

ONTOLOGY 101  
PART 1  
November 14, 2004

The evolution of the Evolution vs Creation Question:

- 1.) Bible vs Darwin
- 2.) Design vs Chance
- 3.) Rules vs Self-organization
- 4.) Two levels vs One level

The question shifts to: if rules, whence their source? But also, if stuff, whence its source? Do the rules and the stuff they govern have the same source? Or does the cosmos come into experience at the intersect or verge of the two? Or does stuff have “built-in rules” that lead to self-organization? But again, that would imply two levels. But we could say that no-rules leads to self-organization. But this still is some sort of rule. It seems difficult for us to avoid a two-level ontology, be it self-organizing or governed by rules from a different source. These are rules and there is stuff. A final alternative would be that rules are only a different kind of stuff, but the existence of a second kind of stuff still leaves us with the number two, whether it refers to levels or kinds of stuff. The ontological conclusion is that the number two is somehow fundamental to existence

The conclusion is consistent with Eddington’s “Uniform sameness is philosophically indistinguishable from non-existence.” That is, one does not exist. So, existence begins with Two, i.e., begins when there is some sort of difference. It is also interesting to note here that Pythagoras who had no symbol for nothing, there was no zero in his time, concluded that one was the proper symbol for nothing. Again, it takes two to exist.

So, the school board in Kansas should decide whether to allow two to be used in schools or to pass laws requiring its deletion from all texts.

The above has ignored the question, does design imply a designer? Or do rules imply some sort of legislative body? We avoided trying to answer two questions: Whence the source of rules, and whence the source of stuff. For those who want to continue the Evolution vs Creation dialogue let them come up with the answers to those questions. The rest of us can take the dictum that two levels, matter/thought, things/names, two species or tuff, or a fundamental difference can be a launch pad for the exploration of alternative ontologies.

-----  
‘How about two kinds of stuff each with two levels, rules and stuff?’

The creation becomes the creator

The design becomes the designer

The selection becomes the selector

Was there an original creator, designer?

Self-organizing of evolving

But the creation involves a dialogue between what is now and what is next. The dialogue between is and become be -> 2.

The irreverence of this view is no other outside level intervention. No outside source of innovation.

.ONTOLOGY 101  
THE EVOLUTION of CREATION vs EVOLUTION

- 1.) The Literal Bible vs Darwin
  - a. Is god the God of all or just of the earth?
  - b. He is God of all Creation.
  - c. Then why should the God of all Creation select the 24 hour rotation period of this one small planet as His unit of time for creating all Creation? Six earth days?
- 2.) The Metaphorical Bible vs Darwin
  - a. Well, the Hebrew word, *yom*, can mean day, but it also means a period of time. The English Bible probably should have read, God Created the world in six epochs or six periods of time, not literal days. The time span is not the issue.
- 3.) Design vs Chance
  - a. With time span out of the way, what is the issue? The issue is, did creation happen all by itself, by chance so to speak, or was there a designer, who designed the world and launched it on its evolving course? There does seem to be rules or principles governing the world and how it evolves, even Darwin admits this, so what is the source of these rules? A Designer?
- 4.) Rules vs Self-Organization
  - a. We agree that there are rules, laws, principle that enable, guide, and limit what happens. The issue is there are rules separate from the world, written on some external tablet, designed and enforced by some external agent, or are the rules built-in-rules, implicit in the nature of matter, actual attributes, and properties of the material world as it is, self-organizing, self-directing.
- 5.) The Source: Back to Design vs Whatever
  - a. Whether the rules are implicit properties or external administrative guides there is still the issue of their source. Even if material particles have the “intelligence” to self-organize, how did they get that way? The demonstration of instances of self-organization does not answer how the ability to elf-organize was acquired. We are back to the issue of the source.
- 6.) The Designer has been replaced by the Design
  - a. Whether there is an on-going Designer or not, there is an on-going design. This design can create and is accordingly a creator. And in the sense the Creator has merged with Creation, the Designer has become one with the Design, and Darwin would have to concede that the selection becomes the selector.

No one can define God; Theologians do not attempt to do so. And no, it is becoming evident that “randomness” cannot be defined. Mathematicians and scientist’s feel it to be undefinable. So why is there a huge dispute between the God-intelligence design-crowd and the “chance” crowd? It may be that God and Randomness are much the same. But the argument that randomness knows what it is doing cannot be made. We are approaching the subject entirely wrong. Wrong questions, wrong issue.

## ONTOLOGY 101 CONTIGUITY AND CONTINUITY

November 15, 2004

We live in a “solid state” reality. Our perceptions of the world are that it is contiguous and continuous like solid state matter. Whereas “real reality” may be more akin to a liquid or to a gas than to a solid having rigid contiguity and unbroken continuity, our perceptions and experience have decreed otherwise. In fact, contiguity and continuity have become the “cement” that holds together our present world view of reality. (And derivative of our perceptions contiguity and continuity are our concepts of causality and consistency.) But against centuries of sensory evidence by billions of humans, the results of certain experiments in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century have indicated that we all may have had it wrong.

General Relativity tells us that space and time exists only in the presence of matter. The curvature of space and the clock rate of time are functions of the local density of matter. The inference of this is that space and time are not basic attributes of the cosmos but are only a property of material objects. And since the distribution of matter in the cosmos is not continuous and contiguous, it follows that neither space nor time is contiguous or continuous. But this view not only contradicts common sense, it violates earlier scientific dogma. Newton held that space and time were “absolutes”; they are the essential infrastructure needed to give location to all objects and events. While this traditional view has been superseded, it still permeates our thinking because it fits everyday experience. How can we all be so wrong?

Observations support Bell’s quantum mechanical predictions of non-locality. No longer is an object either here or there, it can be both here and there. While this has been observed space wise, it has yet to be observed time-wise, but if true an object could exist both now and then. Avatars, Brigadoon’s, Camelot’s, the Once and Future King, no longer fantasies, but now become plausible possibilities. The real connections between entities, and even within an entity, are seen to be not spatial contiguity nor chronological continuity, but visible connections of a non-material nature. Who is my neighbor? Who is my countryman? Is it synchronicity that the internet has come along at just this time to give us new answers to these questions the old contiguity and continuity definitions break down?

With perspicuity beyond contiguity and continuity, the old cloche of connecting the dots has to be upgraded. There has always been some sort of table to hold the dots. But now the table exists only in the immediate vicinity of each dot. Does this mean there is no longer “Newtonian” logical infrastructure? How do we upgrade our logic to fit spatial and chronological non-locality? It appears that our traditional rational processes are too limited, but Gödel has already demonstrated that this is so.