

What Exists, Via Necessity

Copyright 2015 Austin P. Torney

austintorn@aol.com

What Exists, Via Necessity



— Higher Reality —

WHAT EXISTS, VIA NECESSITY

0. *What the heck am I doing here, thrust into life, un-informed of its essence, having to mostly deal with existence, day in and day out?*

So it is that you have noted the necessity of this situation of our human condition, for that's how it is, plus it's also our nature to wonder about the essence of existence from time to time, as probably our most often asked question.

What a dilemma!

In a Theory of Everything forum long ago, in the 9th century, Abunasr Farabi wrote:

*Vague and unrefined did the secrets of existence remain.
Unpierced did that highly revered pearl remain.
Each person said something according to his reason.
Yet untold did the point which was of essence remain.*

And Abulhasan Kharquani replied in the forum in the 11th century (the internet was slow in those days):

*The primordial secrets neither you know nor I.
The words of the puzzle neither you can read nor I.
Your discourse and mine are behind the curtain.
When the curtain falls, neither you remain nor I.*

Omar Khayyam wondered and wrote of the human condition,

*The sphere upon which mortals come and go,
Has no end nor beginning that we know;
And none there is to tell us in plain truth:
Whence do we come and whither do we go.*
— Ahmad Saidi's version

and concluded, eventually, after coming full circle from his deconstructions of religious myth-takes,

What Exists, Via Necessity

*Ah, make the most of what we yet may spend,
Before we too into the Dust descend;
Dust into Dust, and under Dust to lie
Sans Wine, sans Song, sans Singer, and -- sans End!*
— FitzGerald's version

which philosophy I agree with, although,

*The search for the ultimate truth sublime
Of all that is leads us wise through its clime,
Within and without, is a swelling quest;
For then we know ourselves for the first time.*
(— Austin, hereafter non attributed)

but, still, to some lessor event, compared to long ago,

*No one has plumbed the Secret Depths of Truth—
The jewel eludes e'en the wisest sleuth;
Thus we hear wishes turned to beliefs' lore,
Yet none can say "It's this, and here's the proof".*
— Austin's re-transmogrification of Omar

1. We have experiences; thus there is something.

*I, of the endless forms most beautiful,
Am stunned that my glass to the brim is full,
Life's wine coursing through me, as 'magical',
On this lovely, rolling sphere so bountiful.*

1a. If a lack of anything was ever, it would ever 'be' so.

1b. Nonexistence cannot be; it has no properties.

1ba. Thus, Existence has no opposite, by necessity.

1bb. If one still says that nonexistence can be productive then that capability is something, and thus one did not have 'nonexistence' as claimed.

*Nonexistence can't be, nor even be meant;
So it is that existence must be here;
There's no other option, by necessity,
And thus herein these pages we learn its ways.*

1c. There must be an objective, real basis, for there can be no true paradoxes, such as how could something be, for it already is, as a fate accomplished, without any more 'Why' needed, since we already have Truth..

1d. *Allah did it.*

We can't just layer on, non sequitur, that it is a Person. Best to stick only to the truth that we have so far that something exists. We can only refer to it as What IS or the Basis.

2. Experiences demonstrate a pattern of happenings/ events.

2a. We have senses; thus it is proved that there is something physical outside of us for our senses to take in.

2aa. Examples: Our sense of smell begins with molecule shapes; our sense of sound begins with air vibrations.

3. The physical Basis of Existence is not contingent on anything else, or it wouldn't be the Basis; thus, the Basis does not depend on anything else, making it 'ever'.

3a. The Basis has to be simple and non composite, for it cannot depend on its parts for its being. Whatever depends on something else cannot be Fundamental/First.

3aa. It is not makable, for it has no parts for it to be made of/from.

3aab. It is ever; it never became; it just is, unchangeable. There can be no higher dimension in which it can be built or changed in time, as that leads to a regress. Whatever has a beginning is not the Basis.

3ab. It is not breakable, for its has no parts to be broken into.

3aba. It is ever; it never goes away; it just is, unchangeable and unmakeable.

3b. The Basis is made of itself as existence itself, for lack of anything specific to call it. We might call it energy.

3ba. There isn't anything more fundamental to compare it to.

3c. It is not embedded in some larger extent (space) nor in some longer duration (time), for there isn't anything outside of or before the Basis (or it wouldn't be the Basis, anyway).

3d. The Basis has no choice but to be; no option whatsoever. It cannot not be. There is no 'luck' to it; it is ever in the right place at the right time, place and time being of emergent features to us.

3da. There is no point at which any set direction or design could have been imparted to it; so, its form and what it does must be not anything particular, of necessity.

3e. The Basis, being non composite, cannot be a system or a mind. Thus, progression/transformation is expected to be slow, and its accomplishments turn out to be numbingly slow to us.

3ea. It appears that all that happens could not have been foreseen.

3eaa. Brute force is all that's left.

3eaaa. Arrangements have come to be in a workable universe, to us.

3f. High complexity arrives much later / far upward of the fundamental Basis. Proof: It took billions of years for life and us to form. This long yardstick sticks in the throat, and yet it is so.

3fa. Evidently, there are no short cuts of 'magic'; natural processes have to churn, and even with the right conditions, plus evolution, they still have to churn, requiring optimal conditions, such as near extinctions at the right time. If they fail, to us, well, there are always other planets that might bear life. Earth must reside in the 'Goldilocks' zone, where it is not too hot and not too cold.

3fb. If one Big Bang doesn't amount to anything workable, then, since there can be one Bang there can be another.

3g. It is an error to not accept that what we have could just be so, requiring that some way Larger Existence needs be responsible for our lessor existence, and that the larger Existence can just be, throwing away this golden template after only one usage, suddenly no longer requiring a LARGER for the Larger to come from. This error is called "begging the question" by posing an even larger question pretending to be an answer.

3ga. There isn't much worse than the religious who dishonestly state things as if they are truth and fact, given that 'faith' is an honest word, but worse there is, indeed, when such as what they state from page one of the Bible is outright wrong, for man was not made as is, immutable, a few thousand years ago, but evolved, from one tree of life, with the species having not been made separately, plus Earth is not the center of All, as fixed, nor is the sky a dome, and more.

3gb. I don't state that there is no 'God' for sure, as that would be dishonest, but rather say that that it's not established and so I don't have anything to work with. 'Faith' doesn't provide anything, as its definition honestly indicates. I have provided reasons why a Supernatural isn't likely, and another reason is upcoming.

3h. What we have as life in the world is neither the best nor the worst that could be, but a workable average of features that cannot all be maximized. Read a big city newspaper if you dare.

3ha. Example: We survived not in spite of our violence but because of it. Even our cooperation was born out of the need to better our hunts or wars. If we could just erase our aggressive tendencies then perhaps some of our zest for life would disappear, too, as a side effect. Many things are interwoven, and at least there is somewhat of a balance, even if it is a shaky one.

3i. We have not been around that long, and may not last, but what we see is what we got and have, and that's it. If only there was some 'magic' to be applied at large by some Intangible to make it better.

3ia. There can't be extra-, super-, intangible, etc., for they would still have to speak the language of the tangible and exchange energy with it.

3j. The eternalness of the Basis is not in time, such as that it has no earliest event/memory in an endless regression, but is timeless, full, all-at-once, and unchanging at large. Evidently, and surely, there can be perturbations within in.

3k. Nor is it infinite in the sense that it has a spacial ever going on that can be capped as complete, but is spaceless, having but its relations via its arrangements providing a self-made scale.

4. The Basis encompasses a lot, not a little. Proof: the Universe is incredibly large, containing seemingly near endless amounts of stuff.

4a. This ‘extravagance’ of material needs be, of necessity, as all aspects of the Basis have to be, to some extent, at least.

4aa. There is no difficulty for humongous amounts of stuff to be.

5. What is in the Universe spans a great range from the larger to the smaller, relative to us who are near the mid-point, more or less.

5a. Some aggregates in the Universe are quite large, such as stars, their size apparently limited to some certain possible size just before they would have to collapse into a black hole.

5b. The smallest that we can hope to measure—the Planck length, is indeed very minuscule to us.

5c. It’s as if the near endless largest and the near infinitesimal smallest provide for a finite unity at their center, but this is only a speculation to be worked on.

6. All that is and all that goes on is of the Basis, and this is probably why we’re curious as to its nature. Some may be disappointed in not finding a great complexity sitting there.

6a. Still, in a way, the simple Basis can be thought of as great, although it is small and has to be existent, and so it

didn't win a contest or earn its place. It's in the only place at the only time, and even this as a base existent without space or time. Nevertheless, it is great in its own forced way because everything of its higher arrangements is of/from it.

7. Events keep on going on, at least so far, with no stops or repeating loops that we can detect.

7a. The only constant of the Basis is that it makes for change in appearances. It's stillness is apparently not possible.

7aa. Time shows as change in appearances in the order of succession.

7ab. Space shows as order of coexistent appearances in relation to one another.

8. All that happens of the Basis is as real as the Basis, for there is only the Basis.

8a. We can assign degrees to denote what is more and more higher as more and more complex, sometimes calling these properties emergent, but at the end of the day what is of the Real is real, too, for it happens, and this is even if the happenings are a re-presentation, such as via the brain, which is actually the only 'via', anyway.

9. There is consistency in nature's development, and in ours, too, in going from the simpler to the more complex.

9a. We see that a few simple, lowest, atomic elements form right away, and protons make for stars, which produce the rest of the lower atomic elements, and, when stars explode, produce the higher elements, which coalesce into molecules and planets, on some of which primitive cells develop, and can come life, which can then evolve, etc.

*We're constructed from the stuff of stars' grand,
Through life's history recorded in strands
Of DNA, both recent and older,
The parts conducting, to play as a band.*

*Bio-electric-chemicals grow,
Through metabolism, through our road show,
Experiences and inclinations
Forming the life expression that we know.*

*All's thanks to Death's prolonged sifting of 'dies',
Of the rest from the best, silly from wise,
The pointless from the pointed—selection.
Oh, through ink-black rivers we had to rise!*

*Life's birthright, long signed by time, dust, and death,
Doth also serve, for the Earth's living quests,
As an epitaph: RIP; time wears,
The tips of the strands rip, tear; dust is left.*

9b. In us, our neural networks vote for what thoughts and actions become, from what we have become up to that moment.

10. There can be no such events as ‘random’, that is, outputs of changes in appearances becoming not of anything, that is, without regard to what is there, as input, that is, coming, rather, from Nothing.

10a. The determinism of what must be related to what or what must affect what is the price paid for consistency, and so “whatever will be will be” in nature and us. As much as it has a bad taste, that’s the only way it can be, given that there can no ‘random’, plus that if there were a ‘random’ it wouldn’t help, and would actually hurt. The will cannot be free of itself.

10aa. True that quantum measurements are indeterminate, such that we must resort to probability; however, what really happens or is the state that we can’t get at or measure is still of determinism.

10b. *What good is the necessarily determined life which can be no other way?*

We still get to experience it, plus our consistency gives us a fine start on our continuance/survival; however, we can’t really yet layer on motive to What IS.

10c. *Why do humans express themselves in a spectrum from the very good to very bad, and in-between, plus with so much apparent nonsense?*

They have to reflect the wide ranging ingredients of the human recipe. Call it ‘diversity’.

10d. *What about that they could have and should have done better in some way?*

They didn’t or won’t or can’t, and that is the proof that there are no ‘ifs’; the actuality at the time trumps all ‘ifs’, just as it did for us when we indulged in some excesses earlier in life.

What if Hitler had won WWII? He didn’t, and could not have, given the actual circumstances.

10e. We impose local boundaries or try to experiment in isolation in order to get some ideas of local cause and effect, which is fine for what it does, but all that goes on is rather a continuation/transformation of What IS as the Basis. It's not like anything else can stick its nose into things, but if you really want that then it's just another input.

11. An ongoing identity to that which appears to continue in its semblance is provided by the mind; in actuality, things, and even us, are not identical moment to moment, with little deaths of parts and little birth additions of parts happening all the time, as atoms coming and going.

11a. The big death differs only in degree; our atoms may go on to constitute new life of whatever level or end up only as dust. That's the zen of now and then and when.

12. All we ever 'see' is the inside of the mind, which is, of course, a process of the brain called 'consciousness'.

12a. *How could there be a brain process producing consciousness from correlated neural substrates of material?*

Well, there is, and we can stop consciousness via anesthesia to the brain cells. It's not a 'hard' problem, for surely the brain understands its own invented symbolic language, the only representation it (as being us) ever 'sees'. Consciousness is the brain's perception of itself.

*Consciousness mediates thoughts versus outcomes,
And is distributed all over the body,
From the nerve spindles to the spine to the brain—
A way to actionize before moving.*

*Conscious Awareness, which can but witness,
Is a safe haven from which to observe
The drama of our lives playing in our minds,
Granting us a sobering distance from it.*

13. Ha, thirteen is unlucky. Actually, I'm reserving this spot for future developments.

14. *What's a best guess for the actual implementation scheme behind the phenomenal messages that we get, meaning what is the messenger as the noumena?*

14a. You are noting that our map is not guaranteed to be the actual territory, although the brain's fine painting upon that part of reality coming into the senses must have some amount of best-can-do faithful rendering, although it adds things on for usefulness. Sensing waves may be useful for bats but for us turning a small portion of the electromagnetic spectrum wave frequencies into the visible colors seems to serve better than us seeing the jumble and noise of all sorts of waves to then take more time to sort out as to what's what.

14b. Our instruments detect wider spectrum than we can, but, still, we have to make guesses about the nature of reality's workings that are not fully informed, as we cannot fully get to the noumenal.

14c. *Some might say that the message, say, of music, contains its essence, and that who cares if its implementation is of a live band, a radio, or an mp3 player.*

Well, it's true that an implementation that doesn't really make a difference is really no difference, but if we can guess at the nature of the Basis some more, given the constraints of necessity that we've already identified, then, well, that's at least something to do, and it might get somewhere all the way someday.

14d. *What if we've run out of the primal necessities and get to the point that we only exist because this universe, out of many, is suitable for us to have formed?*

Could be, and then that's that, all we are all the more afar from utilizing more necessity, stranded from knowing all, not that we can know all even if this is the only Universe;

however, if there has to be a multiverse then there is the necessity that any and all variations must come to pass, so that would be knowledge; however, the multiverse is hard to get at, and all we have going for it is to look at the fossil Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) for indications of baby bubble universes bumping.

14e. *OK, we can always come up with something, maybe someday, but what good is the understanding that we can't completely know everything?*

Well, even that tells us something—that we can hardly be blamed for not knowing.

Cripes, how do you keep obtaining truths even when all seems to be lost?

That's the power of philosophy.

15. *Fine. What's a best guess for how the Basis works?*

15a. We have found discreteness in nature, which is called the 'quantum', more or less, which disproves any notion of real continuity or continuous motion, but the quantum march on and can serve as an approximation of continuity. Zeno showed all this with his paradoxes based on continuity. The universe is digital, not analog.

15b. So, Relativity's continuum emerges at large numbers, but its assumption of continuity is probably what causes some of its solution to go to infinity, which shows the incompleteness of it. This is not terrible, but helpful for us to join it with quantum mechanics, in the form of quantum gravity, but this hasn't been done yet, so we'll continue to guess.

15c. *Couldn't there be both of the whole and of the particulars, such as our left and right brain hemispheres represent?*

Sure, as multiplicity in unity, such as a grouping order within a symmetry, for the Basis is a whole and complete and yet internally there is change/transformation.

15d. The particulars are relational to one another, and that's all there is. Everything else such as space or space-time, charge, time, motion, and whatnot would be a consequence of the relations, some more directly and some more emergently at much higher levels of complexity.

15e. *What else besides the guess of particulars doing something as a default necessity?*

There is the guess of the only other default that something like 'possibility' or 'capability' is fundamental, granting anything and everything, given the necessity of the fundamental having no set direction (thus it being everything), which we might even combine with the particulars arranging into anything, too.

Plus, we'd have to dispense with something substantially actual as being ever, replacing it something more nebulous

like potential or possibility. We'll have to see as we go along through some musty corridors and dark alleys.

*I'll follow every single avenue,
Whether it's brightly lit or a dark alley,
Exploring one-ways, no-ways, and dead-ends,
Until cornered where the truth is hiding.*

15f. Continuing, I rely on Carlos Rovelli and others who, in the quest for quantum gravity, have revisited some things, putting them in italics...

In order to have a concrete example of a system of classical point particles, the substantivalist will argue that these particles occupy points in absolute space, and that the distances between these spatial points induce distances between the particles. The particles therefore possess their distance relations by virtue of the geometrical relations antecedently present in the space in which they are contained.

By contrast, the relationist will hold that the particles possess distances with respect to each other directly, i.e. without the intervention of an underlying space, and that Newtonian space only furnishes a mathematical representation of these physical distance relations.

In the case of field theories, the relationist has to assume that elementary field-parts possess spatial relations with respect to each other, and that there are coincidence relations between the parts of different fields. It has to be noted that this characterization lacks bite if no restrictions are imposed on what counts as a physical field. For example, if the metrical field of special relativity were accepted as a bona-fide physical field, the above characterization would qualify special relativity as a fully relational theory; and a similar manoeuvre could be performed in the case of Newtonian theory.

Newton's absolute space or Minkowski spacetime would become physical systems themselves, so that the state of the world would become fully describable in terms of relations between physical systems. But this is clearly not what the relationist intends: for him Newtonian absolute space or Min-

kowski absolute spacetime are very different from physical systems.

Leibniz already provided a criterion here, by stipulating that physical “substances” should not only act but should also be acted upon — his relationism is meant to be about the relations between such substances. Newtonian space and Minkowski spacetime clearly are no substances in Leibniz’s sense, since they constitute an inert background that cannot be changed. This obviates the just-mentioned strategy by means of which classical mechanics or special relativity could be construed as relational.

However, in the general theory of relativity the metrical field does become dynamical, so that within this theory the state of the universe may be considered as completely specified by the coincidence relations between physical systems.

The plausibility of this viewpoint obviously depends on whether one is prepared to go along with accepting the metrical field as a physical system that is on a par with the matter fields. If one does, general relativity appears as the vindication of relationalism. If one does not, general relativity appears as not amiable to relationalism after all: the theory allows possible universes in which there are no matter fields, so that in those universes there is only empty spacetime.

It follows that in general relativity spacetime cannot be reduced to matter fields and their relations — at least not always. This may be taken as a vindication of substantivalism with respect to space and time. However, within the context of general relativity the difference between these two options might be considered slight and first of all semantical, depending as it does on whether we consider the metrical field as a physical field or not.

Rovelli infers that as a consequence space and time have disappeared from physics. What he means is that space and time no longer enter as independent entities, on top of what is already determined by all the coincidence relations between the dynamical fields. The spacetime structure is already present in the structure of the fields and their interrelations.

Reality keeps itself in place. Objects interact with other objects, and this is reality. Reality is the net of these interactions. We do not need an external entity to hold this net. We do not need Space to hold the universe. Maybe the Copernican revolution is finally being completed.

The picture of a Universe changing from one global instant to the next is incompatible with what we know about the world. GR inherits from SR the melting of space and time into spacetime. Therefore the relational nature of space revealed by GR extends to time as well.

It follows that in GR there is no background spacetime and therefore in particular no time along which things happen. GR teaches us that we must abandon the idea that the flow of time is an ultimate aspect of reality. The best description we can give of the world is not in terms of time evolution. The dynamics of GR itself cannot be cleanly described in terms of evolution in time.

Proper time S depends on the gravitational field, which is influenced by the interaction with many systems. Typically, harmonic oscillations are isochronous in S . Therefore, S like the distance d described in the previous section, is just an observable feature of the gravitational field, which is particularly convenient to use as a stable reference in our environment, when describing the motion of objects assuming the gravitational field fixed. The dynamics of the gravitational field itself, on the other hand, cannot be naturally described in terms of evolution in any well-defined preferred time variable.

Temporality is an artifact of our largely incomplete knowledge of the state of the world, not an ultimate property of reality.

There you have it, more or less, to keep it humble and simple.

Since we all become of this universe
Should we not ask who we are, whence we come?
Insight clefts night's skirt with its radiance:

The Theory of Everything shines through!

Down... where the mind whirls round and round,
As the ear draws forth the echoing sound,
As the eye sees the light, and of the dark the fright—
We brave the crypt of cause in the depths of night,

Beyond all death, despair, love, and sorrow,
Past yesterday, today, and tomorrow...
To the fathoms of the cryptic,
Where substance slept with arithmetic,

Toward the spark yet nursed by embers,
To the first and last the Cosmos remembers—
To seek the gem that shines—the wealth of mines,
The jewels so treasured by thee and thine.

*We guide thee; we must carry thee;
We're illumination beside thee.
Fear not the proof—
It's the beauty of the truth.*

*You do not just live and love; you are life and love.
They do not flee on, just ahead, unreachable,
Leaving you but to lean and drink their wind.
You are the universe turned around to view itself.*

*Zest, desire, caring, and other feelings sweet
Are your lightning feet for triumphant feats.
All manner of shapes haunt the wilds of the mind,
Just waiting and asking to be tamed as sane.*

*You're the golden chalice to the wine that flows;
Drink, drink!
You're the live, resultant existence that knows.
Think, think!*

*Thoughts fly in the mind like birds wing the wind;
Imagination is the atmosphere wherein ideas are born
And borne on the waves of the sea in which one sees,
Thereupon sprouting from the wings into actions seized.*

All from stardust begins and ends in thee.

What Exists, Via Necessity

*The mighty wrecks of the elements are strewn
Across the universe like chaff from the harvest,
Much of the Cosmos still a vast wasteland.*

*The timeless-formless contains every path,
Though as useless as a library of All books;
For its sum of information is zero,
But one of these possible avenues became ours.*

*In succession due does the large give way and rule
To the ever smaller, the tiny, the minuscule,
And onto the negligibly insufficient 'awol'
Of not really much of anything there at all.*

*We are as beings of the everlasting light dream,
As products time and time again by its means—
Of the eternal return, as baubles blown and burst,
Though frames of time that quench life's thirst.*

*Oh, that which 'IS' the near imperishable,
Its flame of beauty still inextinguishable,
Deathless, ne'er created, ungenerated,
Forever celebrated as immutable!*

*We have often asked why some space exists,
Why it permits the countless to briefly persist
On Mother Earth, nourished under Father Sky—
All of those finite sparks that light and die.*

*And well before that, once upon a storied time,
We simply made it all up, with tales and rhyme,
In place of any physical observations
Or of any revealing experimentations.*

*Now, the surprise: Existence trumps essence!
Essence pales, in stature, to existence,
Even before we know it, which now we do;
'Twas what had to be; life eclipses knowing.*

*Essence's knowing is anti-climax;
It wasn't fancy and complicated,
Nor could it have been—it was the simplest.
'Hereabouts' is where the excitement is.*

16. A purpose?

There is nothing external to What IS to assign it purpose. Purpose is thus local and self-assigned by local processes, and from there it can't extend to be known in non-connected places afar, much less be reported beyond the All.

scottchat: We exist, that is proof of first cause. Since we know the first cause exists and since it is the first cause by definition it cannot have beginning. Not only do we exist but everything around us exists and came from a first cause which I choose to call the creative force in an attempt not to hark back to an omnipotent being. The fact that we are here is scientific proof of the creative force and is therefore not based on faith.

First, I'll put some of my own interpretation, since it helps me sort out my theory, yet your 'creative' aspect won't suffer.

Since Nothing or Nonexistence cannot be, much less be productive, What IS is all there, in its existence, as a done deal, and all there is, as ever, by necessity, since it can't have an opposite. This kind of 'eternity' that I call 'ever' is not in the sense that it has no earliest event or 'memory', causing a regression problem of there being no 'earliest', but in the sense of it being timeless and unchanging as a whole, but with, obviously, transformations/rearrangements within it, for there is no other source for change.

So, just as it couldn't have come from Nothing, it doesn't go along creating more things, ex nihilo, step by step, as from more and more Nothing. It just is, and was never created or begun. It is, still, the source of all that goes on, and in that sense it is still creative, as in arranging into us.

We are already as a part of What IS, with no part that isn't, so, it's not like we are not it and apart from it and thus it has to use us for it to sense or feel. It's as some might say that "We are the universe come to life". So, we are it and it is us, with no 'trying' for that to be, as if it had a 'drive' or a mind.

17. Questions:

Positor:

*That Nothing cannot Be is clearly true by definition,
But ruling out false Somethings is a tougher proposition.*

It's either an Everything, where anything goes,
Or the only default monad, to choose as ToEs.

*Are Nature's laws the only ones that Logic can permit?
Is this great teeming universe the only perfect fit?*

No, since by varying many of the parameters keyed,
Although not by a whole lot, other forms might be.

*Does every counterfactual state involve a contradiction?
Can we invoke Equations to distinguish fact from fiction?*

I've left out how something 'ever', never made,
Can be a feat accomplished, as already made.
(But this is covered since something has to be.)

*If Being is a partless One, can it beget a Many?
And how can Time and Change affect us, if there isn't any?*

The objective world simply is, it does not happen.
Only to the gaze of my consciousness,
crawling upward along the life line of my body,
does a section of this world come to life
as a fleeting image in space
which continuously changes in time. — Wehl

sponge: *Well, since you asked ;) I did notice you dismiss
consciousness as a product of the brain when I don't think
that's yet proved or accepted as a fact. I don't argue about
our consciousness being a result of brain function but that
isn't quite the same thing as a 'product' of brain function.*

*Close enough for government work, as they say, as result or
product or a process, getting consciousness to happen, but at
least we have it surrounded, as needing the brain, which is
good enough.*

18. The easy problem of consciousness:

1. All one ever 'sees' is the the brain's renderings.
2. The brain processes incoming information upwards/sideways/feedback through its various lower and successively higher modules, via its own invented symbolic language (via evolution), ending with a result something like qualia or such as its unified result.
3. Surely the brain understands its own internal language and expresses it accordingly in what we call consciousness/globally, the brain merely perceiving itself.
4. So there is no hard problem. It's all of the processing and of the cascade of internal symbols unto the highest symbol of a result as qualia or whatnot, the brain well knowing its own notation, making 'us' to be the brain, of course.
- (5. The physical gives rise to both the mental and the non-mental, if we wish such a classification, but really there's no brain-body problem because the brain is an organ of the body.)

sponge: By your own argument, you say that, although colour and sound are the result of brain function, the fact that we are given senses to take in the light/sound waves must mean that there is something out there to be sensed.

Why could this argument not apply to consciousness itself, with brain function designed to respond in some way to 'something out there' which produces consciousness?

Anything's possible, but I'll use probability/logic to guess that experiences are made in the brain so they play a big role in the becoming aware of them in consciousness.

19. On life becoming:

A multiverse is such as anything and everything possible goes, obviating the fine-tuning problem by rendering many outcomes, if that way is the only way.

The one universe type leaves open its doings, somewhat, to our guesses, but must also be able to produce an arrangement for life, among others, if it is the only universe.

That life is even possible, by either way, suggests that somehow the capability for life to form is a necessity, but why? **Why should the capability for life have not been impossible?**

Is it that complexity will always necessarily become from any necessarily simple, non composite ingredients, and that the paces of complexity will always be capable of forming life when the right conditions arrive, as they must, eventually, although not at all quickly, as we note for our reality, it having taken billions of years?

But, then, still, there is always the need for stars to form to make the atomic elements, which requires gravity, too, with the stars having to last long enough for life to form. So, then, gravity needs be a necessity for some reason, such as its negative potential energy having to balance the positive kinetic energy of matter as some kind of conservation requirement.

Well, life is here, as 50-80 million species, plus plant life, and so it was 'easy', on Earth, given 4.1 billion years or whatever, plus one day, which is today, and thus it was inherent all along, as potential. A whole lot of humongous non-life of dust and rocks in space must have been inherent, too, by necessity.

I asked my friend at NASA why there is so much stuff out there in the universe, and he said it was so there would be inertia. He's going to be working on Jupiter, which he also said, so I guess I'll have to wait for him to get back to find out more.

20. Emergence

Positor: How can place and time – and all the heterogeneous “stuff” we experience – emerge from something non-composite? If the Basis contains the ‘seeds’ of all this diverse material, surely it must be somehow heterogeneous (composite) itself?

Elemental things have to be something with no internal structure and no components, so they cannot have any parts, which is what makes them basic and fundamental. They could be called monads/bits/energy-points, etc.

Almost everything in this universe is emergent. There can be no higher, external program for life, consciousness, fundamental particles, or even space and time, because it’s already understood how these higher features emerge from simpler things.

From these ever changing, simple energy points or bits, patterns emerge, stabilize, as emergence, and so forth, making most of reality to be layers of emergences. As each level of interaction, processing, or computation inserts itself as a reality, another level of features can emerge beyond it. This is not a purposeful process toward any goal or meaning; it’s of an underlying tendency for the simpler to become more complex. All processing realities work ‘creatively’ by generating emergence.

What can emerge from a cloud of homogenous gas as it forms a solar system is a vast array of complex structures, including all of human achievement!

As we go up through the levels, similar things of a type are less and less the same. Protons are more interchangeable than carbon atoms, and so forth. Higher level emergences are much more fragile. We can be infected by viruses; protons can’t.

Properties of more elemental things such as protons are more stable as made from computations/processes being repeated many times over, each time yielding the same

measurable result because both the inputs (quarks and more?) and processes are completely interchangeable. The same for electrons. Of course, then they can do the emergent thing and form atoms.

There are other clues, too, for the emergence nature of space and time. Relativity has shown that the speed of light is a more basic concept than space and time, since the latter two must adjust to keep the speed of light constant no matter the observer's speed. QM non-locality indicates the primacy of information over space. The holographic principle indicates that information is probably primary over an extra dimension of space, but this isn't so firm. Time emerges locally since simultaneity is relative, which I redundantly add.

String theory is very dependent on space and quantum mechanics is dependent on time. New versions will force them to be independent of space and time, known as background independent, in order to get to quantum gravity.

Positor: Accomplishments, progression and transformation are forms of change; and if the Basis encompasses all existence, such change must be inherent in the Basis itself.

Yes, difference is key, and so now we know that it is a necessity for Something basic/elemental to ever be in flux as change/difference, such as it being energy, or whatever, but energy is often suggested as not only having change but somehow being change. Or one could also look at it as qubits of information that can be 0, 1, or both. It hardly matters, for energy has been shown to be equivalent to information. At any rate, the nature of these elementals is fixed and unchanging, for they are timeless, which also obviates debates about cause, for cause can only occur in time. Time becomes of the elemental states' contents changing in relation to one another.

To see the fundamental as it really is, without our interpretations, without emergences, would be as a meaningless jumble of not even noise.

Positor: *If it could not have been foreseen (even with perfect knowledge of prior conditions?), it seems that what the Basis 'does' must be contingent, not necessary.*

Well, 'foreseen' to me is such that an All-Mighty could do, but 'necessity' is what could be no other way, not contingent on anything, such as if there is only one default or as in determinism.

Positor: *Is "brute force" a property of the Basis, or is it something separate?*

'Brute force' is having no plan imparted from there being no outside or before the Basis/All. In photosynthesis, electrons follow every possible path, and by this achieve a 95% efficiency, as a brute force happening, given no foreseeing.

21. More on Consciousness

Consciousness is dependent on the ability to process information, and so it can only exist in process type realities, meaning those with emergence of higher and higher cascades of complexities that have inputs and outputs, which types are can also called computable, meaning as/of an information process.

Survival is what evolution is all about and intelligence enhances survivability, and so consciousness evolved to enhance intelligence by monitoring and modeling it.

Consciousness, then, is different from intelligence because it has an internal focus, it adding the ability to analyze the intelligence system's internals, and is such of a self-referential loop through which any intelligent entity monitors its goings on, this being akin to the brain receiving itself.

Still, though, aside from intense learning, such as how to drive or entering unmapped areas, the conscious mind trots along behind, post rationalizing actions. By the time 'we' know or sense anything, it is in the past, the processing of it already a done deal.

22. Wrap up of emergence:

The basis for emergent features is contained within What IS, given that's all there is, and so What IS cannot be contingent on any provided laws; therefore the source of the emergences can be observed and explained from within. What IS, then, runs on itself. There can be no completed infinities, so infinity is impossible; therefore, What IS, must by definition have no external context.

Mathematical and physics laws do not have prior existences. They are collections of simple processes and repeated events. The laws of thermodynamics emerge, rather than attach themselves as a given, from reality simply based on the statistical mechanics of the movement of gas molecules.

What is truly embodied are/is basic non-emergent features, which thus have to be of necessity, such as that there is no alternative to existence and that the truly basic cannot have parts, which is a forcing, default situation, and is also the best way I can put it. It is simplicity itself and thus not all that interesting.

What becomes interesting is that "More is different", due to the relations of connections. One energy point or one neuron can't do a darn thing.

23. The Speed of Light

The speed of light can't change because it is of the elemental Planck quantum, the fastest that a bit/energy-level can flip/change in a 'before to an 'after', and so the speed of light limit means that we cannot interact in 'real time' with parts of the universe much further away than the moon, but, truly, there is no 'real time' interaction but only near to that, effectively, at close range. While the sun is as it was eight minutes ago and the as it was a second or two ago, our soda can is as it was a few hundred milliseconds ago, meaning that all that is sensed/known is of the past; events are all done by the time they register.

By necessity, there are basic monads or quantums, whatever they actually are as existences dependent only on themselves, as discrete, granting no true continuum, but only an approximation of one, and so their small but real amount of finiteness makes it necessary that everything cannot happen all at once, given that there must be an interval. Things process/compute themselves a 'jillion' times a second, which is very fast, and so the speed of light is a quick speed, relative to our psychological time. In sum, the speed of light is the speed at which results can be made and so it is the top speed at which things can happen and get reported. Gravity can slow it down, though, along with other interactions, perhaps.

There can be no continua because there can be no infinities, such as the infinitely divisible physical. Necessity strikes again!

24. More questions:

sponge: *Either way, consciousness is still an open-ended question to work on.*

Either way, we may, if we're still around, evolve to undreamed of heights, since the universe has trillions of years left. We are among the first of the pioneers, as an original, unaugmented 'wildlife'. 90+ percent of the planets that will form are yet to do so.

Philosophers already verge on an extra level of consciousness when they can spectate at a second level, such as "How do you feel about the way you feel?" or "What are your beliefs about your beliefs".

In the future there will be super-consciousness capabilities, such as "How do feel about how you feel about the way you feel?" We're not going to become gods but will be way, way up there.

sponge: *I can't just choose what my logic tells me, I want proof!*

'Proof' is that the All has to run by itself, with no outside impetus possible, and another, maybe different, 'proof' is that what is here now existent in the high level was inherent in the simpler, lower phase.

ronjanec: *If existence had a beginning, this would mean that a total absence of all existence was possible at least in a theoretical or observational sense, or again the complete opposite of existence existing.*

If nonexistence can do something, like give rise to existence, then it is truly not nothing/nonexistence but something/existence. Or else it is half-is-half-not:

*It wasn't all there nor totally gone,
Wavering, as both zero and one,
In limbo, between existence and none,
A qubit done before it had begun.*

25. True existence versus a faux existence that is still something, plus the be-all and end-all of Everything

Perhaps ‘existence’ can be defined a bit differently from ‘something’, as kind of a subset of ‘something’ of a false existence.

After we hopefully read Krauss’s ‘A Universe from Nothing’, we sadly come away with the physicist’s Nothing as referred to as the quantum foam (something), the vacuum (that isn’t empty), or the zero-point-energy (that indeed has energy), but it leaves intact that Nothing cannot be.

This quantum foam, as I’ll refer to it, is always there, ever as something basic, jittery, non-zero, and indefinite, because QM must be fuzzy, and certainly it cannot go to zero (which is like an unreachable boundary as a non-existent absolute, so to speak), plus that ‘zero’ is a definite number/state. We are also thankful that Nothing cannot arise, for then nothing would happen from then on, not that our existence isn’t but much ado about nothing.

The quantum foam, though, doesn’t seem to contain any information/processing as it just sits there as the something/sum-thing of everything, and some might even claim that everything and nothing have the same information content, namely zero.

True existence would seem to be that which can persist somewhat, and even go on, as a process/computation. With the understanding that what is physical is informational, and vice-versa, we might newly and more narrowly define ‘existence’ as the ability to process information or, identically, as computation, this requiring that the physical/info relates to and interacts with other info/physical, for example, these interacting/relating qubits/quantums providing for the emergence of a local time, and then more, unto what we have.

We might even see true existence itself, then, as an emergence, it not being fundamental but of the processes of information interacting. Of course, we are dancing close to

the edge of reason here, for existence becomes tenuous and evaporates as all emergent properties must do when we look at them too closely from so far away.

Isolated or unrelating qubits/particles/quantums popping in and out of the quantum foam wouldn't seem to be able to do anything on their own, and so we might say that they don't truly have existence by our new definition, since existence then only appears as a feature of reality once interactions occur, it having no real meaning otherwise, being faux.

So, Descartes amended: "I process, therefore I exist."

Now you have to explain why there should be information and why it should compute as an information process.

How the heck should I know!

Well, guess.

I can't truly say 'necessity', but can speculate that perhaps things could not be any other way—that a quantum/qubit is the most basic thing which has no cause but just is, having to consist of only itself.

Was information created during inflation?

Cripes, why are you asking me? Do I look like Guth?

It's your theory.

Yes, but I get hints from all over, too, and they didn't say.

How does the encoding of complex emergences work?

Do you think I know everything about computation! Yes, I worked at IBM but I took a lot of long lunches.

How do processes run on themselves without a substrate to run on?

Oh, man, the stress of hard information backed by electric signals versus soft information based only on itself; I'm going off to jump into the ocean. Give me some easier questions.

So, the fake nothingness is merely absence of of an information process, as the absence of space and time that emerge from information and information processing?

Yes, it's as the quantum foam, a timeless, dimensionless sea of quantum fluctuations. It's is kind of a shade of a nebulous sub-existence, of hazy, independent things that are always popping in and out at the Planck level, virtually, this being the natural state of 'next to nothingness', as the necessarily simple basis, since an absolute nothingness is not capable of existing—as an impossible Heisenberg non certainty of uncertainty. Sorry, that the best I can do; I'm only human.

Could a fluctuation in the quantum foam, a Planck bubble, become another big bang?

Yes, but I hope it doesn't happen around here, but, thankfully, the probability is very low, but not zero.

How come there has to be a quantum foam?

Um, hubba-hubba, come on!

Necessity is the Mother of All, isn't it?

Oh, yeah; I forgot. There has to be something; it isn't optional. Any regression must ultimately reverse back towards simpler and final 'causes' that are uncaused, and so this 'something' is not prescriptive or directional.

Are we in a simulation?

Not that again! Well, I just read that we should look for glitches to find out, but I'm sticking with Planck sized quantum bits as qubits as a kind of noise.

Noise can do something?

A qubit flipping or changing in some way might impact upon its neighbors, beginning a processes of information changing itself and its surroundings by changing the relationships between units of information, as the most basic events we can conceive of, the events leading to other events and thus setting up a system of causality, of which emergences become.

Really?

Maybe.

I'll bite.

A fundamental quantum/bit can only change once per Planck time, which change/flip is instantaneous, the new state lasting a Planck time before the next flip can occur, not that it takes time but that it sort of does since something is happening.

I see, almost.

Therefore, things experience time ticking along in Planck times or multiples of them. By observing information from many sources we develop the feeling of an irreversible time flowing. The universe is flooded with information about changes that happened in other places all the way back to the big bang.

What was before the big bang?

Oh, cripes! It's foam all the way down, but there's no real foam, per say.

What!

The so-called 'foam' consists of Planck level entities popping in and out of their faux existence, but it is these short lived entities that exist briefly rather than the foam itself, which could be described better as having the potential to cause existence.

Aha, I always thought about Fundamental Possibility/Potential, for it requires nothing else; just the same to support it!

*Time, space, stuff, change, and form are real-ized from
The Fundamental Possibility,
Becoming the penultimate reality,
One possible from the probabilities.*

*Our reality comes not from Nothing,
But exists always as possibility,
One that amounts to something workable,
Among all in superposition.*

*No form of a penultimate realness
Could exist alone before the rest, since
Everything is quantum-there-all-at-once;
For what could make the choice among many?*

*Nor comes it from an absolute Nothing,
Since there can be no such 'thing' at all,
So, since either way is impossible,
Fundamental Possibility IS.*

So, all this is due to Ron Janec?

Well, yes and no, for all is of determinism, but Ron hinted at more than nothing but less than existence if reality had a beginning, which got me thinking, as what we both had to do, given what/who we've become.

There still has to be a something; no choice, with no beginning.

Yes, so we didn't give him otherwise, but he didn't mention it that way, but as more like "before existence", and so we've given him the false not-quite-existence that doesn't do anything as before the more-true-existence that does something, making for the real existence to sort of have a beginning.

Have you ever considered a career in politics?

No, for I like universals over arbitrary instances of any old narrative, among so many narratives would do just the same, and I shy away from the ‘many blood-sucking insects’ as poli-tics.

Now what?

We wait for the Universe to give us replies in the form of post responses, and in the meanwhile we go have a good time somewhere around here.

Where is ‘here’?

I’m off duty, but you could start a thread; however, ‘here’ will probably end up being somewhere in the netherworld of the quantum foam that doesn’t have a ‘where’ or a ‘when’, from which we are here now at our emergent level.

Life is a web, of whos, whys, whats, and hows,
Stretched in time between eternal boughs.
Gossamer threads bear the beads that glisten,
Each moment a sequence of instant nows.

ronjanec: *So what caused the Big Bang?*

Oh cripes! Here I am on the soft autumn riverbank with an almond-eyed houri drinking the wine of life, having just rendered the be-all and you ask me things, but I happen to have my iPad here and so I say unto the Cosmos that is asking because even it doesn't know how it came to be in charge that... oh, that was a fine and luscious kiss dear djinni of rose lipped breath...

Actually, Mother Nature and Father Time made a cosmic egg; no, wait, they weren’t around yet, plus my mind is still on romance.

Actually, the quantum fluctuations that have to be, since this Something is ‘ever’, as is, not in time, as jitterbugging in and out in their constant quaking and shaking because there cannot be Nothing, underwent a low probability happening, boosting into inflation faster than the speed of light,

as banging, or else because it went inward until there was no more inward, due to no infinite density being possible, and exploded, separating virtual particles, making them real, the tiny quantum source ripples becoming writ large as galaxy seed clouds becoming galaxies strung together like cosmic necklaces, along the imperfections made by dark matter, such as like when ice freezes, leaving flaws, the remnant pearl strings of which we can still see today, and then more emergence made for our solar system out of the clouds of inter galactic dust, which begat planets, and so forth unto today, when ronjanec asked about all this, exactly 4.1 billion years and five days after life-pliable carbon formed.

26. Onto the minuscule of the quantum realm

Quantum entanglement informs us that space is not a good foundation to lean on, that information is more fundamental. An entangled thing is not really separate from its other entangled thing; a global activity is taking place in what must be a whole of the basic something. Although a pair of particles may seem to be far apart in spacetime, in their underlying 0D singular, holistic domain they are evidently overlapped.

The basic something, or Something, is proposed as that which is the only possible nature of what we call the quantum foam, that ‘ever is’. Our universe emerged from it, it seems, in some kind of bang whether central or all over, as a continuation or transformation of it, and yet the foam is still about, as ‘ever’, in its necessarily spaceless, timeless, entangled, holistic, and singular basis of zero dimensions in zero time, pervading the more secondary, emergent spacetime at every Planck quantum.

The quantum foam appears to be the jittery and ceaseless popping in and out of so-called virtuals, as if it could neither be completely full nor totally empty, neither all ones nor all zeros, as if fullness and emptiness, as solidity and nothingness, exhaust all possibility and so must form a kind of duality in which neither of the two nonexistent absolutes can 100% dominate, since neither can be, anyway but yet still serve as boundaries that cannot be reached, forcing a kind of average or in-between here and not here or between full and empty.

Of course, the quantum fluctuations are all as touching one another in this spaceless arena, but it’s hard to picture it that way, so our drawings usually portray it as spread out spikes of ups and downs, but with many wormholes to indicate the all-connectedness of all things superimposed, where different events can happen simultaneously.

Existence might be better defined be that which goes on to compute as a process, over and above the Something of just the fluctuations. The subsequent existents are emergences

but just as real, since they don't come from anywhere else, plus that some may be painted in the brain to reflect what is useful toward survival rather than as total faithful representations of noumena.

Ervin László, the famous Hungarian philosopher of science, postulated the quantum vacuum as a universal field that interacts with matter.

He asserts that the field:

"...acts as a holographic medium, registering and conserving the scalar wave-transform of the 3-dimensional configuration spaces assumed by matter in space. This universal fifth field is not inferred from space-time interactions like gravitational, electromagnetic, the strong and weak nuclear forces. In this new type of field, space and time become implicate, enfolded, as described mathematically by Bohm. The fifth field is spectrally (holographically) organized, and is made of the energy present in the interference patterns of the waveforms. The transformations from space-time order to this spectrum dimension are described by holographic mathematical formulations."

Since spacetime is not a continuum, but a discrete fabric, its origin would not then be at any a central point of some tremendous density bang but holistically everywhere, in every minuscule quantum, but note that this, too, is as a kind of 0D, timeless 'singularity', and so perhaps we should not ignore that kind of so quickly dismissed solution of Einstein's equation.

Also, since space is not a continuum, it can't stretch itself to provide for expansion, but since it is discrete, then the building blocks must come from within, as really without, as created and injected space-time grains from the whole that is more or less 'outside' spacetime, as the fuel that keeps on giving, as also called dark energy.

Some might even see quantum arena as the nebulous zone between the space-time universe and the singular domain, where space-time and the singular intermingle. This is similar to an objective reality mixed with a subjective and imag-

inary realm in the mind, which might be modeled in kind, such as the objective brain action popping out of a whole scenario of imaginations/consequences.

sponge: *Onward and upward.*

Or downward and sideward and then upward to the great Upward of complexity.

Something strange is afoot, Sherlock, and it all has to do with nature's axe that chops everything up into discrete quantums due to infinity being impossible, here as in no infinite divisibility.

The imaginations of one's pondering mind toward an thought or action outcome would be as a dipping into the whole a lot of superimposed scenarios of what one's brain has become, this ability somehow of a quantum nature that can have a lot in one place for consideration all at once, just as the universe at large and as a whole might do, although it would have total information, even at every point, as in a hologram.

Meaning?

Is there any meaning to the basic something? Well, only in the necessary nature that it has to have, whatever that gives, by default, which seems to leave out other purposes that we ourselves might dream up, such as that life is a test.

The existentialists take the non prescribed, non-direction as being akin to that of it having no meaning, they thus promoting existence as the most primary, in importance, and what should be ever attended to, albeit that one is forced to ever attend to it. They too thought that man has great freedom, as if he were a kind of mini first cause, but then again they didn't get very deep into how reality has to work, as to why it has consistency, but maybe humans leapfrog onto the Something's no cause and whatever comes of that.

Someone may have stumbled on the answer by accident, but there's a lot to read on the internet, much of it just amusing rather than truly informative, but computed universes are the big thing now.

Homework: Build a universe.

Punshhh: *Can information exist on its own, without a medium in which to be expressed?*

The physical quantum bits equivalence to information due to their relationships would also serve as the penultimate and ongoing medium for an existence process in which they compute more and higher complexities, which in turn do things at that emergent level, and so on, upward, although often very slowly, given possible no preprogramming, but the ultimate medium would be that which makes for these bits to appear, it being the basic something. Since events/experiences happen we know there is information behind the occurrences, and that's good enough for now for our analysis here, leaving it to others to make models and theories in particular, such as for quantum gravity.

The simpler to the more complex information process is kind of like how evolution works, in that what gets reached as a stable platform, more or less, that can then be the base for more arrangements that can become the next level of a stable platform, and so forth via such slow accumulation, but we're not considering organisms here but electrons/quarks, protons, a few basic atoms, stars, the rest of the atoms as higher atomic elements, and molecules, in about that order.

And, of course, that which doesn't reach any stability at all crumbles away, though remaining as a kind of noise, this instability effectively shutting down those attempts/paths, leaving only what lasts to be able to go on to form more complexity.

Electrons and quarks are formed more directly as the elemental particles and so they are very stable to the point of staying as they are for a very long time, whereas molecules

vary in their stability, although they already have a base degree due to their tendency to form, in that some of them are neither inclined to stay together for a long time nor to break apart instantly.

Absolute Never?

Given Something (the basic something), since we know there is something, due to our experiencing, we note that it could have no birth from Nothing, and thus there's no beginning to it, given no other source such as a Home Depot warehouse, making it 'ever' in a timeless way, as being always.

This, is a truth, and so one doesn't need a proof, although we can try to make a proof, out of which we hope to gain more insight on the necessity of there having to be something, instead of a lack of anything at all, including any ability or capability for it to produce something.

So, we admit, tentatively, that there could have been a lack of anything, however silly that is, since there still wouldn't be anything, which is a kind of a near proof, but is really still more like a truth, since we don't just want to use how things turned out as a basis over why there couldn't have been a lack of anything.

Perhaps I have already gone too far, here, but, still, right or wrong, we gain more comfort even from proofs that we don't even need, as in just to be sure, not that the known truth can ever be dented.

So, one is looking to add more to the necessity of there having to be something, such as if that has to be something outside of time because beginnings can only be in time, and so this could be why, yet, still we wonder.

We probably shouldn't have gone beyond having the brute truth, because we are perhaps only rewording what led us to that truth.

Let us rather look for confirmation/proof from science of philosophical truth, which is usually how it goes.

The quantum capability for so-called virtual entities to pop in and out is the basic something, no matter that it is said that the virtual entities 'exist' only briefly since they don't remain for long (of course inflation can be so quick that it separates them from their paired counter parts to make them exist longer as no longer virtual but real).

Well, I guess we still don't know All about why there has to be this quantum foam, especially in its nature, over a lack of anything, but, as said, who needs that when we already have the truth.

Except that we are curious. Could it be that there are two non-existent absolutes that can never be reached ('close' doesn't count), the first, as we know, of Nothing, and the second being total fullness, or Fullness, as defined such that not any perturbation can get through it.

How come? Well, I really have to go off the deep end here and that's why we really needn't be at this point.

Suppose that Fullness and Nothingness exhaust all possibility at the metaphysical level, forcing them to act as a special kind of duality in which neither can be so, but only the in-between.

So, the spikes, anti-spikes, and worm-holes, and whatnot as what goes on as a quantum foam can never be as all ones or as all zeros, or all ups or all downs, or all there or all not, but must jitter about between the impossible emptiness and fullness.

Ah, crap, I give up on more detail, for we don't need it (leaving it to physicists), for we've already derived 'What exists' in that thread from the Something having no beginning and from that and more deductions we've gone up to a great understanding in figuring out most everything.

sponge: *Heard of Stuart Hameroff?*

Thanks again, sponge. I know of his work, from long ago, but not so much on how it's progressed. I think that if they can see where anesthesia operates then that will tell.

Microtubules are protein lattice polymers which organize neuronal interiors and regulate synapses. Several theories including the Penrose-Hameroff 'Orch OR' theory suggest consciousness depends on microtubules acting as quantum computers whose quantum bits ('qubits') involve coherent dipole couplings among pi electron resonance clouds.

...

anesthesia may disperse dipoles to dampen terahertz vibrations in the quantum underground of brain microtubules. Fortunately, many non-polar regions of the quantum underground in living systems are too small for anesthetic molecules, and so non-conscious quantum coherence continues during anesthesia. Life goes on.

The brain is looking like a scale-invariant hierarchy, with clocking frequencies at different spatio-temporal scales – clocks within clocks within clocks.... Anesthetics act at the deepest level, the fastest clock, the inner apex, in the microtubule quantum underground.

Read more at: <http://phys.org/news/2015-04-quantum-criticality-life-proteins.html#jCp>

I can see how memory might require a holographic quantum-based form in order for it to be a very fast operation, and 'thinking', too, for the same reason.

Seems like we have the organizing principle, which is good enough for me, in that the consciousness situation is surrounded, leaving but the details to be worked out.

THE END OF THE THEORY

Epilog: A real life discussion

I happened to go to a community day open house kind of event at a Christian Bruderhof community. They are mostly German pacifists, not liking Hitler's warring ways, and so first going to England, where the war caught up to them, and then to South America and New York State. The community is a kind of best can do utopia in which everyone owns everything but nothing in particular. Sexuality in women is suppressed by long plaid dresses and hair bonnets. There's no makeup, no smoking, no drinking, no personal computers or phones. Anyway, it got me thinking of the spiritual matters that come to dominate so many, although the numbers now are way lower than back in the day.

As usual, we first come up with a template of a principle so firm and stable that we can always count on it, to what it has to apply to, as ever reliable and never failing.

Let us first see through some common templates that are so fragile that they have to be discarded after only one usage.

1. Look at this amazing world of nature, people, things, the heavens of the stars, and more, as this marvelous Existence! My template is that it just can't be as it is, as complete, of a physical/natural All, but needs be of a Higher, Supernatural Realm that just is, but as so much more complex and powerful, more amazing by far, much more than even us compared to an ant or a bacterium.

So, you have it that something so simple, in comparison, can't just be of a natural All, but that something that is countless times higher, to the nth degree, can just be, as the Supernatural All. This is called "begging the question", in posing a much larger question. If we follow your template then even all the more the Higher Realm would then require a HIGHER REALM behind it, ad infinitum.

No, it just ends there, at the second, higher level.

So, we'll throw your template out the window?

Um, yes, we'll have to, but please throw it out the open door, because the windows are made of stained glass.

You're joking; I like your humor. Of course, the second level is the end level because it is the Infinite level, as the Ultimate, right?

Yes, there's no higher level than the Infinite; that's the end, or rather the start.

So now we have a situation worse than I thought, that something now seen as near infinitesimal in comparison can't simply be, but something that actually achieves the Infinite can be. You've still thrown away your template that got you going in the first place. I'm not saying that we're the lowest of the low, for that would be Hell, but it's a long way from our level to the infinite, especially near the end.

Infinite complexity begets the simple that then gets to the more complex, for the Pope and I now accept evolution, kind of, but for the mind.

I'll take it that the maximum Complexity was Fundamental as 'First' but to our view everything began with the simplicity of the Big Bang's tiny but numerous particles that then over a heck of a long time combined and built into the more complex such as us, and probably to even higher beings in the future. Any more templates?

(We went to get a free ice cream cone.)

2. Life, as in nature, and especially our life, is not just organic and that's it, but can only come from a Higher Life.

This is the same template that expires as soon as it's used. We need better templates.

3. Life in nature and in us was inherent all along, long before it blossomed, so to speak, whether becoming through the nows of presentism or as all at once, pretty much, in the events that compose eternalism's block.

Now there's a Truth, and we only need the part of "being inherent", although you've covered the two alternatives of 'time'. Surely, what is here now always had the potential to be so, and so it was built in, so to speak, no matter the implementations you went into as either per time as it goes or per the timeless composition of spacetime. What's here now had to somehow be 'there' in the beginning.

4. God did it, knowing all, planning all, making all.

We are first looking for fundamental Truths, and we have the first one in that 'Something is', due to our experience being something, this Something being equivalently called Totality or What IS and whatnot. We are not able to just layer more onto it yet, such as it is a Person-like system of mind, so that doesn't work as a template even if it's said to be carved in stone as dogma.

We agree, though, that 'What IS' must be ever, as never made, as your 'God' would have to be, too, as timeless, and thus immune to impossible regression that only can be based on time. Both, too, are the source of all that goes on, with not anything going on from anything else sticking its nose into the happenings. Things happen only in and of the Whole.

The Whole and all your synonyms are God and all His synonyms.

You mean that by your belief/faith this is said to be so.

Yes, but I don't always say it that way, mentioning belief or maybe's or could be's, etc.

That's a part of our not very perfect human nature to say things as if they were fact and truth, which is sometimes well meant but misleading at best and dishonest at worst, as not being for sure, dependent on a relative morality, but in our search for truth we can't use it yet, it being akin to me saying that for sure there is no 'God' as being a true fact, although I wouldn't, but rather might say that since

the Supernatural hasn't been established I don't have anything to work with.

We still agree that lying, whether as a Commandment, or as a moral code that even preceded the supposed handing down of the tablets to Moses is not right, in that the innocent can be taken in by it.

So, we only have Something is, that this Something is ever, and that it is ever, "ungenerated", and "Deathless", too, being that it is unmakeable and unbreakable.

But I am your so-called "well meaning" when I tell my 'ministry' and the kids at Sunday school that they will have eternal life in Heaven or Hell, etc.

Still, though, you have stated what you well meaningly want to believe and spread that as truth and fact.

All I really have is faith. We're leaning toward promoting community over religion but religion has taken hold to the extent that we tout it as truth.

Ah, yes, 'faith' is an honest word, being about a belief in the supernatural, giving one, of course, nothing, as it is much less than 'trust'.

What's trust?

It's like supposing something that has already happened, such as the sun lighting the day, will happen again tomorrow, although there is a slight chance that the world might end before then. 'Faith' is sometimes used as just a stand-alone word above its real definition to mean that something gets known by or through faith.

I'm going to keep on 'preaching', as you might call it, layering even much more on, as you would say, as from the Bible/Koran/whatnot.

In your case I'd say you pretty much have to, but it's not going to count yet in our Truth search, but it's more of an

emotional attachment and in that sense fine or giving comfort to some.

Yes, my logical side sees what you are saying, for I'm fortunate to have beliefs about my belief, as a kind of a spectator of myself, but the poverty of my emotional side needs some hope to be taken care of, and if hope/faith is all I have then that's more than nothing. It's kind of a tightrope, though, this logical/emotional divide.

Some myths tell us that this Totality as a Person Higher Power was disappointed with how we turned out, seemingly unable to know His fully intended design parameters beforehand, ending up not taking responsibility for His failure until later, when his Son excused original sin, but this still under the business deal condition that we acknowledge 'God'.

Things like this and that the literal Bible written in plain text for the common man proved to be wrong, as soon as its important page one, tends to have some dismiss what religious people layer on, such as that humans and mammals were made separately, rather than from a tree of life, plus made as is, not mutable via evolution, that the sky is a dome, that Earth's location is fixed as a center of all, maidenly a few thousand years ago, and more, plus the church/religious positions such as that evil spirits cause physical and mental ills, and more.

Ah, those damn fundamentalists sticking to the letter and thus missing the spirit of it all. So, anyway, you do have indications against 'God'.

Oh, there are many more, but they are not sufficient for me to lie and say that for sure there is no 'God', even if I consider Him unlikely. There's no room for bias in a truth search, although in everyday life we are pretty much forced to rely on what we see as probability not being in equipoise as 50-50, and so there is no real fence to sit on.

So, I guess we can't really know either way for sure.

There goes shame and blame!

Oh, cripes; now I'm crumbling my own argument.

I'll help. What about that supposedly we can know, and if we don't we could have and should have, although the truth is that often we can't, or don't?

Yes, reality bites. We say that God made that information available, plus He gave free will.

You are layering on again to the supernatural, but the supernatural hasn't been established, so you can't go on to use it for more. Besides, one's 'will' isn't really free if it has to follow God's will or else burn.

We're trying to get rid of the old, probably made up mean God as being so mentally ill and vindictive that we have to resort to calling His insane-like ways to be 'mysterious ways', we being now in favor of promoting His Son in the New Testament as being the opposite of theme God in the Old Testament, as an extremely kind and forgiving new kind of God, whom to we can repent all our sins if we accept Him.

So, there's still a deal.

Yes, but not much of one. You just have to truly believe, and then you will be saved.

Who's still the Son's father?

We don't really like to talk about that.

I suppose you have many more layers of structure to the unknowable, unshowable supernatural?

Oh, so many more 'layers' as you refer to them, such as angels and their hierarchy, a Holy Ghost, Satan, saints, a trinity, purgatory, and so much else that it takes years to be all told or learned. I'm going for my theological degree.

I'll pass on all those supposings, but I note in reality that Pope Francis seems to be changing things right and left, calling the Holy See such as 'terrorists' for gossiping, and

all who oppose gays and lesbians to be ‘bigots’, and easing up on a lot of other things during a special year of forgiveness.

Yeah, and I even miss the Latin mass and the other rules that went away, but not the special mission sessions in which one got threatened.

Yeah, my father took me to one of those, in which they yelled about hellfire if you didn’t do this or that, as remnants of the mean God theory. Very scary.

Well, humans goof up, you know. That’s how they are.

Ah, here we agree again, as on the base, sinful natures showing up, at least in some human mammals.

Uh-oh.

Our agreements have not been shown to be a terrible thing. I’m just indicating that the various ingredients to the human recipe, whether as intended by God or as a result of evolution, have to result in their wide-ranging expression that we can also plainly see, as as from the devilish end to to the more angelic end, and through the spectrum in between. Even before the supposed fall of man, Eve and Adam had the built in capability to have their nature’s expression do ‘wrong’, and, rather instantly, they did.

Although that’s Old Testament stuff that we downplay, it’s hard to get rid of, for it’s part of the reason for the coming of Jesus, but some religions, such as even the Philippine Catholic Bible put an asterisk on The Garden of Eden story, saying down below in smaller print that Cain and Abel represent the farmers against the herders, who, similar as they seem, were in great conflict, one side growing food and one side growing animals.

Could be that flawed ‘good’s lead to evil, each side thinking that the credibility of their own ways gets undermined by the mere and sheer existence of a different approach, whither political, religious, cultural, and so forth, and so that makes for a fake ‘evil’ to be fought or wiped out.

Ah, humans are going to be the end of us. Whatever made this mess of crap that keeps happening time anytime again.

Again, we agree, and I have to go post this stuff soon, although they might not like the length of this tale that doesn't even go much of anywhere but to show what has to go on from no one knowing much about why we're here, although we have some myths and folklore, unless that is a kind of a point of no point, but it seems as just a wandering in the dark through a well-lit wonderland wherein experiences are the main attraction.

So, what do you do without fear of Hell and reward in Heaven.

You got it. I do good for the sake of good, as grounded on Earth, although I really have to do as I do, but it happens to be that.

So, what exists?

What IS exists; what is not, is not. At our level, all kinds of fine things and feelings exist, as well as the horrible and the unbearable barbaric, and even loads of what we might call just plain nonsense abounding. What we see is exactly how it is for us. This is life.

What about my golden template?

It fails, but it's at least a fine wish for closure and to have a purpose. Whether we're religious or not, we're in a dependence upon What IS, and that pretty much removes what we think of as ego.

**THE SUPER TOE IS CAUSELESS,
THUS, THAT IS THE SUPER TOE!**

Our train of thought has driven us to the answer,
Of all that borne from near 'nothing' onto eternity,
 Of the origin of the original disorder,
 The lone dawn of our trackless radix,
Via the rails and tunnels that ever ran out:

There cannot be ever more and more
Causes beneath even more extended causes;
Therefore, intuitive or not, the causeless is,
Being such as what we observe it in the quantum.

Thus, cause is only of our higher realm,
As downward thence to its root emergence—
 'Possibility' needed no mother but itself;
An egg burst open, born without a chicken.

The causeless bottom is the potential
Of possibility that is/was ever there.

Since it's 'defined' as an undefined chaos,
There's no problem of no initial definition had,
Since it can't have one and so it needs not any.

Things themselves become and go of 'virtual' potential,
Some things remaining as the rather-enduring real.
 The potential is as near to simple as it gets,
Second only to the nonexistent Nothing, of course.

So, then, the potential is of no mind or 'seeing',
For that thought system can never be constituted,
As there are no more fundamentals upon more;
For, the Potential is already the ultimate basis.

Simple things ever combine, and further up,
 And/or go must through phase changes,
Leading to more complex composites/forms.

Stillness, not existing at all, and not even being able to,
But, perhaps threatening to, is near to the base state,

So, it must ever jiggle about, manifesting as loose ‘change’.

You might say, then, that, that is exactly why
There had to be the potential for things;
Otherwise... A lack of anything, forever.

We have now reached the unexpected TOE,
One that even satisfies the ongoing trend,
For, looking down, we’ve always observed
The ever descending simplicity of Nature.

Now, as such, we can’t really expect to find
An Ultimate Complexity sitting
Around there at the simplest point.

We didn’t find Mind there;
Thus, we are here just to be.

This causeless bottom ‘fate’...
Was/is, too, a ‘magical’ state,
For anything can become of it.

‘Possibility’ is what’s fundamental,
For all that can be must first be possible.
This ‘Potential’ for All is the default,
Since a Not can’t be, or even be meant.

FINIS