

In Search of a Cyclops

On how scientists look for a unified field theory but are actually searching for god.

Fredrick Schermer

www.pentapublishing.com

Don't we all want to understand the world and universe we live in? Over the Millennia people, nations, and institutions have delivered their particular answers to this deep need for understanding. This short paper addresses the structures in which these answers are placed.

In religion there are four possible structures available. The first structure is one of singularity in which god exists, the second is multi-faceted in which several or many gods exist, while the third one states that no god exists. The fourth option does not belong to the field of religion perse, but must be mentioned here nevertheless. Agnostics state that they do not know and cannot know about divine existence or divine absence. All religious explanations of the world make use of one of these four structures.

In science there are fewer options; only two. Either matter can get explained on a single platform (unified field theory) or matter can get explained on a platform with more than one member. Two possible structural platforms exist in science, not four. To make the missing two options visible: in science one cannot state that matter does not exist, because matter exists — period. And an agnostic would also look foolish when stating that one does not know nor cannot know about matter.

Obviously the instrument of freedom is that of religion. There is no evidence available that will deliver us the indication that there is only one god, that there are many gods, or that there are no gods at all. And as long as we learn that we need to respect each other in our specific beliefs, we are just fine. In science we are definitively more restricted and the age old battle that existed between the many gods and the single god appears to be now raging on the scientific level whether there is a unified field or not.

The most essential difference between the existence of a unified field and the lack thereof is the almost unscientific substance of nothing. Don't get me wrong. Nothing is nothing no matter how you twist it. And nothingness is nothing other than a fashionable word to say more about nothing. But the distinction between a unified singular field and a field without singularity is exactly that amazing aspect of nothing. When a fundamental separation exists on the ultimate field — not within but between independent members — then singularity will be impossible. We may downplay nothing, because in the idea of a single god nothing does not play an important role. Yet in the idea of several gods there is a very important nothing that is the separation between the various deities; these gods have nothing in common.

In a more ordinary example, some people have no problem to accept that on some level men and women have nothing in common, but when it comes to a unified field theory a good number of scientists jumps on the band wagon to find evidence for that Cyclops, that single unified field of forces. Is it the Christian, Muslim, and Jewish heritage that somehow makes us believe that if there is a single god, then the result of this single god must be singular also? We then say that Eve came forth out of Adam in stead of saying that both were created at the same time! Was one god responsible for that or more than one? Who knows. The freedom will always exist to believe in a single god who nevertheless created diverse results. Yet in science we do not have that freedom. If we do not expect to find a scientific trace of god, then why do we expect to find a scientific trace of singularity?

It will be difficult to find evidence whether singularity exists, right? Maybe not, because evidence for the opposite can be found. We can find mathematical evidence that nothing is a fundamental part of our universe. Through patterns found within the natural numbers, the number zero automatically pops up too. As soon as someone mentions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 a structure - a format - has been used in which zero has its own fundamental place.

To find the mathematical evidence as presented in “In Search of a Cyclops” you can visit <http://www.pentapublishing.com>. A synopsis link can be found on this page as well. Naturally, zero and nothing are not one and the same, but the zeroes in 000001119 do function precisely the same way in that they could have been left out; they represent nothing in particular. With evidence in hand we can say that a single unified field of forces cannot exist because nothing is a fundamental part of the final platform on which it functions as the separator between independent members. Unity, no matter how close we may seem to get, does not exist in the material world.

Talking about Cyclops may have been fun in the old days. Today, we do not go for that kind of stories anymore, but just like what happened to Odysseus it is still easy to get captured by a perceived structure of singularity. It is not impossible to escape, but you have to name the single aspect that can shatter the captivating idea of singularity. That’s why Odysseus called himself Nobody.

“In Search of a Cyclops — The Proof of Nothing” contains scientific information to back up the claim that nothing plays a role in each and every structure that tries to deliver a completed view. While the idea of nothing can be a simple concept in itself, the fact that it is present whenever we try to create a structure about everything, makes it imperative that we need to understand the role of nothing before we can understand everything.