

Review of: "Why Existence? An Explanation with No Remainder"

Grzegorz Karwasz¹

¹ Nicolaus Copernicus University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is an interesting piece of reasoning on the question of existence of the Universe. The “reason” and the “cause” for its existence, the author finds in immaterial entities, such as mathematics, logic and “value”. Soon, throughout the manuscript, the author disregards mathematics, as numbers could exist as abstract entities solely, and not impose the existence of the world. Differently with value and meaning - which are the reason (and the efficient cause) for the universe, also that material (i.e. space, time, energy, matter).

The answer for the question “Why there exists something instead of nothing” is, if I understand correctly, the very question: the fact that some beings are able to pose it.

As says the author, the world exists to “develop life, mind, meaning, and value”.

This solution invokes the old (dating to Plato and Aristotle) distinction between the matter and non-matter. The author does not slip into the discussion of the space-and-time, that frequently are recalled in this type of papers/ books – this is correct, as by modern physics the conditions for the space and time is the physical matter: the author searches the reasons for the material world outside the Physics.

Obviously, the question put by the author is the first, fundamental question put by every thinker. But the author gives a whole panorama of possible (and already discussed in the literature) answers, in a quite concise way: the reach bibliography well-inserted into the text is a strong point of this paper.

Another, interesting although somewhat “bizarre” concept that the author explores is the “retrocausation”, i.e. creation of the universe from later to earlier. But, again, the author avoids to slip into such considerations, which would implicitly assume the existence of the time arrow (i.e. of the material world a priori).

What emerges also from this paper is that some philosophical questions are answered better in different languages: the colloquial meaning of the French “raison d'être” is not the same as “the reason for being”.

The paper is well-thought, and even if the literature trying to answer the question posed in the title is almost infinite, the paper will find its own place in the literature. I recommend its publishing in the present form.

Minor changes

I find relatively less documented the part on the universe fine-tuned: “The Anthropic Principle” by J. Barrow and J. Tipler

could be an example, or any more recent paper in this subject.

Tiny misprints (mainly the spaces between italics and normal fonts) are underlined in the attached text.