

A NEW THEORY OF EVERYTHING?

Bertrand Wong, Eurotech, S'pore
Email: bwong8@singnet.com.sg

Abstract

The conventional theory of everything concerns the unification of the four forces of nature: gravity, weak nuclear force, strong nuclear force and electromagnetism. But some of the most fundamental aspects of nature are left out. This article raises some important points which ought to be covered by a new theory of everything.

Firstly, let's take a look at infinity which is an important idea in mathematics. Is outer space really infinite? If on the contrary outer space were finite and there is a limit or boundary to how far one could travel there, what structure/support (space) would this whole finite space be positioned on. Next, what structure/support (space) would the structure/support (space) of this whole finite space be positioned on, and, what structure/support (space) would the structure/support (space) of the structure/support (space) of this whole finite space be positioned on, and so on and on to infinity? In this case there would be an infinitude of structures/supports (infinitude of spaces on spaces). [Compare: Zeno's paradox] In either case, infinity comes into the picture. The infinity of outer space thus makes sense. Is infinity, e.g., the infinity of outer space, indeed a real physical phenomenon and not a mere concept? The physical or actual existence of infinity implies the possibility of infinite powers such as those deemed to be possessed by a Supreme Creator. The problem here is that it is impossible to physically confirm infinity even if one has an infinite life-span simply because infinity has no end and the search for infinity would be endless, like a cat chasing its own tail. [1 & 2]

Secondly, is consciousness indeed a driving-force behind nature? It appears that it is unscientific or unconventional to consider consciousness as a driving-force behind nature and it is best ignored. But in quantum theory the behaviour of quantum particles could only be described in a probabilistic manner with no certainty, probability being a function of consciousness; Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle postulates that the viewer (i.e., consciousness) affects the viewed quantum particle and vice versa. How to deny the importance of consciousness in science and shouldn't there be a comprehensive theory of consciousness? Without life or consciousness there would not be the need, and, ability, to do science and control nature. A consciousness probably much different from and much more

Copyright © Bertrand Wong, 2013

superior than human consciousness, e.g., aliens or extra-terrestrials, should not be discounted.
[3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8]

Finally, are all life-forms really the result of evolution, or, are they the handiwork of a Creator. To many, life-forms are so complex that they could not possibly have just come into existence spontaneously without the intervention of a Creator, though computer simulation has shown that evolution is possible. How to account for the existence of the Creator? By the same reasoning given just above could He be the handiwork of a Higher Creator, who in turn is the handiwork of an even Higher Creator, and so on and on to infinity. The ultimate answer could be that everything which exists is the handiwork of an infinitely powerful Supreme Creator, who is the First Cause. Those who believe in God would abide by this theory. However there are a number of atheists who do not subscribe to this and many more who neither believe nor disbelieve this. A computer or robot which has been created by man does not question its maker unlike the atheists. It is possible that a Supreme Creator has also created atheists. The idea often put forward is that man has been given Free Will by his Maker to do whatever he likes. How to scientifically explain all this one way or the other? Going further, how did the DNA or “computer program” which is responsible for the development and characteristic of living things arise; who created these “computer programs”? Are there “DNAs” or “computer programs” governing the behaviour of quantum particles?
[5, 6, 7, 8, 9 & 10]

A new theory of everything, possibly with mathematical models, e.g., mathematical models of consciousness and creation or evolution, for the mathematically inclined who favour them, should scientifically supply the answers to some or all of the above questions. This is important as it would provide greater insight of our origin and nature.
[10, 11, 12 & 13]

REFERENCES

- [1] Life In The Infinite Universe, Quarterly Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society, Vol. 20, G. F. R. Ellis & G. B. Brundrit, 1979
- [2] Parallel Universes, Scientific American, M. Tegmark, May 2003
- [3] Wholeness And The Implicate Order, Routledge, David Bohm, 1980
- [4] Alien Invasion: How To Defend Earth (The Ultimate Survival Guide For The Ultimate Attack), Baen Publishing Enterprises, Travis S. Taylor & Bob Boan, 2011
- [5] The Principles Of Quantum Mechanics, Oxford University Press, P. A. M. Dirac, 1958
- [6] Quantum Mechanics, Second Edition, John Wiley & Sons, E. Merzbacher, 1970
- [7] Quantum Theory Of Matter, John Wiley & Sons, A. Modinos, 1996
- [8] Predictions From Quantum Cosmology, Physical Review Letters, Vol. 74, A. Vilenkin, 1995
- [9] Are You Living In A Computer Simulation?, Philosophical Quarterly, Vol. 53, No. 211, Nick Bostrom, 2003
- [10] The Evolution Of The Physicist's Picture Of Nature, Scientific American, P. A. M. Dirac, May 1963
- [11] Superforce (The Search For A Grand Unified Theory Of Nature), Counterpoint, Paul Davies, 1984
- [12] Dreams Of A Final Theory (The Search For The Fundamental Laws Of Nature), Vintage, Steven Weinberg, 1993
- [13] The Elegant Universe, Vintage Books, Brian Green, 2000