

## Science and Faith

Foreword.

The concept of a Big Bang - proposed by Hawking among others, but later refuted by him - arose from observations that indicated our Universe was expanding.

Most consider the logical process is to speculate about its beginning: most Religions and Faiths, as well as Philosophy, contemplate likewise.

A reversal of the expansion process inevitably approaches a situation in which all the matter in the Universe is concentrated in a very small space.

In so doing it would become incomprehensibly dense.

Paradoxically the mathematics imposed upon the process gave rise to the Big Bang Theory in which the Genesis was a Singularity, occupying no Space Time, having no Energy Charge, or Mass.

While some could perceive this to mathematically explain The Beginning; there were, and are, anomalies that continue to generate debate and exploration.

It is to the benefit of the argument that observations, many resulting from improved technology, have been declared as confirmatory. Among these have been the 'discovery' and study of Black Holes.

Despite such apparent confirmation, dissent and dispute remain.

\* \* \*

Twentieth century contemplations of this subject were by no means the first: Fundamental Taoists were possibly the first to give consideration to the Cosmic process, and the ways by which mankind could exist in harmony with it.

From that time to the present the search for knowledge has invariably led to a Metaphysical World rather than to our 'Physical World'.

Understandably, all attempts to explain Metaphysical phenomena in Physical terms have, in general, been unsatisfactory and incomplete.

It was; and remains; inevitable this situation should lead to Conflict: this has occurred most often through the process of Literal interpretation leading to Fundamentalism and thence to the Conflict.

\* \* \*

This has been the historical record of events based on the religions that arose to satisfy the apparently innate Need of Mankind to search for Knowledge, and an understanding of his existence.

This sort of process must of necessity be Anthropic - strongly biased to Anthropocentricity - and be equally biased towards Theism, if only to make it Teleological: i.e. to have cause and purpose.

Arguably, most of the conflict has arisen because of the restrictions imposed by the Anthropocentric closed-mindedness that it generates.

For Mankind to have been created, in its image, by an omnipotent superior being, most conveniently explained the sought for superiority of Mankind.

Despite any erosion evident in this concept - through the existence of the various, stated, strengths of the Anthropic Principle and ending with the misanthropic arguments - any state of open-mindedness demands there remains a possibility that Theist concepts are as valid as any other.

In general there are three considerations which are omitted from the various arguments and concepts advanced.

- Firstly the possibility our Universe is but one stage in an overall Fractal Structure, or is perhaps no more than a portion of one such stage.
- Secondly is the possibility that not every process is linear, but may be simply phased, consequently phased, or may even be organic - dependant upon the structure of Totality.
- Thirdly is the 'improbable' likelihood that the whole of Nature's Process is the result of Pure Chance.

Potentialism has the capacity to include any, or all, of these three considerations, as well as that of a Theist motivation.

During my consideration, of this concept of Potentialism, there has emerged the possibility of an underlying concept of Fundamentalism.

It is difficult to assess whether this should precede the discussion on Potentialism, or follow it.

There is logic in both presentations.

For expediency an outline of Fundamentalism is discussed first. This is because of the probability that it is, by definition, fundamental to Potentialism.

This concept came to me during a bout of insomnia: I was thinking about the position I had reached with collecting data for the Potentialism concept; the following notes represent my thought train of that night.

It seems to me it is a natural foundation that extends into Potentialism.

It remains to be seen how it may further evolve: there is some indication it approaches 'A Final Solution'.

It is this indication that suggests it should be at the end of the discourse, and it would then be metaphorically represented by a closed loop.

Viewed as such it indicates the possibility of the existence of fated paths of experience.

Alternatively, it may be an example of the Ego-anthropocentrism referred to in the Notes.

\* \* \*

It cannot be overlooked that these arguments arose from consideration of the possibility that Science could possibly be considered a Nature Faith: this in turn having arisen from a desire to compare the Nature Faiths as the subject for a book.

In consequence these arguments are a diversion from that work: now destined to resurface after Booklet Ten.

A study of the physical sciences indicates the concept of a fundamental singularity; as well as the possibility of a fundamental energy particle, which I term a **Potention**. (This would have to be an as yet undiscovered basic constituent of a Quark?).

Likewise in studying the biological sciences there seems to be a place for a fundamental unit of 'life form', which has the capability to combine to form a fundamental, viable, life.

This would be the equivalent of the Hydrogen Atom: more realistically the nucleus of the Hydrogen Atom.

In both cases we may conceive a fractal structure.

In the physical world this fractal structure would start in the basic sub-atomic particles and continue into The Universe: perhaps beyond.

In the biological world, it must start somewhere in pre-living, complex, organic molecules and continue through all the discovered arrangements of micro-organisms to all the various life forms within our scale of vision.

In both cases the Sum always has the possibility of being more than the parts it contains.

The enigma is partly explainable by the relationships - either Congregational, or Symbiotic - existing between some, or all, of the constituents.

In like manner there seems to be a parallel in the organisation of some living species, including humans.

\* \* \*

If there were validity in the concept of these fundamental units, it opens up the possibility of a Fundamental Existence in which Fundamental Laws are paramount.

This existence would be at the core of all other existence, including our own making the fundamental laws not only operable in our existence but, by definition, inviolate.

In practical terms this means we ignore them to our own cost; there is always a price to pay.

Liebnitz offered his concept of **Compossibilities**: this includes the possibility of other states of existence.

Quantum Mechanics places our existence in a space-time; this again allows the possibility of other states of existence, in other space times.

The limits of our existence - and, therefore, by definition, our experiences - are illustrated by a Space Time Cone which extends into both past and future from the singularity of the present.

There is also the possibility/probability the past and future are connected via a common point known as the Omega Point.

In this case the future becomes the past coming to meet us.

It seems valid to consider the Time Cone illustration may be equally applicable to Potentialism, with the Potential at the singularity of the cone becoming manifest - within the limits of appropriateness represented by the cone - to everyone who has a cone of experience/awareness falling within a similar limiting cone, in the same space/time.

Thus reality depends upon the correct juxtaposition of two or three cones of experience floating 'aimlessly' in an infinite chaos.

In turn this suggests the possibility we each have a Personal Existence that is as unique as our DNA structure etc.: I use the initials **I.E.** to refer to this characteristic.

\* \* \*

Perceived Existence is limited to the sum total of Human Experience' is a commonly acknowledged statement: i.e. all the I.E. which has existed and still exists.

In reality this excludes all, or most, of that which has become extinct; together with anything the oligarchy choose to keep from their subjects; as well as anything the establishment ignores.

Whatever limitations are imposed, our perception of our existence/reality must be Anthropocentric; is usually anthropocentric; and is possibly no more than the sum of the ego-anthropocentricity that has ever existed.

However, though we may choose to distort reality, we cannot escape the laws applying to the true reality: whatever that may be.

One of these fundamental forces may well be manifest in the interaction between all physical opposites: an interaction likely to apply equally to non-physical relationships.

Thus there will be an attraction between I.E's contained within a limited range of similarities: these limits must also have fundamental 'direction'.

This becomes the basis for the formation of all focussed groups such as Faiths, Religions, Politics, and Schools of Philosophy etc.

These limits of similarity must be fundamental if the above grouping process is natural.

That it applies to physical characteristics is unquestioned: as is the possibility of valid interbreeding if the hybrids are appropriate to necessity and survival.

\* \* \*

If this line of thought is valid, it must be equally valid that Difference is also a fundamental characteristic. If so it must be a variable characteristic in order to suit necessity and survival - as previously noted for physical characteristics. Also, by definition, as a fundamental characteristic it must have purpose.

In this case I suggest the purpose arises from the perceived presence of unrealities differing from the truth/norm.

Alternatively it allows for the variation in human perception towards the same event.

In human terms our existence is, as previously noted, the sum of the individual perceptions which group together into a number of shared perceptions.

It is the difference such perceptions, between groupings, which have the potential to create conflict and opposition.

Perhaps these are the forces necessary to drive a naturally progressive process?

\* \* \*

Clearly the form and nature of the opposition will not generate violent conflict if the process is natural.

It follows the appearance of violent conflict is most likely a sign of inappropriateness, thus indicating we have strayed beyond the fundamental limit: human history has validated this state.

In turn this suggests relative opposition is the natural means of making progress in the right direction.

This raises the question about the appropriateness of direction.

Our perception of what is right depends upon conditioning. Thus Gravity is perceived more in a down direction, than towards the centre of the attracting body. Likewise the Past is behind us, and the Future in front of us.

The former immediately becomes invalid - in relative terms - if the observer is anything but upright.

The latter is now generally accepted as not to be the case: Past, Present, and Future are now thought to be contiguous.

It thus becomes almost certain there must be a fundamental 'Direction' that makes fundamental laws valid.

If we were to regard the 'S'-Curve as one such possible representation, the curve becomes a fundamental path; always in balance for natural functions. Any other path is, by definition, relatively unnatural; fundamentally less balanced; possibly less productive: should it be invalid, it will be inappropriate.

Thus it becomes probable that a direction having long-term effect, must be towards the Omega Point.

In turn, valid Compossibilities are those within the Field of Attraction of the Fundamental Path. Additionally, Fundamental Purpose must be responsive to Natural Forces.

Note: Natural Urges such as Sex may not necessarily be considered fundamental. This is illustrated by the possibility of survival by means other than the sex act.

Procreation on the other hand is almost certainly fundamental, albeit conditionally.

The constitution of a Fundamental Existence is probably beyond human conception. However, it seems likely it includes a Fundamental Cosmos: but only if there is a necessity for its presence.

\* \* \*

None of this line of thinking indicates whether there is, or is not, a Fundamental Controller.

With all other such thoughts, human perception finds it easier to accept the necessity for a controlling hand. The alternative is to consider the possibility of an inescapable event, arising from the chance aggrandisement of compatible and appropriate conditions.

It seems logical to suppose that the consequence of all Compossibilities meeting at the Omega Point will either be the next Big Bang, or, Armageddon.

\* \* \* \* \*