God creates by creating multiple wills in His imagination (fractionalization) is necessary for movement from far to near, for those created entities who do recognize their singular Creator move towards and return to Him. This they achieve by becoming acutely conscious of Him, through the AWE, and this, in turn, can only be achieved through intentionally proper behaviour, that reflects the AWE.:

The Prophet said: “God said: “The son of Adam hurts Me by abusing time, for I am Time; in my Hands are all things and I *cause* the revolutions of night and day.”<sup>65</sup>

To understand what God means by “time” in the Hadith, one will have to understand the concept of “GRC” discussed in a later chapter.

### The main goal

On page 93, a question was posed with respect to what our goal in life should be. After discussing this section it becomes clear that glorifying God ought to be our goal, that is, our main goal, based on the AWE; this approach would cover and bring about all other categories of goals

---

65. *Sahib al-Bukhari*, Volume 9, Book 93, Number 583. (See also, Vol. 6, Book 60, Number 351). The plural form of Hadith is Ahadith, but we shall use “Hadiths”.

## Where does 'God' fit in?

("subgoals"), whereas the focus on each one of the other subgoals will not bring about a realization of all the others to their fullest extent. With the degradation of the unicity-and-absolute-uniqueness concept of God that naturally effuses with the embracement of the glory of God, the AWE is undermined, and all the other categories of 'religious goals' cannot be fulfilled properly, or get side-tracked into erroneous and harmful rituals and practices. The glorification of God, through realization that He is the sustainer of all, brings about compassion and the issue of rights being upheld for the sustenance for all, which in turn, brings about the fulfillment of the other sub-goals: morality and justice on the individual and socio-politico-economical level; the realization of the proper pathway to the confirmed existence of paradise; the 'spiritual' aspects that one engages in to build up one's character so as to better engage in these sub-goals, etc. This is the reason why the AWE must be the basis of a *true* belief system. Most of the current belief systems and religions focus on one or more of the sub-goals other than the main goal, and, what is more, they do not even have fully developed and non-contradictory concepts for these subgoals in both concept and practice.

### Type of universe

God had to create a Universe with this depth of the potentiality for Good and Evil, for if it were a 'shallow' universe, where one would have the no *potentiality* of transgressing far, or for receiving much suffering, then our behaviour, which depends on the potentiality of wrong and suffering, would also *not* have had the opportunity for ascending to such heights. This diminishment of potentiality is due to the fact that we would not have had the ability to achieve the greatest good, which comes as a counterforce

## **From Microbits to Everything**

against the greatest harms/evils. In this vein, this type of universe, which possesses a vast range of moral inclinations, helps maximize and diversify the AWE, even if there is a minority who behave this way, for this ‘minority’ stands out as a gem. In essence, the Creator is looking for quality, not quantity, and it is only through this type of a system that gems can and will arise. In other words, the variety and depth of experience needed for the soul X, when it is created, can only be brought about by passing through the sieve of this universe. Then when soul X meets God, it has something to talk about. It is not in the state of being almost a zero as it was when first fractionalized.

In assessing the type of universe we happen to be in, the following obvious question arises: could God not have created a Universe in which the extent of the potentiality of suffering was not great? In other words, could He not have created a shallow Universe and still have had the function of the AWE within it, fulfilling His goal? The creation of such a shallow universe would necessarily have instilled it with less possible variety in the details behind the AWE for each individual and, similarly, less variety for God in His interaction with the created wills/entities. It would be like having a great music collection but of only one type of music genre, played over and over again. Having a plethora of genres of great music is more interesting! A deeper universe with a greater potentiality of suffering and conversely, of a greater level of peace, joy or pleasure would create the conditions for maximal variety. Hence the necessity for our *type* of universe.

### **Consciousness as the property of absolute objectless space**

Consciousness is the very property of space itself: it is a unique indivisible absolute consciousness that is synonymous with God. Consciousness (as

## Where does 'God' fit in?

denoting a general term for sentience) is not God, but God is of consciousness. God creates structures out of atoms (ultimately microbits) by sheer will, through His consciousness; God also fractionalizes other wills within His own will. This decision by the Creator to create individual objects within His space, by assigning a number and unique identification for each thing,<sup>66</sup> is by the command of the Creator:

They ask you about the *ruh*; say it is a command from your Sustainer and of [its] knowledge you have been given little.<sup>67</sup>

This Being, whose consciousness is the property of objectless space itself, is an uncreated infinite boundless 'entity' we are calling "God". When we are imagined to exist within that space, we are essentially created as non-particle based consciousnesses within the overarching consciousness of God, embedded within that objectless space, there being no outside. A human, being more complex than a worm, is a better antenna to *tranfocus* consciousness, so to speak, and thus has been endowed with more aspects of that overarching consciousness than the worm. As that consciousness becomes tranfocused on more complex carbon-based bodies, it is able to learn and develop further, more than, for example, other creatures with less complex nervous systems. However, more on the details of 'fractionalism' and 'transfocation', and what exactly constitutes life and consciousness in Chapter 5.

---

66. Because no two creatures can be born in the same space, and if they are, then not at the same time.

67. 17:85

## **From Microbits to Everything**

### **Imagination of God and free-will**

If we are the created imagination of God, do we have free-will? What we can say is that we do have choices in this universe, and that we will be accountable for making the wrong choices, in front of God. From all practical points of view, one could say that we have “free will” in this sense. For all those who are satisfied with this, they can go on to lead a life for the glory of God and all that this entails. However, those who want to delve deeper and resolve some issues concerning free-will, including some crucial ‘paradoxes’ which are resolved, please refer to the Appendix.

### **Non-Anthropomorphic definition of ‘need’**

Did God have a need to create the universe? When trying to explain the word ‘need’ in relation to God, there is a difficulty because we, as humans, tend to associate negative attributes, or weakness this word. When the word ‘need’ is used to describe the fact that the Creator needs the AWE, it does not fully capture what we are saying, because the word ‘need’ contains notions of non-self-sufficiency and dependency. Obviously, this is not what we mean by ‘need’. A better word to use is the word ‘desire’, in that it is God’s desire. However, if the word ‘need’ gets attached to the view we are presenting, it is most crucial that several issues are cleared-up immediately.

Firstly, we cannot ignore the fact that we do mirror, in a limited way, the attributes of God. Where we differ from God is that His attributes, such as knowledge and power, are infinite, whereas ours are finite and themselves exist only by the will of God. In the Quran, innumerable verses exist in which it is stated that God loves those who perform particular actions sincerely. This implies that He intensely likes the performance of something.

## Where does 'God' fit in?

He needs that, but certainly not to the extent of undermining the notion of self-sufficiency. If we engage in that particular behaviour that He espouses, it will be good for us and we will be appreciative of God. He wants us to be appreciative of Him, but not to the extent that He could not survive, exist or be diminished in His majesty, even an iota, were He not to get that appreciation from us:

People, it is you who stand in need [for sustenance] of God –  
God needs nothing [for sustenance] and is worthy of all praise  
[i.e. that results from AWE]... (35:15)

In fact, the verse above shows that though God is in need of *nothing for self-sufficiency*, He would like us to praise Him. The argument that criticizes the ascription of the word 'need' to God, charging anthropomorphization to the nature of God, misses the whole point that God does indeed have attributes that are mirrored by human beings. We know, for example, that God is Intelligent, and we too ourselves are intelligent, if we act wisely and with knowledge, avoiding harm. Is to say that God is intelligent anthropomorphizing God? Nobody thinks that God is being anthropomorphized when the word '(infinitely) intelligent' is used in connection with God; however, that is because being 'intelligent' does not convey connotations of dependency, as does the word 'need'. The main point is that since God is not a biological or any type of particle-based being, we cannot think of the qualitative aspect of many of His 'thought states' such as His love being exactly the same as our types of feeling of love. Nonetheless, there are parallels and "love" shows a desire that resides within Him.

If God did not create anything, He would be Alone, from past forevermore, to future forevermore. Yet again, like the issue of 'need' and

## From Microbits to Everything

'love', we must not devolve into anthropocentric notions of 'being alone' and loneliness. Nonetheless, His self-reflective existence is clearly incalculably richer, fascinating and amazing, once He has created. Imagine: in all likelihood, God has created countless universes similar to ours, each with a beginning and an ending. The created intelligences that have now developed from those universes that have ended, would now be in that higher company with God.

God's being is not the same once He chooses to create, where we are one of the prime reasons for the universe's creation. In being thankful for this honour, we should strive our best towards that goal of coming close to God, as we will end up in some type of relation with the Creator after our heavy-particle bodily death. The worst scenario will be our consciousness being cut-off from that Creator if we have neglected Him and His will in this life. Yet such an ascent of the AWE cannot begin if we shut our eyes to the signs in the universe that point to the Creator, and if we are trapped in an inverted vision of reality. In this inverted vision, we think that *only* the immediately apparent material universe exists and may become *obsessed* with possessions and the accumulation of objects and all the concomitant behaviours resulting from such an outlook. We do not see created objects in this universe merely as tools towards the realization and consciousness of the Creator and His will. Our will may try to usurp the Creator's will. We must always strive to invert the inversion and bring it in line with the reality that all things are being sustained God's Mind, that He is the only absolutely real, at each and every moment. In this manner, we would be elevated by the attitude of gratitude as encompassed by the AWE towards such a unique entity as the living ground for all transformational existences. The lesson is that we must try our level best not to be neglectful of this fact in our daily lives. This is what we can and should strive for, as the very purpose of our creation. This will indubitably – if followed – grant us



## Where does 'God' fit in?

true success in our lives as we journey into eternity. Beyond our physical death in terms of shedding our heavy microbotic bodies, is a transformation akin to a vista change for a cocooned worm-like creature that metamorphizes into a magnificent butterfly: to explore vast new and unimaginably wondrous realms – the gardens of eternity!

### Witness!

Our primary position is that of being witnesses unto the Sustainer at the bare minimum and we must not fall from this level. If we do, we are being ungrateful. Man was created for worship (by praising God) though God does not need this for self-subsistence, but it increases AWE 2 and this pleases Him. Note that the verse in the Quran 51:56, that states that God has created Jinn and Humankind only to worship Him, is pointing to the fact that the creator desires such worship for Himself, to infinitize the AWE, praise being a subset of the AWE. And since praise is a dynamic concept which grows or shrinks, we have the notion of AWE associated with it, for when praise increases so does the AWE 1 and when AWE 1 increases, so does the Creator's AWE 2, when we consider it from our sequential (time-based) perspective! All pristine morality is derived from the recognition of being witnesses unto reality under the consciousness that God is the Sustainer and Developer (*rabb*) of all things and hence is the Creator too. In fact, this is why the word Sustainer is used in this passage and not Creator, as it encompasses the attribute of "Creator" and has wider ramifications. If God is the Sustainer of you and I and of all things great and small, then how can we shut-off the fountains of sustenance and damage the beneficence that He has provided to all things? This certainty based recognition of, or 'witnessing' Him being the Sustainer through design of

## From Microbits to Everything

everything in nature, of seeing things as they are in the pellucid causal nexus, is indeed the basis of all true morality, encompassing both social and environmental domains.

### Is punishment in hell forever according to the Quran?

If our Will is ultimately controlled by the will of God and for all the reasons connected with the purpose of creation discussed in detail in the Appendix, then how could He punish such created entities who operate upon His will forever, especially since, firstly, He is the very one who has designed the scenarios and secondly, how can He mete out punishment for infinite duration for evil(s) committed for a finite period? Indeed, will those *homo sapiens* who are extremely nasty characters, that is, those who do not use their God-like wills judiciously and never change towards the proper path of thought and conduct, in that their misbehaviour is a result of associating/replacing others with God, be punished forever?

### The finite nature of all punishment

In the Quran, everlasting punishment is never depicted for anyone. The view that everlasting punishment does exist has arisen mostly as a result of the erroneous interpretation of the word *kbaaliduun*. *Kbaaliduun* from the root *kbalada* signifies: that which does not decay, “to live in a place without deterioration”<sup>68</sup> and, hence, goes on or abides, as when the word *kbwalid* is used to denote the three stones that once served as a base for a cooking pot,

---

68. Omar, Abdul Mannan, (2006), *The Dictionary of the Holy Quran*, p. 106.

## Where does 'God' fit in?

which remain abiding despite the deterioration of the contents of an entire desolated house. It can be translated as *that which endures*. Here, the stones have the quality of imperishability, due to their constitution as well as their locational invariance. Let us now apply this concept further, in order to understand its usage in the Quran. Let us assume that there was a human being who was immune to old age or was immune to diseases – hence he would live *perpetually* unless hit by a car and was killed. This word is a lot like one of Newton's laws, which states that an object will stay at rest or move with constant motion unless acted upon by an external unbalanced force. This is the true understanding of this word, which will bear out in all Quranic contexts: There are some verses in the Quran where *khaaliduun* is used and it is usually translated into English as 'forever'; however, this becomes highly problematic, to say the least, when the following verses are translated. Here, the word is usually translated as simply 'therein to abide', instead of "forever", in an inconsistent fashion by most translators. Why? Because if it were not, then it would read as follows:

And as for those who will be glad (that day) they will be in the Garden, abiding FOREVER, as long as the heavens and the earth endure [and they do so only temporarily as stated in the Quran 46:3, which becomes a contradiction!], except for that which your Sustainer wills: a gift unfailing. (11:108)

The above translation, with *khaaliduna*, translated as FOREVER, would be inconsistent within the Quran. However, when we adopt the true understanding of this word, as outlined above, we get the proper meaning, which is:

And as for those who will be glad [that day] they will be in the

## From Microbits to Everything

Garden, abiding without decay [that is, without facing entropy or any form of permanent destruction], as long as the heavens and the earth endure, except for that which your Sustainer wills: a gift unfailing. (11:108)

In summation then, let us call an object X existing in an environment Y. The word *kbaalidunn* applies to the nature of the object X (i.e. imperishability, in terms of not decaying and hence enduring). The mistake that has been made is that this particular word has been applied to the duration of existence of X in environment Y, rather than to the *conditional* self-property of imperishability of object X, situated in environment Y. That the word *kbaalidunn* means that which does not decay or is intrinsically everlasting, is clear from other verses in the Quran where, in paradise, in the hereafter, the believers will be served by everlasting youthful entities-cum-boys (refer to Quran 56:17 and 76:19); the tree of immortality (Quran 20:120); Satan tempting Adam and his wife to eat from the tree in order to gain access to immortality (7:20); that the prophets were not made in forms that required no eating of food and nor were they immortal (21:8), and finally, someone who amasses wealth thinking that it will make him immortal (104:3).

But what does “as long as the heavens and the earth endure” mean? Precisely what we shall explain in detail in this book: that the next life starts immediately after this one: Heaven and Hell exist akin to parallel systems but are not discernable to our senses or extensions of our senses (tools). When one dies, one is placed in either paradise or hell (i.e. the lighter microbitic universe). These two domains exist until the entire heavy microbitic universe collapses, at which time so will the lighter system, as they are within the same boundaries of space. God could either continue the punishment of those in hell in the next universe that emerges from this universe, or place

## Where does 'God' fit in?

the person in question in paradise in that next universe – this is purely up to God. Such a scenario is precisely described by the following passage in the Quran:

As for those who will be wretched, they will be in the Fire; sighing and wailing will be their portion therein, abiding without decay, so long as the heavens and the earth endure, except as your Sustainer wills. Lo! Your Sustainer is doer of what He wills. (11:106-107)

For those who were placed in paradise immediately after death, while this heavy microbitic universe existed alongside, their reward will continue even after this universe is destroyed – it will be a gift never to be cut-off, even though it could be, since the will belongs to God (see 11:108, cited above). Note, that by “heavens and the earth”, the new heavens and earth of the afterlife are not being referred to, since the new system to arise after the destruction of the present heavens and earth, are eternal and the question of their enduring does not arise.

Now there may be a further objection and some may say that verses 11:106-108 occur *after* verses 11:103 to 11:105, which talk about the day of judgment; hence, God is talking about the new paradise and hell that will be created *after* this universe is destroyed and not a parallel universe type of hell and paradise that we are explaining in our book. It appears to us, however, that although God initially talks about that system which will be created after the destruction of this universe, in verses 11:103, 105 where we are faced with the Day of Judgment, He backtracks and gives us the whole scenario in verses 11:106 to 107. Such a ‘non-sequential’ sequence can also be found in the following verses, dealing with the creation of the universe: 41:9 to 41:12. The backtracking here occurs in 41:11, 12.

## From Microbits to Everything

That punishment in hell is not everlasting is also clear from two other verses:

Surely hell is a place of ambush, a dwelling place for those who transgress the boundaries [set by God]: they will *abide therein for ages*. (78:23)

Here the word used is *abqaabaa*, meaning *a very long period*. It is the plural of *buqub* which denotes seventy or eighty years, or a long time. Another word in the Quran, namely, *abadan*, used in verses 4:169, 33:65 and 72:23 also means a long time.<sup>69</sup> In these verses, the word *khaalidiina* is used in conjunction with *abadan*. We have already shown that *khaalidiina* does not mean dwelling forever in a particular location and hence *abadan* cannot also concomitantly mean this, and vice versa. In addition, the word *abadan* as used in the Quran means to remain indefinitely, as the following verse shows very clearly that Prophet Abraham would maintain (*abadan*) dislike between himself and the idol-worshipping tribe he was brought up in, *until* they believe in One God alone:

And there has arisen between us and you hostility, and disaffection will continue unabated [i.e. the disaffection will not 'decay', unless, and therefore] UNTIL you believe in God (Allah) only...(60:4)

To fulfill the AWE, God has created entities that may or may not submit to His laws as ordained in the Quran; however, since God has

---

69. See *Arabic English Lexicon* by Edward William Lane; *Mughni al-Labib (Grammar)*, by Al-Shaikh Jamal al-Din ibn Hisham Al-Ansari and *Taj al-Arus (Dictionary)*, by Imam Muhib al-Din Abi-l-Farid Murtada.

## Where does 'God' fit in?

endowed Himself to be the Most Merciful, it would appear to be a gross contradiction that He should punish someone forever, particularly if He Himself has absolute control of all wills and decisions made by His imagined entities such as you or I (even though He has made quasi-separate wills through fractionalization: refer to the Appendix). Here we see that this is not, nor was it ever the case, that punishment is everlasting. In 4:168, it states that God will not forgive those who cover the truth and are unjust. Similarly, in verse 4:116 it says that if one commits *shirk* (an Arabic word meaning: associating a partner with God) one will not be forgiven, but for other transgressions He may forgive, if He so wills. However, this is not to be taken as meaning that one will never be forgiven for *shirk*, but rather, that this is something from which repentance and correction is required, divine replacementization being the mother of all major transgressions and at the very root of all major evils. God will not forgive this 'sin' without repentance and amendment in one's actions; however, He may or may not simply wipe out other minor transgressions or some types of major ones that are not associated with *shirk*, even if one does not specifically make amends in those. For example, on the Day of Judgment a person's scorecard is 48% on the positive side and 52 % negative. A person needs only 2% to be admitted into paradise. God may overlook 2% to bring his mark up to 50%. That 2% would have nothing to do with associating others with God. On the other hand, someone's scorecard is 25% good and 75% bad. The additional 25% needed to bring his mark up to 50% cannot be granted by God, since it involves *shirk* "and will not be forgiven"; so the person will be cast into hell. Only those who step out of bounds as defined in the Quran, those whose desires place an object above God and whose whole life is consumed by the power of that object, be it a person, place or thing, are said to be committing *shirk*. These are the people who are the most wretched, and only these will be placed in hell<sup>70</sup>. However, the punishment of hell, though most severe

## From Microbits to Everything

for such an individual and unimaginably lengthy, is reformatory and not forever, as discussed previously in connection with the word *kbaaliduun*.

Instructive, in this respect, is the story in the Quran (Chapter 18, Verses 36-38) of the two people who owned property: one of them, who owned a lot more than his neighbour, was very proud and felt himself to be self-sufficient. According to the Quran, this arrogant individual was committing *shirk* by his very behaviour. One who is in submission to God, cannot, by definition, be one of those committing *shirk*, and cannot end up in hell. Therefore, only those who commit *shirk* end up in hell, through their behaviours and the intention behind these behaviours. There are many levels of *shirk*, beyond the threshold *shirk* level and, just as there are levels in paradise, so too are their levels in hell. According to this analysis, one cannot be complacent by calling oneself a Muslim. A person who calls himself/herself Muslim does not get off 'scott-free'. Is the self-claimed Muslim committing *shirk* in the sense of making some desire(s) his/her God. Conversely, one who believes in One God (*tawbeed*) and does not commit *shirk*, does good deeds and believes in the hereafter, would have nothing to fear or grieve about, for so long as he/she maintains this way of living, such a person will certainly end-up in paradise and is indeed a Muslim. Such a person is in submission to God, even though he or she may never have even heard the word 'Islam', Quran or Muhammed, due to the limitations of the environment that person may find himself or herself in, or may have wrong ideas about these *terms*, but if once shown their true nature, would accept these most willingly.

The fact that punishment is not forever, should not lead to false comfort for the one who is condemned to be thrown into hell for even one year. Do you know how it feels to be in hell for even a minute? And, as has been

---

70. Quran 92:15



### Where does 'God' fit in?

illustrated above, those who commit *shirk* will occupy hell, not for a minute, but for an immeasurably long time! Lastly, it has traditionally been stated by many Muslim scholars that *khaalidiina* means living forever in a particular place and that if one ends up in this situation, punishment is everlasting for those who associate/replace others with God. Yet, if punishment for such a crime is forever and is denoted by *khaaliduun*, why is a possible exception being made in the Quran, where it is clearly stated that: 'The Fire be your dwelling place: you will dwell therein *khaalidiina*, except as God wills (6:128). Given the analysis above, this can mean two things: either God will forgive you, although you deserved to be in hell, or, if we take the standard interpretation of *khaalidina*, of put being in a place forever, then God will one 'day' remove you from hell, which means that even with the standard interpretation, 'forever' is translated to being 'temporarily', if God so wills.



## **Chapter 4**

### **Solving the Problem of Evil**



## **Chapter 4**

### **Solving the Problem of Evil**

If there is God and if He is all powerful and good, then why is there “evil”? This is the so-called problem of evil. It has baffled many minds and has led others to doubt either the reality of God or His goodness. The argument usually is that there is no God, because if there were God, He would not have created a world like this. Let us examine the veracity of this assertion.

#### **Evil as a prerequisite to goodness and pleasure**

What we call “evil” is simply the hurts that we all experience as a result of our vulnerabilities. You meet a bully on the road and he demands your wallet. You resist but you have insufficient resisting qualities. Of course, the wallet just sits there, perhaps quietly contemplating whether you should have taken some serious martial arts training. It is no use. You go home broke and hurt. In other words, all hurts result from only two things: 1. Someone’s capacity to inflict hurt on you and 2. Your capacity to experience hurt. If no one or nothing could hurt you, you would not have any problem with “evil”. To ask the question of why evil exists, therefore, is simply another way of asking why you have the capacity for suffering and why do others have the capacity to inflict suffering on you. There are two answers.

## From Microbits to Everything

*Evil makes individuality, creativity, productivity and society possible:*

You have the capacity for hunger. When you are hungry, you suffer. Because you do not like to suffer, you look for food. If you are not a farmer, this means that you must find a means to get some food. In other words, the capacity for hunger pushes you to work. If we could not be hungry, there would be no need for food and there would be no farmer. Let us take another example. You have the capacity to feel lonely. When you are alone, you feel hurt. Of course, you do not like to be hurt. So, in response you look for acceptable company. Your capacity to be lonely has compelled you to communicate, to fraternise and to build a society. Again, you have the capacity to be hurt by your ignorance of many things. For example, when you are ignorant of how to float and you jump into the lake, you end up with a disproportionate share of water in your system. You of course, do not like this. So, as a result you exert your self to learn about the mechanics of water and of floating. You learn about how to swim or, in the alternative, you build or buy yourself a floatation device. When you are compelled to learn, you will have to use your senses systematically. You are forced to use and to develop your many faculties with the result that you acquire skills that some people have not acquired. Not only does this allow you to ward off one more hurt, but it sets you apart from some people and makes you identifiable as an individual. We do not all suffer the same things and certainly not at the same time. Your different hurts and your different responses to various hurts set you apart from others and makes your experience unique. Individuality is possible only because none of us has suffered the same hurt as the other has suffered. Without our different vulnerabilities and our different responses to same, we would lack our individual personalities. We are each shaped by our vulnerabilities, be they of wealth, health or gender. Because I have not gone through what you

## Solving the Problem of Evil

have gone through, you think and feel things differently from me. You are in other words, the hurts that you have suffered and your responses to these hurts.

Without our vulnerabilities we could not be human. If you think of yourself, you will see that you are no more than your experiences. These experiences are no more than your hurts and responses to them. You learned this and that and you did this and that only because you needed to do so, or you wished to avoid or remove a real or potential hurt. Since you act because of these hurts, it follows therefore that if you lived in a world without suffering, that is, a world in which you did not suffer hunger, loneliness, sickness, shame, poverty, insecurity and so forth, you would not act. Where there is no fear, there can be no heroism. Where no one is weak, there can be no sense or act of compassion. Where one is happy alone, there is no need for need for others and no need for love. Simply put, every form of human pleasure is possible only because of the presence of these hurts that we suffer. If there were no hurts, there would be no action and pleasure. To enjoy a thing, you must need it. Would you rather be born in a world in which you experienced no need for any one at all and therefore lived all alone or would you rather be born in a world in which because you feel the need to be loved, you live with the beloved in a companionship? If we had no need to eat, to build, to heal, to love and so forth, we would not do these things. If we had no need to act and did not act, we would not have any inventions, no creative works, no communication, no society, no individual uniqueness and achievement, nothing: we would just be sitting there or lying there, like the mountain. I am sure that none of us would like that.

The important thing here is that not only would we not act, but our faculties for doing these things would also be unnecessary and absent. If you have no need to walk, you will have no use for legs and so you would have no legs. If you have no need to chew, eat, laugh, drink or speak, you will

## **From Microbits to Everything**

have no need for the mouth and therefore, you would be toothless and mouthless. The same goes for all our other faculties. In a world without hurts, you would be an eyeless, mouthless, earless, legless, stomachless, toothless...human being. You would just be a motionless blob, sitting there all alone. Just imagine such a creature!

The conclusion, therefore, must follow that some type of suffering or so-called evil is logically necessary as a precondition to goodness, to pleasure, to human creativity, productivity and to society. A world of "evil" is therefore no more than a world that makes it possible for each one of us to be unique, to be human and to have joy. Looked at this way, one can easily see why a Good God would create such a world to be and allow it to continue. You can see how inestimably brilliant He is. There are several other reasons for the creation of this universe which we shall examine in the next section.

### **Another Reason for Living Here: Evil as a Possibility Of Knowledge<sup>71</sup>**

The second reason for the existence of evil is as follows: God's creative power is endless and for that matter, He has created many worlds besides the earth. The earth is where the life of the human being begins, but the destiny of the human being is not the earth but in many other worlds.

As we have already seen, it costs God nothing to make anyone of us. All that God has to do to make you live in the hereafter is to will that you live hereafter. And God knows that you will love to live hereafter. Now God is the Most Generous and the Most Compassionate Being. It is His nature to give and to give abundantly, over and over again. In addition, God loves those who love Him. Their companionship gives God Pleasure. So, it follows that if you love or please God, you are guaranteed to live hereafter in



## Solving the Problem of Evil

His close presence. Because there is a hereafter, it has an impact on the significance of our experiences here on the earth. Our experience here serves as an introduction to the many possible worlds of God. Of God's many worlds, none is like the earth. Each world is unique in the same manner as each human being, each leaf and each day is unique. On the earth, each day presents us with opportunities to hear, see, feel and know a great many curiosities of unparalleled proportions. From some people or events we come to know courage, kindness, patience, love, goodness and so forth. And from others, we learn anger, hatred, stupidity, ugliness and so on. There is always something to be learned from any experience no matter how unpleasant or unwanted. We each must shun evil for our own sake, but we must also learn from things that happen to us. My conduct and my fortunes educate my neighbours and I about the many sides or possibilities of being and their experiences too, educate them and I about other possibilities. Every dream, every nightmare, every act, every effort, and in short, every life event educates us, shapes our views of reality and enriches our perspectives

---

71. The whole thing is analogous to the development of a fetus into a human being. The earth is like the womb of the hereafter and we are the fetuses in it. Death is the birth and entry into a greater world. Alas, the human being like the tiny sperm cannot imagine that the human being is capable of being transformed into a being a million times greater than itself and is capable of being born into a world of endless stars and a variety of life forms in constant sound and motion, colourful, elegant, sophisticated and for period time ten thousand times the life of the sperm. But it has happened. Like the sperms that we once were, more possibilities await us than we can ever dream of, or can even imagine. Indeed, if you pay serious attention to life, you will come to know that this entire earthly experience is like a dream, unimaginable. It is unbelievable that we are happening and yet it is real; God willed it and there you are. The greatest miracle of all is that only a few years ago, we were all nothing and now we live. Having lived once, you have absolutely crossed the barrier of non-being into being and it is easy to see how you can live from here to there forever more, by the will of God.

## **From Microbits to Everything**

along the way to God, our Goal.

Because I live on the earth I know what it is to be hungry and to lose a dear one. I also know what it is like to laugh, to play and to be cherished. I know how hard it is to accomplish things and I also know how joyous it is to accomplish things. I have felt the excruciating pain of illness and I have also felt the exhilarating joy of health. I have worked and I have played, won and lost and I have seen and felt many countless and wonderful things. There is no place like the earth and my experience here has given me a perspective about reality that I could not otherwise have gained if I had been born say, in paradise. All God's intelligent creatures are students on a course entitled "God's Many Signs and Worlds". God wants us to learn about Him and to come to appreciate and to love His Greatness and Glory, through His creation. The earth is one of the signs of God and a required reading. It is a required reading because of all the unique qualities described earlier. There are more pleasant readings as part of the course. Now because of the law of opportunity costs, none of us could have been born into two different worlds at the same time. God, therefore, had to determine which one of His worlds to place us in first. The decision was entirely up to God. For us human beings, He chose this world as our starting point. As I have already explained, if God wills the human being could live forever. As compared to forever, the time spent on the planet is like one trillionth of a millisecond; it is almost nothing. I also mentioned earlier that for those who love God, at least the hereafter is more pleasurable than this world. Therefore, given that the earth is a required reading and the time spent here insignificant, it makes sense that God allows us to begin on the earth in the less pleasant world and then upgrades us to the more pleasant, later on. By giving us the earth first and for only a short period, God has ensured, at least for those who love Him, that the hereafter would be more pleasant. We come to live for the first time in this world, without much to

## **Solving the Problem of Evil**

compare our experience with. It is thus easier on us to handle this type of “evil”: we have not known anything better. It is easier to be poor and then rich than to be rich and then poor; it is better to be sick and then healthy than to be healthy and then sick. It is better to be deprived and then rewarded with abundance later, than to be rewarded with abundance first and then deprived of it later. Placing human beings in this world as the starting point of their very long journey is, therefore, kind. It is a wise decision on the part of God. This is a clear sign of God’s compassion for us. To be placed on the earth, therefore, is to be given an opportunity to experience a very unique perspective of God’s reality. Those who have been (created) into different worlds, have not lived like we have lived; they have not known what we have gone through and we do not know what they have gone through. If we human beings had been born directly into a world of more pleasures instead of this world, we would have been forever denied and prevented from ever experiencing one of the dramatic, deep and memorable creations of God, that is, the earth. Now if you go to heaven from the earth, you can have something to talk about and to compare things with. Your company and conversations will be more interesting and you yourself would be more pleased, more grateful to God and happier.

### **But there is relief**

But although evil is a necessity, the degree of suffering has been tampered and limited by two things: by the short span of our lives, and by our desire and ability to reduce suffering. Humanity is, in fact in the process of discovering the means to curing much of the physical and mental hurts that afflict us. How much progress can be achieved is completely dependent

## **From Microbits to Everything**

upon time and human effort. If there are any limitations to progress, it would appear to lie mostly in human laziness, greed and stupidity. Right now, there are some types of suffering that we could eliminate or reduce if we choose to do so. We can reduce hunger, homelessness, tyranny, ignorance and so on. The strong need not abuse the weak; the learned need not deceive the ignorant; the rich need not rob the poor, nor be greedy. We need not hate and hurt one another. We need not destroy ourselves and our environment. Yet every day, these are the things we do and these are some of the things that rob us of some of the joys of life. Much of human suffering is attributable to the actions and inactions of our fellow human beings rather than to the cycles and processes of nature. If people were inclined to reduce suffering for all, many people would suffer significantly less than they do right now. At the individual level, much suffering could be eliminated by a fundamental change in desires. Love of the harmful may result in harm to oneself, no doubt. Love of the good results in goodness and therefore, peace. For example, because of scarcity of some things, the desire for gold, a high status and the one hundred and one charms of the material world one can easily be frustrated. Frustration leads to hurt. A change in the quality and quantity of things you desire would lessen your desires, the less would be your frustrations and therefore, the less your pain. In the final analysis, however, because many hurts will occur as a result of events or things beyond the person's control, subjective exercise alone would not be enough. Not only must the individual strive to change his or her priorities, but each is called to purposefully help change the collective priorities of the society as a whole towards improving the lot of everyone. You, as an individual, have a responsibility to reduce the harm that you may cause or allow to be caused to yourself and to others. However, the society as a whole, has an even greater responsibility to reduce as much suffering as possible for each fellow being. This is a call for

## **Solving the Problem of Evil**

compassion for the weak and the hurt, and justice for all. This is a calling within human capacity and if responded to positively, will make this world a better place.

In addition, God has, out of His compassion, made our lives relatively short so that we do not endure evil for long. Each one of us has a limit on how much we can tolerate. There is only so much we can take. The more intense or unbearable the evil we experience, the shorter our lives. The unbearable soon kills us. Furthermore, our ability to endure, resist and to overcome evil is strengthened by the comforting thought that our time is short, God is with us and that with Him, a hereafter more enduring and forever blissful exists.

### **Differences in human experience and God's justice**

If God is Good, you may ask, and we are supposed to be learning, why does not everybody enjoy or suffer equally? Why do some people appear to live in affluence whereas other people live miserable lives? The answer lies in the uniqueness of the person. We could not all have been born at the same time to the same parents and subject to the same weather, upbringing, weaknesses and opportunities. As we are born at different times, and raised at different places under different conditions, our experiences must differ. You are unique in time and space. So when you suffer or enjoy things, you do so uniquely. The question cannot therefore, be “why can't I enjoy myself like so and so over there”, for you are not so and so and you are unlike anybody else. As I have already explained, your limitations make you the unique person that you are. When you wish for another's fortunes, you in effect wish that you were that other person or that you were non-existent. This is a wish for death and that is an insult to your individual personhood and also to the collective purpose for our being on earth. We

## **From Microbits to Everything**

are born into this world to learn about the many possibilities of reality. Learning is possible only because there are unique events and experiences. Your experiences offer unique educational perspectives to yourself and to those who know you. In turn, your neighbour's unique experiences offer you more educational possibilities. It would defeat the educational purpose and the advantages of unique individuality to have everybody subject to the same experiences.

It is true that some people appear to suffer more than others, but the fact is that everyone suffers in their own way and none of us is wronged in the least. The ultimate measure of success is with God. God does not burden any person, nor does He make any demands upon any person beyond his or her control. Each person is judged uniquely according to his or her unique circumstances. God treats the similarly situated, similarly and the differently situated, differently. Every difficulty that a person faces is known to God and He takes this into account every time in judging the person. Those who have more are expected to do more and are judged accordingly. The more you are able to act, the more you are judged by your actions. The less you are able to act, the less you are judged by your actions. Those who cannot run are judged by how far they walk. Those who cannot walk are judged by how far they crawl and those who cannot even crawl are judged by how much they wish to run or to walk or even crawl. When a person is completely incapacitated as result of circumstances beyond his or her control, that person is excused from any human or moral responsibility and becomes completely blameless. The blameless please God. The consequence of that is that every involuntary handicap or difficulty opens heaven's doors to the person.

Despite the value of suffering as an educational possibility, to the extent that we can minimize or remove handicaps to moral choices, or to the extent that we can minimize or remove suffering, we are obliged to remove

## **Solving the Problem of Evil**

them. Everybody's life is unique and incomparable and therefore, equal to everyone else's. As such, no one human being has the right to increase another's misery, or to restrict their moral choices without just cause. Those who hurt others must be prevented from so doing at all times. It is needless to say that from our perspective much suffering is undesirable. Therefore, even though these are educational possibilities, we are not asked to blindly seek after things that make us suffer. Rather, while the world has been set-up in such a manner as to make exposure to the stupidity and evil of others inevitable, we often have a choice as to the type of educational possibilities that we wish to have. And whenever we have a choice, the reasonable thing to do is to maximize our exposure to less hurtful educational possibilities and to minimize destructive educational possibilities. The incentive for so doing or refraining from the other is often the practical consequence that follows from choosing one way or the other. There are many things to learn and there is not enough time to learn them all. Some things bring hurt and lead to destruction, while other things bring goodness and health. Only the unthinking and the foolish will indiscriminately expose themselves to whatever possibilities on the basis that they are learning. The wise person is required to choose what type of thing to learn whenever possible to do so, in order to minimize their hurts.

It is true that there is not much joy in sickness, broken dreams, deprivations, abuses, betrayals and wars. True, much living is filled with sorrow. But look at the other side too. Not long ago, I walked past a little park with many colourful trees. Scattered about on its ground were uncountable leaves, some dead and many freshly fallen. Close to where I walked, many pigeons flew here and there in their little familial groups, seemingly undisturbed by the little children playing nearby. Up in the heavens the blue sky seemed like a glorious tapestry, with its gentle clouds gradually dispersing. As I looked on, cool winds from nowhere blew past

## **From Microbits to Everything**

and around me, softly blending the pigeons, the leaves, the children and my view into one complex tapestry of a vibrant earthly family. The ordinary was, at once, extraordinary and very impressive. I walked on but I could not help but noticing how nice it was to be alive, to be able to see, to know and to experience! The point is that much living is filled with joy, for there certainly is great joy in being alive and being a conscious witness to it. There is joy in being with loved ones; there is joy in accomplishments; there is joy in satisfying needs, and, for the most part, what people need in order to make their lives enjoyable are food, shelter, basic health, caring companions and the pursuit of meaningful goals. Thankfully, all these are within the reach of human ability.

To sum up then, God has given us lives and placed us in a world that allows us to experience pain and joy. He has given us the opportunity to learn and to accomplish things. God has also given us the capacity to increase our joy and decrease our pain. The best human qualities that we have and cherish, such as compassion, love, courage and creativity arise in us only because we are born in a world with suffering. To be born unto the earth is to be given a very remarkable educational opportunity unparalleled in its intensity and qualities and unobtainable anywhere else. The One who has given such an opportunity and the ability to live, free of charge, with even a promise of greater and better worlds to come, cannot justifiably be called bad. Certainly, God is not only Good, He is also Most Kind.



## **Chapter 5**

### **The Human Mind and the Issue of the Soul: The Solution to the Mind and Body Problem**



## Chapter 5

### The Human Mind and the Issue of the 'Soul': The Solution to the Mind and Body Problem

#### Contemporary Views

In Volume 1, we showed exactly how and why the universe is made up of only one type of particle in absolute space. What implications does this have on the question of the soul? What is it and in the first place does it even exist? And is there a solution to the mind and body problem? Of the several views on the issue of the mind/body problem, we shall discuss the three main ones in connection with the model that has been derived in relation to microbits. Today, we have the three *basic* positions, without getting into the sub-categories:

1. *Materialists*: Who say that there is only the brain and no such thing as mind.
2. *Dualists*: Who say that there is the brain and mind and these are of two entirely different categories of things.
3. *Property Dualists*: Who say that the mind is an emergent property of the brain and that they both interact with each other strongly.

The solution to the mind/body problem we introduce in this chapter, fits into none of the above and defies all categories. But first, let us examine what the critics of the dualists have to say as a preamble.

## From Microbits to Everything

### The Physicalist Trap

Philosopher of the mind, Patricia Churchland asks the following questions regarding the ‘soul’, which she feels is problematic. Let us take these one by one in order to show how the basic problems have been resolved by the microbit concept. Churchland states that:

On this hypothesis [of substance dualism], no reduction of psychological theory is forthcoming because the former is a theory about states and processes of mind-substance, whereas the latter is a theory about the states and processes of a material substance, the brain. Each substance is thought to have its own laws and its own range of properties, hence research on the brain is not going to yield knowledge of the mind and its dynamics, nor by parity of reasoning, will research on the mind tell us anything about how the brain works.<sup>72</sup>

The unavailability of a solution to the manner of interaction between two radically different substances does not entail that substance dualism is false. For all we now know, further research may yet discover a solution.<sup>73</sup>

A staunch anti-dualist, philosopher Daniel Dennett, in his book *Consciousness Explained*, discusses the contrasting views on the mind:

By thinking of our brains as information processing systems, we

---

72. Churchland, Patricia Smith, (1989), *Neurophilosophy: Toward a Unified Science of the Mind/Brain*, p. 318.

73. Ibid., p. 320.

## The Human Mind and the Issue of the 'Soul'

can gradually dispel the fog and pick our way across the great divide, discovering how it might be that our brains produce all the phenomena. Our consciousness does not consist in the fact that your brain is inhabited by an inner agent to whom your brain presents displays...<sup>74</sup>

The problem with Dennett's view is that the material that comprises the brain is solely made of atoms and ultimately micobits (for those that have not read Volume 1 of *From Microbits to Everything*, substitute the word 'subatomic particles', every time you see the word "microbits"), and microbits cannot generate consciousness, no matter how they are arranged; at the most, re-organized or complexified matter/energy can only produce different and more sophisticated mechanical, electrical, photonic etc. functions. Indeed, whatever Dennett uses to explain the self, will *always* remain a *unified conceptual entity in its functionality* that somehow acts in space to command the body, whether he calls it "multiple drafts" or whatever. Furthermore, his view cannot explain subjective experience, such as pain, pleasure and countless phenomena experienced by the unchanging unity of self. Indeed, both philosophers of the mind and philosophically inclined neuroscientists are at a loss to explain *qualia*. Christof Koch, biologist and cognitive scientist at Caltech in Pasadena, California remarks that:

It is true that there's this deeply mysterious aspect of consciousness that is subjective feeling. Why should physical activity in some subset of my brain give rise to this buzz in the head? It's a logical chasm. It's non-sequitar.<sup>75</sup>

---

74. Dennett, Daniel C. (1991), *Consciousness Explained*, p. 433

75. CBC Radio, *Ideas: The Matter of Mind: Parts 1 and 2*. (Aired in 2002)

## From Microbits to Everything

The problem with the thinking of many philosophers of science is that they mistake correlation for causation; they assume that the brain gives rise to the mind because of the correlation between brain processes and our conscious reactions. All explanations that seek to show that the mind is the product of the brain are trying to say that Level 2 (the mind) depends on and is a result of the activity of Level 1 (the nervous system). However, the activity in Level 1 is basically the motion of particles. Now no matter how those particles are re-arranged and/or move, they cannot create Level 2. Only physical functionality is changed, that is all! The reason why even quantum mechanics as the new physics or the further advancement of quantum mechanics will *never* be able to solve the mind-body problem is because it still deals with subatomic particles and is forever trapped in Level 1. This is what this I refer to as *The Physicalist Trap*. Colin McGinn, philosopher at Miami University comments that:

I do sympathize with [mathematical physicist] Roger Penrose... I think his view is a little too conservative in a way...[in that]...quantum theory applies to non-psychological phenomena, non-conscious systems, so it's unlikely that it will give you an account of conscious systems.<sup>76</sup>

Furthermore, indeterminism does not exist in the laws of nature. This erroneous assumption is the result of assuming that reality is formed by perception and, as discussed in volume one of *From Microbits to Everything*, it arose as a counter-reaction to mystical doctrines in the form of Logical

---

76. Ibid. Also refer to two books on this subject by Colin McGinn (see bibliography).

## The Human Mind and the Issue of the ‘Soul’

Positivism. Nothing special lies behind quantum mechanics in reality. Level 1 comprises of atoms and subatomic particles, essentially in motion. As stated above, a complex arrangement of motion gives nothing but a mechanical/electrical/chemical/biological function based on that configuration of complexity, and that complexity still remains in Level 1. In the mind-body problem, then, the observer or witness always exists. Those who look at the bottom-to-top solution of the mind emanating from the brain cannot prove that the particles that comprise the brain are the observers, taken collectively, because no matter how complicated their motion and interaction, they cannot rise above the category of being merely the interaction of particles!

In this vein, the following arguments of philosophers of the mind, Patricia Churchland and John Searle are flawed, from a number of angles, which we shall now discuss in depth. Firstly Searle says that:

...we had this debate a century ago about life...[e.g.] you’ve got to have a “vital spirit”, an *élan vital*. And now we can’t even remember it.<sup>77</sup>

The analogies these philosophers are drawing to criticize dualism are incorrect: The phenomena of light, which was puzzling a century ago, lay in the explanation of Level 1 – the motion of particles etc., to produce light. Those who could not understand ‘light’, immediately ‘jumped the gun’ and erroneously took light to be something that belonged to Level 2. The issue of ‘vital spirit’, is more complicated, however: Although knowledge of DNA etc. shows us what the building blocks of nature are, the physicalists provide no ultimate explanation for what it is that causes the biological development

---

77. CBC Radio, *Ideas: The of Mind: Parts 1 and 2*. (Aired in 2002)

## From Microbits to Everything

of things, that is, what causes their precise motion to precise locations to produce precise organisms or biological structures, for precise functions. It cannot be plausibly explained by chance (i.e. no mind behind the process/laws)! The criticisms spouted by Searle and Churchland, as a result, are erroneous, for these thinkers take the invalid example of light and the unresolved example of vital spirit. In fact, explaining consciousness is a different kettle of fish entirely, since it pertains to explaining *qualia*, that cannot be lumped with light or vital spirit.

Colin McGinn, had expressed the view that a ‘new physics’ would be needed to explain consciousness, which coincides with what we have expressed and explained in depth in the first volume of this series:

Now the physics you’ll get there will presumably be very different from the physics we have now, because the physics we have now isn’t a theory of the conscious world at all. It’s a theory of the non-conscious physical world. So whatever “physics” we have which applies to consciousness will have to have very different laws and different principles, different explanatory ideas if it’s going to account for the specificity of consciousness. But it seems to me that, yes, we do basically need a new physics, that is to say, a new overall theory of the natural world.<sup>78</sup>

Let us see how the view being presented in this book solves the mind/body problem through an entirely ‘new physics’, and which also, in the process, nullifies Patricia Churchland’s primary objection that “Dualists will have a special problem with interpretation – namely, how to reconcile

---

78. CBC Radio, *Ideas: The Matter of Mind: Parts 1 and 2*. (Aired in 2002)



## The Human Mind and the Issue of the 'Soul'

the results with their conception of the mind or soul as a non-physical substance in causal interaction with the nervous system.”<sup>79</sup>

### Microbits and absolute objectless space as a new overall view to explain consciousness

We can see that contemporary philosophers on the issue of the nature of consciousness are considering only two basic approaches: either the physicalistic approach or dualism. However, in this chapter, we claim that the solution is neither. The mind is not made of any particles but is the translocation of the objectless space of the consciousness of God. In Chapter 1, M. Muslim proved the universe to be the Imagination of God and, as such, His space. The solution to the mind-body problem is linked directly and seamlessly to this proof. Once this proof is comprehended, *everything* else flows and one can easily see how and why human consciousness can arise only as a result of and within another pre-existing higher consciousness and that taking all fundamental points into consideration, this is the only possible solution. It is indeed impossible to solve the consciousness problem unless the unique line of argument we are presenting is understood and followed. Here is an analogy to see why: Let us assume that there is an expert on bird flight; he is also someone who has never seen any fish. He goes to an aquarium and in the distance he observes some fish ‘floating’, according to him. He finds this singularly remarkable because he notes that the aerodynamic design of fish is not commensurate for sustained flight. In other words, he does not realize that the fish are *floating* in water since he does not have a notion of water associated with

---

79. Ibid., p. 180.

## From Microbits to Everything

them. This ‘water’, analogously speaking, is the all-pervasive objectless space of God (God’s mind and being) from whom our consciousness is drawn and sustained, as a result of His creative will. God makes His space accessible to microbit based structures and, as such, these structures become portals, as small wills. Furthermore, if God does not will His space to be accessible by microbitic structures, then no matter how they are organized, such objects would not become sentient, for He is the one who, as it were, empowers a character who He has created to see through eyes, hears through ears and thinks thought, as an imagined finite creation within His infiniteness. But when He wills such accessibility, then such structures have to be *organized in a particular and precise way* in absolute space to be a gateway for the expression of limited intelligence-cum-consciousness. Such a process is that which comprises *fractionalization* (the *initiation* of creation of other sub-wills within the Will of God) and *transfocation* (the simultaneous *sustenance* of the wills into various bodies that are comprised of particles as they become portals for objectless space where the property of Intelligence lies). In this chapter, we shall explore and elaborate on this concept at greater length.

We have, thus far, seen that as the particle based body interacts with objectless space, hitherto defined, it is effused with consciousness, which we called transfocation. Consequentially, our new explanation is indeed physicalist to a large extent, since we are saying that the body becomes a content for consciousness; it gives the appearance of being the solely the result in a particle comprised body. However, it is actually a portal for objectless space, wherein resides the property of Intelligence and Consciousness, as it is not the particles which really give rise to consciousness, but fractionalization and transfocation within the space of God, that is, of God’s mind. In reality, the materialists are correct in saying that if the mind is in the brain or is an emergent phenomenon, and *if* body and brain do indeed stop functioning, then we shall cease to exist. However,

## The Human Mind and the Issue of the 'Soul'

the problem, of the continuation of life after death, does not even arise when we are dealing with consciousness being the property of space. Let us explore this concept further.

### How exactly does consciousness/will arise?

If intelligence is a property of space, since we are in the Mind of God, and God's essence and being pervades absolute objectless space since it *is* that space, then how exactly do other intelligences arise? When a microbitic (subatomic particle-based) structure is created and that body becomes more complicated, as it develops, it is able to become a portal of that ultimate consciousness of the Creator that the Creator has willed to be accessible to all creation within that space of His consciousness. However, the level of consciousness depends on *the level of the organism's biological complexity*. The biological body, in other words, interacts with objectless space (i.e. the mind of God) in a limited way and thereby gains limited consciousness. In other terms, the biological object becomes conscious at a certain stage and develops a particularized personality of self because it is imagined to form, as a creation and not pantheistically, from the ultimate will of God: indeed consciousness can only arise from *the* Consciousness. This consciousness that sentient entities possess is *not* part of God, because God creates the biological object with His imagination and as such it is His creation, for imagination is a form of creation.

The other important factor is that our consciousness is initialized in terms of knowing its relation to the Creator. There are two analogies that can be used to describe the generation of consciousness: a series of flutes of different sizes are laid out in an extremely windy place – each one produces a different sound, based on its complexity. It becomes conscious,

## From Microbits to Everything

metaphorically, upon producing the sounds. Or yet another analogy: molecules permeating space are accessed by the vocal chords, producing the voice; different types of vocal chords produce different sounds, whilst being in the same space. To know the consciousness's relation to the Intelligence (God) that created the form within His mind (God's mind), there must be some type of communication between God and the creator of that consciousness – this is the initialization that God discusses in relation to the creation of man, in the Quranic verse 7:172.

### **The brain as switchgear: Why memory is not stored on carbon based bodies**

In order to realize what consciousness really is, let us examine a tiny creature. There is a flatworm worm called *Planaria* which, when its head is cut-off, grows another head, and when its tail is cut off it produces another tail – in fact when it is cut in two, one gets growth from both ends and you get two 'new' *Planaria*. These creatures break themselves up in order to reproduce (reproduction by fission). Now when this type of experiment on severing the *Planaria* was first conducted in the 1960s by J.V. McConnell, it was discovered that if this flatworm is conditioned by exposing it to a light source wherein there is a change in overhead illumination designated by Conditioned Stimulus (CS), followed by a weak electric shock, designated as Unconditioned Stimulus (UCS), the worm contracts itself in a longitudinal direction as a Conditioned Response (CR). Learning occurs when it anticipates the shock before it is given and curls up, after simply having been exposed to the CS. Now when the worm is cut up in half, two worms are produced: one with a new head, and the other with a new tail. When these new worms are reconditioned, *both* the 'new head' worm and the 'new tail'

## The Human Mind and the Issue of the 'Soul'

worm appear to remember their previous conditioning: The worm with the new head has retained a great deal of 'information'; something which was not expected since the new head never received the initial conditioning.<sup>80</sup> Given this anomalous situation, scientists have speculated that the worm's memory is distributed throughout the body, since they believe that the molecules in terms of neurons, RNA or what have you, could contain memory in the form of engrams or structures recorded somehow on the biological components. However, these conjectures fall flat with this organism: The experiments on Planaria prove that memory is not stored on neurons, because the neurons were in the brain part of the creature and the brain was in the head, and the new head Planaria, that is, the one with the head that had been amputated, never received any training/conditioning. Indeed, the researcher in one of the latest studies, concludes – in the report comes to a conclusion which is strikingly at odds with what is generally considered to be the 'official position' of a purely materialistic scientific perspective – that:

The finding that organisms derived from the anterior and posterior regions or a trained organism retained the same amount of memory was significant because it suggested the hypothesis that memory is non-neural.<sup>81</sup>

Furthermore, there is no proof for such storage of long-term memory and as far as short term memory goes, at the most, that which can be proven is that

---

80. The result of this recent experiment confirm the classic experiments conducted in the 1960s.

81. Mueller, Caitlin T., (August 1, 2002), *The use of classical conditioning in planaria to investigate a non-neural memory mechanism*.  
<http://www.dr-michaellevin.org/Planaria/prelimdata/CMueller.pdf>.

## From Microbits to Everything

some type of thinking *utilizes* certain parts of the brain or nervous system and that these then change shape and form connections etc. This experiment, or indeed any other experiment so far, does not prove that memory is retained in the biological structures. Besides, if memory is stored and the neurons/other cells and structures hypothesized for memory storage, they are in a dynamic state of either disappearing or changing shape, how do we, for example, retain fixed memories. As biochemist-cum-philosopher, Rupert Sheldrake states:

Not only have the hypothetical memory traces proved to be spatially elusive, but their physical nature has also remained obscure. The idea of specific RNA “memory molecules” was fashionable in the 1960s but has now been more or less abandoned. The theory of reverberating circuits of electrical activity ... cannot explain long-term memory. ... If memories are somehow stored in synapses, then the synapses themselves must remain stable over long periods of time: indeed, the nervous system as a whole must be stable if it is to act as a memory store. Until recently this was generally assumed to be the case ...<sup>82</sup>

Sheldrake goes on to explain that the brain, in terms of the functioning of the nervous system, is more dynamical than once thought and he highlights some experiments to illustrate this. Even at the molecular level – with the exception of DNA – as Francis Crick points out, there is a turnover of molecules within a few days, weeks and certainly no longer than a few

---

82. Sheldrake, Rupert, (1988), *The Presence of the Past: Morphic Resonance and the Habits of Nature*, pp. 165-166.

## The Human Mind and the Issue of the 'Soul'

months.<sup>83</sup> Steven Rose, the world-renowned expert on research into memory, states:

So was Hebb right: is memory biochemical or synaptic? But this is where the paradoxes begin, *for neither in the chick nor in mammals does the memory 'stay' where the initial synaptic changes occur.* If the specific region of the changes in the chick brain is removed a few hours after the learning experience, the memory surprisingly, is *not* lost. [All emphasis is ours].<sup>84</sup>

Rose goes on to recount how a patient, whose hippocampus was removed – which is involved with learning and memory – could remember events of his life up to the time of the removal of the structure; however, he could not retain memories of immediately fleeting events and hence learn new things.

Keeping in mind the view that is being advocated in this book regarding consciousness: how can the Planaria's behaviour be explained? Are two Planaria souls created by God upon cutting the worms in two? Here is the answer: Since the *whole* body of the worm experiences the consciousness in absolute space, for both the top and bottom half of the worm, when it is cut in two, then two worm personalities are created which, up to that point of being cut, retain the same memories (i.e. experience of previous conditioning). This is because both halves of the single worm which is cut has more or less the same accessibility to the property of consciousness in absolute objectless space, the brain merely being a switchgear to generate the activity of the senses of seeing, hearing etc. If a human being were cut in half and if the bottom half produced a new torso and head and the top half

83. Ibid. p. 167.

84. Rose, Stephen, (2006), *The Future of the Brain: The Promise and Perils of Tomorrow's Neuroscience*, p. 160.

## From Microbits to Everything

sprouted new legs etc. then the 'new head' human would not remember anything because the bottom half of the body would not have been accessing the consciousness that is the inherent property of absolute objectless space. The human body in other words is not symmetrical with respect to such accessibility as is a creature such as Planaria due to the nature of the structuring of the microbits.

Memory then, both short or long-term, is not stored in the brain. It is not stored on or in any particle in this universe. Ultimately, everything that has happened or will happen is indeed already written and exists in the mind of God exactly as it happens or will happen to its minutest detail, but it is only He who lets the sub-wills in His mind access that which He wills. The basic mechanism for this is the GRC as discussed in Chapter 6. General human memory is a narrow and low level access to the personal record discussed in that chapter. The access to one's personal file in the record depends on the focus and what one pays attention to and if one has brain damage to a particular area etc., such personal records cannot be built up, and one only operates in the moment, with short-term memory. This is because that particular part of the brain is responsible for accessing the record and its malfunctioning severs its connection with the record. The continuous, albeit limited, access to the records is necessary for the notion of self-hood, learning and mental growth, accountability, and the very practicalities of living. But how then does all of this explain *qualia*? Essentially, since all consciousness exists by the will of the divine Consciousness within which it operates, the ultimate *qualia* are witnessed because they are imagined to be witnessed/experienced by the Consciousness of God within each created and sustained 'consciousness.'



## **Chapter 6**

### **General Rate of Consciousness (GRC) and Reality**



## Chapter 6

### General Rate of Consciousness (GRC) and Reality

#### Part 1: Quantum Lights: Life as fractions of time

*These slumbering nights take me prisoner  
Di, dadada-daa  
From ten thousand open fields  
To the caves of drunken shadows  
O mischievous brain:  
I thought you were my friend  
Pray, whence these nightmares?  
Shhhh, restless puppet; what a circus!  
It's been dark in here for so long  
O sun, where have you been?  
I speak these commanding words  
No puppet; no nightmares,  
I am ten thousand open fields  
A million skies away!*

#### Introduction

Everybody knows what life is. Apart from our own lives, we see so much of it everywhere. Life is abundant in every corner of the earth. Yet defining what it means to be alive has eluded us for the longest time. The same goes for consciousness. We all have it and yet you only have to pick up a book on the matter to see that the Doctors on the subject still do not agree as to what consciousness is. In this chapter, I will show what life is and how it can be

## From Microbits to Everything

re-created. I will also explain what consciousness is and how it continues throughout even after death. The subject is complex. So, keep your best thinking cap on. Please follow me.

### What is life?

To answer this question we must first see what life is not. This calls for a comprehensive review of reality. Reality consists of an infinity of space<sup>85</sup> and a number of things that we call matter. Matter is divisible into very small parts. Throughout this paper I shall refer to the smallest unit of matter as a “microbit”. Every piece of matter is made up of a number of microbits. All microbits are the same. Because every thing is made up of microbits, the barest units of matter are the same across all planes. One fundamental property of matter is that every unit of it moves. The reason matter moves is that every unit of matter is limited. It is not possible for something to be limited and to be completely at rest in itself. Because to be limited is to be moving or moveable, the first definition of being is motion. The important thing about movement is that different things move at different speeds. But how, you ask, do things move differently, if they are all made up of the same stuff? The answer is in their numbers. Each unit of matter is made up of a number of microbits. The speed at which an object, say a cell, moves is directly proportional to the total number of microbits that make up the cell.

---

85. I do not subscribe to the definitions of space as put forward by Descartes and Einstein. Following Descartes view of space as an “extension”, Einstein postulated a “curvature” of space. These views in effect define space as an object or a limited thing. This begs the question as to what it is that limits space. In any event, for those of you interested in the subject, you may read our Volume 1 of the *From Microbits To Everything* series.

## Quantum Lights

Under the same conditions, the less the number of microbits that make up an object the faster the speed. The more the number of microbits in the object the slower the object. The less the number of microbits in an event, the faster the event. The more there is, the slower the event. In the same conditions every thing is what it is because of its number and speed. Whenever the same number of microbits is present as a unit, the same function shall be present. The reverse is true. As for the question of the differences in the qualities between things, apart from quantities, they arise as a result of positionings in space. I do not wish to be technical on positioning except to say this. Each composite microbit has a *direction*. It is the directions that allow one thing to join with this and that in a fitting relationship. So, although we see variety of things, the variety does not come from the differences in the “material”. It is rather the differences in arrangement of the same material that gives us variety of things. The quantities and the positioning of microbits result in functions and identities. The quantities and the positioning determine the speed and the capacities of every thing. Let’s call this “speed” for short. The reason speed is critical is that it is the means by which nature enables presence in time and space. If “you” are not doing anything at all, you do not exist. And what you are doing determines where you are and who your neighbours may be. When the speed of an event changes significantly, its relationships also change. The result is that *that* event disappears. This means that in order to have a stable world like our own, nature has structured things so that the speed at which things happen in any defined portion of space, must rigidly repeat. Only when the speed of things repeat can we get the continuity that we call the “familiar”. Because every thing is repeating at a particular speed, the position of every recurring event is fixed as a unique number and as a fraction of time.

Not only does speed account for variety, it also makes all the difference

## From Microbits to Everything

in terms of neighbourliness. Those who are at the same speed are neighbours; whereas those at different speeds are not. In terms of presence, what you see depends upon what you are. And what you are depends upon how fast or how slow you move. Speed then is both identity and the glue that holds things together. This makes sense because it is easy to see that objects that move at significantly different speeds cannot act as an organic unit. To function as one organic whole, all parts of a subject must move at the same rate.

### The real difference between the living and the dead

Now that we know how the world is set up let us see what the difference is between the dead and the living. The dead have all the properties of the living except one. In ordinary language, we say that something is dead when it stops “moving”. Interestingly, we also know that dead or alive, matter itself cannot be destroyed, at least not in this world. So after death, we should expect the matter that made up the so-called dead to be present in one form or another in space. But as I explained earlier, to be matter is to move. This must mean then that the microbits that originally made up the body of the dead, continue to move even after the death of the organism. Of course, since these microbits are no longer bound together as one body, they eventually scatter. Because the microbits that formed the body of the dead continue to move however, we must revise our notion of death then to say that to die is not so much a total cessation of motion as much as it is cessation of motion *at a given speed*. In other words, the dead are not so much still, as much as they are, as *compared to* the living. Death then is relative. Death is a relative type of cessation, much like what happens when the slowest runner “disappears” from the view of the fastest runner. Because both the dead and the living are made of the same stuff and also because

## Quantum Lights

both the dead and the living are moving, the clearest, and the only difference, between the dead and the living is in their different speeds of motion. We say that something has died when the speed at which it was previously moving, changes. Conversely, the dead can become alive if the speed at which they were previously travelling changes into the speed at which the living move. This is the fundamental difference between life and death: speed.

If you think that the foregoing is far fetched, ask yourself how it can be that the living can munch on the so-called dead and have life from them? If the dead were completely different from the living, how come meat gives us life? What we call living tissue is no more than consumed “dead” tissue. What happens when we eat is that the so-called dead meat is re absorbed into our stream at the speed of the living. This is how life continues. But then if the dead are not really dead then what do we mean when we say that something is dead?

As I mentioned a short while ago, the only difference between the dead and the living is that they do not move at the same rate. In so far as the living become “dead” after the living’s rate of motion changes, it must follow that immediately following death at least, the speed of the dead must be slower than the speed at which the living were before the cessation. But in so far as the microbits that form the “dead” are never destroyed and they never stop moving, what is destroyed when some thing dies, is not so much life, as much as it is life as we perceive it. What is “stopped” in the dead is the repetition of the speed of the life-unit.

### **The ‘speed’ of life**

Life as we know it, like everything else on earth, is organized at the specific speed of light. The speed of light is approximately three hundred thousand kilometres per second. Every cell; every fly, every animal and living body

## From Microbits to Everything

on earth moves at the biofluidic speed of light. I shall shortly explain what I mean by 'biofluidic'. The things that do not move at the biofluidic speed of light are those that we see as "dead". Because every living thing is organized at the biofluidic speed of light, all life forms on this planet contain photons in their cellular processing. Light is life. The building blocks of life on earth are light. This is so because light is critical to our lives. We cannot warm ourselves, see anything or do much without light. Furthermore, without light, plants cannot live. Without plants no animal, fish or humans can live. Before we discuss the implications of all this in detail, please allow me to explain the type of motion that is required for life. There are two kinds of motions in reality. These are *biofluidic* and *geofluidic*. If you can think of an organism as a number of parts, the biofluidic motion is the movement of the parts within the organism. This type of motion is vibratory or pulsative<sup>86</sup>. It involves the repetition of the rate of rest within the same space. This movement is like music beats. There is movement in time but not from place to place. The geofluid motion, however, is the motion of the whole life-unit from place to place. The movement of the parts of an organism biofluidically is the only thing that gives the whole organism presence or time. Now it is necessary that things move this way, because nature has no other way of maintaining continuity of activities except through their *repetition*. Think of life as an activity in space. There are of course, different kinds of activities. But all that life is just an activity in time. Let's call this a beat for short. This beat can be counted as a distinct frame in time so that the number of beats in, say, a second can be counted. In order to continue living, this beat must repeat. There cannot be too much of a gap between one beat and the next. If the beat is life, not beating is death. It is thus not efficient for a beat to occur for say a second and then not beat for another second. For continuous living, it is best that the rate of repetition be very

---

86. In *From Microbits to Everything, Volume 1*, by Muslim and Haque, the pulsative motion of the photon is described in detail. This new view of the photon also resolves the wave/particle paradox of this particle.



## Quantum Lights

fast so that there will be the least gap or rest between them. In our case, what this works out in practice is that we are beating a number of times equal to three hundred thousand kilometres times per second. This is very fast. It is this fast repetition of our life-activity that gives us a sense of being alive all the time.

### Lifeness

So far, we have seen that in order to have life on earth we need biofluidic motions at the speed of light. The question is: is this enough to create life or is there more? Another way of looking at the same issue is to ask whether the photons are alive since they move biofluidically at the speed of light? In order to answer this we have to make a distinction between “lifeness” and the functions that a particular organism may have because of its parts or divisions. What is lifeness? What is the primary characteristic of the living?

On the earth, the simplest definition of lifeness is the ability to feed and to reproduce. As a matter of necessity, however, it cannot be said that all living things need to feed and reproduce. An organism needs to be alive before it feeds. We can imagine an organism that does not need to eat or that lives for only a short period and then dies. The need for food and reproduction is the result of the particular limitations and capacities that nature has placed on life on earth. But that does not mean that all life forms need to eat and reproduce. There is a universal definition of life for all possible frames of existence. Whatever the universal actually is, our lives must also partake in it. The particular is always a part of the universal. This takes us back to the beginning. What is lifeness? If life is not necessarily drinking, eating, sleeping and having babies, then what do all life forms have in common?

## From Microbits to Everything

### Is awareness the same as life?

Some people might reply that liveness is self-awareness and that if you are not conscious that you are alive, then you are not alive. The problem with this is that nobody would deny that the plants, for example, are alive and yet, how can we prove that each has an awareness of itself? No one has proved that the simplest proteins or cells, for example, are aware of themselves. Besides, it is possible to have a living thing that is permanently in a coma. A human being that is in a coma is alive even though he or she may not be aware of himself or herself. Awareness is a function of many functions, including the senses and the existence of others in order to enable the idea of the self as apart from others. But all these functions do not define life itself. The ability to be aware of oneself and of others is the result of very specific functions in life. It is possible to be simply alive and not have any of the senses or organs of perception. It cannot therefore, be said that being aware of oneself is critical to liveness. Across all possible existences, what all life forms have in common is presence. It does not matter what form a life takes, you cannot be alive if you are not present. Here, I am referring to a distinct or special type of presence. It is that presence that is life. But life is no more than a given activity in time. Hence, when I talk about presence, it is the same as saying that life is continuing activities. Not every activity, however, is life. So, in order to make things easier, we first need to understand time.

The simplest definition of time is activity or motion. A second is time. But so too is one millionth of a second. The problem is that each unit of time can be divided into further smaller fractions so that we can have one billionth, one trillionth and one zillionth of a second and so forth. Now just as there are endless fractions of time, so too are there endless fractions of speed. Some activities can be so fast that a trillion of them can take place in, say, a second. Of course, some are so slow that even a second is not enough for one of such activity to occur. The short of it is that there is relativity of

## Quantum Lights

time and relativity of speed.

As I said earlier, however, only things that move substantially at the same speed stay together. Nature's way of enabling presence for life is to fix a General Rate of Presence (GRP) for every defined universe. What this GRP means is that for every given universe, there is a speed that constitutes the maximum or the norm for the fundamental structures that make up what we call the universe. You can think of this as the protocol, the standard, the container, border or the medium in which all things take place in a particular universe. This GRP is also the thing that sets one universe apart from another. There is a very sound logic behind this arrangement. Unless you set a standard for a given universe, you cannot have difference, variety, stability, familiarity and neighbourliness. This is why nature set up the GRP. Think about it and you can see how brilliant the set up is.

Since time is a number of motions, think of maximum presence as the fastest possible repeating activity; or as the most endless activities in the shortest moment. Each GRP is a fraction of this presence. As different universes have different GRPs, it follows that some have more presence than others. Different universes have different GRPs so that their time or presence would be different from ours. The GRP of any given universe gives it, *its* presence or its "now". The consequence is that not only would life forms differ from universe to universe, but also, what we call "presence" is relative. Our "now" or even our "future" may not be so at all for those with different GRPs.

In order to be alive, the core of every organism must be at par with its GRP. Any thing less than the GRP makes the subject less present or absent in time. This absence is death. When the organism is at par with its GRP, the organism becomes *time* in that particular universe. As time, the organism is at the same level as the building blocks of its universe. It is present. As time, the organism is "constantly" present in that universe. It is this constant presence of the make up of an organism that makes it alive. Life is constant presence of the same activity without let. Note, however, that the constancy

## From Microbits to Everything

must be at par with time itself so that the life unit must beat at the same rate as the beat of time in that GRP.

### We are fractions of time

When the speed of an activity is at par with time, it becomes time. So, another way of looking at life is to say that *life is time with a form*. Or that life is time made manifest. Living things then are no more than fractionalized time. We are all fractions of time. What this means is that contrary to what people believe, the life force is not 'in' you. The life force is a universal, indivisible quality of which you form a part for a little while. One important thing to remember is that even though the GRP is the maximum in any universe, it is obvious that all sorts of lesser speeds are possible in that universe. It is only when an activity reaches a given GRP that it becomes alive in that zone. Therefore, death is no more than the de-acceleration of a life unit from a given GRP. Birth is the acceleration of matter to a given GRP.

Being alive, however, is one thing. The ability to do anything with that life is quite another. Continuity of life is maintained by *repetition* of the beat. If the beat does not repeat at the same GRP, life ceases. It is the continuity of the beat at par with the GRP that gives us the continuity of life. In our world for instance, nature achieves continuity through continuous supply of energy by way of light (for plants) and food for all others. Each unit of energy is timed to replace the one as soon as it is spent so that there can be no interruption in the beat at the GRP. The whole thing is a clockwork.

### GRCs

One significant characteristic of GRPs is that they can be calculated mathematically. In the future, this would allow for communication and for

## Quantum Lights

movement between planes. But I digress. Related to the GRP is the General Rate of Consciousness (GRC). The GRC is of the same speed as the GRP except that the GRC is only concerned with awareness or perception. As I said earlier, not every living thing needs to have awareness. So, the GRC affects only those organisms that are wired in such a way as to have consciousness. Just as our lives are based on the GRP, so too are all abilities to be aware, based on the GRC. Because our GRP is the biofluidic speed of light, our GRC is also organized at the speed of light.

In organizing our lives at the biofluidic speed of light, nature also organized our perception at the same speed. There is a unity of being. It does not make sense for the life of the organism to be organized at the speed of light and for the perception of the same organism to be organized at a significantly different speed. Because every living form in our world is organized at the speed of light, this forces all of organisms to be together in the same time frame and to be capable of sensing and being able to relate to one another.

This GRC is the same for every living thing on earth. Every person is aware of events up to a maximum of his or her GRC. What this means is that we can be aware of anything that moves at a rate that ranges from 100 percent to 1 percent of our GRC. Anything below 1 percent or over 100 percent of our GRC escapes our attention and does not ordinarily exist for us. Like perceives like. While the GRC enables us to be conscious of those like us, what we can actually be aware of depends upon how many functions we are. For instance, if you do not have eyes, you cannot be aware of things that require eyes. If you do not have wings you cannot partake in activities that require wings.

## **From Microbits to Everything**

### **The Mechanics of Consciousness: When GRP = GRC**

The consciousness of every person depends upon and is organized around four things. First, presence as a fraction of time. This, as I have explained, is achieved by continuity of motion at par with the GRP. Second, the capacity to receive or collect information from within or outside of oneself. This is a function of receptacles or organs that can collect or receive information. Third, the ability to process the information so as to be able to recognize and name them. And fourth, memory. The ability to process information depends upon memory and it is indeed, a subset of the functions of memory. Without memory, we are unable to recognize, identify and to name things.

Thus, apart from presence as time, the most important ingredient of consciousness is memory. There are two kinds of memories. There is general memory and particular memory; or objective memory and subjective memory. The general memory is the memory of time itself, or of the given GRC. This memory exists independent of your individual memory. You must know that if you are alive because you move at par with time, then naturally, time is itself alive as well, and this time is also aware. For if time could not be alive or conscious, you being a fraction of time, could never be aware or conscious. But this subject requires details which requires further treatment that will be elaborated upon, hopefully, in future works.

In the sense that everything is in motion in this universe, everything has its own innate presence. However, this presence does not necessarily equate with consciousness, but with the potentiality for consciousness. For consciousness, one needs biofluidic motion at the speed of life, organized in the body of the subject in a particular way, as it is, for example, exhibited in the nervous system through which the biofluidic movement occurs, of organisms that possess memory and can communicate in their own ways. For such creatures, the maximum rate of their  $GRP = GRC$ . A door nail, gases etc. are in motion at the macro, and/or subatomic level, but they do

## **Quantum Lights**

not have the requisite biofluidic movement and their GRP falls short of GRC. However, if their constituent microbits were to be reorganized, even for an instant so as to be able to generate the requisite biofluidic motion, they would become conscious. (This, for example, is illustrated in the Quran in 41:11).

### **Universal IDs**

The remarkable thing about every thing being run according to numbers is that every person or event can be given an ID number. For human beings, the identification number of the individual can be calculated as a factor of the date, time and place of birth of the person. Thus, by way of an example, where “1” stands for the speed of light, a person on the earth can be identified, for example, as 1-10/13/2000-18:00-123456. For completeness, after the death of the person, this number can be extended to include the date, place and time of death. This is how earthlings and all others are recorded in God’s Book of numbers.

### **The discontinuity of consciousness**

In addition to the above, another way to know that our perception is also organized at the speed of light is this. Light is a series of on and offs. Every thing that moves must rest. The rests are the ‘offs’ of light. If our GRC were faster than that of light, then in any given moment, our awareness would be on before light came on. This would mean that we would see the “offs” of light. In effect, we would not see light all the time, but we would see light as frames going on and off. Conversely, if light moved faster than our GRC, then we would not see any “offs” or darkness but by the same token we would not see any light either. This is because if the speed of light were

## **From Microbits to Everything**

faster than our GRC, our times would never meet. Whenever light was on, our perception would be off. To make things clearer, you can imagine light as a baton runner. The point at which consciousness meets with light is the exchange of the baton. If our GRC were at a different speed than that of light, then whenever light was ready to give us the baton, we would not be there. We could never meet. We are aware of light. Therefore, it follows that our perception moves at the same rate as that of the speed of light. It is necessary for our GRP and GRC to be at the speed of light in order for us to be able process light and to use same. Because we are at par, whenever light is off we are off and whenever it is on, we are on. Because we are always on at the same time as light or because, we are light, this gives us the sense that light is never off. Whenever you travel at the same speed as another, both of you appear to be resting. It is that simple. If you lived on another planet where light was not that important, you probably would not need to move at the speed of light in order to be alive.

The speed of things can be both a capacity and a limitation. It is the GRP that enables the birth, presence and continuity of a variety of persons and of events in an otherwise uniform microbitic world. What the speed does is to make us “captives” or natives of a certain place. It is the GRP that gives rise to the notion of a “place” or self in an otherwise placeless and selfless universe. Of course, you are not alone in there and by virtue of your locked position, you meet others regularly and are able to know and to do stuff with them. If you were not locked in by your GRP, the world would have had no stability and therefore, no sense of self or of knowledge and orderly relationships. The speed of being and of perception is therefore, the great God’s building blocks of entire universes.

### **GRCs and the relativity of the present**

It is true that our perception appears to be constant. We ordinarily think that we are present all the time. But this is not so at all. In truth, because of our



## Quantum Lights

GRC, our awareness fades in and out, on and off, in 1s and 0s. Our perception is not constant, but discontinuous from moment to moment. The sense of constancy of things that we all have, arises as a result of the unity of the speed of the things that surround us. All the things that we are aware of fall within our rate of consciousness. Because we all move at the same rate, the spaces between us remain unchanged. It is this “unchangingness” in the spaces within and between us that give us our sense of constancy. We do not notice things that move outside of our GRC for the very reason that we never meet. Your GRC is your fixed portion of presence as compared to an infinity of possible presences. What you are able to perceive and for how long, depends upon how much you can be on within the least amount of time.

You can think of time as the maximum speed possible (infinity). Then think of a particular GRC as a fraction of this infinity. The greater the fraction, the more you can perceive in time. The lesser the fraction, the less you perceive in time. The result is that even though time is present as a possibility of endless frames extending from the past, the present and to so-called future *at once*, our GRC forces us to see only one frame. This makes us one dimensional. This is good for our kind of world. It is ignorance of the past and of the future that often makes attentiveness on the “present” possible. Our GRC leads to the exclusivity of our awareness on our fractionalized frame. This frame can be mathematically expressed as a unique number within infinity. This is what *we* call the present. But as a fraction of infinity our presence is no more present than a cup of water in the ocean. This is the only way in which the relativity of time can be properly understood. It is possible organize different GRCs and GRPs so that for example, our past, future and present can be a fraction of the presence of a given person. For these types of beings, all that we are and would be are present to them at once.

I have argued that life on earth is the motion of matter at the speed of light. Life as we know is it biofluidic movement at the speed of light. The

## **From Microbits to Everything**

dead are those who cease to move at the speed of light. Both our lives and consciousness are arranged at the speed of light. This makes sense, for we need light for everything on earth. This realization does lead to a greater understanding about the real nature of consciousness, which we shall now delve into further.

### **Consciousness as a property of space**

The particular consciousness or experiences that we have as human beings is shaped by our brains and bodies. But consciousness as a whole is independent of brains and bodies. It is space that is conscious. We come conscious when we come into space and become portions of this space. What is important to remember is that no particular number of microbitic arrangements is required in order to be conscious. It is only necessary that you be present in space in order to have the potential for consciousness. When I say that consciousness is space, I mean by that all portions and parts of space are conscious. So, when we are born, into space, we are automatically born into consciousness. However, what you become aware of, depends upon what you are. Having a brain gives you a particular awareness. But you do not need a brain in order to be conscious. Given that it is space, but not the brain that gives us consciousness, not having a brain, does not necessarily makes you unconscious. Not having a brain gives you a brainless consciousness. Of course, in our present condition, you will never know how it feels like to be without a brain. But that does not mean that therefore, brainless objects have no consciousness. I will get into more detail about this below. For now though, what is important is that the reason we are able to personalize our awareness and claim it as “I” is the fullness that a particular presence brings to a particular portion of space. Let me explain. Imagine a conscious space before our births. Let us call this space “empty” for the sake of convenience. The type of consciousness that this

## Quantum Lights

space possesses is solely that of itself or of the emptiness. It is the presence of things that result in divisions. Where there is no thing or event, there is unity. Thus, pre-time or pre-events consciousness is undivided and hence one. Also, it is passage of events that give rise to pasts and futures. So, since this space has no events in pre-time it does not allow for the possibility of past and future. Now whenever an event is born, it necessarily occupies a portion of space equal to its limits, number, capacity, extension or function. Given that every portion of space is conscious, that portion of space that the event occupies is also conscious. With the presence of the event, the previously “empty” portion becomes filled to the extent of the event. What we call the person or the individual or the sense of “I” is born, when the given portion of space becomes exclusively occupied with the repeating or continuing activity of what we call the body. You can see then that should the attentiveness of awareness on a given body break for one reason or another, the person would no longer be conscious of himself or herself. It is this perfect fixation of attention or perfect link between consciousness and a particular event that enables the fractionalization of the otherwise universal or indivisible consciousness. The divide is the body or event. It necessarily results in the “privatization” of the “public” space. It is also this perfect fixation of attention on a particular event that gives rise to the multiplicity of times in an otherwise indivisible unity of presence. In fact, it is this “private” sphere that we call the person.

The whole process of the relationship between consciousness and events is akin to acting. But here, it is more serious, more perfect in a sense of necessity. It is only the perfect possession or ownership of given body by a portion of space that can enable the unity that we call a conscious body. Obviously, that portion of consciousness that now refers to “I” existed before the body was born. And naturally, when the body dies, the consciousness still remains as a portion of space. In between, however, this previously “eventless” consciousness gets to be or have a body. Given that the body is temporary, it must follow that this type of consciousness is also

## **From Microbits to Everything**

temporary. The interesting thing is that after the birth of the body, space changes forever. For when the body is no more, still, what the body did, remains in the “memory” of the portion of space that the body occupied. If you are not clear about this, think of the portion of space that the body occupies as time. Let us say that a person lives for 40 years. Now assume that time is conscious so that every moment or fraction of this time remembers every thing that you did in that moment. If you look at it from this angle, you can easily see how it is that even when the person is no more, the person remains in time. The birth of the body and its resulting events, forever change the contents of the consciousness of space. If you can think of space as a wall, births are paintings. They leave permanent portraits in these walls. This is one of the facets of immortality. I will discuss this in more detail later.

### **Proving that consciousness is independent of matter**

How, you ask, do we know that consciousness is a property of space? As I write, there are at present billions of human beings, fish, birds, insects and animals on earth. Every one of these beings is conscious at the same time. But each species is made up of a different quantity of microbits. Compare. And certainly, when it comes to the brain, different species have different brains. So, if consciousness were a property of the brain, then only those with the same or similar brains should have it. Those with different brains should have different consciousnesses. But there is no such thing as different consciousness. In reality, there are endless arrangements of microbits. The numbers differ greatly from species to species and from one universe to the other. Yet, all beings that have biofluidic motions, regardless of how many or how few microbits they are, can be equally aware or present provided that they have the same GRC. Granted that some beings are more complex than others, still, complexity is not the definition of awareness.

## Quantum Lights

Complexities are accessories to life. In this world, the being that is only milligram in weight is no less aware or present than the being that is a billion kilos in weight. Consciousness, like time, or presence, is the same for everyone, pea-brain or not. In addition, there are other life forms that do not have heads with brains in them like ours and yet they too are conscious. This, therefore, necessarily means that consciousness does not depend upon the brain or upon how big or small you are. The point, however is that if two beings with different rates of motion or two beings with two different quantities of microbits, can be equally conscious, then it must follow that consciousness does not arise from any particular speed or any particular quantity of matter. If consciousness were caused by, say, 1 speed of GRC or conditional upon a certain quantity of matter, then those with 2 speed of GRC should not be able to have it. Continuing with the example, if consciousness were fixed at say, 2 then those who are not 2, should not have it. But then if both 1 and 2 give rise to the same consciousness then that must mean that consciousness does not depend upon either 1 exclusively or on 2 exclusively. This is because if consciousness were dependent upon any number then only that number should give rise to it and not two or more different numbers. The fact that in our example, 1 and 2 can cause the same phenomenon shows that the phenomenon is not dependent on either 1 or 2. But then if it is not dependent upon 1 or 2, it cannot be fixed at any other number either. For if any number other than 1 or 2 were the exclusive cause, then neither 1 or 2 could have caused it either. The fact that different arrangements of matter from the small to the large exhibit consciousness, therefore, proves that consciousness is not dependent on any particular arrangement of matter. Now reality is made up of different arrangements of matter and space. Therefore, if the arrangements of microbits are not the causes of consciousness, then the only other cause for consciousness must be their presence in space. However, presence in space is just another way of saying that it is space that gives them consciousness.

Of course, one could argue that consciousness is not independent of

## **From Microbits to Everything**

matter, but that simply, different numbers give rise to the same consciousness. But if so, then the numbers become irrelevant for the purpose of causation. Every number is unique and if despite their uniqueness, every numerical arrangement of microbits from 1 to infinity can give rise to the same thing, then we have to move beyond the numbers. In a nutshell, awareness is neither dependent upon the number of microbits that form a life-unit nor upon the speed of the microbits at any given place. Reality is made up of only numbers (of microbits) and space. If, therefore, the microbits do not give rise to consciousness, then it must follow that consciousness must come from space. Besides, it is more elegant that the consciousness of all be one than to have endless beings making up their consciousnesses as they go. Unity of source gives us unity of world, unity of communication and unity of experience. Given that each person is unique, if every person made and carried his or her own consciousness, each consciousness would be unique. This would not only be ugly from a system's point of view, it would pose an incorrigible communications problem. How do you propose that each unique consciousness could invent the necessary language to communicate with the trillions and trillions of other unique consciousnesses out there across countries, planets and galaxies?

### **Expanding the number and variety of the conscious**

The above has several consequences. First, all provided that it is arranged biofluidically at a minimum of the speed of light,  $c$ , any number of things can be conscious as we are. It does not matter what material that life-unit is made of. Even stones would think and speak if arranged properly. While the contents of consciousness may be unique, according to the events taking place in there, consciousness itself, like presence, is not unique. It is the same across reality. Second, consciousness itself, does not rise and fall like

## **Quantum Lights**

the events that are the contents of consciousness. Because consciousness is space, it is capable of aligning itself with endless speed possibilities of microbits from the slowest to the fastest. Because events are different from space, what happens to events does not necessarily happen to consciousness. That is to say, that when the event that forms the contents of a particular portion of consciousness stops, consciousness does not have to stop with it; and does not, in fact, stop.

As I mentioned briefly, the person is born when consciousness takes the form of the activities of the body within its presence and focuses on them exclusively to the point that it becomes one with the body. You may think of consciousness as a perfect actor. It completely identifies itself with the events in its presence by focusing on them to the exclusion of all else.

### **On the issue of the Self**

As you know, no two persons can occupy the same position at the same time. Every person's birth, position and capacities in space are unique. Also, the variety of circumstances is such that although we all live in the same world we do not usually have the same experiences. Even when we share the same things, the uniqueness of the person is such that all experiences get filtered; and reality presents itself uniquely to everyone. For every one of us, our identity as a person is maintained by the fixity of our GRC and the uniqueness of our positions in time. Also, as I mentioned earlier, the activities of every person from the date of birth to death can be traced as a number. So, in theory, it should be possible to trace every step of the person.

## **From Microbits to Everything**

### **Self as body (SAB) model**

There are two views of the self. One view is that the self is the result of the total activities of the body at any given time. According to this view, the self is not an independent quality separate and apart from the works of the body. But it is simply the body at work. As long as there is a living body, there is a self. When the body dies, the self too dies. If this view is true, then death is the end of the human being. The only way to regain the self, following death on earth would be a regrouping of microbits exactly as they were before. But even if rebirth were possible, the same individual could not be duplicated. This is because the individual is not only a product of a given GRC but also the person is a product of a given time, place and fortunes of birth. Since time and circumstances are unique the same experiences cannot be duplicated. Therefore, if the self were the activities of body, none of us could ever return as we are. This view then shatters all dreams of another life. But is it true?

### **Self as Driver (SAD) model**

An alternative view to the above, is that the self is not the activity of the body but that it is separate and apart from it. According to this view, the self and the body exist in a relationship that is much like that of a driver in a car. When the body is active, the self is the director. But when the body breaks down, the self simply steps out and continues elsewhere. Let us explore this model. If the self is separate and apart from the activities of the body, it must either be inside or outside the body. Let us first discuss the possibility of the self being outside the body.



## **Quantum Lights**

### **The Self Outside the Body model**

If each person has his or her own self, then logically, the self must be limited. If it is limited, then the self must be made of microbits. If this microbitic self is not inside the body but external to it, the problem is that being outside the body, these microbits must move at a speed that is far greater than that of the body. Things that move at different speeds do not stick together. Whether as one or as many microbits, therefore, if the microbitic self were outside the body, we would have a situation where, because of the differences in their speed and therefore, time, the self could be on Mars for example, while the body could be in Mecca. Furthermore, if the self were outside the body, given that its GRC would be faster or higher than that of body, we would have a situation where it could be conscious of events taking place at a higher GRC while being simultaneously conscious of events at our GRC. The self would thus have multiple consciousnesses and be two or more different beings at once. Clearly, not only do we not have multiple consciousnesses; it is unnecessarily messy. This would also be a negation of the individual and for that matter of moral, legal, intellectual and spiritual responsibility.

### **The Self Inside the Body model**

Let us suppose for a moment that the self is in the body. As discussed earlier, if there is a self inside, it should be different than the rest of the cells that make up the body. The reason why the cells move at their GRC is because of the number of microbits in them. The cells are multiplications of microbits. We already know that in order for two or more things to be together, they have to move at the same speed. Clearly then, in order for the microbitic self to be in the body, it too must move at the same speed as the cells. The problem, however, is that the self cannot move at the speed of a

## From Microbits to Everything

cell unless it is a cell. But a cell is a cell is a cell. We know that conception begins with cells from parents. If there is a microbitic self, it must already be a part of these foundational cells. If it is a cell, it is simply a cell. It is no different from any other cell. Every minute or so, billions of these cells are spilled around the world without consequence. On the other hand, if the self is not a part of the cells that form the embryo, then it is impossible to see how it needs to be a cell in order to run the body and yet it does not form a part of the cells that make up the body. In addition, cells die from time to time. The new ones that go into the body are the cells of other living things that we consume as food. No cell forms a part of the human body that is not from a parent or from food. If there is a microbitic self then it must come from food or from the parents. First, if it is from food or from the parents, its speed must be that of its parents and hence no faster than that of the parents. Second, whether from parents or from food, if there is a microbitic self, it must be capable of being identified in the body as an irreplaceable and undying group of cells. For how can it be in charge if it dies while the body is still running? I am not at all discounting the possibility of permanent cells. But whether it is permanent or temporary, if the self is a part of the body, it is the body. Whether or not they are the building blocks that hold the entire structure together, foundational stones are still stones. So, if the self is inside the body, this leads us to a position that is not different from that of those who say that the body is all that there is. But let us assume for a moment that there is a permanent group of cells that form the self and this automatically passes on. In this respect, if it is the self that gives life, or if life depends upon the presence of this self, then all life forms should have it too.

There is an even more intractable problem with this model. It is this. This model tends to disprove that which it seeks to prove. Human consciousness is what it is because of our unique GRC. So, if we are forced to conclude that the self is made from some microbits, then upon cessation of motion at our present speed, the human consciousness must cease. If it is

## **Quantum Lights**

said that the self continues after death, the rate at which this self moves, independent of the body, must necessarily be different. This would mean that the self that continues post-death, does not and cannot have human consciousness. This necessarily gives rise to discontinuity of the person. Or in other words, permanent death.

### **Self as Space (SAS) model**

If you have followed this paper carefully, it is clear that the answer to the question of self was already self evident when I explained that consciousness is a property of space. If we define ourselves by our consciousness and consciousness is space, then naturally, we are portions of space. But don't worry. It works, so it does not matter where the self is. At the end of the day though, nobody cares so much about the self as much as we care about continuity. The question is not whether there is a self but whether we can continue to be alive and be as conscious as we are, preferably if not in a better world, in a place that is no worse off than here. But is there continuity of life from here?

### **Death as an opportunity for a different GRC**

We have already seen that consciousness does not die since it is a property of space. We have also seen that the microbits that form the body do not die and continue to move even following death. But the question is whether we can still be conscious of our persons when the body is no longer there. The answer is yes. But for this, we have to turn again to the GRC. When the person is alive, his or her activities are like drops of water into the cup of consciousness. As long as the person is active, he continues to drip, one drop at a time. Every drop remains in the cup of this consciousness. While

## From Microbits to Everything

the person is the drop before it drips, he or she is also those drops that have already dripped. On the person's last breath, all that happens is that he or she stops dripping. But the drops in the cup that are already me, remain as they must. All that has happened at my death is that the opportunity for more drips has ceased. But that opportunity was always futuristic and never actual anyway, until the drip occurred. But before every drip, I was. It is always this historical "I" that is you. So when because of death, there is no new drip, that should not erase the "you" that was before the opportunity for more.

Let me elaborate further. Your body repeats its motions from presence to presence. But you know that you are not just this motion in this second only. You are all those years. So, if the motions of the microbits in this minute were your consciousness and self, then you should have no more than this second of awareness or sense of self. The self is historical. So, if all you are is the present activity, where is the continuity coming from? The fact that the self is necessarily historical, shows then that your consciousness extends beyond the present activities or quantities of microbits. Again, since reality is made up of only microbits and space, if you are more than the present quantities of microbits, then you must be a portion of space.

The body gives content to consciousness. The body is also necessary for the continuity of experience and action on earth. But the body is not necessary for the continuity of awareness itself. After the activities of a given body have filled a certain portion of consciousness, the consciousness retains the events of the body and is thus able to maintain, as a minimum, the self as it was before the body stopped moving. The past is what makes the person. But death is the cessation of repetition and not the cessation of the past. The past does not and cannot cease. What dies is the possibility of more experiences and not the experiences themselves. In order for the contents of consciousness to be emptied upon death, we must show that the contents depend upon the continuity of the body and further, that the

## Quantum Lights

contents were no more than one item, to wit, one event that was repeating itself from moment to moment so that when that repetition stops, there should be nothing left in the room of consciousness. For if the historical events are present to consciousness, in addition to the activities of the repetition, then cessation of the repetition should not erase the historical contents. This also means that it is not the person that dies but the opportunity for more experiences.

### GRCs and the relativity of the present

It is true that our perception appears to be constant. We ordinarily think that we are present all the time. But this is not so at all. In truth, because of our GRC, our awareness fades in and out, on and off, in 1s and 0s. Our perception is not constant, but discontinuous from moment to moment. The sense of constancy of things that we all have, arises as a result of the unity of the speed of the things that surround us. All the things that we are aware of, fall within our rate of consciousness. Because we all move at the same rate, the spaces between us remain unchanged. It is this “unchangingness” in the spaces within and between us that give us our sense of constancy. We do not notice things that move outside of our GRC for the very reason that we never meet. Your GRC is your fixed portion of presence as compared to an infinity of possible presences. What you are able to perceive and for how long, depends upon how much you can be on within the least amount of time.

You can think of time as the maximum speed possible (infinity). Then think of a particular GRC as a fraction of this infinity. The greater the fraction, the more you can perceive in time. The lesser the fraction, the less you perceive in time. The result is that even though time is present as a possibility of endless frames extending from the past, the present and to so-called future *at once*, our GRC forces us to see only one frame. This makes us

## From Microbits to Everything

one dimensional. This is good for our kind of world. It is ignorance of the past and of the future that often makes attentiveness on the “present” possible. Our GRC leads to the exclusivity of our awareness on our fractionalized frame. This frame can be mathematically expressed as a unique number within infinity. This is what *we* call the present. But as a fraction of infinity our presence is no more present than a cup of water in the ocean. This is the only way in which the relativity of time can be properly understood. It is possible organize different GRCs and GRPs so that for example, our past, future and present can be a fraction of the presence of a given person. For these types of beings, all that we are and would be are present to them at once.

I have shown that following death, consciousness must continue. But even more so, death provides an opportunity for a different GRC. At a different GRC, not only would you be able to experience different things, you could also see your so called past live! Follow me. In order to properly understand the relativity of the present, we must understand how it is tied to the rate of rest of the person. The rate of rest of every person is what you are. What you are is defined by how many times you come on and off in a moment of time. If we define the unit of time as one second for example, then the rate of rest is how many biofluidic motions the person makes in that second. You will remember that this is the same as your GRC. Whether the unit of time used is a second, a microsecond or many divisions of microseconds, still, the same reasoning applies. But it should be remembered that because the capacity of the person is fixed, no matter what unit of time we use, the rate of rest is always the same. The number of times you move in say, a second, is also calculable in lesser or greater fractions of time. What this means then is that in reality, our motions are also our rates of rest. To move, is to reposition yourself from one space to another. Since, no one can move unless he or she rests, it follows that the number of our moves is always equal to the number of our rests. But we have seen that this rate of rest is not the same for everyone across reality. Just as we come in different sizes, so too do we come in different rates of rest. Since the rate of rest is

## Quantum Lights

presence and since this rate is relative, it must follow that presence too is relative.

First, the future. At our current GRC, we are present a number of times equal to about three hundred thousand kilometres per second. Naturally, 300,000 kilometres is not the maximum distance possible. Nor is the second, the least time possible. A second is divisible into trillions of fractions or even less than that. This means then that at our current GRC we do not have the maximum presence in reality. The thing is that there are a lot of regularly occurring events taking place at extremely different speeds. There is no such thing as one rate of motion for all things. Because events at extremely different speeds exist, and because time is defined as regularly occurring events as measured, all kinds of different times exist 'at once'. You may think of time as a series of numbers from 1 to infinity, with every GRC as a particular number in that series. It is not that there is "you" and then you move. There is no "you" until there is a particular move. You are the move; and in particular, you are the move at that fixed speed. Given that all kinds of events are taking place at different speeds, how do we manage to perceive things? The solution is that everybody perceives himself and of others like himself up to a maximum of his or her GRC. And no matter what a person's GRC may be, he or she can be present only to events that happen at the same speed as does the person. Of course, we can perceive events that happen at lesser rates than our maximum GRC, but we cannot perceive events that happen at rates faster than our GRC. But if it is speed that gives you a particular presence and if speed is relative, then it must follow that presence too is relative. So, again, there must be different 'presences' across space.

What does this mean? What is present to us, may be past to someone and what is past to us may be present to someone else. What this also means is that if we change our GRC, we change what times we can perceive. At a different GRC, we can perceive our pasts and even our so-called future. I will get to the issue of the past in a moment. As for the future, we ordinarily think of it as not existing at the 'present' but something that we

## From Microbits to Everything

move into. The problem, however, is that if it does not exist, it is nothing. If it is nothing, it remains nothing and cannot be moved into. For example, if 2 does not exist, you cannot go to it from 1. Every motion in space, whether it be physical, temporal, mental or whatever requires space. So, if the spaces that we are moving into, that is, if the so-called future, did not exist, we could not move into them, since we could not move into “something” that did not exist. The future is not so much something to come, as much as it is something to come for us. We have a future only because our GRC forces us to see only one moment of time. The GRC is the mechanism for delay, par excellence. Of an existing ocean of fresh water, it shows you one drop at a time and feeds you one drop at a time. Your GRC does not allow you to see the entire ocean. And so, naturally, we are led to believe that all that there is only a drop at a time. In reality, all things that have happened, and all things that “will” happen, already exist at once. But then if the future exists, so too must the past. This is because the past is no more than a fraction of the future as accessed incrementally. The past is possible only when you have a future. The past is the step before the next; where the next is the future. Where there is no next or where there is no future, there is only the present. Where there is no next, there is no past or future. If the future exists, therefore, so too must the past. Unlike space where the larger you are the more you can accommodate, with time, the equation works the other way. The faster you are the shorter your steps. Just as those with different speeds are never in the same place, so too those with different ons and offs are never in the same time. With respect to space, your presence is your extension; so that having more of it is the same as having more place. With respect to time, your presence is your speed, so that having more biofluidic speed means having more events. Events are to time what extensions are to space. But all this stuff is relative so that having more events is only reasonable in the context of comparing two or more actors or observers. What is most interesting is that for all things, the lesser is always present in the larger. Everything is a fraction of everything else up to infinity.



## Quantum Lights

This is true of distances, weights, depths, speeds, times, powers and every thing else. The lesser fraction is always present to the larger. But the larger is not always present to the lesser. To explain, any number from one to ninety is always present to one hundred. The lesser is always present to the greater. There is only one time, one space and everything is a fraction of everything else in this oneness.

Let me explain things even further. Imagine events as a number of music notes, with the GRC as the music player. Imagine further that there are two persons with completely different GRCs. One plays one hundred notes a second and the other plays one single note a second. Both players are required to play the same notes over and over again. The total number of notes is one hundred. The first player plays all the notes in a second. The second player plays all the notes in one hundred seconds. Let us assume that at any time, the position that a player occupies is his presence. We can clearly see then that because of their differences in speed, the two players would never play the same note at once. Whenever the slower is on one note, the faster player would be one hundred times away. Not only that, we can also see that the future notes of the slower player are not the same as the future notes of the faster player. In the first second, the first player finishes all his notes and has no future notes to play. The second player, however, would have ninety nine notes and ninety nine seconds to go. Similarly, we can also see that because the faster player already plays all the notes in a second, wherever the second player may be, the faster player knows how many notes the slower person has played and how much left to go. While it may take the slower player one hundred seconds to see all this, it takes the first player only a second to see all of that. Although the number of the notes are the same, 100 notes of the second player are equivalent to one note of the first player. One hundred seconds of the second player are equivalent to one second of the first player. This is of significance, for in our world it is the speed of events that give us time. So, if the events that we measure time by can be slower or faster to someone, depending upon their GRC, then

## **From Microbits to Everything**

naturally, our “present” is not necessarily so present at all for those with different GRCs. All this can be expressed as a simple rule. In order to be able to perceive the past, present and future events of an actor, the state of rest or GRC of the observer must be equal to, or greater than, the total possible life span of the actor. When there is 100% correspondence between the total moves of the actor and the state of rest of the observer, the life of the actor can become present to the observer in one moment, much like a wall. But what type of person can grasp all your movements at once? The person must be one whose GRC enables him or her to see all the multiple times that you cannot see and who can see all your life’s drama as: stills, pieces or tiny dots.

### **On seeing the past after death**

The GRC gives us a certain version of reality. First of all, it fixes our natures and abode. Second, the GRC compels us and those like us to be objects of experience for one another. But in fixing our place out of endless possibilities the GRC limits our perception to one moment instead of perception of endless moments in eternity. The important question, however, is whether reality is what we can perceive or whether what we perceive is only a fraction of what is out there as a whole. Because we repeat ourselves a number of times in order to be aware, every object of our perception must repeat with us in order for it to come within our awareness. If the subject of our awareness is an object, the parts that make it so, must repeat with us in order for us to say that it is there. If the subject of our awareness is an event, its parts, being fractions of time, must also repeat with us in order for us to continue to experience it. But it is one thing to say that events must repeat with us in order for us to be aware of them. It is quite another thing to say that if they do not repeat with us, they do not exist. It is not our ability to perceive something that makes it real. It is rather, the

## Quantum Lights

presence of the thing in space, whether we are there or not, that makes it real. Let's see.

Remember that every event is made up of energy. And energy is another name for a particular number of microbits moving around from one portion of space to another. Whether an event repeats at the same rate as us or not, when it happens, it takes place in a specific portion of space as a fixed quantity. But we know that energy cannot be destroyed. So, after the event happens, if we cannot perceive it, it cannot be because the energy that made up the event has been destroyed. In order for the past to "disappear" we must be able to explain how it is that real events made up of real matter in real space can disappear or go anywhere. If from nothing, we get nothing then from some thing (energy) we cannot get nothing (disappearance). There is no mechanism in space for turning real things into nothing. It is impossible to see how the non-repetition of a fact or event at our rate of perception, automatically erases the event from space. When the repetition of the event ceases, the fact that the event took place in space has not ceased and cannot cease.

Whether a thing repeats or not, what happened before, has happened. Let's keep in mind that to be is to move. Whether we move things or not, every portion of matter, from the smallest to the largest, is moving. Both before a given number of microbits manifest as events to our perception; and after they cease to be within our awareness, they too repeat in accordance with their state of rest, from moment to moment. The energy that you used to move yesterday, for example, is still around somewhere. So, really, even when events do not repeat for us, the microbits that formed the event repeat elsewhere. Therefore, since the microbits that form the events are not destroyed and since the same microbits continue to repeat all the time, if we cannot perceive them, it can only be that they are not repeating at the same rate as us. Not only that, every event is unique in terms of quantity, time and position and as such, can be identified as a unique number. So, the shapes of the microbits that you used to move from point A to B can also be

## From Microbits to Everything

identified. Of course, the area that you moved in also exists. At the time that you were moving, those present could see what you were doing. The only reason they cannot see it now is because both you and they are at the same GRC and the GRC forces you to see only one moment at a time. If you could see multiple times, you would see yourself as you were. But the reason you are not able to see multiple times is because of your current GRC. When you die and have no body with which to do certain things, your consciousness can either remain in a perpetual state of reminiscence or take on another form with a different GRC. The good news is that because of the relativity of times, your consciousness could take on a new GRC that would enable you to see all your past as though it was live.

Ordinarily, we define speed as the distance travelled in time ( $v = d/t$ ). But this definition is circular if we go deeper. Time is also a form of motion. So to say that speed is distance travelled in time is the same as saying distance travelled per distance travelled. This does not make sense unless there are two or more motions to compare with. If we were thinking as though there was only one mover in the whole of reality, what would the “least time” be? Maximum motion? If this were so, then the definition of the highest speed would have to be explained as “maximum motion per maximum motion”. An absurd definition, since we need maximum distance to compare to maximum distance. But this is exactly where human perception leads us to.

We are used to thinking of time by comparing ourselves to others. But this is not the universal standard. Speed is the maximum distance travelled but we cannot say per “what”, without going in circles. The simplest answer is that in so far as every thing is in motion, the fastest speed is that which has maximum distance as its state of rest. That is another way of saying that time is distance. This way, we come to know that the fastest time is simply the whole of space. It takes time to think of an apparently non-moving space as time. But that is the reality. Now, the whole of space is the present. So, the time occupied by every person is the portion of the space he or she occupies

## Quantum Lights

as his or her state of rest in an infinity of 1. What is interesting here, however, is that at the fastest speed, the mover is still. At the fastest speed, there is no gap between the mover and its distances. The mover is the distances: one and the same. This is what I mean when I say that time is distance.

But if time is distance, then there is no such thing as time versus distance. It is time versus time and distance versus distance. How then does motion figure in this equation? Being here at our GRC, each one of us is a certain distance. This is the maximum portion of space each occupies in one moment of a second. Remember that our biofluidic rate of motion is about 300,000 kilometres per second. But as we have already seen this is not the maximum. But to show you how the second is not the standard, let us divide a second into a billion fractions and call each fraction a “bino” second. When we divide 300,000 km by the bino second it works out 0.0003 kilometres per bino second. We can continue dividing time until we get tired. But the point of the exercise is that as the times get smaller so too does the distance traveled by us, to the point where the distance travelled becomes but the tiniest possible point. In the least amount of time all of our motions work out to an extremely tiny still dot of space. From the perspective of the person who can perceive the most therefore, we move not, except extremely slowly. And if our GRC is an almost invisible point to another, you can imagine how small are the little slow moves that we call events that come out from the body. If the body is a still dot, the activities of the body must be even tinier still dots. We can correctly describe the body then as an extremely tiny dot; and its activities, as little pieces of an extremely tiny dot. Because these pieces leave the body as used energy, they fall as pieces, as it were, to the ground, but not far away from the body. While the activities of the body are going on, their relationship to the body can be characterized as the breaking of pieces of our bodies. When the events are over, we can describe them as the falling of the pieces. Like leaves falling from trees, that’s exactly how our events relate to us in time. As long as we

## **From Microbits to Everything**

live, we continue to stand in the same place. Our GRC fixes our perception or place in the universe rigidly like prisoners. It is our leaves that are our future and they become our past when they fall. When the leaves are falling, that's what we call activity. When they are falling, they still have some connection with us. This is why we perceive them. But we must remember that every fall can be perceived only vaguely. For necessarily, by the time the process of breaking begins, we have already lost some connection with the activity that we call our own. This is so because we and our activities do not move at the same rate. In any event, we are structured so that we can perceive only the tree as it stands. That fixed position is our presence, our awareness. So in reality, we move not. It our events that move and it is our events that we call our pasts and futures. Because of the differences between our GRC and the speed of the activities coming from our GRC, when the bits happen they must necessarily leave us. This explains why we are unable to perceive the things that we have done. But whether we perceive them or not, the leaves; the pieces; the bits are there. Every leaf, every bit, every piece falls close to us and piles up like notes that can be picked up, like photos that can be seen and like objects that can be felt. The one who can see or pick up our pieces then is only the person whose GRC enables him or her to see our GRC as those extremely tiny dots in space. But don't say that the leaves are not there because you are stiff as a tree. If only you were flexible enough to turn around, you would see the pile up!

### **Conclusion**

I have argued that life on earth is the motion of matter at the speed of light. I have also shown that consciousness is a property of space and that death of the body does not end consciousness. As for time, I have showed that our pasts and futures are accessible to us, should we be able to change our GRCs. As long as we are here, our GRC is fixed. But death gives us an

## **GRCs and the Scriptural Evidence**

opportunity to change our GRC. So death is not the end but the beginning of a new life. As for our pasts, they have nowhere to go and they do not disappear, they exist and can be accessed by those who are permitted to see them. It matters then what we do in this world because every thing from the good to the bad, is recorded. And if you can forever live with what you have done in your past, what kind of past would you want it to be? What kind of life would you want others to see, if they could also see all that you did once?

### **Part 2: GRCs and the Scriptural Evidence**

#### **Introduction**

In this section, we shall be exploring further the realization of GRC discussed by M. Muslim in the previous chapter. In further discussions with M. Muslim, he has summarized the view regarding the GRC as follows: From the vantage of God, who has the ultimate GRC (infinite), all times are at one place. This is the flip, or the inverse of all places at one time (the 'now') which we experience. We therefore experience the universe in terms of time extension only fractionally, in the now, and not in multiple times. Other entities such as angels can experience several times and the past and future to certain ranges. If the absolute vantage point of all times at one spot defines the totality of all creations for God, as is also indicated in the Quran, when it is stated that: "They see the [Judgment Day] indeed far-off, but We [God] see it in proximity." (70:4 and 70:6), and we call this the Dream of God, this universe is the flip, or reverse of this, that is, it is a Reverse Dream. Let us explain all this further, so that it becomes cognitively understood clearly. Let us say that you throw five letters on the table at the same time: QRUAN. In your mind as the author, you know that the word is QURAN and you know it instantly. You see the whole. This is analogous to multiple times at one place. Now you have a slow student who is reorganizing the

## From Microbits to Everything

letters and a faster student. When the slower student has reached QUR, the faster one has reached QURA and can look back at the work of the slower one who is only at 'R'. Furthermore, the faster student can also see the 'QUR'. This corresponds with other higher GRC entities such as angels who, due to their higher GRC's, are ahead in their reading of the written universe, as it were. An increase in our GRC due to death, or other special circumstances in this life would enable us to see aspects of the past or future, as in 'postcognition' and precognition, respectively, not as an imagined vision, but as a concrete reality in space.

The vision of reality this whole scenario presents is that that absolute reality is God and that His vision is absolute. From this absolute vision all exists already as pre-planned existence. The fractionalization of consciousness into created entities within His overarching consciousness in turn means that these entities can only perceive a fractionalized worldview. The cognitive functions operating at GRC light speed ( $c$ ) are in sync with a GRC of a light speed based ( $c$ ) universe. Herein, everything has a synchronized binary rhythm of an on/off mode that does not exceed  $c$ . If other entities or the human being utilize(s) those faster microbits wherein a faster GRC mode is possible, then the extraction of ultimate reality is of a time other than the *now* in which the light speed GRC is operating. This then frees the entity from the prison of the now. The past and future of the lower GRC frame can be observed from the higher GRC reference frame. Breaking away from the current speed of light GRC would enable the human being to see the future. To give an example of the future, at a higher GRC, you observe Mr. Johnson getting into his car to go to the office, but you also observe him reaching the office one hour later at your 'now', while Mr. Johnson's now is that of him still getting into the car. While Mr. Johnson can only be at one place, that is, in Mr. Johnson's *now*, your vision of Mr. Johnson of the future one hour later is a vision of the microbitic space he will occupy in one hour.



## GRCs and the Scriptural Evidence

### GRC and the Quran

Is there anything on the Quran on GRC? In the Quran it is written that God records everything and is a witness to all happenings (58:6); that He records the number of all things (72:28); that everything is recorded in a book (78:29) and that all events are in a clear book (6:59). This clear book is nothing but the record of all happenings that exist, have existed or will exist, in microbitic form. Note that seeing future or past events does not mean that the observing entity can change the events. Such entities, with faster GRC's, will only be able to observe them. If someone with the human GRC is able to peek into the record of the future and see themselves, they will not be interacting with the other self. That observer will see what amounts to what is like a three dimensional video clip, of a particular event of the future, or of the past. Everything is in a clear record, and that record is like a book (*kitaab*) which leaves out nothing small or large because it *is* the very event that can be reviewed in its utmost detail. What all this amounts to is that:

All times at one place (or point) in the mind of God, as His imagination = Dream of God = the pre-existent universal script = 'the clear record' = *kitaab* (mentioned in *some* verses of the Quran, in this context.)

GRC = **General Reading-rate** of the (pre-existent) **Universal Script** = **GRUS** = rate of exposure (*baraa*) of the pre-existent universal script or book (*kitaab*).

As mentioned by M. Muslim, the universe is the flip of "all times at one place" and "is all places at one time", where the time is the 'now'. In this sense, being the 'flip', the universe is like the *Inverse* Dream of God. In the last section in this book, we will be looking further into the concept of "inverse dream" which coincides with the attributes of the Creator, why the

## From Microbits to Everything

word “dream” has been used to describe the universe and what further ramifications this has on our understanding of the nature of the universe and the human being’s place in the cosmic scheme.

### Another meaning of the word *Kitaab*

Let us prove isochronal existence as the absolute frame of reference, that is, that the future and past already perennially exist and that it is only due to our limited GRC’s that gives us the ‘now’ of moving into the future from the past. We shall use the *indirect method* of proof commonly used in mathematics, that is, we shall start out by a statement which is the opposite of what we want to prove and see if it leads to a contradiction or paradox. We shall begin by claiming that only the “now” exists because the past is no longer here and is fleeting away behind us, at all times, and that the future, at all times, is uncapturably ahead of us and not here. However, with a little thought, it is clear that there is no such thing as the “now”, for it becomes a mere abstraction under objective scrutiny, since one cannot capture a static moment called the now. This is because the now continuously sheds into either the past and future and nothing else. But if the past and future do not exist, then the ‘now’ does not exist either. However, we know that *something* exists and have a feeling for the ‘now’, so how do we resolve this seeming paradox? The paradox can be resolved only by assuming that the past and future all exist at the same ‘time’, as was discussed in the previous section. It is exactly like a book, or *kitaab* as the Quran calls it, and, moreover, a clear book. In a book, all the words exist and are only separated by *distance*. Now a reader who reads the book, has a reading rate. Let us assume that the reading rate is 4 words per second. However, let us also assume that this same reader has another reading rate (a speed-reading technique that he does not normally employ). Let us assume further that he is reading Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* (3.1.65):

## GRCs and the Scriptural Evidence

To be or not to be: that is the question: Whether tis nobler in the mind to suffer (65) the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune,...

The speed-reader can stop reading at the slower standard rate, break away and scan Shakespeare's play both forward to, and behind the quotation above, very fast, up to 20 words per second. In this analogy, note that a reader will, when reading the book at the standard rate have a so-called "now" position, but that "now" is always moving behind and the future is always approaching the reader. The reality of the situation is that all the future and the past is present, in the now, but that it is the focus of the reader that makes him a prisoner of his reading rate. This imprisonment can be broken and then he will be able to read the forward and aft positions of the book, which are a distance away. Likewise, the reading rate is akin to the GRC and the breaking away is like speed reader defocusing on the sentence that is being read at the general reading-rate to go to the speed-reading rate. This is why the word *kitaab* is used in the book for the record, for all times exist at one place, subject to our accessibility like a book or *kitaab*.

In the Quran 57:22 it states that God will bring into presence that which is in the *kitaab*. This is consistent with the GRC concept: When one is reading a book, everything is already there. In other words the past and the present already exist but we read them through or GRC or GRUS, just as the words come into cognitive presence as we read a paper book; indeed, they do not spring up from nothing or from the mind of God when we read them, for they already have a pre-existence in the book/mind of the Supreme Author. The word *baraa* in the Quran in Chapter 57, verse 22 therefore does not mean created or brought into existence or into being, but brought into cognitive presence, display or show from pre-existence, or revealed from pre-existence. For example, this word *baraa*, in another form,

## From Microbits to Everything

is used in the Quran when it is argued, that the blameless nature of Moses was exposed or revealed to his unjust critics because the evidence for that was *already existent*. This is in 33:69.

### How GRC works: the cognitive mechanism

In the Mind of God all movement can be seen as a series of stills; when played fast, one gets motion. To God, everything is one overlapping still that captures all existence; this still, as it is cognitively seen by the presence of one entity, such as the human being, can be envisioned as a set of frames, stacked one atop the other, with gaps in between each frame. The distance between the frames (i.e. the gap) is the “off” position with respect to the photon’s rest point, in back and forth motion (oscillatory). The rate of the “off” position (denoted here by the size of the gap between the frames) constitutes the “GRC”. For explanatory purposes, let us say that we have 10 frames or stills. Let the gap between them be “x”. The total length will be  $L=9x+10t$ , where “t” is the thickness of the frame (the duration of the “on” position which is the same as the “off” position). If someone had a GRC twice that of ours then the distance between the frames would be halved and just in terms of “x”, it would now be  $x/2$ . The resultant equation would be L divided by 2 or  $4.5x+5t$ . In other words, the frames would be stacked closer and would therefore have a shorter total length. For brevity, we can eliminate “t”, for it is not immediately useful for explaining the basic concept; the “x” value is the only term of import that is to be considered for now. Now for someone with twice the GRC as our light-speed in vacuum based GRC, the distance between the frames would be halved (i.e.  $4.5x$  instead of  $9x$ ). This, in turn, means that someone with twice the GRC would see an event which occurs in 12 hours, occur in 6 hours and, in effect, would have seen the future 6 hrs of the person with the smaller GRC. The reel of life, as it were, is being played faster. Remember that cognition in this

## GRCs and the Scriptural Evidence

context is perception of reality and cognition is the GRC; therefore, GRC is perception of reality. The same applies to seeing the past.

The ratio between the speed of light and the new GRC is the *Time Compression Factor* ( $T_{cf}$ ): Therefore:  $T_{cf} = c_0/c_n$ , where  $c_n = kc_0$  and where  $k$  is a real number between one and infinity;  $c_0$  is the speed of light in vacuum. Making the appropriate substitutions, we find that  $T_{cf} = 1/k$ . This is the factor which we use to convert one GRC to another; in this case the light-speed GRC that we live in is the reference GRC. Note that if the frame rate (GRC rate, or biofluidic cognitive processing rate) is faster, so is the geofluidic rate and therefore someone observing the past or future in relation to our 'time' would still see things at a normal rate, because the ratio of GRC (biofluidic motion) to geofluidic motion remains the same in any GRC frame. To understand this, without going into mathematical details, here is an analogy: someone who is able to read faster than another person will still have the same understanding of the sequence of events. In other words, whether I read the sentence: "He threw the ball up the roof" in a microsecond, or in 3 seconds, I will still have the same understanding and the ball will not move faster up onto the roof just because my reading rate is faster. However, since the sentence would have been read faster, I am ahead of the slower reader, and can move into his future, since I would have read that part of the sentence which he would not yet have reached to read!

There are four basic steps in the whole process of past/future record access:

1. A higher GRC, for humans, is achieved by the *Breakaway Event*, that can happen to the following entities and in the following situations:
  - (a) After death by humans and jinn.
  - (b) By the natural ability of angels assisting the human by showing him/her the future/past.
  - (c) Special cognitive techniques to move to a higher

## From Microbits to Everything

GRC while still living in the carbon-based body.  
(d) Precognition.

2. Multiple times can be seen, like a person scanning a book, (i.e. access to the *Multi-time Complex*). Focusing on a particular time in the past or future, which is analogous to choosing a starting line to read from anywhere in the book, for a particular person, event etc.
3. The actual reading of the book at a new faster GRC, from a starting point, where the frames are compressed by the *Time Compression Factor*, and where the frame constant  $G_f$  is fixed, so as to see everything, intelligibly, with cause and effect, as it occurred in the light-speed GRC from which one was defocused (broke away).

### The significance of numbering

As has been mentioned previously, in the Quran, it states that everything in creation has been numbered.

There is none in the hierarchy of the galactical clusters, or on the earth but comes unto the Beneficent as a servant. He has enumerated them and numbered them with numbering. (19:94)

Part of the numbering system is the intended sequence of events to take place. If everything is one point or all frames are co-existent as one frame for God, He knows the order of events and that knowledge is the numbering system. This is rather like various components of a complex machine lying around for assembly; a master assembler knows which

## GRCs and the Scriptural Evidence

order they have to be assembled in, whereas a novice would not. The master does not need an instruction book with a numbering scheme written for him. He knows the sequence of the jumbled pile. He can, however, impart that knowledge to the novice. Similarly, such knowledge is imparted to the one who accesses the matrix of all events (the multiple-time complex) with the higher GRC, and such sequencing becomes available as frames/stills, as discussed before. It is not very difficult for God to impart such knowledge into the created entity, since the will of the created entity is simply the fractionalization of the will of God! It is also important to note that God *knowing* the numbering scheme, is not just academic knowledge for God, or something that He muses over as pastime. To *know* the numbering scheme *is* the way in which things actually happen; God's knowledge *is* the activity that transpires. Furthermore, the numbering and the sequencing can be denoted by the same number. All things are in God's knowledge and are ordered, for numbering implies order, and that though He knows things in absolute wholes and fixities, does not mean that they are not sequenced when accessed by one of His fractionalizations (i.e. the human mind etc.). What is happening, in fact, is that when God sees things from His perspective, all times are at one place, but when He perceives through His fractionalization, then they are played out, as it were, in the intended sequence, the sequence intended by God, that is, according to the numbering scheme. This is tantamount to someone having infinite reading rate, who knows the open page in a book instantaneously because He knows the sequence of the letters. Let us say that I am the author and I create a sentence and scramble it. When I look at the sentence I will know what it means immediately. Take for example the following: "ehe logt n dve oth arhilar". This is actually: "the dog ran over the hill". I, as creator of the sentence, know it immediately. I know the true sequence of the letters no matter how they are stacked up. Now I choose to fractionalize in my mind by creating a sub-will. This sub-will cannot read at the infinite rate, and is limited to a processing rate by particular structures of microbits. However,

## From Microbits to Everything

this sub-will is allowed to choose the letters in sequence; it takes time to complete the sentence. This knowledge of sequencing comes from none other than the creator. In fact, we would go so far as to say that, for the fractionalized entity, the *knowledge* of sequencing is instantaneous and automatic and is merely unfolded at a particular rate: that rate is the GRC. The unfolding occurs at a particular rate, yet is instantaneous and automatic because the fractionalized mind comes from the domain of objectless space that knows everything and is the author of all imagined existence.

### Speed of Angels and GRC: the Quranic evidence

In Section 1, it was mentioned by M. Muslim that speed is of two kinds that he termed geofluidic and biofluidic. That which is motion, related to oscillatory motion/frequency, is biofluid, (such as the heart-beat) and that which one traverses distances as per the formulae  $v=d/t$  (like driving a car from A to B) is geofluid. In the Quran, the geofluid or non-oscillatory vectorial motion of the angels is many times that of human beings. It states, in the Quran, that the time taken for the angels to travel a particular distance that would be one day, would take a human being 50,000 years. Here is that enigmatic verse:

The angels and the spirit ascend to Him in a Day the measure of which is 50,000 years....They see the (Judgment Day) indeed far-off, but We (God) see it in proximity. (70:4 and 70:6)

Note that prior to this verse, another verse states that “God is the Lord of the ways of ascent”; that is, there are many ways of physical ascent and mental or ‘spiritual’ ascent. Ascent means going up, but going up means that there is a baseline, which is zero. They have their own ways of ascent or



## **The Quran and Life after Life**

propulsion. Note that angels are not limited to the speed of light; they are comprised *from* light, which means that they are comprised of particles smaller than light, that is, components (fractions of the light particle). It does not seem that efficient to be limited to light speed when we know the vastness of the universe, or that it would take one day of travelling for the angels to receive instructions from God, from a Preserved Tablet in space, as some Muslims hold. The instructions of God with respect to the angels are received instantaneously as direct communications. Their travelling huge distances has other purposes related to glorifying God and not in order to travel to receive instructions on how and what to do with the lives of other creatures on earth. If the geofluidic speed of angels is that fast, can you imagine the various biofluidic speeds of angels that pertain to the GRC, as there is a directly proportionate relationship between the biofluidic (oscillatory/cyclical) and the geofluidic (non-cyclical) speeds: the higher the geofluidic speed attainable, the higher the biofluidic speed and hence the higher the GRC. The greater the GRC, the greater the ability to access the record of past/future events in terms of range!

### **Part 3: The Quran and Life after Life**

#### **The Quran on 'Soul' and Consciousness**

God sustains everything by His mind and He has willed self-conscious domains to arise in this universe, that is, individuals. However, self-consciousness can only arise as a result of a self-consciousness entity that can imagine localized areas of particle based objects in an absolute objectless conscious space so that consciousness is essentially transfocused at those points – by the mind of God. At each moment these particle-based bodies are being sustained by Intent, just as every structure within that space is sustained at each and every moment by God's will albeit through cause and

## From Microbits to Everything

effect, which is imagined. We can understand this ‘will’ further, through some scriptures. In fact, among all the scriptures of the world’s major belief systems, we see a correlation between that which pertains to the actual nature and structure of matter and that which is in the Quran. As a result, we shall examine the verses in the Quran to see what further knowledge we can adduce on the issue of consciousness. In fact, we can now see more fully why the *ruh* has been defined in the Quran as *a command* from God. For the Quranic verse says that it is a command of your Sustainer. How appropriate a choice of words, because the commandment of self-consciousness is being sustained continuously by God, hence by the ‘Sustainer’, by the maintenance of the fractionalized will and body! This becomes easier to realize once we realize the unique solution: that all is in the mind of the Creator and there is no outside. We are all part and parcel of God’s imagination and are created consciousnesses within His overarching consciousness, which alone is absolute and uncreated. The self-consciousness that makes you and I is not comprised of microbits (which are also willed and sustained) but is an immediate and ‘pure’ willed product of the property of objectless space in which the body is situated, that is, the Mind of God. In other words, all ‘it’ needs is to be impinged with a biofluidic microbitic body through which it can experience the universe of microbits.

In Chapter 2, we examined various scriptures that are united in their conception on the existence and basic nature of God. The Quran is not only compatible with many scientific facts, but also with those which have also been recently discovered. This book – the Quran – has many other statements that are ‘scientific’ but which present day science has yet to confirm. Furthermore, in the Quran, it is discussed as to what happens after death in conjunction with the nature of self-consciousness. Given the unparalleled record of the Quran, in terms of its accuracy in depicting reality with respect to unknown phenomena only recently realized, we shall examine in this chapter the issue of consciousness with respect

## The Quran and Life after Life

to the modern debate on this issue as expounded by philosophers and cognitive scientists. Indeed, it would be foolish to ignore the Quran as an indispensable resource, once we have verified its properties. Most researchers and scientists, especially in the West, may not be aware of these properties of the Quran, and we hope that this work can draw them into the direction of examining such a book that would help advance knowledge in their own particular fields.

The first question is: What is the evidence in the Quran, for the existence of such an entity integrated with the shell of the human body – the so-called ‘soul’? There are several verses in the Quran dealing with the word ‘ruh’, commonly taken to be the ‘soul’. The most pertinent one for our discussion is 17:85, quoted earlier pertaining to the issue of the of God, hitherto discussed. This verse essentially states that: people ask you (Muhammed) about the *ruh*; say that it is *a command* from your Sustainer/Lord. In order to know what it is, you need a large body of knowledge, but of that large body of knowledge you have been given only a little.

From the Quran we can gather that the *ruh* is associatively linked to the human body and that it appears during embryonic development; this coincides with the discussion based on microbits as elaborated above. By associative linkage what is meant is that the instantiation of your existence in the mind of God is not located somewhere in space, nor is it in the body as a particle comprised object. Rather it is relational: it is the focus of God’s attention to create a consciousness from within His consciousness and have it linked to a particular body, once He decides to form a particulate (microbitic) body, in that space. However, this is a linkage that occurs by the conscious fractionalization of God to create a will within His overarching Will, as part of the development of nature.

It has been mentioned that there is a subtler body connected to our carbon-based grosser body that will exist after death for us. But what is this subtler body comprised of? In the Quran, the other entities which exist are the Angels, that are made of more subtle particles (see verses 6:61-62). One

## From Microbits to Everything

Hadith states that Angels are evolved from ‘nur’ – subtler particles, we surmise, smaller than the ‘photon’<sup>87</sup>. *From* nur means from (reflected) light, hence derivatives of the photon, and hence smaller than the photon as per microbitic concepts<sup>88</sup>, where the photon is not a fundamental particle according to the microbit scenario.

*We* also possess ruh. The *Ruh* (Gabriel, the non-human, angelic messenger of God) brings revelation. For the *ruh* see: 15:28 – 33, 16: 2 ; 17:85; 40:15; 78:38; 15:26. Therefore, we will also inherit a subtler particle based body after we lose our grosser body; that subtler body being comprised of smaller microbit comprised particles.<sup>89</sup> One hint from the Quran about the individual’s continuation of life after death is clear from the Quranic passage which states that:

It is God who takes away the souls at the time of death, and those that do not die, during their sleep. He keeps those for which He has ordained death, and sends the rest for an appointed term. Certainly, in this are Signs for those who ponder seriously. (39:41)

The activation and de-activation is a result of the motion of microbits in a certain way in the brain-body system. So far, it has been realized that certain gases, for example, inhibit the transfer of photons from the microtubules

---

87. Ayesha reported that the Prophet Muhammed said: “The Angels were created from light, and the Jinn from smokeless fire.” From Sahih Muslim, Vol. 4, p. 1540, no. 7134.

88. Muslim, M., and Haque, Nadeem, (2001), *From Microbits to Everything: A New Unified View of Physics and Cosmology: Volume 1: The Cosmological Implications*.

89. It is interesting to note, that in the Quran, it is narrated that when Iblis (Satan) was asked by God to bow down to Adam, he said that he would not bow to a creature made/originated from clay; he forgot, neglected or perhaps did not realize the point that he was essentially being asked to bow down to a creature whose essence was *ruh*, not ‘from clay’.

## The Quran and Life after Life

which comprise the neurons<sup>90</sup>. Sleep and death disconnect certain motions, thereby rendering an inactivity of the consciousness or the ‘soul’ to perceive anything.

One does not need the carbon-based body for the *nafs*<sup>91</sup> (consciousness and human personality) to exist and it is possible that a *nafs* may ‘leave’ (forever) this type of body of ours, such as in the case of death or even *some* brain dead individuals who are being kept on life support. However, since we do not have the knowledge to know when and if the *nafs* has ceased operating in the grosser carbon-based body, we must not disconnect such individuals from life-support because the *nafs* may still be associated with those bodies, and the body might be revived. There is a curative or life prolongational aspect for the patient. In such a situation, effort must be in the direction of life preservation, even in such adverse situations. The 12<sup>th</sup> century Muslim philosopher, Ibn Rushd (Averroes) made a remarkable analysis of the above-stated Quranic passage:

He [God] equates sleeping with death in suspending the activity of the soul [or consciousness] .... For since the soul/consciousness returns to its own state [upon awakening] we know that the suspension of its activity does not happen to it due to a defect in its essence, but is the result of some deficiency affecting its instrument. Hence it does not follow that if the instrument is corrupted, the soul must be corrupted, too. Death is a form of corruption; therefore it should affect

---

90. For more details on this, see “Contemporary anaesthesia and anaesthetics” on the web-site: [www.general-anaesthesia.com](http://www.general-anaesthesia.com).

91. Note that in the Quran, in 29:57, it states that “Every *nafs* will taste death.” It does not state that every *nafs* will die; this is because it is not made to die, but only continue to exist in another environment: in other words the *nafs* will just experience a phenomenon of death, like any other experience and move on, hence the word ‘taste’.

## From Microbits to Everything

[only] the instrument [and not the soul], as happens during sleep; or as the Philosopher [Aristotle, *De Anima*, I, 4, 408b, 21] says: “If the old man were to find an eye like the young man’s eye, he would be able to see as well as the young man sees.”<sup>92</sup>

In 17:85 the reason why the word command has been used is that the creation of the *ruh* is by the command of the Creator in the sense that it is fractionalized at a certain time and transfocused into the human body at a particular stage of development of the human before birth, as a result of the organization of microbits, as previously discussed when GRP=GRC. These microbitic particles then become a portal for consciousness that is the property of space. This would be the basic level of conscious apperception intended by the Creator for that particular species. Secondly, each creation has a specific and unique number or identity associated with it in the mind of the Creator, which is part of the ultimate record of things that are created<sup>93</sup>. The proof of fractionalization is denoted by the Quranic words: “*from His Ruh*”. Now if we take Ruh to mean command as explained in verse 17:85, the meaning is: “from His command”. But His command is nothing but His will, so we can also say: “from His will”. But His will is part of His consciousness – a directive instance of His consciousness, as it were – so we can say “from part of an instance of His Consciousness” i.e. fractionalization, remembering that any part of His Consciousness or Will, must also be a will or consciousness. Linguistically, the Arabic word ‘min’ can mean part of something. For example, in the Quran it is stated that we are created “from a despised fluid”<sup>94</sup>, that is, the seminal fluid.

---

92. Averroes (Ibn Rushd), (2001), Najjar, Ibrahim (Translator), *Faith and Reason in Islam: Averroes’ Exposition of Religious Arguments*, p. 127.

93. See 58:6, 72:28 - 29.

94. Quran 76:2.

## The Quran and Life after Life

However, we know that we are not created from this fluid but from that which is a component of it, i.e. the male germ cell, which forms part of the equation, the other being the ovaries. The word “from” (*min* in Arabic) then means taking from a larger whole, in this context. Consequentially, *from* His Ruh means from His command and from His command means from His thought and will. The Ruh is the thought of God and command simultaneously, and the thought is to create another will *within* the Will *and to continuously sustain that will*, once created, since it is part of objectless space, which is everlasting, and only needs the desire of God to have it exist in various forms and venues.

### What exactly happens upon death: The physics of it all

It is being claimed in this book that a ‘second body’ arises in relation to our current carbon-based body upon which we are focused, when we die, and that life continues with this ‘new body.’ What is the nature of that resurrection that we can gather from our knowledge of the universe, based on microbits? And is there evidence for all of this, in the Quran? The following verse actually depicts the development of the secondary subtle body:

We have decreed death to you all and We will not be hindered from replacing (*nubaddila*) your likenesses (*amthaalakum*) and bringing you into a new beginning (*nunshiakum*) in what you know not? (56:61)

What we have translated here as *nubaddila amthaalakum* is the most accurate meaning of these words. The root of the word *nubaddila* is *naaba*, which means: to supply in the place of another. This passage then is not saying that God will change your form, or even *change* your likenesses, be that as it may.

## From Microbits to Everything

What is being revealed here is that that which is a likeness of you (a *simulacrum*) will be a product of the continuation of your consciousness plus the new microbitic body that emerges after the destruction of the old body. In other words, your consciousness will automatically, whilst in the continuum of consciousness, become focused into another replica that identifiably has some of one's original physical characteristics, but is not the same, by exiting your consciousness into a new form that you do not even know about. One is therefore re-forming anew, in what one knows not not, denoted by the Arabic word: *nunashiakum*. *Nunshiakum*, is used many times in the Quran as meaning bringing something into being that did not exist, and conveys the idea of *growing and forming* as part of that bringing into being (i.e. new formation). In fact, in the same chapter it is used both after and before the above-cited verse 56:61, namely, in 56:35 and also in 56:72. In verse 70:41 it is stated that:

So I swear by the Lord of all risings and settings, that indeed We are able to replace them with better than them; and We are not to be outdone.

It is interesting to note is that rising and setting refers to that which already exists, but is a relational matter: When the sun rises, it is due to your perception of the location of the sun, as you are rotated about the earth. Like the sun, our consciousness does not vanish. It rises as a result of the utilization of microbits. This shall soon be further explored. In 70:41, the word *nubaddila* for replace is used, which shows that this word definitely means replacement. In part of 47:38 of the Quran, where God is criticising those who are very selfish in their use of money, the word *amthalakum* is used, showing that this word indeed means that which is like, but not identical, in this case the likeness referring to the pattern of behavior rather



## The Quran and Life after Life

than physical form:

And if you turn away, He will replace you (*yastabdi*) with another people; then they will not be the likes of you (*amthaalakum*).

Our brain comprises neurons. It has been realized increasingly that the human will can control the firing of neurons to such an extent that even in clinical cases, where a person has a pathological condition of the brain, patients can be retrained to use other pathways circumventing the dysfunctional area and thereby gaining use of physical locomotion that had been hampered by the damaged region. Neuroscientists Jeffrey Schwartz and Sharon Bagley, after being involved extensively in clinical observations, have concluded that “neuroplasticity and power of the mind” can indeed exert a force to shape the brain.<sup>95</sup> When one decides to focus on something we see the usage of the brain associated (controlling and processing signals to) that activity. The will controls the molecules, atoms and electrons, and hence, various aspects of the brain; it is indeed a form of internal telekinesis. This, of course, is in contradistinction to the dominant interpretation of classical physics which upholds a materialistic basis, where there is no top-down control – there is no mind controlling the processes. We shall quote at length, Henry Stapp, a leading quantum physicist who has spent years researching the implication of physics to the question of consciousness. He has this to say about the issue:

---

95. Schwartz, Jeffrey M., and Bagley, Sharon, (2005), *The Mind and the Brain: Neuroplasticity and the Power of Mental Force*, p. 375.

## From Microbits to Everything

The core ideas of the arguments in favor of an identity-emergent theory of mind and consciousness are illustrated by Roger Sperry's example of a "wheel." (Sperry 1992) A wheel obviously does something: it is causally efficacious; it carries the cart. It is also an *emergent property*: there is no mention of "wheelness" in the formulation of the laws of physics, and "wheelness" did not exist in the early universe; "wheelness" *emerges* only under certain special conditions. And the macroscopic wheel exercises "top-down" control of its tiny parts. All these properties are perfectly in line with classical physics, and with the idea that "a wheel is, precisely, a structure constructed out of its tiny atomic parts." So why not suppose mind and consciousness to be, like "wheelness", emergent properties of their classically conceived tiny physical parts?

The reason that mind and consciousness are not analogous to "wheelness", within the context of classical physics, is that the properties that characterize "wheelness" are properties that are *entailed*, within the conceptual framework of classical physics, by properties specified in classical physics, whereas the properties that characterize conscious mental processes, namely the various ways these processes feel, are not *entailed*, within the conceptual structure provided by classical physics, by the properties specified by classical physics.

That is the huge difference-in-principle that distinguishes mind and consciousness from things that, according to classical physics, are constructible out of the particles that are postulated to exist by classical physics.

## The Quran and Life after Life

Given the state of motion of each of the tiny physical parts of a wheel, as it is conceived of in classical physics, the properties that characterize the wheel - e.g., its roundness, radius, center point, rate of rotation, etc., - are specified within the conceptual framework provided by the principles of classical physics, which specify only geometric-type properties such as changing locations and shapes of conglomerations of particles, and numbers assigned to points in space. But given the state of motion of each tiny part of the brain, as it is conceived of in classical physics, the properties that characterize the stream of consciousness – the painfulness of the pain, the feeling of the anguish, or of the sorrow, or of the joy – are not specified, within the conceptual framework provided by the principles of classical physics. Thus it is possible, within that classical physics framework, to strip away those feelings without disturbing the physical descriptions of the motions of the tiny parts. One can, within the conceptual framework of classical physics, take away the consciousness while leaving intact the properties that enter into that theoretical construct, namely the locations and motions of the tiny physical parts of the brain and its physical environment. But one cannot, within the conceptual framework provided by classical physics, take away the physical characteristics that define the “wheelness” of a wheel without affecting the locations and motions of the tiny physical parts of the wheel.

Because one can, within the conceptual framework provided by classical physics, strip away mind and consciousness without affecting the physical behavior, one cannot rationally claim, *within that framework*, that mind and consciousness are the

## From Microbits to Everything

*causes* of the physical behavior, or are *causally efficacious* in the physical world.

Thus the “identity theory” or “emergent property” strategy fails in its attempt to make mind and consciousness efficacious, insofar as one remains strictly within the conceptual framework provided by classical physics. Moreover, the whole endeavor to base brain theory on classical physics is undermined by the fact that classical theory is unable to account for behavioural properties (such as electrical and thermal conductivity, and elasticity, etc.) that depend sensitively upon the behavior of the atomic, molecular, and ionic constituents of a system, and brains are certainly systems of this kind, as will be discussed in detail later.<sup>96</sup>

Seeing that ‘classical physics’ cannot explain the phenomena, Stapp and his colleagues have resorted to quantum mechanics.

### Telemorphogenesis

Major problems exist in the dualist, emergent and materialist positions, that cannot be resolved by the ‘quantum mechanical approach’, since it still deals with particles and they have a location in space, subject to the Physicalist Trap, as discussed on page 164-169.

Wherein lies the solution, then, and how do we tackle whether, and if so, how consciousness exists after death? Essentially what happens is that when we die, our will does not die but, being sustained as a command of

---

96. Stapp, Henry P., (2004), *Mind, Matter and Quantum Mechanics*, pp. 236-237.

## The Quran and Life after Life

God, which it always is, focuses on ambient microbits in space and forms a new body. The will-based control of particles to alter the shape that form this new 'form' is what we shall now refer to as: *telemorphogenesis*. We are indeed brought into being in that which we do not know through a *telemorphic* process. Our likeness is thus substituted for the old body in this process, or, in other words, our body is replaced by that which is like the old one. After this process, the angels take over and 'escort' this new form; of course the self or *nafs* is now using this new microbitic body. For those who are on the right side of God, they will depart from their now obsolete dead bodies gladly, but for others who have transgressed beyond bounds in their conduct, they will not want to leave and will, in futility, resist departure, as they know the dread that is in store (see the Quran 6:93)! The human will would serve as a cohesive force and an attractor for these smaller particles, just as the will utilizes the carbon-based brain in various ways, which then leads to the usage of our limbs etc. In both the utilization of the biofluidic luminal and the newly evolved biofluidic superluminal body, there is an independent will that is a fractionalization of objectless space (the Mind of God). That *same will* uses different bodies.

This process is captured by Prophet Abraham's request to God to show him how the dead are brought to life (Quran 2:260). Now obviously, humans did not have computers around 4,000 B.C. in Sumeria and God could not tell Prophet Abraham to plug-in a simulation CD based on Java programming in the D-Drive to see what exactly happens to the body when a person dies. He was, instead given an analogical simulation in 3D; he was told to take four birds, train them to respond to him and place them on separate hills. Then he was instructed to call them in some unspecified manner as per their initial training; they came flying back to him, in convergence; they were subservient to Abraham's will. Similarly, a group of microbit particles (analogous to birds) will be brought together and

## From Microbits to Everything

will be co-joined much as the gases and dust particles coalesced to form the sun. Interestingly enough, another analogy is used in the Quran which, though it does not capture the simulative aspects of the formation of the 'new body' after death, does convey the fact that there is a conservation of matter and energy, or essentially particles. This is combustion. In the Quran, in verse 36:79, those who are skeptical of life after death are told that God will indeed raise create life because of His knowledge of every creation and immediately after this, it is stated that:

He is the one who has made fire for you, from the green tree and then from it you ignite. (36:80)

Now in combustion, there is chemical transformation occurring, as well as energy conservation. No particles are lost. They are only dispersed within space. So this verse conveys the concepts of both conservation of particles and dispersion. The analogy of the birds, however, conveys will-based control (commands), automaticity and convergence from particles in a dispersed state. This together with the third analogous concept of *unfolding* from the potentialities present in the seed, gives us an unprecedented view of the details of the mechanism of the seamless continuation after death:

And of His signs is that you see the earth stilled, but when We send rain upon it, it quivers and grows. Indeed, He who has given it life is the giver of life to the dead. Indeed, He is competent over all things. (41:39)

## The Quran and Life after Life

### Automatic and seamless continuity of consciousness

That there is a seamless continuity of consciousness upon death can also be realized from the Quran itself. Note that in verse 56:61 the word *thumma* (“then”) is not used. The *absence* of this word in the passage is very telling. Usually, whenever the word *thumma* is used in the Quran for a creative process it signifies that one event occurs after another, is not simultaneous and that one process may take a long time before another one follows. The omission of this word implies gaplessness in and continuity of a process, in the sense that there is no gap and that you are not defocused from one body and refocused into another; you are always in focus but your microbitic structure changes. It is simply that the ‘information’ processing rate changes (the GRC changes) and concomitantly so does the ‘scenery’, since your consciousness lies as a fractionalized entity within the overarching mind of God, that He chooses to keep activated.. If you were on a very slow moving car, then got off and entered into a faster moving train, you would retain all your memories and experiences and notion of self in a seamless continuity. However, there would be a demarcation of the change of the type of experiences you would perceive from the point at which you transferred onto the train. When we die, we lose use of our body and for that instant become bodiless, and for a very brief period remain as a fractionalization in the mind of God without a microbitic body. There is therefore some type of individual awareness but it is not the normal awareness of self. From this position, as a fractionalized component within objectless space, we are almost instantly given to reassert our will and shape another body out of the ambient microbits. We cannot choose any type of body or form as these microbits follow rules (i.e. remember that the birds come together in a rule based manner as they are trained by Abraham) and we are, likewise, impelled to form a body

## From Microbits to Everything

which is similar, though without any imperfections to our earthly body, hence the term “replace their likenesses” in 56:61, in the Quran.

The next life, which is not visible to us cognitively because of our speed of information processing due to our heavy microbitic body is not limited to light speed ( $c$ ). It will, of course, take a bit of time for the individual to acclimatize to the new environment, because the individual is in a totally new surrounding. It would initially be analogous to a newborn baby in a totally new vista than the pre-natal environment.

### The mechanics of life after this life

We have described, most probably for the first time, to our knowledge, *exactly* what occurs after death in terms of the *detailed mechanism* based on a new physics in a manner that corresponds with verses from the Quran. Let us now get an overview from birth to death, and move beyond immediate death, to see what happens to the individual consciousness, or the journey of what in so-called religious terms has been termed the soul. What then is the soul, according to the Quran and our analysis using physics? It is a command from the Sustainer as it is stated in the Quran, in which the fractionalized will has an existence without any form. It is given ‘a number’ by God, and is singled out for uniqueness of personality. Now, initially, this will or soul does not have a completely mature body when it is still in the embryological phase, but is aware and has consciousness as being a separate will within the will of God. What has happened is that this will has become transfocused to a community of particles as the body, during embryological development. This body becomes an amenable receptacle to the intelligence that is the property of objectless space. God focuses will  $x$  to body  $x^f$  and will  $y$  (another ‘soul’) to body  $y^f$ . *The focus is automatic because*



## The Quran and Life after Life

*space has the property of Absolute Consciousness (of God) which is grabbed, as it were, by the complex body that has arisen – what we call biological life.* Through body  $x^1$ ,  $x$  observes things and indeed commands the movement of  $x^1$ .  $x$  accumulates experience etc. and develops memories and a further distinction in personality. Now when  $x^1$  becomes unoperational,  $x$  must 'leave' the body and is re-transfused in a seamless continuum to the substitute 'body'  $x^2$  discussed in the previous section. Now  $x$  is connected to  $x^2$ .  $x^2$  continues to exist in the parallel universe of hell or paradise until the entire universe, including the parallel universe of hell and paradise is destroyed. Nothing remains of these universes except the Face of God. God then re-creates a second universe from the memory of the last one, where He, God, remembers everything of that first universe, down to the motion of every microbit. He evolves this second universe out of the previous one's record. All the numbers (entites) are recalled and  $x$  is transfused into a third body  $x^3$ , to live forever in a reconstitution of the same paradise and in the company of the Creator or, temporarily, in a hellish existence until the time of punishment has been served, after which that entity that deserved such punishment is finally granted paradise. It must be realized that this whole process is necessary if God is to create entities that are like Him, to the extent that He has maximized the simulation of free will given the constraint that He, being so powerful and omnipresent, cannot create outside His self. Also note that the fractionalization of objectless space which we call  $x$  (your self or *nafs* in Arabic) lives on forever, through different bodies, finally settling into body  $x^3$ , based on the physics associated with the fusion of objectless space with the re-patterning of microbits in the various functional forms we call bodies. All that changes is the scenery. You were therefore built to live into eternity; you will inherit paradise immediately, if you follow God's laws and establish truth, peace and

## From Microbits to Everything

justice for all mankind and nature, and this is why you should not fear or grieve. In other words, you will be at peace, and at home, in the panoply of existential continuum.

So it is that when we die and exit from our visible body, we leave with the notion of self and all memories, as there is in reality no death, but only a continuance and transference. The brain is simply there for movement as a switch gear for the five senses, helping us experience pain and pleasure and signaled mechanical movement. You are the driver, the body is the bus. We develop our self through the body and, after death, through another body. We witness through our bodies, and God Witnesses things both through us and globally, since He is the Imaginator of all that exists:

Indeed, He comprehends all vision, but vision cannot comprehend Him.<sup>97</sup>

In the following passages, the process of life after death is described, as depicted in the Quran:

1. He (god) is omnipotent over His servants; He sends guardians over you until when death comes to one of you, our messengers receive him, and they do not neglect (anything). Then they are restored unto God, their sustainer, the just. (6:61 – 62).
2. You are taken to a place in this universe (where that could be is anybody's guess and is inconsequential, because of your concomitant non-interactability with the visible living) and your perception of time and space is obviously not that

---

97. Quran 6:103.

## The Quran and Life after Life

of the normal person who has not died, because, for one thing, you do not have a body made of heavy microbits (i.e. carbon-based) anymore. You are literally in a different form. At this stage, we are at one of the levels of the Angelic microbitic density and an increased GRC and this is why we can see Angels when we die, according to the Hadiths (sayings of the Prophet) and also why the living cannot see the dead. The individual, as a pattern of interacting microbits with the soul (i.e. the translocation of your consciousness in your body) continues to exist in a parallel universe of paradise or hell, co-existent with this visible heavy microbitic universe, until the entire system, including paradise and hell, are destroyed and a new universe is made to spring up. The new universe of paradise and hell, is created of the same type as the parallel paradise and hell existent right now, minus the overlaid current heavy particle based universe comprised of electrons, atoms etc. (14:48):

And the Day when we shall roll up the universe like a scroll rolled up for books – as We began the first creation, We shall repeat it; a promise binding on Us. Truly, We shall do it. (21:104)

Note that the universe's final destruction is compared to a scroll most aptly because it contains information to be re-displayed in another form when the scroll is re-opened. One can envision a second Big-Bang from which the universe is re-created by microbits that re-establishes the heaven and hell that existed in Universe 1, with no heavy universe component.

## From Microbits to Everything

3. As far as the rest of the world is concerned, someone who has died might as well be in another dimension because when you die there is now a *barrier* between you and them (see Quran 23:100). You exist, yet you cannot communicate with them in any physical manner and they cannot see you, hear you, feel you or touch you; and neither can you interact in any such a manner (unless willed by God, which is not generally the rule).

There is no mention in the Quran and Hadiths of any *ghosts existing in the sense of communicating with you or being seeable*, as is so popularly held in Western and many Eastern societies and as popularized in ghost stories in various novels, movies etc. And there is absolutely no re-incarnation. The angels will take the lives of those who are in a pure state, saying: “Peace be upon you. Enter paradise, because of what you used to do.”<sup>98</sup>

In the oft read Chapter “Ya Sin” it is most clearly stated that the person who was preaching the Oneness of God to his people, who were rejecting him was killed; however, he was immediately granted paradise. Thereafter, his tribe was destroyed with a cataclysm (likely a volcanic eruption), *proving that his ‘time’ in paradise was not after the day of judgment, but before*. In other words, there is the first paradise that exists in parallel to this universe. Here is that passage:

“Verily, in the Sustainer of you all have I come to believe: listen, then, to me!” [He then died] and he was told: “Enter paradise

---

98. 16:32

## The Quran and Life after Life

(*jannat*) !” He exclaimed: “Would that my people [still on earth] knew how my Sustainer has forgiven me, and has placed me among the honoured ones [i.e. others already in paradise]!”

And no host out of heaven did We send down against his people, nor did We need to send down any: nothing was (needed) but one single blast and lo! They became as silent as ashes. (36:25-29)

Those who are evil, are placed in hell almost immediately after death:

Those whom the angels will carry off while doing wrong to themselves, will offer submission, saying: “We did not commit evil” (The angels will reply): “Yes! Truly, God is the All-Knower of what you used to do. So enter the gates of Hell: there you shall abide...”<sup>99</sup>

In addition, Hell exists now as this verse clearly exhibits, since it is stated that there are some who will experience the suffering of hell soon after they die:

If you could only see the wicked in their death agonies, as the angels stretch out their hands [to them] saying, ‘Give up your souls. *Today* you will be repaid with humiliating punishment for saying false things about God, and for arrogantly rejecting His revelations.’”(6:93)

Hence the hellish or paradisiacal state commences as soon as we die.

---

99. Here, in 16:28, no mention is made of a lag between death and life in the hereafter.

## From Microbits to Everything

There may be a questioning period for some people before one is placed into hell or paradise that is akin to a parallel universe within our universe. However, this questioning, which many will experience, varies in terms of duration. Most Muslims have taken the erroneous view that the period of the grave lasts until the day of judgment, when the whole universe is destroyed because they have not analysed the whole Quran in terms of this question and have only looked at particular Hadiths, each of which provides a snapshot of the whole process. In addition, the Hadiths in which are stated that both the good and the bad will be in their 'graves' until judgment day, contradict the Quran and even many other Hadiths. In fact, those Hadiths which, in fact speak of those who have departed from this world as being in the "grave" until the day of judgment that blatantly contradict the Quran must be rejected, following the rule that the Quran takes precedence over Hadiths (sayings of the Prophet), as many of these Hadiths may be inaccurate and falsely reported.

In Chapter 22, verse 7, when it states that: "And that the Last Hour is bound to come, beyond any doubt, and that God will resurrect all those who are in their graves" refers to the fact that the whole universe and the earth will be destroyed and that God will create a new universe and earth from the memory of this earth, and the redevelopment of life in the second universe will be from the memory of the previous earth (and universe) which resides in the mind and imagination of God. All of those who had been created in the first Universe/Earth plus the co-existent first Paradise and Hell will, as it were, will be raised as entities from His memory, as it cannot literally mean graves because the universe would not exist! Note that the root meaning of grave (*kabr*) is to 'inter' or put into, which is essentially storage.

There is a Hadith narrated by Abu Hurayrah from the Prophet Muhammed in which it says that the angels seize the soul of the believing

## The Quran and Life after Life

slave and take it up to the heavens, and the angels say, “How good is the soul which you have brought from the earth,” then they bring it to meet the souls of the believers [who are already in paradise], and they rejoice over it more than anyone of you does when an absent loved one returns. They [the people in paradise] ask him, what happened to so and so? But they [the angels] say, “Leave him alone, for he was facing the distress of the world.” He [the person brought by the angels] says, “But he died, did he not come to meet you?” Then they [the angels] say, “He has gone to his home in *Al-Haawiyah* (the pit of Hell).” So the soul of the believer meets the souls of other believers already in Paradise.<sup>100</sup> The summary of this Hadith is: when a person dies (call him ‘Tom’), he is taken to paradise to meet other believers. The people in paradise ask him about another mutual friend (‘Harry’). Tom thinks that Harry is also in paradise but the angels inform these dwellers of paradise that Harry has been cast into hell. It must be noted that in this Hadith, when it states that the angel takes the soul up to paradise from the earth, it cannot be referring to the soul being brought from Doomsday to the Day of Judgment, because of the simple fact that everything gets destroyed and re-created again on Doomsday (*yaum al-qiyaamat*) – there are no angels, earth, or human souls to conduct the transportation or courier business of carrying souls! Therefore, this Hadith pertains to pre-doomsday matters and is only one of the Hadiths that shows that people already exist in paradise.

In addition, note the existence of paradise and hell in the *miraaj* of the Prophet where the Prophet actually saw paradise and hell; he also conversed with some of the long departed prophets. This event was not a vision, but a concrete actuality. For example, see Quran 53:14-17, where

---

100. Nasaa’i, *Kitaab al-Janaa’iz*, Baab ma yalqa al-Mu’min min al Karaamah inda Khurooj nafsibi, 4/8.

## From Microbits to Everything

the “Garden of Abode” exists in *this* universe, as the Prophet Muhammed, on his Night Journey, traveled to a ‘lote-tree’ near this region. Also refer to the related Hadith on this: *Sahih Al-Bukhari*, Vol. 4, Hadith No. 429.

According to what we have now discovered, with respect to microbits, we can say that it was not Prophet Muhammed’s grosser (heavy microbitic) body that visited these regions in our universe but the subtler body. Thus, if one entered the room, one would still see the body of the Prophet, sustained in its biological functioning, but his mind/consciousness would have left his carbon-based body in his second lighter microbit composed body, to visit these various regions, simply by the will of God who transfocates all wills, where and as He pleases.

There is one Quranic passage which has been erroneously understood to refer to the punishment of the grave until judgment day:

...While an evil torment encompassed the Pharaoh’s people, the Fire; they are exposed to it, morning and afternoon. The day the hour is proclaimed: Admit the people of Pharaoh to the severest punishment. (40:45-46)

What is the severe punishment that the people of Pharaoh receive; it is indeed the actual Fire of Hell, not simply a *vision* of the Fire, as proponents of the “punishment in the grave” believe. They are exposed to the fire in the sense that they are physically before it and actually experience it as existing in front of them, before they are cast therein. All that the subsequent verse is saying is that at a particular time, that is, “The day the hour is proclaimed”, they will be thrown into the fire. In the case of the followers of the Pharaoh, they died and were placed in Hell, where they are shown the actual fire repetitively before being dumped into it, on a certain ‘day’. Being exposed to the fire or being brought before it in the passage above is



## The Quran and Life after Life

denoted by the word '*yuardbuna*'. There are many verses that speak of this proximity before something, using the same word. For example, such verses speak of being before the fire, before being dumped into that very fire, or being before God on Judgment Day. (Refer to the following Quranic passages of the actuality of fire in front of the hell incarcerated, employing *yuardbuna*, rather than the word denoting merely a vision of it: 42:45; 46:20; 46:34; 11:18; 18:48; 36:32 and 36:53). The main point is that it is not an image/vision or dream of the actual fire but the fire itself before one's eyes.

We have seen that from the evidence at hand that *heaven and hell therefore exist as parallel universes embedded within our visible universe*. However, they are made of such small particles, so close in size to the smallest unitary particle out of which all particles have been made, that they are not visible to us by any of our senses, unless the Creator makes a special exception, as in the case of the Prophet Muhammed. In the Quran, reference is made about the barrier (*barzakab*), as discussed above. It is interesting to note that *barzakab* is spoken of, in the context of two saltwater seas that do not intermix (without conversion across the barrier), as has recently been discovered, such as the Mediterranean Sea and Atlantic Ocean, each of which have distinct properties. Their respective densities are different, yielding a barrier of 'surface tension'. Similarly, the properties of matter/energy are different between the visible universe and that which co-exists with this one (paradise and hell), as the latter are on a level of matter/energy that is of a lesser density and particle size. This barrier for us is, therefore, cognitive (the nature of hardwiring of our nervous system), due to the nature of the particles out of which this other world is made, in this case, the wide gulf between the sizes, speeds and densities of particles of the next world. At the same time, the issue arises as to why the inhabitants of the other world cannot see us, for we are made of larger particles and are more densely

## From Microbits to Everything

constructed. The reason for this is also due to the nature of the hardwiring of the cognitive apparatus of individuals in the next life: for instance, we may see or hear, or not see or not hear something, in this life, because our brains are not hardwired for seeing or hearing certain things or frequencies. The barrier is like an opaque wall: Those on the inside cannot look outside, and those on the outside cannot look inside. As a result of complete non-interaction in this way, it is truly a two-way opaque sensory barrier. The difference between the barrier in the oceans, and the barrier that separates the living from the departed, is that in the oceans, the flow of the type of water (without conversion) does not occur from A (one ocean) to B (the other ocean) whereas in the barrier spoken of in connection with death, the *information* flow does not occur between A (the living) and B (the dead) as signals from each 'zone' cannot be processed or registered and the particles are non-interactable. It is erroneous then, to state that after we die we are *in* the state of the (barrier), since we are not in the barrier per se; the barrier is, however, a cognitive one based on the hardwiring of the brain and particle arrangement causing the living and the departed to remain disconnected, until we eventually join them. It is truly a parallel universe. However, it must be stressed that there are no other dimensions: only microbits in absolute space that produce these two systems of life and the afterlife, that is, the life that exists immediately after death.

In summary, this is the process of life after this life:

1. The self-consciousness that man has been infused with was created as the body was developing in the womb and has had some type of communication with God before such infusion: "And when your Sustainer brought forth from the children of Adam, from their loins, their offspring, and asked them to bear witness about themselves [asking]:

## The Quran and Life after Life

‘Am I not your Sustainer?’ – to which they answered: ‘Yes, indeed, we do bear witness!’” (7:172)

2. Taste death in this life. This is death No. 1. (see verse 6:61- 62)
3. Transfer of the conscious self into the subtle body. The soul (now re-transfocated in the subtler body)soul, is received the Guardian Angels at death, as is stated in the Quran (6:61-62). This reception is in the form of a cohesive set of microbits that forms a new physique. Just prior to this re-transfocating, we are literally bodiless for an instant, and this is what is meant when it is stated that we are “brought back” to our Sustainer:

“...the Angel of Death who has been given charge of you, will take you, and then unto your Sustainer you will be brought back.” (32:10,11)

Regarding *barzakh* (the barrier) it is stated that: “...behind those there is a barrier until the Day when they will be raised.” (23:100)

4. The Universe is destroyed – everything is destroyed – including the ‘soul’. Everything, then, is regenerated because it is all in the mind of the Creator. We stand before God on Judgment Day.
5. At the end of the day, there is no more death – there is

## From Microbits to Everything

everlasting life in a new universe of paradise and a purgatorial type of hell: the death of Death!

Analysing the Quran in these terms (that is, stages 1 to 5) we see that, for example, in some passages, only a few of these stages are mentioned, but by looking at most of the main verses in the Quran on this subject, we can get the whole picture. Here is another passage:

Then He makes the Path easy for him. Then He causes him to die [become still: root of the word *maut*], and puts him in his grave [storage]. Then, whenever it is His will, He shall unfold him (*ansharahu*). (80:20-22)

A human being who dies, or more accurately speaking, whose body dies, that is, because the consciousness does not die, will be placed in paradise or hell soon thereafter, as shown previously, or will remain in relative dormancy under the physical control or restraint of the angels for a duration until he or she is cast into either of these domains. The above-referenced verse reinforces this point, as it does not speak of being raised on the day of judgment. In contrast, the verse explains that the raising unto a new life would be at the appropriate time, and could be *before* judgment day, due to the usage of the word “whenever” it is His will (*idha shaa-aa*). This is similar to verse 42:29 which speaks of God gathering together humans and extraterrestrials whenever He wills (*idha yashaa-u*). In other words, God does *not* say: “Then, on the day of judgment, He will raise him.”

Furthermore, in the above passage, most translators translate the last sentence as being: “He shall bring him back to life, or raise him.” This however, implies that the person is non-existent and then God makes that person exist again. This interpretation is not accurate, however, for it

## The Quran and Life after Life

would contradict other passages which clearly state that the human being does not really die, but continues life in paradise or hell as soon as he or she ‘passes away’. In 43:11, the same basic word is used, when God “raises (*ansharnaa*) therewith the dead land” by sending rain. Now obviously the vegetation that grows on such dead land does not sprout out of empty soil. Seeds already exist, ready for sprouting: they are there, latent and are existent for the *unfolding* into new forms, which is the basic meaning of the word as it occurs in verse 81:10: “And when the scrolls [record of deeds] will be unfolded (*nushirat*)”. Similarly, our consciousness (*nafs*) exists as a seed after we die, ready for the new life and unimaginable growth, whereby God rejuvenates and makes us grow into that new life, just as dormant seeds are activated and grow by rainwater that God sends from the clouds. This is depicted clearly in the Quran, where the same word is used for ‘raising’:

And He it is who sends down, again and again, waters from the sky in due measure: and We raise [re-activate, rejuvenate] therewith dead land [i.e. dry earth, when the water interacts with the foliage’s seeds]; likewise will you be brought forth.  
(43:11)

This new life is activated in our new bodies. Being in a grave does not necessarily mean that we are dead in the sense of being non-existent; rather it is a relative term in that it connotes, for example, that compared to the opportunities and possibilities open to a butterfly, the pre-butterfly stage in a cocoon is akin to being interred or buried in a grave-like structure until the creature emerges and has a new life. Another analogy is that of someone who is carrying a packet of seeds; they are not activated and do not grow until they are planted in fertile soil. Similarly, when we die (one of the root meanings in Arabic for death (*maata*) is ‘stillness’), our

## From Microbits to Everything

consciousness, though it exists, must be planted, in the new environment for activation and growth. Consequentially, in the transition phase, when our conscious self is extracted from our bodies under the supervision of the adroitly punctual angels responsible for this task, we exist and are conscious, yet need to be released by being placed in the ‘new environment’ of paradise to continue our journey into infinity. There is no barrier (*barzakh*) either to enter paradise or to be placed in hell by the Creator. The barrier is only between this life and the next. That is why it says that “*behind* them” is a barrier for they cannot return to *this* life, nor communicate with the living of this life. There is no barrier to move on *forward* to the new environment after death:

...behind those [who leave this world] there is a barrier until the Day when they will be raised. (23:100)

### Deeper meanings of the words ‘death and ‘grave’

It must be remembered that the word death, in the Quran, is also used to mean the covering that people put on themselves cognitively so that they do not see the truth. If they do not see the truth, it is as if they are dead because they are unresponsive, as it is explained in the following passage in the Quran:

Certainly, you cannot make the dead hear...” (27:80)

Consequently, the blockage of this information can exist:

1. If we are selectively filtering information and therefore do

## The Quran and Life after Life

not see the truth. Cognitive filtering is given by the following passage: “We are best aware what they hear with when they listen to you ...” (17:47).

2. If there is no sensory input from this world to those who have just died. Verse (27:80) can also be applied to this aspect of not hearing.
3. Non-existence, as when everything is destroyed and God re-creates us once again from His ‘memory’ as in Quran. See 22:7.

So we can see that the words death and grave in the Quran, do not necessarily mean being placed physically in a grave, or that your soul will be confined in a physical structure called a grave until the day of judgment. These words pertain firstly, to cognitive blockage associated with the barrier (*barzakab*) and secondly, to the fact that initially, a period exists when we are not yet planted, as it were, in the new environment of the new life for activation and growth, or to put it in more ‘classical’ terms, keeping in mind how we have defined terms in this book, for the evolution of your soul.

### Further proof of a parallel Universe of Paradise and Hell

It is written in the Quran then, that one day the entire system will be destroyed and nothing will remain except the face of God:

And invoke not any other deity along with God – none has the

## From Microbits to Everything

right to be worshiped but He. Everything will perish except His Face. His is the Decision, and to Him you (all) shall be returned. (28:88)

According to this view, we must be made to die twice: once when we die the earthly death, and the second time when the entire universe is destroyed and only God remains, when we are in the mind of God. However, is there such a statement in the Quran? Amazingly, there is:

They [those who cover the truth] will say: “Our Lord! You have made us die (stilled us) twice and you have given us life twice. (40:11)

What are these two deaths?

1. The first is our earthly death. However, this is not really death but a death of part of “us”, specifically our body and our old, slower GRC. That is why it is characterized, in the Quran, as “every soul/self *tastes* death”<sup>101</sup>, since the soul or self never dies but only experiences a moment called death – the death of the body, or the relative stillness of the body. This is not really death but transformation to a new type of life in a new body.
2. When the universe and everything in it (including your mind/soul that exists, after your earthly death) perishes.
- 3.

---

101. Quran 3:185; 21:35; 29:57



## The Quran and Life after Life

Since God made us die the first time, it means that we must have been alive, so this cannot refer to the state of life *before* our birth, as many scholars assume. It can only refer to death *after* conception of the carbon-based body. Similarly, when the whole universe is destroyed you are ‘there’ in the mind of God, because you had once been and are simply ‘refractionalized’ and raised to a high GRC. In summation, God raises us twice when:

1. When we are raised from our earthly ‘death’ to a higher GRC.
2. When we are re-created on judgment day from the mind of God, from His memory, through a recreation of a new type of heavens and earth: heaven and hell, because everything perishes and is *re-issued* anew. Here we are raised from zero GRC (existence as a memory in God’s mind, with no microbitic body) to a very high GRC in the new microbitic body form.

Note that the people mentioned in 40:11 are in hell *after* the universe perishes and are commenting about the two deaths that they have experienced as discussed above, in point number 2.

It is crucial to note that the word for death means the stillness of something from its prior functional capacity, or its relative stillness with respect to its post functional capacity. This word is *al-maut* in Arabic, and is used extensively in the Quran in different forms, based on root letters. For example, in the Quran, it is stated that:

How can you refuse to acknowledge God, seeing that you were dead (*am waatan*) and He gave you life, and that He will cause

## From Microbits to Everything

you to die and then will bring you back to life, then you will be brought back unto Him. (2:28)

To get the *core* meaning, the verse can be translated as follows, with our understanding of the words “death” and “life”:

How can you refuse to acknowledge God, seeing that you were *not activational* and He made you *activational*, and that He will cause you to become *less activational* and then *more activational*, then you will be brought back to Him.(2:28)

This verse is concerned with the creation of life, the carbon-based body, from non-existence and then the death of the body, though one’s consciousness continues to exist at a higher GRC, which is referred to as ‘bringing back to life’. God does not speak of the third death here (the death or non-existence we face just before the Day of Judgment when everything perishes except the face of God).

Many Quranic Quran translations give the reader the wrong perception that there is only one death. For example in Yusuf Ali’s translation, among others, it states:

“Is it the case that we shall not die, except our first death, and that we shall not be punished?” (37:58, 59)

This verse, however, uses the words *illaa mawtatanal-unlaa* means the previous, not the ‘first’. Hence the translation should read:

“Is it the case that we shall not die, except our *previous* death, and that we shall not be punished?”(37:58, 59)

## The Quran and Life after Life

### Coma, unconsciousness and non-REM sleep

The interesting question which arises is: what happens when one is in a coma or under anaesthesia. Those who have general anaesthesia usually do not recall any thoughts occurring during the state of unconsciousness. But if there is a thing such as the 'soul' which has a sort of an independence from the body, why then are we not conscious when we are in a coma, when we are 'unconscious' or during the state of anaesthesia? In order to answer this question, we need to draw upon an analogy: If one is in or near a library, three basic states may exist. The first is one where we have access to books and read them; the second is one where we cannot access the books because the library is closed; the third is where we check-out the books. The first case is where our 'soul' or *ruh* is within our body and is interacting with the library, or our brain, where our brain is a portal to objectless space, the place where the property of consciousness ultimately resides. The second case is when we are in a coma or unconscious, where our hardware/brain is not accessible to the software, or, the consciousness that is present in objectless space, since the portal is blocked. Even the normal sense of 'self' is gone, because the normal sense of self arises from a body and location in absolute space. In other words, only the dormant self prevails, as sustained by the transfoculation. This self becomes activational upon the particularized interaction microbits (the body). It is as if the soul is non-existent, though in actuality it is still there. It is just that the books in the library cannot be accessed! It is now known that the biophotons that operate through the microtubules in the brain, play a vital role in consciousness and that certain chemicals, given for producing unconsciousness, block the distribution of this information processing that normally occurs through the biologically facilitated movement of light<sup>102</sup> (which is slowly coming close to the GRC concepts of our processing for consciousness requiring the

## From Microbits to Everything

biofluidic motion of light). In the last case, however, in our library analogy, that is, checking the books out when we die, our transfocused consciousness leaves our grosser body, now being transfocused on a lighter body, constituted of less dense and smaller particles. We retain our memories, as the memory is part and parcel of the transfocused object through the GRC.

### **‘Artificial Intelligence’ and the ‘creation’ of new forms of life**

Finally, one may ask: what are the implications of our views on consciousness and the soul with respect to the issue of artificial intelligence? By the end of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, we may produce walking and talking robots but they will just be tin-headed-dumb-mechanical-contraptions that need to be ultimately programmed by us humans and will not have the human type of simulated free will. Even an organic virus would have more ‘free will’ than such creations! This is because consciousness is a direct result of the fractionalization and translocation of the Consciousness of God into particle based objects that have to be arranged in particular way so that they become a portal to the intelligence in objectless space and this, though it be theoretically possible, is exceedingly difficult to say the least, as the hypothetical ‘man-made’ nervous system has to interact in a precise fashion with objectless space. By ‘precise fashion’, what is meant is that the microbits have to be arranged in a particular way, so as to exhibit and maintain particular speeds of interaction and directions (patterns in absolute space that go up to the speed of light in ‘vacuum’,  $c$ ) that then become, as an integrated whole, forming a set of cohesive subatomic particles,

---

102. Refer to the footnote no. 90., on page 229.

## The Quran and Life after Life

which whole serves as a receptacle to accessing the consciousness that is *already resident* in absolute space. What is needed is a continuum of dynamic and automatic (self-propelled) representation of the outside space by the internal space (mechanisms of the body): *Voila!* The emergence of life and consciousness. As discussed previously, it is crucial to remember that without our embedment in the sea of absolute objectless space wherein the property of intelligence *already* lies and has the potential to be borrowed, as it were, absolutely no arrangement of microbits (subatomic particles) would be able to yield any consciousness whatsoever. Hardware made of silicon, at least in the way it is being currently manipulated, does not exhibit the dynamical properties of such natural nervous systems, or an arrangement of microbits found in animals, down to the lowliest worm. However, if particles from any material were to be arranged with the proper firing patterns (including the binary “on-off” GRC mechanism) and speed of light interaction between the cells so created, then one would create consciousness, be the medium stone, iron, or of something we cannot imagine. In fact, the following verse in the Quran is actually pointing to this possibility:

And they say, “When we are bones and crumbled particles, will we be resurrected as a new creation? Say: Be you stones or iron, or some created thing, you have in mind, which is greater. (17:49 – 51)

In stating that it does not matter whether you are made of stones or iron, etc., what is being said is that *you* (the human being) could be made of those materials and hence be conscious. Now if we were to be made of stone, for example, then it would be possible to construct an entity made of stone and iron and this new entity would automatically become conscious, if structured

## From Microbits to Everything

in the proper way. Achieving the biofluidic speed of light is one requirement. Obviously, it is not the iron atoms that would move at the speed of light, but those particles that would be part and parcel of the matrix of an iron structure would have to be channeled to go at that speed *biofluidically*, just as, for example, human beings are mostly comprised of carbon, hydrogen and oxygen, but have photons associated in the matrix of these elements which gives them consciousness. If life on this earth were to continue for tens of thousands of years, with advancing technology, it is entirely conceivable that the creation of a conscious being would be achieved. Obviously, at the end of the day, it is God who is creating and we are only the manipulators of pre-existing material, where consciousness always remains the property of absolute space from which it is drawn. As such no one creates consciousness itself.

### Stepping outside the ‘Reverse Dream’

We have shown that the universe is made of microbits and that the physical laws all emanate from the intelligent ordering of these microbits in three-space by a singular Intelligence who is not comprised of microbits. A theory of consciousness based on our view is neither scientific nor religious, or, one could say, it is both. When we are dealing with the mind of God no such distinctions exist in the laws at the ultimate level. There is the Creator and the created. The created go through developmental processes all based on microbits – willed and existing by the sustenance of the Creator. The existence of consciousness is again willed and exists by the sustenance of the same Creator as an instantiation and particularized consciousness that only perceives through the created body. The main difference between consciousness and microbits is that microbits, unlike self-consciousness, are

## The Quran and Life after Life

not themselves self-conscious, and they re-cojoined to create the myriad particles and structures in absolute space. Fundamentally, however, we can see that there is no bifurcation normally called spirit and matter, sacred and non-sacred and religious and non-religious, for everything is created, sustained and integrated by and on the same platform of divine objectless space. Such a view of nature, space-time, consciousness and microbits, fosters a view of universe centred on, and created by, a personage of Infinite Intelligence whose inimitably resplendent signs are manifest in every facet of nature. Indeed, this is the one to whom we eventually have to return to, or, indeed, recognize, because He is the Sustainer of, and behind, all forms.

We had discussed dream and reverse dream in connection with the GRC. However, there is another angle to describing this term. Many people often wonder whether we are living in a dream, especially since, when we reflect upon the past, it appears as if it were a dream. This universe is like a dream, but not in the usual sense of a dream; it is a dream that is sustained by the continuum of God's intense creative imagination. We, as fractionalizations of God's will, are witnessing that dream, yet erroneously think that it is *the absolute reality* and not the *imagined-cum-created reality* of the one who is Ever-Wakeful and Ever-Watchful. However, if we were to still our minds to the reflection of God as the generating source of this dream, which we call the universe, we would be able to perceive that we are in a reverse or negative dream. It is a reverse dream because we are witnessing the dream while being still fully awake, and because God is Awake while imagining it. When one reverses the reverse dream, one *realizes* that it is a dream, and that therefore there is, logically speaking, a higher realm of non-dream as a basis which is responsible for generating that very dream. By merely thinking of the word 'reverse dream', one can be instantaneously transported to reflect on the Creator of that reverse

## From Microbits to Everything

dream, as one is able to improve 'seeing through' the veil to the presence of God.

Therefore, we do indeed have the potential to transcend the reverse dream, by re-focusing our attention, by re-directing our face towards the Face of God, because the Face of God is the focus of God and the focus of God is the maintenance of the visage of the universe, through its created laws etc. This re-direction involves stilling ourselves from our daily distractive busyness, so that we can perceive the true nature of our placement within that reverse dream. We do not need a disaster or tragedy to start thinking about these things at this deeper level of understanding: we have to be vigilant towards, work and improve on this awareness all the time, be we in the midst of 'good' or 'bad' times. Proper behaviour, words and actions in which one is conscious of God will help us realize the reverse dream even more, as our behaviour would not become a shield to this realization, but rather, a facilitator. In this acute frame of mind, we would experientially realize that there is an outside to this dream, and that outside is God.

This stepping outside, is by cognitive re-focusing on the fact that God is the Personality; He is No Thing, in that He is not comprised of particles and hence any type of structure, but He is *not* nothing. We are therefore to acknowledge and welcome Him. This frame of being, enables us to fulfill the very purpose for which we have been created, which is to be welcomed and embraced in the grace of God's creative company, in peace with Him and, as a result, ourselves. No matter what our current circumstances might be, or hurdles we face, this realization is indeed the supreme goal to strive for, and it is accessible to all of those who are truly awake.



## The Quran and Life after Life

### Secret of the Universe

As a summary, here are some final thoughts in verse.....

*At edge's chasm of infinity we stand<sup>103</sup>  
What direction we turn to, is our command  
For how we reason to understand  
Determines in what abyss we'll land.*

*The universe was created for evolving the soul  
Towards the eternal, our never-ending goal  
Forget what myths galore have been told  
Alchemical delusions turn gold into mould*

*The universe's secret imagination of God  
A seed in spaceless space did bud  
For maximal diversity, quark to cod  
To maintain justice we began within mud*

*So do not grieve over bodily death  
When sigh shall we on very last breath  
For God's imagination preserves the kernel  
On His right side, we're not infernal  
Whence in after-world, comes rendezvous again  
A glorious vision of paradise not pain.*

---

103. Poem entitled: "The Secret of the Universe": by Nadeem Haque, 2005.

## **From Microbits to Everything**

*In certainty's arms we need not fear*

*The universe's secret for all is to bear*

*Our true destiny's crystal clear*

*It's always being whispered, just open an ear.*

## Appendix: Resolving the 'paradox' of free-will

### The 'paradox' of free-will

If we are all part of God's imagination, where is free-will? The basic dilemma in the free will issue is the following: if we are truly 100% free then where is the control of God and how does He, or can He have foreknowledge? If, on the other hand, He controls everything 100%, then we do not have free-will and if this is the case, why then would He punish or reward us? In this section, we shall try to resolve this issue with a totally different approach based on our realizations thus far.

At the outset: If my consciousness is a result of fractionalization and translocation of the conscious space of God Himself, then is my will really my will? The answer to this question is yes and no? Let us examine the 'no' part, from which the extent of the 'yes' can be determined. God has the Will with a capital W. Our will is really part of His consciousness, arising because He creates microbitic forms within that space, which are then transfocused with consciousness through fractionalization, because they experience a touch of God's consciousness, due to His will to fractionalize, be these wills confined within the limited space in which those bodies exist. So on the unique level of *ultimate* reality, nothing other than God exists, for He is the *Abad* (in Arabic and in the Quran meaning: the Absolute and Indivisible One). However, one can and ought to appreciate the lengths to which God has gone to simulate an 'other' within His space – an entity that becomes conscious within that space and appears cut off from the *Abad*, and gives the appearance of having 100% free will. Despite this, in reality, this appearance of 'free-will' is just an illusion because we are all part of His conscious imagination. It is as if the large Will becomes individually acting small wills.

## From Microbits to Everything

In other words, it becomes individuated though retaining the overarching indivisible Oneness, since the individuation is part of the imagination within the space and control of the big Will. Fractionalization is like pouring water from a big jug into small cups; however, this is a special jug which retains its level of water and cannot be diminished. Now if someone does good, he or she is in line with the big Will's ideal wishes; and likewise, nature follows created laws and is in line with the big Will's wishes. However, if someone does transgress, though such behaviour goes against His (God's) ideal *wish*, it is still 100% controlled by His Will *because all small wills are part of His big Will, that has imagined the smaller wills*. This is indeed the meaning of the following verses in the Quran:

And unto God prostrates whoever is in the celestial systems and the earth, willingly or unwillingly, as do their shadows in the morning and evening. (13:15)

The willing are those who consciously follow the laws of God among humankind, trees, plants, mountains, stars, animals, the stars, the gases etc. The unwilling are those who are following the laws of God even if they consciously go against God's laws of proper behaviour – they unwillingly prostrate because even their rebelliousness and rebellious choices are 100% controlled and ultimately directed by God (as explained previously). The words used for “willing or unwilling” are, “*tan’ammwa kar-hammwa*”. The same basic words for ‘willingly’ and ‘unwillingly’ are used in:

Say: Spend willingly or unwillingly, it shall not be accepted from you; surely you are a transgressing people. (9:53)

And also in:

## **Appendix: Resolving the ‘paradox’ of free-will**

Then He directed Himself to the universe and it was dust/  
gaseous; He said to it and to the earth: come both, willingly or  
unwillingly. They both said: We come willingly. (41:11)

In 41:11, there is proof that the physical objects follow the created natural laws fall into the category of those who prostrate willingly. Then in verse 9:53 it is shown that ‘unwillingly’, refers to an act performed consciously under a compulsion of some sort. In the context above, the compulsion is that no movement occurs without the thought of God for that movement to occur, yet mentally, the rebellious ones do not want to submit to God – hence they do so unwillingly. In other words, their unwillingness is also willed by God. Just as the sun controls particular shadows 100%, so too does the Will of God control all physical and ‘mental’ movement; hence the reference to shadows in verse 13:15. In fact 13:15 can be phrased as “Everything in the universe is scripted by God, both for those who willingly follow His laws, as well as those who do not”.

Everything in existence right now is 100% controlled and sustained by God and all events that unfold, do so because His will actively unfolds. In fact, in the Quran it states that:

This is nothing but a reminder unto creation, unto whoever of  
you wills [i.e. chooses] to walk straight. And you do not will  
[choose], unless (it be) that Allah wills [chooses], the Sustainer of  
the worlds. (81:29)

God, with His will says: “Be and it is!” and “Be and will Be!” That is, all future events will become sequentially what He has planned. In fact, the following Quranic verse, discussed earlier in the book, with reference to GRC, clearly speaks of this type of structuring of existence:

## From Microbits to Everything

No disaster can happen on the earth or in yourselves, but it is in a book before We expose it: That is truly easy for God. (57:23)

Note that this verse is not saying that God has foreknowledge only, but that the plan itself is pre-written in a 'book'. The 'book' is discussed in Chapter 6. If Mr. X kills Mr. Y for greed, for example, it is part of the plan and story that God has written that this will indeed happen. It is an earthly disaster for Mr. Y. It is part of the script, as it were. Then according to the rules that God sets, Mr. X will get punished in the hereafter and, at the minimum, face psychological turmoil here, unless Mr. X repents sincerely. Everything that happens, will happen as is thus written, yet we cannot know this, unless we are given knowledge of the future by Him, because of the shielding from us of the knowledge of future events. Since all things happen by His will, we shall still face the causal consequences of our misdeeds and injustices. However, the killing of Mr. Y by Mr. X, will lead to a situation where the AWE can be increased by those seeking justice; for most of those who realize and seek the justice would have a quantitatively superior understanding of the AWE, than others who do not see the AWE, and the former will grow and evolve. This is the reason why God rebutted the angels' misgivings<sup>104</sup>, that although *homo sapiens* were going to be created and many would indeed shed blood unjustly, such misgivings were shown to be unwarranted. It was illustrated, by God, that human beings have the potential to use information, by developing categories through naming things and hence gain knowledge and consequentially do good. It was for such ends that their creation was justified, because not all of them would misuse the information in the universe. Some would follow the commands of God. Teaching Adam all the

---

104. Quran 2:30

## Appendix: Resolving the ‘paradox’ of free-will

names, signifies the *unlimited* capacity of human beings to define objects. An analogy will illustrate this: let us say that an infinitaire (a person who has an infinite amount of money!) gives his son all his money. This does not mean that he will spend it all in one shot; he cannot spend infinity, anyway! It means that he has the key to the account and can perpetually keep obtaining the bank notes at his leisure. Similarly, teaching Adam all the names means that we have this inexhaustible bank account of being able to name things, that is, to keep acquiring knowledge. On the other hand, the different classes of Angels are not given such an account, for they have only been allowed to withdraw certain amounts, in specific denominations, up to a finite level, as each of these types of Angels that are being addressed by God in the Quran are specialists only.

When we realize who we are in terms of our relation to God, in respect of His absolute control over everything, including *all* wills as part of the large Will, we realize that this universe is an unfolding story of the Creator, in which each character or person that emerges is part of a pre-designed text, only then do we truly realize the absolute power of God. It is interesting to note that the universe itself has been described as a script which folds out like a scroll and closes up. On a scroll, everything is written, yet as a closed-up scroll unscrolls, that which is written, line by line, is unfolded or exposed.<sup>105</sup>

In conclusion then, one can see that we have been made to befriend the Creator through the AWE and that we have been endowed with the ability to act through the choice-based system. Yet at the same time we are nothing but the imagination of the Creator and He, being eternal, has had to go to such elaborate lengths to create similar though limited ‘others’ so that He can, at the end of the day, include the AWE, as a co-existent *thought* within

---

105. Quran 21:104.

## From Microbits to Everything

His self.

A final question needs to be answered more deeply: could someone not rightfully complain to God of the following: that if he/she was evil, it was God's design, and that he/she is consequentially one of those who was averse to submit to God, not by his/her own will, but 100% by the will of God? And if this was the situation, then how could God possibly punish him or her? Such retribution would be the height of injustice, yet we all claim that God is the most just? In other words, how would the individual be responsible for intentions and actions, if it is 100% God's will, and if that is so, then how can punishment by God be justified? As a corollary, is the view being propounded in this book not all contradictory and therefore sheer nonsense?! The answer to this very pertinent question is that creation is part of the story that God has written, in which the characters themselves do not know what is coming (unless accessing the future through a higher GRC), yet the author has inbuilt rules as to how the characters will be, the behaviour also being ultimately written by the author. Imagine an author having written a story with several characters, one of who kills someone and is therefore punished. The author's friend, having read the story would sound insane and crazy if he said: "Why did you punish that character – after all YOU, the author, made him kill the other character in Chapter 6. Now you are punishing him by hanging in Chapter 8." Similarly, anyone assessing the script of creation cannot therefore complain of any injustice, for not only is it part of a story fulfilling the desire of the Creator to continuously unfold the AWE, but it is also a story or script based on consistent rules and laws, and a necessary one. It is a necessary one, since a mix of those who believe and do not believe, or at least having the potentiality for these behaviours, creates one of the conditions for the furtherance of the AWE, and, as has been emphatically explained previously, it was for this very purpose that the entire universe, in all its complexity, was



## Appendix: Resolving the 'paradox' of free-will

created.

### A more formal proof for the non-existence of commonly inferred 'free-will'

1. From nothing comes nothing.
2. The universe is something.
3. So there was an Eternal, Absolute One that created the Something we call the Universe.
4. We call this Being God.
5. So, only God is the Absolute, unimagined, ever-existing Being.
6. Hence the Universe is His Imagination and not absolute in the sense mentioned in #5. He is the source of all Imagination.
7. God's imagination includes the creation of the motion of limited things.
8. There are only two types of motion in this imagination:
  - (a) Microbitic (subatomic particles that form all matter and energy).
  - (b) The non-particle based motion of Thought, or Consciousness that wills all microbitic movement in the Imagination. One can call this thought, motion that causes particle motion.
9. Imagination is, at its base, nothing but thought.
10. So one can say that human thought, which is not made of particles, is part of the Imagination of God. In other words when I think and act, my thoughts cause movement, because it is 8 (b) alone that *ultimately* causes motion. In other words, the Thought of God causes my thought to act on a subset of particles in this universe, i.e. the neurons to move and hence engage in activities. Since my thought is a subset of the Thought of God, I have no independent free-will.
11. Hence *ultimately*, no free-will exists.

## From Microbits to Everything

### Changing the script

Given the conclusions arrived at in the last section, Man is stuck in the curious position of being neither a robot entirely, nor a god. Man is almost like a robot because man is 100% controlled by God, being part of God's imagination. At the same time man is *not* a god, though possessing *limited* God-like attributes, but is a quasi-multifurcation of God's will and therefore has this 'autonomous feeling', and hence God-*like* characteristics. Man, is not really a god because man is only part of God's imagination and is the quasi-multifurcation of the Will of God into 'others' with a will, a will with limitations, where there is no 100% independence of action or choice. In as much as man is controlled by the thoughts of God, he really is not responsible for his actions, when we come to mean who is ultimately behind all choices; however – and this is a big however – *man is 100% responsible for his actions in the realm of the character that he has been assigned to play in the mind of God, with God ultimately imagining the choices of that character.* Each person (or character) has that God-like capability of choice to remain a witness to the Ultimate will – God. Each person can choose to be aligned with God's attributes, or go away from this path. In other words, the script is changeable. The changeability of the script is also written by God, but nonetheless, is carried out by one of His imagined entities. We can see how far, in terms of the intricacies, and to what lengths God has gone to create as much simulation of free-will as possible within His mind. *So one operates as if one has limited free-will. One is responsible for one's actions, here and hereafter. However, the deeper analysis presented, shows how the free-will issue is really structured, in terms of the ultimate reality of things. Those who understand this will have a fuller understanding of existence to their own benefit.* It is instructive to note that nowhere in the Quran is the equivalent word in Arabic "free-will" been used. However, in the Quran, the choice of taking the correct or the wrong paths is indeed mentioned.

We talked about the aspect of the solution to the free-will problem that

## Appendix: Resolving the 'paradox' of free-will

showed that God is in complete control. At the same time, since we are essentially instantiations of objectless space in that we become fully conscious when God creates a sentient form using microbits, that then participates in a space full of other structures, we do, nonetheless, develop a separateness and a personality. This concomitant separateness gives us a god-like ability and a god-like will, where the choices we make are really our choices, albeit acted upon ultimately by God but as *imagined autonomous characters*. At any time, we do have the choice to return to God. The most evil and depraved man or woman on earth has that choice; examples, such as the story of the Pharaoh and Moses in the Quran are good illustrations of this, where Moses is asked to deliver the message with some sensitivity to the Pharaoh, even though he has transgressed so much<sup>106</sup>. The changing of the script is also part of the script and God chooses to guide whom He wills to the right path. We start off with the same pure nature of witnessing the Creator and of knowing right from wrong, and when we err, He is the one who guides whom He wills and lets go astray whom He wills (i.e. those characters who are consistently rebellious). We can see here that God has done His utmost to simulate free-will and autonomy and on this basis, seeks to bring close, those who are both cognitively and morally far from Him.

### Foundational problems with the standard interpretation of free-will

Many people would object to the free-will view expounded in the previous section. They think that man has the free will to choose: indeed, they ask: why would God punish us if He had *not* given us free-will? Now logically

---

106. Quran 20:43-44.

## From Microbits to Everything

speaking if everything is in the Mind of God, which many would agree is the case (as we have discovered in field-testing these ideas) then if one says that we have free-will it means that we must have 100% autonomous free-will absolutely independent of the will of the creator to make choices, albeit limited choices. The problem is this: if all thought is in the mind of God, it is 100% controlled, as it is the part of the thoughts of God (taking shape as reality). Our thoughts and will cannot be de-linked or decoupled from the Thoughts of God – this is an utter impossibility. If that is the case, then it is impossible to have the 100% free-will. The argument collapses immediately. One need not enter into secondary or tertiary points such as: if we have 100% free-will then how does God know the future of all events (absolute foreknowledge), that is, events in which 100% free-willed actors, such as ourselves, act? For example, does He have 100% extrapolative knowledge? The only way one can get out of the 100% God control of our wills is by disproving that we are not in the mind or part of the imagination of God (i.e. one would either have to find a flaw in the argument in Chapter 1 and elaborations in subsequent chapters, or clearly show that it is not conclusive). However, this leads to us being ‘outside’ of the space of God, which is utterly impossible.

An understanding of the reality of the ‘free-will’ issue and life after death that have been described in this book, enables one to realize that everything and everyone in the universe has a fixed destiny, controlled absolutely by an infinitely immense, yet personable, Creator. It enables one to realize that this type of universe *had* to be here, and that in the more immediate end, everything will turn out fine for those who believe. If this reality is not known, then there will always be lingering doubts about various fundamental issues of existence and purpose, since the picture would not be complete. It is the certainty about the *complete* picture that gives one greatest peace – the picture of the Scribes and the Scrolls.

## Appendix: Resolving the 'paradox' of free-will

### The Scribes and the Scrolls<sup>107</sup>

*You see, every thing in this world has its destiny. The scribes have written and the scrolls have been rolled. The aim of the great God shall be fulfilled, whether you like it or not. This is why the scriptures tell us that whatsoever is in the heavens and in the earth, submits to God, willingly or unwillingly. The fools resist and are defeated. The wise, submit and are welcomed.*

*To help you see how wise God is, think of the world He has created as a great drama. Every character, however complicated, every scene and every plot in this act, however spontaneous it may seem, is scripted.*

*It has to be this way, because, how else can you create anything, if characters, plots and scenes you have not written, pop out of nowhere into your production? And where will they come from? And even if things could pop out of nowhere, still, they must fit into a plan, or nothing would work. Do you get it?*

*Let me put it another way. Nothing can exist in space unless it has a beginning and an end. But to say that something has an end, is the same as saying that it has a destiny; that is, a minimum and a maximum reach. No universe can be built or made to exist without a plan or order. But if the thing has a plan or an order, that must mean that it must be a limited proposition. The endless does not need to have any order or plan. Nothing would happen to the endless if it had no order or plan. But the same cannot be said for the limited. All limited things need order in order to be able relate to one another.*

*Look! If the good Lord went to great lengths to ensure that your parents, your language, your mind, your heart, and every cell that make up your body and more, are taken care of, without seeking any input from you, what makes you think that He would leave your destiny to chance? Reflect! How is it possible for your destiny to be left to chance, when you yourself and every thing that makes you what you are, have not been left to chance?*

---

107. [www.BibleQuran.org](http://www.BibleQuran.org) - February 12, 2007 @ 3:31 pm by M.Muslim (a.k.a. "The Bridge")



## Bibliography

Al-Ashqar, 'Umar S.; Al-Khattab, Nasiruddin (Translator) (2002), *The Minor Resurrection (What Happens After Death) In the Light of the Quran and Sunnah, Islamic Creed Series, Vol. 5*, International Islamic Publishing House, Riyadh.

Averroes, (2001), Najjar, Ibrahim (Translator), *Faith and Reason in Islam: Averroes' Exposition of Religious Arguments*, Oneworld Publications, Oxford.

Banaei, Mehran and Haque, Nadeem, (1995), *From Facts to Values: Certainty, Order, Balance and their Universal Implications*, Optagon Publications Ltd., Toronto.

Castell, Alburey and Borchert, Donald M., (1983), *An Introduction to Modern Philosophy: Examining the Human Condition*, (4<sup>th</sup> Edition), Collier MacMillan, London/New York.

Casti, John L., (1990), *Searching for Certainty: What Scientists Can Know About the Future*, William Morrow and Company, New York.

CBC Radio, (Aired: June 20 and 25, 2002), *Ideas: The Matter of Mind: Parts 1 and 2*.

Churchland, Patricia Smith, (1989), *Neurophilosophy: Toward a Unified Science of the Mind/Brain*, The MIT Press, Cambridge.

Cleary, Thomas, (Translator), (1995), *Dhammapada: The Sayings of Buddha*, Bantam Books, New York.

## From Microbits to Everything

Crick, F., (1994), *The Astonishing Hypothesis: The Scientific Search for the Soul*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

Dennett, Daniel C., (1991), *Consciousness Explained*, Little Brown and Company, Boston/Toronto/London.

Guenther, Herbet (Translator), (1970), *The Jewel Ornament of Liberation*, Rider & Co., London.

Henry, Gray (Editor), (1997), *Islam, Tibet and the illustrated Narrative: Tibetan Caravans*, Foundation for Traditional Studies, Fons Vitae., Louisville.

Hofstadter, Douglas R., (1980), *Gödel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid*, Random House.

Hume, David (1988), *An Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, Prometheus, New York.

Kant, Emmanuel, Meiklejohn, J.M.D. (Translator), (1990), *The Critique of Pure Reason*, Prometheus Books, New York.

Kant, Emmanuel, Meiklejohn, J.M.D., (Translator), (1911), *The Critique of Pure Reason: Gesammelte Schriften*, Volume 3, Berlin.

Kline, Morris, (1985), *Mathematics and the Search for Knowledge*, Oxford University Press.

Mackie, J.L., (1982), *The Miracle of Theism*, Clarendon Press: Oxford.

Martin, Michael, (1990), *Atheism: A Philosophical Justification*, Temple



## Bibliography

University Press, Philadelphia.

Mascaro, Juan (Translator), (1962), *The Bhagavad Gita*, Penguin Books, New York.

McGinn, Colin, (1999), *The Mysterious Flame*, Basic Books, New York.

McGinn, Colin, (2006), *Consciousness and Its Objects*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Muller, F. Max, (1881), *The Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. 11, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Muslim, M. and Haque, Nadeem, (2001), *From Microbits to Everything: A New Unified View of Physics and Cosmology: Volume 1: The Cosmological Implications*, Optagon Publications Ltd., Toronto.

Omar, Abdul Mannan, (2006), *The Dictionary of the Holy Quran*, Noor Foundation – International Inc., Hockessin.

Philips, Abu Ameenah Bilal, (1990), *The Fundamentals of Tawheed (Islamic Monotheism)*, Tawheed Publications, Riyadh.

Rose, Stephen, (2006), *The Future of the Brain: The Promise and Perils of Tomorrow's Neuroscience*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Schwartz, Jeffrey M., and Bagley, Sharon, (2003), *The Mind and the Brain: Neuroplasticity and the Power of Mental Force*, RegenBooks, N.Y.

Seckel, Al (Ed.itor), (1986), *Bertrand Russell on God and Religion*, Prometheus

## From Microbits to Everything

Books, New York.

Sheldrake, Rupert, (1988), *The Presence of the Past: Morphic Resonance and the Habits of Nature*, Vintage Books, New York.

Smith, George, (1979), *Atheism: The Case Against God*, Prometheus Books, New York.

Stapp, Henry P., (2004), *Mind, Matter and Quantum Mechanics*, Second Edition, Springer, Berlin/Heidelberg.

Stoddart, William, (1997), *Outline of Buddhism*, Foundation for Traditional Studies, Fons Vitae, Louisville.

Tzu, Lao, *Tao Te Ching*, (1963), Lau, D.C. (Translator), Penguin Books.

## Index

### A

*abadaa* 142  
Abraham 107, 109, 142, 237-238, 240  
Adam 130, 140, 228, 251, 270  
*abqaabaa* 142  
*al-Haq* 106  
*amthaalakum* 231, 233  
anaesthesia 229, 259  
angels 11, 23, 97, 127, 224, 228, 244-245, 247, 270-271  
*ansharabu* 252  
anthropomorphization 135  
artificial intelligence 11, 260  
AWE 9, 51, 111, 122-132, 134-137, 142, 270-272

### B

Bagley, Sharon 233, 281  
*baraa* 217, 219  
barrier 53, 153, 244, 249-251, 254-255  
*barzakab* 249, 250-251, 254-255  
Bhagavad Gita 95  
Big Bang 7, 28, 54-56, 119  
biofluidic 184-185, 189-190, 193, 196, 206, 208, 213, 221, 225-226, 260, 262  
brain 10, 44, 87, 163-167, 170, 172, 173-176, 179, 194, 196, 197, 229, 233, 235-237, 242, 250, 259  
Buddha 97-100  
Buddhism 97, 99-100

### C

chance 18  
Christianity 9, 109  
Churchland, Patricia Smith, 164, 167-168, 279  
command 133, 226-227, 230, 240  
consciousness 9-10, 132-133, 164-165, 170-171, 176-177, 179, 189-190, 194, 197, 225, 230, 241, 260, 273, 280

## From Microbits to Everything

### D

dao 94-95  
death 10-11, 98, 136-137, 141, 153, 157, 170, 180, 182- 184, 187- 188, 191, 199, 200, 203-204, 206, 210, 214, 216, 221, 226- 229, 230, 231, 237- 240, 242, 245, 250-252, 254-258, 265, 276  
Dennett, Daniel C. 164-165, 280  
design 7, 27-30, 105, 122, 137, 169, 272  
Dhammapada 97  
Dharmakaya 99-100, 102  
dream 153, 218, 249, 263-264  
Dualists 163, 168

### E

emergent property 163, 234, 236  
Epimenides 81  
eternal 7, 15- 20, 25- 26, 43, 46- 51, 53, 58, 110, 126  
evil 138, 149, 152-53, 155, 157, 159, 245, 248, 272, 275  
evolution 7, 18, 20, 21, 28

### F

fractionalization 130, 143, 170, 216, 223, 227, 230, 237, 239, 241, 260, 267  
free-will 9, 11, 129, 134, 267, 273-276

### G

geofluid 184, 224  
geofluidic 184, 221, 224-225  
God 7- 9, 13, 15, 18, 21- 24, 27- 31, 42-54, 56- 69, 84, 88, 93, 97- 103, 105- 107, 109-119, 121-138, 140-145, 149, 152-155, 157-158, 160, 169- 172, 175- 176, 191-192, 215-220, 222- 229, 231- 232, 237,- 242, 244- 246, 248- 249, 251- 253, 255,- 258, 260, 262- 265, 267- 276, 281-282  
Gödel, Kurt 8, 79-84  
grave 11, 246- 248, 252-255  
GRC 10, 130, 176-177, 179, 189-191, 193, 196-197, 199,-203, 205- 210, 212- 219, 220-225, 239, 243, 256, 257- 259, 261, 263, 269, 272  
GRP 10, 187-190,192  
GRUS 217, 219

### H

Hadith 130, 228, 243-244, 246-248

## Index

Hawking, Stephen 21-23  
Heaven 140  
Heisenberg, Werner 78  
hell 9, 98, 138, 140-144, 241, 243-249, 252-254, 257  
Hinduism 97  
Hume, David 8, 61- 67, 69- 72, 74, 77, 280

### I

*illaa mantatanaal-uulaa* 258  
Imagination 9, 113, 115, 128, 134, 169, 273  
indeterminism 166  
inverse dream 218

### J

*jannat* 245  
judgment 141, 244, 246, 248, 252, 255, 257

### K

Kant, Emmanuel 8, 61, 70-75, 77, 280  
*khaalidiina*, 139, 145  
*Khaaliduun* 138-140, 144-145  
*kitaab* 10, 217-219

### L

light 121, 167, 172, 183-185, 188-189, 191-193, 198, 214, 216, 220-222, 225, 228, 240, 259-262  
logical positivism 166

### M

Materialists 163  
matter 7, 10, 18-19, 22, 24-27, 30-43, 45, 52, 62-63, 71-72, 75, 85, 88-90, 93, 106, 110, 115, 119, 123, 152-153, 165-168, 170, 179-180, 182, 185-186, 188, 193, 196-198, 201, 203, 206-207, 211, 214, 223, 226, 232, 238, 249, 261, 263-264, 273, 279  
*mant* 252, 254, 257  
McConnell, J.V. 172  
McGinn, Colin 166, 168, 281  
memory 10, 172-174, 241, 243, 259  
microbits 4, 105, 115, 119, 133, 163, 165, 176, 180-183, 191, 196-204, 211,

## From Microbits to Everything

216, 224, 226-228, 230-232, 237, 239, 242-244, 248, 250-251, 259-263, 275  
mind 7-8, 16-17, 25, 28, 31, 38, 42-44, 46, 61, 63, 65, 68, 72-73, 76-77, 80, 86-  
90, 92, 95-96, 100, 106, 108, 110, 113, 115-116, 119, 122, 128-129, 163-172,  
175-176, 211, 215, 217, 219, 223-227, 230, 233-236, 239, 246, 248, 252, 256-  
257, 261-262, 264, 274, 276

Muhammed (Prophet) 144, 227-228, 247-249

Multi-time Complex 222

mysticism 7, 95, 102, 111, 113

### N

*nafs* 229

Newton, Isaac 56, 110, 139

*nubaddila* 231-232

*nunshiakum* 231

### O

Objectless Space 9, 119

ocean 112, 193, 206, 208, 250

Old Testament 109

Origin-Force Proof 7, 56

### P

pantheism 9, 95, 110, 115

paradise 140-141, 143, 154, 241, 244, 246-248

photon 165, 184-185, 220, 228, 261

Physicalist Trap 9, 164-166

physics 11, 54, 56, 84, 105, 166, 168, 231, 233-236, 240-241

Planaria 172-173, 175-176

Preserved Tablet 225

### Q

quantum mechanics 166, 236

Quran 9-11, 70, 94, 100-101, 106-107, 109-110, 112-117, 119, 121, 124-128,  
130, 134, 137-145, 191, 215, 217-220, 222, 224-232, 237-240, 242, 244, 246,  
248-249, 252-257, 261-271, 274-275, 279

### R

Relatiological Proof 7, 30

Reverse Dream 11, 215, 262

## Index

*rub* 133, 226-228, 230-231, 259

### S

*sama* 118

Satan 140, 228

Schwartz, Jeffrey 233, 281

self 8, 10, 21, 27, 43, 76-77, 79, 82-84, 89, 94, 102, 105, 125-127, 134-137, 140, 144, 150, 165, 171, 176, 186, 192, 199, 200-204, 217, 225-226, 237, 239, 241-242, 250-251, 254, 256, 259, 261-263, 272

Sesamatic 7, 30, 107

Sheldrake, Rupert 174, 281

*shirk* 143-145

soul 110-11, 132, 163-164, 168, 227, 229, 240, 243, 247, 252, 255-256, 259-260

Stapp, Henry 233, 236, 282

### T

Tao Te Ching 94-95, 282

Taoism 94

*tan'ammwa kar-hammwa* 268

*tamheed* 113, 144

telemorphic 237

Telemorphogenesis 11, 236-237

3D 9, 116, 119, 238

Time Compression Factor 221-222

translocation 133, 169-170, 243, 251, 259-260, 267

Trinity 109

### U

Uncertainty Principle 78

Unitarianism 110

Universal IDs 10, 191

universal script 217

universe 9, 18, 21-24, 28-29, 34, 48, 54-57, 61, 67, 85, 88, 95, 105-110, 112-116, 119-120, 122-123, 125-129, 131-132, 134, 136, 140-141, 163, 169, 176, 187-188, 190, 192, 196, 214-217, 225-226, 231, 234, 241-244, 246-250, 252, 256-257, 262-266, 269-273, 276

## From Microbits to Everything

Y

*Ya Sin* 244

*yastabdil* 233

*yuardhuna* 249



























































