

Exploring the Role of Consciousness in the Origin of the Universe and Life: A Hypothesis of a Sentient Creator

Edoardo J. Bruno*

Abstract

This article aims to highlight how consciousness may be interconnected with topics related to the existence of God, physics, and cosmology. Despite the importance of this relationship, academia has studied consciousness in relation to each of these themes separately, neglecting to consider all four within a unified analysis. The notion of a conscious God is defined as a sentient creative consciousness that may have generated a holographic universe, a universe from nothing, a multiverse, or a cyclic universe as to create life and intelligent beings. The discussion addresses how this conception of God can be confirmed or refuted through various means, such as the presence of potential mathematical codes in the spacetime of the universe, the information contained within the universe and planet Earth, the development of artificial intelligence, and contact with extraterrestrial civilizations. This article demonstrates that science and philosophy can work together to solve the great mysteries of the cosmos that humanity has pondered over for centuries.

Keywords: God; Consciousness; Theory of Everything; Technology; Philosophy of Science.[†]

* Catholic University of Milan, Italy; edoardo.bruno@gmail.com.

[†] Received on June 15, 2025. Accepted on June 30, 2025. Published on June 30, 2025. DOI: 10.23756/sp.v13i1.1696. ISSN 2282-7757; eISSN 2282-7765. ©Bruno. This paper is published under the CC-BY licence agreement.

1. Introduction

Questions related to life trigger animated discussions in the academic world, such as: why is the universe suitable for life? (Davies, 2007; Lewis and Barnes, 2016; Gribbin and Rees, 1989); does God exist? (Spitzer, 2010; Stenger, 2007; Diller and Kasher, 2016); and what is the nature of consciousness? (Schneider and Velmans, 2017; Searle, 1997; Seth, 2021). However, these questions remain unanswered.

Concerning the relationship between God and a universe suited for life, scientists have argued that the creator hypothesis is unnecessary for understanding the cosmos. They presented theories that appeared to reject God's existence. The biologist Dawkins (2006, p. 101) asserts that an evolutionary process dominated by random events is sufficient to prove that God does not exist. Conversely, Hawking and Mlodinow (2010, p. 180) argue that our universe is merely one of the infinite cosmoses, proving that God is not required to ignite the spark of the cosmos. Krauss (2012, p. 185) contends that our cosmos is self-created from nothing, rendering the God hypothesis unnecessary or redundant.

Regarding the possible connection between God and consciousness, studies on awareness have linking this topic to a specific subject. Penrose (1994) explores the relationship between consciousness and physics, focusing on quantum mechanics and cosmology. Polkinghorne (2007) discusses the intersection of quantum physics and theology, analyzing issues related to the existence of God and the nature of the universe. Chalmers (1996), by contrast, examines the nature of consciousness and its implications for understanding the universe, including philosophical debates on cosmology and metaphysics.

Israeli mathematician Aczel's (2014, p. 249) voice is critical for clarifying the mystery surrounding the cosmos, life, and God. Concerning Gödel's incomplete theorems, Aczel argues that humanity will never discover what predated the Big Bang or caused its advent. He concludes that humankind will never confirm the existence or nonexistence of God because the ability to answer this question lies beyond human capacity.

In this essay, I highlight how the arguments of Dawkins, Hawking, Mlodinow, Krauss, and Aczel can be challenged through the study of the universe. Additionally, this work differs from academic studies by Penrose, Polkinghorne, and Chalmers as it seeks to unify the topic of consciousness with physics, cosmology, and the existence of God into a single analysis.

In Sections 2 and 3, I argue that physical laws and universal constants, which appear to be fine-tuned to facilitate life, may support the belief in a God who may have intervened at a specific moment in cosmic history. Furthermore, I examine various theories regarding the origin of the universe—the multiverse; cyclic universe; universe from nothing; and various theories of everything, including string theory, loop quantum gravity, and the hypothesis of the anthropic principle—to exclude or affirm the existence of a creator.

In Section 4, I attempt to answer the question “Who is God?” by exploring the possibility that a specific creator linked to consciousness may have created a cosmos that engenders life. I endeavor to establish whether this hypothesis can be connected to any theory of the origin of the universe, and consider the root cause of our cosmos or multiple universes, as well as whether it can be regarded as a theory of everything.

Finally, in Section 5, I address whether the proposed hypothesis can be confirmed or refuted through specific means. I emphasize the importance of philosophy, which is fundamental for understanding the relationship between God, consciousness, and science, and is crucial for confirming or refuting the discussed issues.

2. Between science and God: Origin of the universe and the possibility of a creator

Among the primary pieces of evidence supporting the existence of God are the physical laws¹ that originated with the Big Bang, which occurred approximately 13.7 billion years ago owing to the implosion of a primordial energy core. Our cosmos is governed by perfect physical laws, such as gravity and relativity, which have enabled the emergence of life on planets within the habitable zone. Physical laws involving randomness, such as those in quantum mechanics, are fundamental to explaining the possibility of planetary life.

Albert Einstein recognized the exceptional nature of the laws of physics and, in a letter to Romanian mathematician Solovine (1987, p. 118), observed that the order of the universe, made possible by these laws, was not an inevitable outcome. According to Einstein, the expectation of a universe characterized by messaging and chaos would have been more logical. Consequently, he asserted that the laws of nature constitute the most significant evidence in corroborating the weakness of atheistic thought, thus denying the possibility that God may have created the universe by establishing such physical laws.

Therefore, the physical laws suited to life constitute the initial evidence supporting the existence of a creator because God may have formulated them prior to the Big Bang to enable the emergence of life in the universe.

The theory of everything is closely related to physical laws.² Throughout history, new laws, such as Newton’s law of gravity, Einstein’s theory of relativity, and Max Planck’s quantum mechanics, have been discovered. The existence of a theory of everything is inevitable because of the finite number of laws in the universe, making it possible to unify all known physical phenomena into a single law.

Modern scientists are striving to find a theory of everything, given that relativity focuses exclusively on gravity to understand large-scale phenomena, whereas quantum

¹ Feynman (1999) studied the nature of physical laws.

² Regarding many physicists’ aspiration of discovering the theory of everything, see Weinberg (1993), Barrow (1991), and Close (2017).

mechanics³ addresses three non-gravitational forces (electromagnetism, strong nuclear force, and weak nuclear force) to analyze microscopic processes. These two theories, along with their four forces, differ markedly from each other but coexist in the same universe, enabling the emergence of life.

A proposed model of the theory of everything predicts the existence of a quantum theory of gravity. Several quantum gravity theories exist, including string theory (Kaku, 1999), loop quantum gravity (Bojowald, 2010), causal fermion systems (Finster, 2006), causal set theory (Surya, 2019), causal dynamical triangulation (Ambjørn et al., 2010), and the ER=EPR hypothesis (Maldacena and Susskind, 2013), which seeks to reconcile relativity with quantum mechanics. However, a common problem among these theories is that they fail to explain why a theory of everything, represented by quantum gravity, in which relativity and quantum mechanics unite to allow for the emergence of a cosmos or multiple cosmoses suitable for life, should exist.

From this perspective, creator intervention may be necessary to conceive a quantum theory of gravity or propose another hypothesis through a specific physical process. This becomes essential for ensuring the coexistence of entirely different laws that would have resulted in the formation of chaotic universes or their collapse.

An additional issue linked to physical laws are the universal constants.⁴ Rees (1999, p. 2) asserts that the universe revolves around six universal constants. If these constants change even slightly, the emergence of life would be rendered impossible. Among these, the constant that stands out for its precision in promoting planetary life is epsilon, the strength of the bond between atomic nuclei, which has a value of 0.007. This value is crucial because it determines the generation of all atoms on Earth.

From a strictly scientific perspective, one can argue that since the Big Bang, the epsilon constant could have taken any value between zero and infinity. The fact that it ended up being precisely the value of 0.007, capable of giving rise to life, leads us to consider that universal constants may have been purposefully designed by a creator to allow life to emerge. This reasoning can be extended to the other physical constants studied by Rees. If the intensity of the electrical forces binding atoms and the gravitational force acting upon them, the amount of matter in our universe, galaxies, diffuse gas, dark matter, the fabric of the universe, cosmic antigravity, and the number of spatial dimensions were altered slightly, our universe would be incapable of sustaining life. Consequently, the idea of a creator remains plausible for universal constants.

Physical laws and universal constants were established prior to the Big Bang era. The possible intervention of a creator could have occurred only at that moment, because once

³ Regarding the extensive bibliography on quantum physics and its implications for understanding the universe, some of the most relevant texts include those by Bohm (1989); Binney and Skinner (2008); Eisberg and Resnick (1985); Feynman, Leighton, and Sands (1965); Griffiths (2004) Greenberger, Hentschel, and Weinert (2009); Cox and Forshaw (2011); and Chester (1987).

⁴ Regarding universal constants, see Eddington (1956) and Barrow (2002).

the general rules were established, the universe began self-regulating without requiring any further external intervention.

In recent decades, various theories have emerged to explain why the universe is suited for sustaining life. These theories⁵ can be divided into five major categories: the multiverse, cyclic universe, universe from nothing, holographic universe, and the anthropic principle.

The concept of the multiverse is based on the idea that our universe is merely one of an infinite⁶ number of universes, each with its physical laws and universal constants. Over time, various versions of the multiverse have been formulated, including the many-world interpretation (Everett, 1957), eternal inflation (Guth, 2007), black hole cosmology (Good, 1972), and cosmological natural selection (Smolin, 1997).

Tegmark (2014), Greene (2011), and Mersini-Houghton (2008), in their respective works, attempt to classify the multiverse into specific categories. Tegmark divides the multiverse into four levels, Greene proposes nine types, while Mersini-Houghton presents three models.

Contrastingly, the cyclic universe posits the existence of a single universe that replicates cyclically over time. Examples include the Big Bounce (Ashtekar et al., 2006), the Steinhardt-Turok model (Steinhardt and Turok, 2007), the Frampton model (Baum and Frampton, 2008), quasi-steady state theory (Hoyle et al., 1993), and conformal cyclic cosmology (Penrose, 2010). These models demonstrate the continued relevance of the ancient idea of the cyclic nature of the cosmos in the twenty-first century.

The theories of the universe from nothing and the holographic universe are completely different. Tryon (1973) was the first to argue that the universe was born from nothing, and stated that our cosmos originated from quantum fluctuations in the quantum vacuum before the Big Bang era. This version has undergone several revisions, including Hartle and Hawking's (1983) state, which argues that the cosmos originated from an unbounded initial state, and Ellis and Maartens' (2003) emergent universe model, which asserts that our universe existed infinitely in the past in a stable state before becoming unstable and developing the cosmic inflation that led to the birth of the cosmos. Furthermore, in quantum potential cosmology, Ali and Das (2015) propose that a quantum fluid comprising gravitons present before the Big Bang contributed to the birth of the universe.

The term "universe from nothing" may be misleading because several models predict the existence of different forms of energy that caused the Big Bang and were present before the implosion of the primordial energy core. Therefore, these theories are called the "quantum vacuum universe."

Contrastingly, the holographic universe posits that there was nothing before the Big Bang and that our cosmos emerged from the implosion of the primordial energy core.

⁵ Vaas (2011) has written one of the most comprehensive books on theories about what existed before the Big Bang.

⁶ Regarding the questions related to infinity, see Heller and Woodin (2011), Barrow (2005), and Rucker (1984).

Hertog (2023), the primary proponent of this hypothesis, argues that physical laws evolved throughout the history of the universe to become what they are today.

The abovementioned theory categories are primarily related to scientific questions. By contrast, the anthropic principle addresses the question of the existence of life from a philosophical perspective. Carter (1973) states that observations about the universe must satisfy the necessary conditions for the existence of intelligent observers. Expressly, the characteristics of the universe we observe are not random but must be such as to allow our existence as observers. Barrow and Tipler (1986), meanwhile, emphasize that observing a universe that permits life is normal, since we are here doing it. This implies that it is not an isolated event but rather a necessary coherence among physical laws, universe constants, and the emergence of life. In summary, the anthropic principle highlights that the characteristics of the observable universe are a consequence of our presence as observers, emphasizing the role of these conditions in enabling life.

All theories described above are premised on the assumption that our life-permitting universe is not unique because it could be one of many cyclic universes formed by a quantum bubble or the evolution of physical laws following the Big Bang.

None of these hypotheses necessarily exclude the existence of a creator because they do not diminish the uniqueness of our life-permitting universe. However, they fail to explain why physical laws suitable for life formation have emerged in one or an infinite number of universes.

This reasoning does invalidate the previously mentioned theories; as such, they can be further explored considering the possible existence of a God who created at least one universe, or an infinite universe endowed with the potential to harbor life. Such universes would have been created by God through the establishment of precise natural laws suited for life, since without divine intervention, any type of cosmos would appear empty or lack the potential to be ordered, as physical laws would likely not have arisen spontaneously from the Big Bang.

3. God and the emergence of conscious life in the universe

The various stages that follow the Big Bang should be highlighted. In the early stages, fundamental phenomena occurred during the formation of a universe suitable for life. The superforce that emerged from the Big Bang split into the four forces we know today: gravity, electromagnetism, strong nuclear force, and weak nuclear force. Additionally, all components that dominate the cosmos were formed, including quarks, electrons, atoms, protons, neutrons, hydrogen, and helium (Weinberg, 1977).

Over millions of years, various elements combined through the action of gravity to form early stars and galaxies. Throughout these processes, the cosmological constant controlled the expansion of the universe, preventing it from collapsing or exploding before planetary life could form (Singh, 2004).

Other elements are also essential for the formation of a universe suitable for life. The arrow of time, according to which every physical element develops from state X in the past to state Y in the future, is crucial for maintaining order in the physical processes that lead to life. Similarly, our universe comprises three main elements—ordinary matter (4.9%), dark matter (26.8%), and dark energy (68.3%)—without which the cosmos would have collapsed long ago (Sloan, 2020).

Regarding Earth, significant factors enabled life to emerge. First, Earth is in a habitable zone, neither too hot nor too cold, and is at the right distance from the sun to provide water, a basic ingredient for life. Moreover, the Earth's almost circular rather than elliptical orbit allows the planet to remain permanently inside the habitable zone. Additionally, Jupiter in our solar system intercepts asteroids that might otherwise strike the Earth, and the Moon plays a fundamental role in stabilizing Earth's axis of rotation. Owing to these factors, life emerged on Earth approximately four billion years ago with the birth of the famous primordial cells. However, we do not know how it was formed—whether through a chemical process that occurred within Earth (Bernal, 1951; Haldane, 1929; Oparin, 1924) or due to material originating from space, as the panspermia hypothesis posits (Wickramasinghe, 2011).

The only certainty is that primordial cells led to the emergence of living beings that have populated the Earth for billions of years. The biological foundation of all living species is Darwinian evolution, based on natural selection (Darwin, 1859). After billions of years, the first intelligent species capable of reasoning and comprehending the mysteries of the universe appeared on Earth.

The key question remains whether the processes that occurred on Earth are replicable elsewhere in the cosmos. Currently, there is no direct or indirect evidence of extra-terrestrial life (Webb, 2015). However, as physical laws and universal constants remain consistent throughout the universe, the same mechanisms that led to the emergence of life and intelligence on Earth can be replicated on other planets. Moreover, if a multiverse or cyclic universe exists, the same physical laws present in our cosmos could have given rise to intelligent beings in other universes. Notably, life forms distinct from those on our planet may develop in universes with physical laws that differed from our own.

It is thus essential to consider whether a God possibly intervened in all the processes described above. Physical laws, universal constants, chemical elements, and DNA—who created all this information precisely encoded for life? As previously observed, to avoid an empty universe, a creator who established the fundamental rules for the formation of the universe must be introduced, and these rules were likely conceived before the Big Bang.

Consequently, God could not have intervened directly during the phases of the Big Bang, emergence of DNA, or evolution of species. However, one can argue that God may have played an indirect role in these processes. Without the establishment of physical

laws and the calibration of universal constants prior to the Big Bang, the processes that led to subsequent events would have been impossible.

This reasoning applies to all universes in which life may have evolved. A potential creator may have conceived infinite universes by developing specific physical laws to promote the emergence of life and intelligence in as many places as possible and may have created physical laws different from those known to us by being capable of generating life and intelligence in ways beyond our comprehension of certain universes.

In other words, God could have formed other universes suitable for life and intelligence before the beginning of the multiverse or cyclic universe, allowing the laws of nature to be established to conduct the necessary processes for the development of life and intelligence without requiring direct intervention.

4. God as consciousness: A new perspective on the origin of the cosmos

Having defined the periods of the universe's history in which a creator may have intervened, the following questions arise: (i) who is God, (ii) what does God comprise, and (iii) how did God create a suitable universe for life? Answering these fundamental questions requires understanding the concepts of first physical and divine causes.

The Big Bang was the first physical cause. This event was confirmed by the discovery of cosmic background radiation in 1964 and COBE satellite imagery in 1992. However, if we posit the gravitational singularity of the Big Bang as the first physical cause, the world as we know it could not have existed. Indeed, if we take as our sole reference point the primordial energy core from which the implosion occurred 13.7 billion years ago, we should expect a chaotic, empty, or illogical cosmos. Rational laws, such as relativity—capable of transforming energy into matter, a fundamental prerequisite for life—would not necessarily have emerged from the Big Bang. This reasoning leads us to conclude that we must seek the cause of the universe in God.

To understand what God is and how God created our universe, it is important to clarify the concept of consciousness, which can be divided into two main categories: phenomenal and access. Phenomenal consciousness refers to the subjective, qualitative experience of awareness. It is what accompanies our perceptions, emotions, and mental states. When we talk about how an experience manifests—such as seeing a color or feeling a sensation—we are referring to phenomenal consciousness. This includes aspects like “qualia,” a term used to describe the subjective sensory experiences—such as perceiving red or feeling pain (Chalmers, 1995).

Access consciousness concerns the ability to use information present in our minds to reason, make decisions, and communicate. It allows us to actively access and manipulate information, performing cognitive and behavioral functions. Access consciousness is

more oriented toward action and information processing without necessarily involving subjective experience (Nagel, 1974).

Daniel Dennett (1992) argues that consciousness is an emergent property of complex physical systems, and therefore, there is no need to invoke God to explain it. According to this view, consciousness arises from the organization of the brain and its interactions with the environment, without requiring a divine origin. However, Dennett's thesis has some limitations. The development of phenomenal and access consciousness in humans goes beyond mere evolution, as these components are not strictly necessary for a species' survival, as suggested by Darwinian theory. Moreover, the American philosopher does not explain why the universe allows, through precise physical processes, the emergence of phenomenal and access consciousness. Since the Big Bang, a universe devoid of conscious beings would have been far more probable, given that physical laws would not have necessarily been destined to originate from the primordial energy core that gave rise to our cosmos.

The significance of consciousness as potential evidence of God's existence is also supported by renowned mathematician Aczel (2014, p. 218), whose book *Why Science Does Not Disprove God* asserts that consciousness, which enables the creation of art, architecture, literature, science, and mathematics, may have been conceived by a creator.

We must now take another step towards understanding the mysteries of the cosmos. As consciousness is essential for enabling humans to accomplish extraordinary feats, such as the creation of highly sophisticated computers, architectural masterpieces, and sublime music, a possible God that possesses consciousness can be inferred. Without it, God would not have given rise to a universe with special physical laws and universal constants.

This consciousness can be conceived as a "natural" God comprising currently unknown physical processes. It can be defined scientifically, and like all living beings, consists of the scientific elements necessary to create a cosmos suitable for life. However, these elements may differ from those with which we are familiar, because carbon-based life forms on Earth developed from events that occurred only during and after the Big Bang.

The context in which this consciousness emerged can be theorized scientifically. The notion that nothing existed before the Big Bang is problematic, mainly because the primordial energy core required an agent to form and subsequently implode it to initiate the birth of the cosmos. Accordingly, we can deduce that the constitution of the primordial energy core requires a spacetime distinct from the one we inhabit, as the latter emerged only after the birth of the cosmos.

Therefore, the hypothesis of a singular universe, as the holographic universe model proposes, allows for the plausibility that a sentient consciousness that predated the Big Bang in a yet unknown spacetime utilized its awareness, comprising unknown physical processes, to establish physical laws and calibrate the universal constants. This consciousness may have formed and imploded the primordial energy core to generate a universe suitable for life. During the processes leading to the birth of the universe, this

consciousness most likely became part of the spacetime continuum it created and, thus, continued to exist.

This sentient creative consciousness should be considered the principal divine cause of the universe and capable of developing a cosmos suitable for life. Concerning the potential existence of a multiverse, cyclic, or vacuum universe, clarifying the issues related to the concept of infinity is crucial.

If other universes exist or if quantum energy was present before the Big Bang, the paradox of infinite regress arises. This concept was illustrated in the notorious conversation between Arthur Eddington and a woman who, during a lecture, asserted that the world could be considered a flat disc resting on the back of a giant turtle. She claimed that this turtle stood on another turtle, which continued *ad infinitum*. This analogy can be associated with any theory positing the existence of a multiverse or cyclic or vacuum universe. In the first two cases, each universe implies the existence of another, creating an endless process.

The same applies to those who argue that our universe originated from a quantum fluctuation, which would have required another form of energy to generate it, once again triggering an infinite regression. To circumvent this, Borde, Guth, and Vilenkin (2003) formulate a theorem stating that the inflationary multiverse was not infinite in the past but had a well-defined beginning. Vilenkin and Mithani (2012) revise this theorem and conclude that the multiverse and cyclic and emergent universes have definite origins.

Vilenkin and Mithani's (2012) hypothesis establishes that any model associated with the multiverse, cyclic universe, or vacuum universe has a primordial physical cause, represented by gravitational singularity, at the inception of these theories. However, if we consider the primordial energy core as the primary physical cause of the multiverse, cyclic, or vacuum universes, a cosmos suitable for life, such as ours, could never have been formed.

This is because any universe within the multiverse, cyclic universe, or vacuum universe is chaotic or characterized by incoherent natural laws. Rational physical laws fundamental to the formation of life could not have developed in any universe because they were not inherently destined to emerge from any Big Bang that may have occurred. Consequently, even theories concerning the multiverse, cyclic universe, and vacuum universe require a primary divine cause that may be identified as the sentient creative consciousness theorized above.

If any of the aforementioned theories hold true, a sentient consciousness comprising unknown physical processes could have created the multiverse, cyclic universe, or vacuum universe through its awareness, which predates the origins of these theories and established specific physical laws in a spacetime distinct from the one in which we live. The purpose was to create a cosmos or an infinite series of parallel or sequential universes capable of sustaining life.

In the vacuum universe, as well as in Ellis and Maartens' (2003) emergent universe hypothesis and the quantum fluctuation-generated Big Bang theory, a sentient creative consciousness is responsible for establishing physical laws and calibrating universal

constants. Conversely, the multiverse and cyclic universe models confine the intervention of this consciousness to the formulation of natural laws and suggest the random emergence of universal constants in various universes.

The hypothesis of a sentient creative consciousness can also be linked to the theory of everything. Theorized consciousness could have developed a theory of everything because a framework that reconciles diverse principles such as relativity and quantum mechanics, could be formulated only through a conscious act.

Furthermore, the hypothesis of a sentient creative consciousness could be considered a theory of everything because generating a cosmos or multiple cosmoses suitable for life, wherein relativity and quantum mechanics coexist, may have been possible only through a conscious act rather than a specific pre-existing theory.

The intervention of this sentient consciousness occurred before the emergence of the cosmos(es). Considering the history of the Earth and the immense scale of the cosmos, the purpose of a sentient consciousness may have been to create a universe or infinite cosmoses where life could develop in as many locations as possible.

The evolution of all forms of life on Earth over the past 500 million years suggests that this purpose has been accomplished. The consistency of natural laws throughout the cosmos further supports the notion that each galaxy has multiple planets that sustain life. The potential rarity of intelligence does not preclude its emergence in every galaxy. Should the sentient creative consciousness have generated other universes or formed a cyclic universe, so that life and intelligence could inevitably develop elsewhere or re-emerge?

The hypothesis of a sentient creative consciousness shares similarities with the deistic God that Voltaire (1772, p. 21) theorized, in that both propose a divine first cause that “lit the fuse” of the universe. However, the fundamental difference is that whereas the deistic God is a transcendent creator beyond human comprehension, a God of sentient creative consciousness is a scientific creator with a well-defined nature represented by a consciousness comprising unknown physical processes. As will be discussed in Section 5, science can confirm or refute this concept.

Other issues worth addressing are whether the sentient creative consciousness, comprising unknown physical processes and existing in a spacetime distinct from our own should be considered the ultimate primordial cause of the universe, the multiverse, cyclic universe, or vacuum universe, and whether the presence of a natural God before the Big Bang, represented by this consciousness, introduces the paradox of infinite regress. This raises the question of who or what created this specific creator *ad infinitum*.

To avoid the issue discussed above, I propose that prior to the Big Bang, the physics of our cosmos as we understand them today, did not yet exist. Instead, there was an

entirely different reality, in which the philosophical concepts of the ultimate first cause and infinite regression did not apply.

Consequently, our natural laws may lead us to infer that a sentient creative consciousness is the first divine cause of the cosmos(es) it creates to cultivate life.

Rees's (2001, p. XI) essay *Our Cosmic Habitat* asserts that the major mysteries of the universe fall within the domain of philosophers and theologians. Contrary to Rees, I argue that these questions are not solely concerned with philosophy but can also be addressed in the realm of science. I contend that to understand the mysteries of the universe, answer the question Leibniz (1898) posed centuries ago: "Why is there something rather than nothing?," and determine what breathes life into the equations of physics, we must invoke a divine first cause, which I refer to as sentient creative consciousness, a fundamental entity laying the foundations for the development of life in the cosmos.

This scientific conception of God can aid in unveiling the mystery of the universe by answering the questions that remain highly debated among physicists, philosophers, and theologians.

5. Potential scientific demonstration of the hypothesis of the creator's sentient consciousness

Here, I argue that the hypothesis of a sentient creative consciousness determines the existence or nonexistence of God.

A possible approach to confirm my thesis involves analyzing the information present in the universe and on planet Earth. According to Aczel (2014), Wheeler (1990), Seife (2007), and Lloyd (2006), the human genome, the processes that led to the origin of life, human evolution, and the universe's beginning—composed of physical laws, initial parameters, and equations—are themselves codes made up of information. Studying these codes could reveal whether they were created solely by a sentient consciousness with the aim of developing life within the cosmos.

Regarding the hypothesis of a sentient creator consciousness, studying the mathematics of the universe's spacetime is essential. Hsu and Zee (2005) suggest that the cosmic microwave background (CMB) offers an extraordinary opportunity for a possible creator of the universe to send messages to its inhabitants using Lagrangian mathematics.

Meanwhile, Broadbent (2023) proposes an equation similar to the well-known Drake Equation, comprising 15 factors that represent the probability that intelligent life in a previous universe generated our cosmos. This equation can serve as a thought experiment to help identify the factors related to the origin of our universe, facilitating the examination of each to determine whether our universe was intentionally created by God.

Consequently, mathematics is crucial in determining whether a sentient consciousness has developed a code or equation containing all the answers to the greatest

mysteries of the universe—such as what existed before the Big Bang, the theory of everything, and the existence or non-existence of infinite parallel or serial universes.

Finally, we must consider the means by which this assumption can be verified or refuted. Technology will likely play a crucial role in this endeavor, considering its relentless advancement and domination of the global landscape. Raymond Kurzweil (2005), in his book *The Singularity Is Near*, theorizes that in the future technological progress will surpass human comprehension.

Furthermore, artificial intelligence (Russell and Norvig, 2021; Rich, Knight and Shivashankar, 2010; Luger and Stubblefield, 2004) can lead to the development of conscious entities, such as robots or computers that possess unprecedented mathematical capabilities and can potentially solve previously insurmountable problems, including the existence or non-existence of the conscious God, as theorized in this article.

An alternative approach may involve implanting microchips into the human brain or transforming individuals into hyperintelligent cyborgs (Clark, 2004; Gray, 1995; Mann and Hal, 2001) that use their immense potential to corroborate or confute the hypothesis of sentient creator consciousness.

These options could prove to be valuable allies in discovering whether or not a conscious God exists. Equally important is establishing contact with intelligent extraterrestrial species in the universe. In this case, technology can serve as an intermediary: by developing extremely powerful satellites or spacecraft in the future, we could potentially establish communication with alien civilizations.

Vinge (1993) suggests that extraterrestrial civilizations might reach technological singularity, while Smart (2012) emphasizes that such civilizations could transcend the fabric of spacetime in the future. These considerations lead to the conclusion that any aliens in the universe would likely possess advanced intellectual and technological capabilities, enabling them to understand the structure of the cosmos and our place within it. Sharing such information with humanity would represent a significant opportunity to confirm or refute the existence of a conscious creator God.

Furthermore, the SETI program remains fundamental to this inquiry, continuing to play a crucial role in the search for intelligent life in the universe (Montebugnoli, Melis, and Antonietti, 2022).

If the hypotheses of a universe from the vacuum or a holographic universe—which posit a single universe—are valid, then the conscious God theorized in this article might be present within our cosmos. Consequently, a research project similar to SETI, aimed at discovering a creator through the construction of highly advanced radiotelescopes, could potentially identify this entity at a specific point in spacetime. Such an analysis could also highlight the physical processes that constitute God and what kind of physics and spacetime existed before the collapse of the primordial energy core, considering that this creator may have been present before the Big Bang.

In conclusion, adopting the concept of agnosticism is helpful for the hypothesis of a sentient creative consciousness. Dawkins's (2006, pp. 46–54) *The God Delusion* distinguishes between two types of agnosticism: (i) “temporary pragmatic agnosticism,”

which entails suspending judgment when faced with an enigma for which an answer may eventually be found, and (ii) “permanent theoretical agnosticism,” which applies to mysteries that can never be resolved because they lie beyond human verification.

Temporary pragmatic agnosticism should be adopted to address the questions in this section. Whether a sentient consciousness comprising unknown physical processes created the universe, multiverse, or cyclic universe to cultivate life is unclear. However, further studies on cosmic and terrestrial informational structures and mathematics, combined with technological advancements and potential contact with alien civilizations, may ultimately enable humanity to definitively confirm or refute the existence of a sentient creator consciousness.

6. Conclusions

In this article, I have sought to delve into the major mysteries in philosophy and science that continue to arise in our universe. Questions such as “why does a universe suitable for life exist?” or “does God exist?” or “can science provide answers to the questions of the cosmos?” were considered central to the analysis.

Unlike Hawking and Mlodinow (2010), who dismiss the possibility of a creator, and Krauss (2012), who argues against the existence of a predetermined purpose in the universe, I contend that the physical laws and universal constants suggest the possibility of a God who created the cosmos with the intention of fostering the development of life.

Even if subsequent processes leading to the emergence of life occurred by chance, acknowledging that these events occurred indirectly through God is inevitable. Without the establishment of natural laws and the fine-tuning of universal constants, such occurrences would have been impossible. The possible existence of a multiverse, cyclic universe, vacuum universe, and the anthropic principle does not alter the aforementioned assumption because the specific nature of the laws governing our cosmos demands an explanation that can only be fully comprehended through the concept of God.

Various theories, such as string theory, loop quantum gravity, and causal fermion systems, do not resist God’s existence. Only a creator could have conceived a cosmos or infinite cosmoses governed by entirely different sets of laws, such as relativity and quantum mechanics.

In this article, unlike the studies by Penrose (1994), Polkinghorne (2007), and Chalmers (1996), which explore consciousness in relation to specific fields such as quantum mechanics, theology, and the universe, I have aimed to integrate the issue of awareness with cosmology, physics, and the existence of God within a unified investigation.

In Section 4, I elucidated the nature of God and the essence of God’s composition. The fact that consciousness enables humans to create artwork, music, and literature leads to the conclusion that God, if God exists, is a conscious being comprising unknown physical processes. This consciousness may have established physical laws, fine-tuned

universal constants, and subsequently formed and imploded the primordial energy core to bring sentient beings into existence on various planets.

The hypothesis of a sentient creative consciousness is compatible with any theory concerning the origin of the universe, as the Borde–Guth–Vilenkin theorem asserts that the multiverse, cyclic universe, and vacuum universe must also have had a beginning. In my view, this beginning was caused by the aforementioned consciousness, which may have formed a cosmos or infinite universe before its emergence to foster life.

In the case of a holographic universe, the creation of a cosmos suitable for life would have occurred before the inception of the aforementioned hypothesis, once again, because of the proposed sentient consciousness. Furthermore, given that a different form of physics existed before the Big Bang, I emphasize that this sentient consciousness cannot be associated with the philosophical concepts of a definitive first cause or infinite regress, which humankind explores through the physical laws governing our cosmos. Therefore, it should be regarded solely as the first divine cause of the holographic, vacuum, multiverse, or cyclic universe.

The various theories of everything do not reject my hypothesis, because only consciousness could have created a cosmos—whether parallel, serial, or infinite—with a specific theoretical framework in which fundamentally distinct laws such as relativity and quantum mechanics can coexist. Moreover, I have argued that the hypothesis of a sentient creative consciousness may be considered a theory of everything because the only conceivable means of unifying all physical phenomena within a single framework is through a conscious act that occurs prior to the inception of the universe, multiverse, or cyclic universe, without relying on any specific theoretical model.

In this final section, I assert that the hypothesis of a sentient creator consciousness—unlike Aczel’s (2014) position, which denies the possibility that humans can discover whether God exists or not—could one day be confirmed or refuted scientifically. The limitation of my study lies in the current lack of technological means and the insufficient understanding of many aspects of the cosmos, which currently make this hypothesis untestable. However, in the future, exploring the presence of possible mathematical codes created by a creator within the spacetime of the universe, the information contained in the universe and on planet Earth, as well as the development of artificial intelligence and contact with alien civilizations, could serve as valuable tools to validate or reject the hypothesis of a sentient creator consciousness.

Moreover, future research might explore how interdisciplinary approaches—combining advances in neuroscience, cosmology, physics, technology, and philosophy—can offer new insights into the big mysteries of the universe.

Consequently, regarding the hypothesis of a sentient creator consciousness, a temporary and pragmatic agnosticism can be applied, since it will ultimately be confirmed or disproved through scientific progress.

In conclusion, this study fills a significant gap in the academic landscape by suggesting that consciousness is not merely an isolated phenomenon but a key interpretive element connecting complex issues such as the existence of God, the origin of the

universe, and the theory of everything. It invites—through this new perspective of a sentient creator consciousness—a deeper and more integrated reflection that can shed light on our understanding of the cosmos. As Einstein (1938, p. 83) stated: “To pose new questions, new possibilities, and to consider old problems from a new angle requires creative imagination and marks a real progress in science.”

References

- A. Aczel. *Why science does not disprove God*. New York: William Morrow. 2014.
- A.F. Ali, S. Das. Cosmology from quantum potential. *Physics Letters B*, 741, 276-279. 2015.
- J. Ambjorn, A. Goerlich, J. Jurkiewicz, R. Loll. CDT—An entropic theory of quantum gravity. arXiv, 2010. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1007.2560>.
- A. Ashtekar, T. Pawłowski, P. Singh. Quantum nature of the Big Bang. *Physical Review Letters*, 96 (14), 141301. 2006.
- J. Barrow. *Theories of everything: The quest for ultimate explanation*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1991.
- J.D. Barrow. *The constants of nature: From alpha to omega - The numbers that encode the deepest secrets of the universe*. New York: Pantheon Books. 2002.
- J.D. Barrow. *The infinite book: A Short guide to the boundless, timeless and endless*. New York: Pantheon Books. 2005.
- J. D. Barrow, F. J. Tipler. *The anthropic cosmological principle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1986.
- L. Baum, P.H. Frampton. Entropy of contracting universe in cyclic cosmology. *Modern Physics Letters A*, 23 (1), 33-36. 2008.
- J.D. Bernal. *The physical basis of life*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1951.
- J. Binney, D. Skinner. *The physics of quantum mechanics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2008.
- D. Bohm. *Quantum theory*. Dover Publications. 1989.
- M. Bojowald. *Once before time: A whole story of the universe*, New York: Knopf. 2010.
- A. Borde, A. Guth, A. Vilenkin. Inflationary spacetimes are incomplete in past directions. *Physical Review Letters*, 90 (15), 151301. 2003.
- D. Broadbent. Could our universe have been initiated intentionally: An epistemological framework. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, 31, 4–12. 2023.
- B. Carter. Large number coincidences and the anthropic principle in cosmology. In *Iau Symposium 63: Confrontation of cosmological theories with observational data* (pp. 291–298). Dordrecht: Reidel. 1974.

Exploring the Role of Consciousness in the Origin of the Universe and Life: A Hypothesis of a Sentient Creator

- D. Chalmers. Facing up to the problem of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness*, 2 (3), 200-219. 1995.
- D.J. Chalmers. *The conscious mind: In search of a fundamental theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1996.
- M. Chester. *Primer of quantum mechanics*. John Wiley. 1987.
- A. Clark. *Natural-born cyborgs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2004
- F. Close. *Theories of everything: Ideas in profile*. London: Profile Books. 2017
- B. Cox, J. Forshaw. *The quantum universe: Everything that can happen does happen*. London: Allen Lane. 2011.
- C. Darwin. *On the origin of species*. London: John Murray. 1859.
- P. Davies. *Cosmic jackpot: Why our universe is just right for life*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. 2007.
- R. Dawkins. *The god delusion*. London: Bantam Press. 2006.
- D. Dennett. *Consciousness explained*. New York: Back Bay Books. 1992.
- J. Diller, A. Kasher. *Models of god and alternative ultimate realities*. London: Springer. 2013.
- A.S. Eddington. *The constants of nature*. In Newman J. R. (eds.) *The world of mathematics*, 2. New York: Dover Publications, 1074-1093. 1956.
- A. Einstein, I. Infeld. *The evolution of physics*. New York: Simon and Schuster. 1938.
- R. Eisberg, R. Resnick. *Quantum physics of atoms, molecules, solids, nuclei, and particles*. Wiley. 1985.
- G.F.R. Ellis, R. Maartens. *The emergent universe: Inflationary cosmology with no singularity*. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 21 (1), 223-232. 2003.
- H. Everett. "Relative state" formulation of quantum mechanics. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 29 (454), 454-462. 1957.
- R. Feynman. (1965) *The character of physical law*. New York: Modern Library. 1965.
- R. P. Feynman, R. B. Leighton, M. Sands. *The Feynman lectures on physics*, vol. 1-3. Addison-Wesley. 1965.
- F. Finster. *The principle of the fermionic projector*. *AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics*, 35. 2006.
- I.J. Good. Chinese universes. *Physics Today*, 25 (7), 15. 1972.
- C.H. Gray. *The cyborg handbook*. New York: Routledge. 1995.
- D. K. Greenberger, K. F. Hentschel, F. Weinert. *Compendium of quantum physics: Concepts, experiments, history and philosophy*. Springer-Verlag. 2009.
- B. Greene. *The hidden reality: Parallel universes and the deep laws of the cosmos*. New York: Vintage Books. 2011.

- J. Gribbin, M. Rees. Cosmic coincidences: Dark matter, mankind, and anthropic cosmology. New York: Bantam Books. 1989.
- D. J. Griffiths. Introduction to quantum mechanics. Prentice Hall. 2004.
- A.H. Guth. Eternal inflation and its implications. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 40 (25), pp. 6811-6826. 2007.
- J.B.S. Haldane. The origin of life. *Rationalist Annual*, 148, 3-10. 1929.
- J.B. Hartle, S.W. Hawking, S. Wave function of the universe. *Physical Review, Part D*, 28 (12), 2960-2975. 1983.
- S. Hawking. A brief history of time: From the Big Bang to black holes. New York: Bantam Books. 1988.
- S. Hawking, L. Mlodinow. The grand design. London: Bantam Press. 2010.
- M. Heller, W.H. Woodin. Infinity: New research frontiers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2011.
- T. Hertog. On the origin of time. London: Bantam Press. 2023.
- F. Hoyle, G.R. Burbidge, J.V. Narlikar. A quasi-steady state cosmological model with creation of matter. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 410 (2), 437-457. 1993.
- S. Hsu, A. Zee. Message in the sky. *Modern Physics Letters A*, 21(19), 1495–1500. 2006.
- M. Kaku. Strings, conformal fields, and M-theory. New York: Springer. 1999.
- L. Krauss. A universe from nothing: Why there is something than nothing. New York: Atria Books. 2012.
- R. Kurzweil. The singularity is near: When humans transcend biology. New York: Viking Press. 2005.
- G.W. Leibniz. Principles of nature and grace. In *Leibniz: The monadology and other philosophical writings*, R. Latta Translation. London: Oxford University Press, 405-424. 1898.
- G.F. Lewis, L.A. Barnes, B. Schmidt. A fortunate universe: Life in a finely tuned cosmos. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2016.
- S. Lloyd. Programming the universe: A quantum computer scientist takes on the cosmos. New York: Knopf. 2006.
- G. Luger, W. Stubblefield. Artificial intelligence: Structures and strategies for complex problem solving. San Francisco: Benjamin/Cummings. 2004.
- J. Maldacena, L. Susskind, L. Cool horizons for entangled black holes. *Fortschritte der Physik*, 61 (9), 781-811. 2013.
- S. Mann, H. Niedzviecki. Cyborg: Digital destiny and human possibility in the age of the wearable computer. Toronto: Doubleday Canada. 2001.
- L. Mersini-Houghton. Birth of the universe from the multiverse. arXiv. 2011. <https://arxiv.org/abs/0809.3623>.

Exploring the Role of Consciousness in the Origin of the Universe and Life: A Hypothesis of a Sentient Creator

- A. Mithani, A. Vilenkin. Did the universe have a beginning?. *Physical Review, Part D*, 46 (6), 2355. 2012.
- S. Montebugnoli, A. Melis, N. Antonietti. The search for extraterrestrial intelligence. In *Proceedings of the 2nd SETI-INAF meeting 2019*. New York: Springer. 2022.
- T. Nagel. What is it like to be a bat? *The Philosophical Review*, 83(4), 435–450. 1974.
- A.I. Oparin. *Proiskhozhdenie zhizni*. Moscow: Izd. Moskovskii Rabochii. 1924.
- R. Penrose. *Shadows of the mind: A search for the missing science of consciousness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1994.
- R. Penrose. *Cycles of time: An extraordinary new view of the universe*. London: The Bodley Head. 2010.
- J. Polkinghorne. *Quantum physics & theology: An unexpected kinship*. London: Spck Publishing. 2007.
- M. Rees. *Just six numbers: The deep forces that shape the universe*. London: Basic Books. 1999.
- M. Rees. *Our cosmic habitat*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 2001.
- E. Rich, K. Knight, B.N. Shivashankar. *Artificial intelligence*. New Delhi: McGraw Hill India. 2010.
- R. Rucker. *Infinity and the mind: The science and philosophy of the infinite*. London: Paladin. 1984.
- S.J. Russell, P. Norvig. *Artificial intelligence: A modern approach*. Hoboken: Pearson. 2021.
- S. Schneider, M. Velmans. *The Blackwell companion to consciousness*. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell. 2017.
- J.R. Searle. *The mystery of consciousness*, London: Granta Books. 1997.
- C. Seife. *Decoding the universe: How the new science of information is explaining everything in the cosmos, from our brains to black holes*. New York: Penguin Random House. 2007.
- A. Seth. *Being you: A new science of consciousness*, New York: Penguin Random House. 2021.
- S. Singh. *Big Bang: The origin of the universe*. New York: Fourth Estate. 2004.
- D. Sloan. (ed.). *Fine-tuning in the physical universe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2020.
- J. M. Smart. The transcension hypothesis: Sufficiently advanced civilizations invariably leave our universe, and implications for METI and SETI. *Acta Astronautica*, 78, 55–68. 2012.
- L. Smolin. *The life of the cosmos*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1997
- M. Solovine, A. Einstein. *Letters to Solovine*. New York: Philosophical Library. 1987.
- R.J. Spitzer. *New proofs for the existence of God: Contributions of contemporary physics and philosophy*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing. 2010.
- P.J. Steinhardt, N. Turok. *Endless universe: Beyond the Big Bang*. New York: Doubleday Publishing. 2007.

- V.J. Stenger. *God: The failed hypothesis: How science shows that God does not exist*. Amherst: Prometheus Books. 2007.
- S. Surya. The causal set approach to quantum gravity. *Living Reviews in Relativity*, 22 (1), 1-75. 2019.
- M. Tegmark. *Our mathematical universe: My quest for the ultimate nature of reality*. New York: Vintage Books. 2014.
- E.P. Tryon. Is the universe a quantum fluctuation. *Nature*, 246 (5433), 396-397. 1973.
- R. Vaas. *Beyond the Big Bang: Competing scenarios for an eternal universe*. Berlin: Springer. 2011.
- V. Vinge. The coming technological singularity: How to survive in the post-human era. *Whole Earth Review*, (winter), 11. 1993.
- Voltaire. *Les cabales. Oeuvre Pacifique*, Paris. 1972.
- S. Webb. If the universe is teeming with aliens ... where is everybody?: Seventy-five solutions to the fermi paradox and the problem of extraterrestrial life. New York: Springer. 2015.
- S. Weinberg. *The first three minutes: A modern view of the origin of the universe*. New York: Basic Books. 1977.
- S. Weinberg. *Dreams of a final theory: The search for the fundamental laws of nature*. London: Hutchinson Radius. 1993.
- J. A. Wheeler. Information, physics, quantum: The search for links. In W. H. Zurek (ed.), *Complexity, entropy, and the physics of information* (pp. 354–368). Redwood City: Addison-Wesley. 1990.
- C. Wickramasinghe. Bacterial morphologies supporting cometary panspermia: A reappraisal. *International Journal of Astrobiology*, 10 (1), 25-30. 2011.