

FIRST PRINCIPLES OF MY SCIENCE

AN E-BOOK

By

EMMANUEL GEORGE CEFAI

ISBN NUMBER : 978 - 9957 - 51 - 33 - 3 (2019)

FOREWORD
TO THE FIRST PRINCIPLES OF MY SCIENCE

I-My intention was to write a work that treated the Genesis of the Mass Universe - Treated the problem –

II-But was led to the Principles of Global Balance Adjacent Contiguous Reference Frames – And also the Principle of Mass : energy Percentage adding Further significance to Einstein's $e= mc^2$ –

III-Wanted to continue on $e= mc^2$ and arrived at the Principle of Mass : energy Percentage –

IV-Afterwards I discovered that Newton's Gravitation was shaky – I treated Gravitation in the light of the Principles I had discovered by using Reference Frames – I found to my surprise that this fitted better – Replacement of Newton's static Universe by a Dynamic Universe –

V-Realized that a Static Universe and Evolution were Antinomies – So I also criticized Einstein's 'Closed Universe' –

VI- Then I discovered the Rule of Proportionality in all Science –

VII- I also discovered that the Foundation of Science was Philosophy –

X-I applied and extended the Rule of Proportionality in Science as a Golden Rule to – (i) Further Enunciations of Principles and (ii) Further Proportions and (iii) Verification of Enunciated principles and Principles still to be enunciated. - I noticed that also by this Time the Spirit of Science was changing especially from enunciation of Principles by Induction to Enunciation of Principles by and through the Rule of Proportion – I discovered also that Evolution had a Descent from the Physics to the Biology – And that the Rule of Proportion was common to all levels and types of Evolution – Indeed whilst in Evolution everything changed the Rule of Proportion remained always the same, constant, there, continuous.

XI-I planned my work in such a way that first of all I would make sure that the foundations of such works would be rock-strong.

It is like the case of the foundations of a building – if the foundations are not 'rock strong' then the building will be bound to be shaky under attack of the elements.

But if the building be built with and on 'rock strong' foundations I found that the building will be bound to resist and stand strong and shining like a lighthouse to others under any attack.

I mentioned the attack of the elements in the building of stones and/or bricks; but in the building of this work I had in mind the attacks of the critics. Such attacks are most welcome as of themselves and at the end thereof they finish in strengthening the building I have built, that is my works, my system.

I do not want my works and/or my system to be 'idolized' or held as an icon : I only want to whet the appetite not only of the other thinkers and scientists after me but to whet their appetite for making more and more discoveries, increasing our knowledge, and that in the process I trust and hope they will – perhaps unknowingly – enunciate more and more proportions proportionately with the ever-increasing volume of their discoveries and/or uncovering of knowledge.

I fully agree with the great Bacon that science has to be utilitarian at least in its basic aim – and what aim is greater than that of attaining to Immortality of Ens? I opine that that the

higher the target that one sets, the better the chances that at least if not reaching it at least one nears to it, and in the process also make discoveries and/or add knowledge (including here medical knowledge, hope and relief) to human kind.

*I wanted also that my work be continued not by the few select but practically by the whole populations inhabiting this world after me. That is why I emphasize so much on the enunciation of a methodology of geniusship which would open the possibility to all the future populations of the world in each individual member – that is the aim at least – to be discoverers and/or those who add to the knowledge, or rather cumulus of knowledge before them. I look most of all **at giving to those after me a tool – not icons or dogmas – such that if possible and as much as possible all members in the future populations coming after me will all be individually discoverers and/or those who add to knowledge and discovery.***

This aim, I feel, is as noble as the target set by myself in regards to Immortality of Ens.

I hold that the works labours sacrifices discoveries and additions of knowledge made by me – not only me – but each one of us should have these aims and such like aims.

The future of our world, our future world will then be immensely – I would dare say in my humility – in a revolutionary and startling way – be bettered, only, and only if, our future populations and our future civilizations know and practice how to wield in peace and to betterment the power – ever-increasing to without limit as the target – yielded them by future discovery and knowledge.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

TO

FIRST PRINCIPLES

List of Certain Basic Discoveries made and/or treated –

- 1-Genesis of the Mass Universe*
- 2-Genesis of Matter : energy*
- 3-Rim of the Mass : universe*
- 4-Ever-Continuous Extension of the Mass Universe*
- 5-Principle of Global Balance*
- 6-Principle of Contiguous Adjacent Reference Frames*
- 7-Principle of Mass : energy Percentage*
- 8-Critique of Newton's Gravitation*
- 9-Reference Frames (especially vis-à-vis the Principle of the Mass : energy Percentage)*
- 10-Replacement of Newton's Laws*
- 11-Realization that Static Universe and Evolution were Antinomies*
- 12-Critique of the 'Closed Universe'*
- 13-Treated the Building of Science like the Building of a Palace with Foundations Upwards*
- 14-Rule of Proportionality in all Science*
- 15-Discovery that the Foundations of Science were Philosophy*
- 16-Rule of Proportionality in Science extended to Enunciation of Principles*
- 17-Rule of Proportionality in Science extended to further Proportions*
- 18-Rule of Proportionality in Science extended to Verification of Principles Enunciated or to be Enunciated*
- 19-Change from Enunciation of Principle by Induction to Enunciation through the Rule of Proportionality*
- 20-Discovery that in Evolution Descent was from the Physics to the Biology*
- 21-Discovery that the Rule of Proportion was common to all levels and types of Evolution*
- 22-Evolution changed but Discovery that the Rule of Proportion remained always Sovereign, Constant and Continuous*
- 23-Discovery of Principles of Mind*
- 24-Discovery of the Law of Boiling to Protoplasm of Ens*
- 25-Discovery that Hypotheses and Theories Could Globally Equal and Equalize Infinite Reality et*

FURTHER EXPLANATORY NOTE

In coming to the conclusions in this work I observed the following:

1-That the first and maximum import in all matters pertaining to scientific discovery and knowledge *the observation and/or experimentation of empirical facts* came first (both in priority order and in chronological order) and foremost – as indeed has been done in the science since its immense progress in the last centuries.

2-That all these observations and experiments made by numerous eminent scientists over the centuries could be reduced or rather short-listed to a number of specific Principles, Laws, Rules and so on. And may this process be repeated again and again and again!

3-That the said Principles, Laws, Rules and so on had *all in common as a common factor and as a genetic link* the **proportion** that is evident in them

4-That I saw that these said Principles, Laws, and Rules reflected as in a mirror the mass universe.

5-That I saw that proportion (the Greek *proportio*) was the common underlying factor in all the phenomena occurrences and structures:matter:energies in to the mass universe.

6-That I saw that *all proportions expressed empirically and already known inter-transformed into each other according to the simple Principle **proportio ex proportio***

7-That I realized that the Principle of **proportio ex proportio** was widespread and extended *practically and basically* without exception over the mass universe

8-That I saw *that all the all mass universe could be expressed in proportions independently of directly observed empirical fact – that is in the basis of the **proportio ex proportio Principle*** – although these proportions ‘in fine’ lead to and were ‘ancestored’ by proportions observed empirically the eminent scientists before.

9-That accordingly I drew up enunciated and gathered these proportions together into a basic preliminary scientific explanation : plan of the mass universe.

The said plan of the mass universe is the basis of this work; indeed it is this work.

CONTENTS
OF
FIRST PRINCIPLES OF MY SCIENCE

CONTENT

I – Space-Mentalism-Physicalism

II-

1-The Principle of the Datum of Physicalist Space

2-The Principle of Ever-Increasing Propensity to Continuity of Extension of Physicalist Space

3-The Principle of Identity of Physicalist Space with its Continuous Extension

4-Of the Identity of the Continuous Extension of Physicalist Space and the Genesis of Energy

5-Of the Einsteinian Identity of Energy to Matter

6-Of the Syllogistic Principle that Physicalist Space in fine is the genesis of Matter

7-Of the Syllogistic Principle that in fine a Principle of Datum (of Physicalist Space) is the Genesis of both Matter and Energy

III –Inter-Transformation

1-Of the Continuous Inter-Transformation of Energy to Mass and Vice-versa in the Mass Universe

2-Of the Principle that any two or more substances that transform or can transform into each other (like Energy-Matter) there is a Percentage however Minimal of each substance (say Energy in Mass; Mass in Energy in any Substance

3-Of How in this Percentage (example : Mass : energy Percentage) there is a minimal percentage (of the other substance(s)

and a predominant percentage (of the substance itself)

4-Of how the Minimal Percentage though very near to $\rightarrow 0\%$
never can = 0%

5-Of how the Prevalent Percentage though very near to $\rightarrow 100\%$
never can = 100%

IV-Energy-Motion and the Principle of Mass-Energy Percentage

1-Of how all Energy Possesses a Minimum Percentage
of Mass

2-Of How all Mass Possess a Minimum Percentage of Energy

3-Of the Principle of Mass : energy Percentage

4-Of the Principle of Conservation of Matter

5-Of the Principle of Conservation of Energy

V-Of Global Balance and Contiguous Adjacency

1-What is Global Balance in the Mass Universe

2-What is Global Balance in the Mass Universe

3-The Consequence of Global Balance in the Mass
Universe; Boundaries (otherwise these would

Tear apart or not be);and Continuous Extension itself

4-Global Balance as the 'Pump' of the Mass : Universe

5-Global Balance is an ideal and physicalist datum
at the same time

6-What is Contiguous Adjacency in the Mass Universe

7-The principle of Immediate Contiguous Adjacency
in the Mass Universe and the Global Balance of
that Adjacency

8-What is a Reference frame in a Physicalist Mass
Universe

9-What is the Stability of a Reference Frame in a
Physicalist Mass : universe

VI-The Three Principles of the Mass Universe

1-The Principle of Global Balance

2-The Principle of Contiguous Adjacent Reference-Frames

3-The Principle of Mass : energy Percentage

4-Of these Three Principles are the Lords of
the 'Mass Universe'

5-Of How these Three Principles are the Common Ancestors
of all Other Principles

VII-Descent of Principles –

- 1-Of How the Principles in the Mass Universe are Organized as in to a Genealogical Tree
- 2-Of How Principles Descend from One Another As Human Descendants Do
- 3-Of How the Common Ancestor Principles are the Three Principles of the Mass Universe
- 4-Of how All Principles in the Mass Universe are linked as in a Chain to each other
- 5-Of How the Principles of Non-Living Processes are linked as in a Chain to the Principles of Living Processes
- 6-Of the consequent relation (ideal and physicalist) of Non-Living Processes and Living Processes
- 7-Of the consequent relation (ideal and physicalist) of Non-Living Processes and Living Processes
- 8-Of How the Living Processes and Principles Come Next Chronologically

VIII-Common Ancestors, Basicity and Arcanness –

- 1-What is Arcaneness
- 2-What is Basicity
- 3-Of the Principle that Arcanness is Proportional (directly proportional) to Basicity
- 4-Of the Proportionality of Arcanness to Common Ancestors
- 6-Of the Proportionality of Basicity to Common Ancestors
- 7-Examples of Arcanness and Basicity in the Evolution of the Body Plan of Living Enta

IX-Living Enta; Protoplasms of Ens

- 1-What is Ens
- 2-What is Living Ens
- 3-What is Protoplasms of Ens

X-The Overthrow of Isaac Newton

- 1-Of how Newton Put Gravity to Link the Rotation of Celestial Bodies Like of our Planet to the Sun
- 2-Of How Newton himself admitted that he did not know how to Define Gravity
- 3-Of How the Link between our Planet and the Sun is not 'Gravity' but the Operation of the

Three Principles of the Mass Universe Together
Namely : Global Balance; Contiguous Adjacent
Reference Frames and Mass : energy Percentage
4-Of How Therefore the Three Principles of the
Mass Universe Replace Gravity
5-Of How this Replacement as in 4 overthrows
Newton's Laws
6-Of How Newton's Law of Inertia assumes a Static
Universe – this is contrary to our ever-expanding
Ever-moving Mass Universe
7-Of How Newton's Static Mass Universe is
Replaced by our Dynamic Mass Universe
8-Of how Newton's Inertia is therefore replaced
by Our continuous Flowing Energy : Motion
9-Of How Newton's Static Universe with its Law
of Inertia would require an 'Overhanging God
Hand' to Move It; in our Case No Such hand Is
Required

XI-Principles and Phenomena

1-Of How in the Mass Universe every Phenomenon
moves accordant to One or More Principles
2-Of How Therefore Principles Govern Phenomena; Phenomena constitute Evolution and the
Mass Universe; therefore
and accordingly (as by syllogistic reasoning)
Principles Govern Evolution and the Mass Universe
3-Of how Principles once Known can be Controlled
or Manipulated by us Humans
4-Of How if we Humans Know all Principles we can
control and manipulate all Principles
5-Of How the Human Control and Manipulation of
Principles is the Equivalent of Control of the Mass : universe in the
Non : Living Processes and immortality of Ens in the Living
Processes
6-Of Our control of the Mass Universe through our knowledge of Principles
7-Of our Control of Immortality of Ens through our Knowledge of Principles

XII-Proportionality as the Genesis of the Principles in the Mass Universe

1-Of the Principle that in Global Balance what occurs in any
one reference frame in the mass universe must occur : progress
in the next and so on such that the same events must occur in adjacent reference frames –
Principle of Sameness
2-Of the Principle that Global Balance requires the Principle of
Sameness to occur all over the extent of the expanding
Mass universe - Principle of the Occurrence of the Principle

Of Sameness All Over the Mass Universe

3-Of the Principle that the Occurrence of the Principle of Sameness All Over the Mass Universe and the Occurrence of

Proportion in to the same Mass Universe are Identities

4-Of How therefore and accordingly Proportion has its genesis in Global Balance

5-Of the Principle that in to the Mass Universe Proportion is

directly Proportional to Global Balance (and Contiguous Adjacent Reference frames) and vice-versa

6-Of How therefore Proportion like to Global Balance holds together the Structure of the Mass Universe

7-Of How All Motion in the Mass Universe Occurs and Must Occur Within the Structure or Form resulting from Proportion and Global Balance

8-Of How All motion in the mass universe is the genesis of all (Bio)chemical Combination in the same (mass universe)

9-Of How All (Bio)chemical Combination in the mass universe is directly proportional to the Progression of Evolution in the same (mass universe)

10-Of how therefore as by syllogistic reasoning from 6,7,8,9, Proportion and Global Balance Hold Together and are the Genesis of the Progression of Evolution in the Mass Universe

11-Of How Therefore all Principles enunciated in regarding to Phenomena in the Mass Universe must all be Proportional : that is directly proportional or inversely proportional

XIII-Proportionality in Non-Living Processes

1-Of How Phenomena in the Mass Universe can therefore Express Themselves in Proportion and in no Other Way

2-Of How therefore by Knowing Proportion of any Phenomenon

in the Mass Universe we will know how it will and indeed – must – express itself

3-Of How the Physicalist-Empirical Expression of any Phenomenon and the Proportion or Proportion or Proportions Relative to the same are faces of the same Coin' and identical

4-Of How Therefore the Empirical Expression and Description of Any Phenomenon in the Mass Universe and its Relative Proportion(s) are Identities

5-Of How therefore the Act of Describing the Empirical Expression of Any Phenomenon and the Act of Enunciating any Principle(s) relative to the same Phenomenon are Identities

6-Of How therefore any Phenomenon in the Mass Universe

can be 'tackled' Either by Describing it 'empirically' Or By Ex

Pressing – Enunciating its Relative Proportion(s) – as

Principles

7-One How One Expresses Proportion (s) in Principles; and that is What we Do and What Do in Our Works

8-Of how Therefore by Expressing Proportion(s) in the Principles

relative to Non-Living Processes We Describe These Processes

9-Of how the Expression of Principles as per 8 in the Writing

Of the Mechanics, Dynamics, and Other Science of Non-Living Processes in the Mass universe

XIV-Proportionality in Living Processes

1-Of how Within All Parts of the Mass Universe all Principles are related and on the Same Genealogical Tree

2-Of how Principles operating Occurring in Non-living Processes are the Relatives of the Principles Operating in Living Processes

- 3-Of how in the Mass Universe All phenomena Whatever Must Occur According to Principles
- 4-Of how the Life Processes in the Mass Universe must Occur Accordant to Principles
- 5-Of How therefore the Life Processes in the Mass Universe must occur accordant to Principles
And how since All Processes are related as per Above the Principles of the Life Processes are related to the Principles of the Non-Living Processes and Vic e-Versa
- 6-of How the Expression-Enunciation of the Life Processes through the Enunciation of Principles must be as through Principles similar to and related to the Principles Enunciated relative to Non-living Processes
- 7-Of how the Phenomena of Life Processes Can and Indeed Must Be Expressed as through Such Principles (Enunciation of Such Principles)

XV-Specific First Principles of the Life Process

- 1-The Connected Jar Principle
- 2-The Law of Stages
- 3-The Moment of Collapse

XVI-The Genesis of Life (On the Law of Boiling in to Protoplasms of Ens)

XVII-The New Meaning (Additional Meaning) of Verification in Science

- 1-Of How We Verify By the Examination of Empirical Description of Phenomena
- 2-Of How Empirical Description of Phenomenon and the Enunciation of the Relative Principle are Identities
- 3-Of how Therefore We Can Also Verify from the Enunciation of the Relative Principle(s) as well as from the examination of the Empirical Description of Phenomena

XVIII-General

XIX-The Philosophical Basis Of My Works

XX-The Brain Organ or Equivalent

XXI- Other Works

XXII-The Contribution of the Philosophy to the Science

- 1-Ancient Ideas-where Philosophy and Science were Joined Up
- 2-Renaissance Philosophy
- 3-Mentalism
- 4-Philosophy as the Foundation of Science
- 5-Avoiding Re-making a Rift between Philosophy and Science

- 6-Of How Philosophy and Science Have Common Ancestry in the rule of Proportion
- 7-Of how Philosophy and Science Have Common Methodology in the Rule of proportion
- 8-Of How the Marriage of the Common Ancestry and the Common Methodology of Science and Philosophy are the Parents of the Offspring Common Content of Philosophy and Science
- 9-Of How Finally Philosophy and Science should be brought as much as possible to a Common Content

XXIII-My early Philosophy as the Basis of My Science

- 1-The Idea of Infinity
- 2-The Knowledge of Infinite Spatiality from the Idea of Infinity
- 3-The division of Spatiality in to the Mentalist Universe and the Physicalist universe
- 4-Our Knowledge of the Mentalist Universe is from the Idea of Infinity
- 5-Specificity
- 6-Our Knowledge of the Physicalist Universe is from Specificity but Clear and Reliable
- 7-Our Knowledge of the Physicalist Universe from Specificity is Limited
- 8-Our knowledge of the Physicalist Universe is to be Increased as we are Prodded by our Idea of Infinity
- 9-Of How the Mind Reproduces and/or Extends Specific Data ex-Specificity to Further Specificity
- 10-Of How the Process in 9 is done as through the Theory of Inexhaustible Hypotheses
- 11-Of How the Process in 9 and the Process of Scientific Enunciation of Theory, Hypothesis and Principle are Equivalent:Identities in terms of the Principle of equivalent : identity

XXIV-The Value of Hypothesis and Theory –

- 1-Of the Methodology of our Assertion of Hypothesis and Theory ex-Specificity
- 2-Do Hypothesis and theory Differ or are Equivalent : Identical?
- 3-The principle of Equivalence of Inexhaustible Hypotheses to Infinite Reality et
- 4-Scenario
- 5-Impossible Scenario?
- 6-Moving to Reality et
- 7-The principle of Equivalence of Finite Hypotheses to Finite Reality et
- 8-Globality of Finite Hypotheses
- 9-Principle of Necessity of Ever-Increase of Enunciation of finite Hypotheses
- 10-Principle of Extendibility of Finite Hypotheses to Infinite Reality et as by Proportion q.v.
- 11-Assertion:Proof Percentage
- 12-The principle of Assertion : Proof Percentage
- 13-Assertion Percentage inverse to Proof Percentage
- 14-Towards a high assertion percentage

15-Final Stage : Assertion rather than proof

XXV-The Descent of Evolution

- 1-At the Rim of the Mass Universe
- 2-The genesis of Fisei
- 3-Expansion of Rim must Result in Evolution
- 4-The Direction of this Evolution is Prevedible, Inevitable, and Irreversible as expansion at the Rim itself
- 5-The Common Ancestors Laws are found in all Branches of Science to the Biology and Thus Manifest the Descent of Evolution
- 6-The descent of the Physics of the Stars to the Physics of the Earth
- 7-The descent of the Physics of the Earth to the Chemistry of the Earth
- 8-How the chemistry of the Earth descended to the (Bio)chemistry of the Earth in the operation of the Law of Boiling in to Protoplasm of Ens
- 9-Of How the (Bio)chemistry was married to Stimuli with Emotions as the Offspring
- 10-How the Triad of Biochemistry of Stimuli and Emotions evolved to the s/c Living Process(ess)
- 11-On the Genesis of the Living Process(ess) to Present Evolution
- 12-Of the Descent of the Physics to Quantum Physics
- 13-Of the Rule of Proportionality 9cf.the Rule of Law) as the Rule in all Descents of Evolution abovementioned
- 14-Of the vital Import of the Rule of Proportionality in the Increase of Knowledge of Evolution in all Its stages of Descent
- 15-Of the Vital Import of the Rule of Proportionality in the Increase of Engineering Knowledge in all the Matter : Energies and Protoplasm of Ens in The Different Stages of Descent of Evolution

XXVI – Of The Five Scientists

- 1-Of the Experimental Laboratory Scientist
- 2-Of the Theoretical Scientist
- 3-Of the Mixed Breed Scientists from the Union of 1 and 2.
- 4-Of the Mathematical Scientist
- 5-Of the scientist of Proportions and Observer of the Rule of Proportion in All Science

Glossary

FIRST PRINCIPLES

I

Space – its Types – Mentalist and Physicalist

There is nothing which can be in space or physically outside of the human mind that cannot be in the human mind at the mere will of the human mind.

We humans have contact with the phenomena and existences we perceive before us through only one road only namely our mind.

But the human mind is very potent : in a previous work of mine¹ indeed I had enunciated the *infinite* potency of the human mind.

In other words the human mind could have in it *the idea of infinity* – this in itself shows the infinite potency of the human mind – for how can the human mind have this idea of infinity without being itself infinitely potent?

And there are two circumstances in which the human mind perceives the phenomena and existences ‘outside of it’.

One is when it observes what it perceives *directly* and rays of light from the perceived object(s) fall on the retina of the relative human eye. In other words *there is a direct line of flow of matter-energy from the object to the perceiver, the human eye relaying to the human mind.*

The actus is physicalist and indeed there is the *physical transfer* of matter : energy to the human eye – without the physical transfer to the human eye from the perceived object there is no direct perception.

In other words the actus of direct perception is in this physical transfer of energy : matter from the perceived object to the perceiver.

This is very clear and there is nothing more clear and more ‘safe’ in the sense that we are ‘sure’ of what we perceive – and this in spite of the doubts levied by the metaphysicians from Descartes to our days.

In other words the act of perception is physical and a physically occurring phenomenon which we can indeed touch for our satisfaction as an Empiricist would require.

The other type of perception also utilizes a physical transfer of energy : matter but in a different way. That is : in direct perception there is a line joining up the perceived object and the human brain through the human eye; in what I shall term (in order to distinguish it from direct

¹ Vedi : The Reflections On a Metaphysics Of Existence – 1978 – as yet unpublished

perception) *indirect perception* there is a line joining up already introduced energy : matter in the brain to an area of the brain perceiving this energy : matter – in other words the line joining up the perceived object and the human brain is between one part of the same brain and another part of the same brain

This is the physical dynamics of perception – of both types of perception (namely direct perception and indirect perception) - in brief.

Both types of perception are ‘safe’ and ‘valid’ – both in fine ‘use’ the actus of energy : matter passing from perceived objects to the brain – in direct perception directly; in indirect perception indirectly.

And indirect perception has an advantage over direct perception in that it combine re-combine and use in all ways the energy-matter already existent (physically existent) in the same brain through direct perception in an infinite and ever-increasing variety – as is witnessed by the above-mentioned *Idea of Infinity*

Therefore in it and within it the human brain has the potency to combine re-combine and use all the building blocks of the mass universe in such an infinite ever-increasing variety of ways modes and circumstances as to simply *match equal and be identical* to the physicalist combination, re-combination and use of the different building blocks of energy matter in the universe ‘outside of the brain’

In the human brain therefore there is through-and-in ‘indirect perception’ a view of the ‘world outside’ much more extensive that that presented by direct perception. Indeed this view *in its general outline* is the view of the universe outside ‘just as if God were perceiving the universe’.

Now I shall explain *detailed perception* and *general outline perception*.

In detailed perception the perception is focused, restricted to specific data of the perceived object – the more this perception is focused, the more specific in as direct proportion (And vice-versa) (This I call *the Principle of Focusing of Perception*) and the more specific the perception, the more distant from perception of a general view of the whole the mass universe (And vice-versa) – (This I call *the Principle of General View of Perception*).

In general outline perception we do not pay attention to detail, indeed the less detail the more general the view of the universe – as per the just enunciated Principle of General View of Perception.

Therefore we humans have clearly two Options of Perceiving (Perception) – one is that of specifying more and more and focusing more and more; the other, the inverse, is the general view. This is a Principle I term *The Principle Of Options Of Perception* q.v.

Both Options are valid ‘safe’ and their dynamics is physically explained and manifested previously (above).

We humans can choose Options at will – indeed we can choose one Option this moment, then the other Option the next moment, then switch back again to the Other Option and so on.

Indeed we can focus on the specific data of the perceived object(s) – this we term as Empirical Observation; or else widening our perception and de-focusing from specific data to the wider horizons of the Universe – this is Thought.

Both are valid and we humans need to use both and indeed generally have used them well and both – otherwise how could we have reached our present civilization?

Now corresponding to both these Options there are two 'panoramas' we perceive – one in which we generally see and perceive the more 'specific' 'focused' object(s) we term as *physicalist* (in previous science it was termed 'the world outside' 'the world outside of the brain'); the other in which we see the more general view above-mentioned – *mentalist*

In our terminology therefore there will be 'two' universes and 'two' spaces and so on – physicalist and mentalist corresponding to the above. Both are valid and 'safe'; now we humans perceive the one; now the other. That is how we are civilized.

In the same mode in my work I use the term 'ideal state' – this refers to the mentalist universe and generally means 'as should be' – and then there is the 'practical state' – this refers to the 'universe' 'as it is physically'.

By the way there is another name for the physicalist universe in my terminology – *mass universe*.

We shall be meeting this term a lot of times.

What is the Mentalist Universe - Definition

The mentalist universe is by definition-assertion physically spatially (in terms of physicalist space) *outside of* the Rim of the mass universe (s) which it (that is the mentalist universe) touches.

The Rim of the mass universe *must* be taken as the 'boundary line' so to say.

To one side of this boundary line there is space; to the other space as well. Thus in the Ideal State the space on either side of the boundary line should be equal, similar, identical.

But it is not so in the Physicalist State. For the mere and sheer presence of a moving boundary line *that is motion indeed as in continual motion* signifies that the 'space' on either side of the boundary line is not the same in the Practical State

For on one side the space is in motion; on the other no.

In fact there are the following alternatives:

(1)-the space is in motion on one side of the boundary line. In this case the boundary line will be pressed by the space in motion extending further and further in a continuous way in to the territory (physicalist territory) of the space that is not in physicalist motion (mentalist space). The spaces on either side of the boundary-line are therefore different; one is physicalist the other mentalist. And this is the case with our universe, the mass universe as otherwise the mass universe would not encase us, imprison us and be around us (like a prison) and on the other hand we would notice feel and recognize it around us;

(2)-the space is in motion on *both* sides of the boundary line : in this case the boundary-line would be cancelled by the spaces in motion advancing in opposite direction; the spaces in motion would meet, conflict and cancel and kill the motion of each other; the boundary line would disappear and there would be just mentalist space and mentalist universe. There would be no mass universe in this alternative : therefore and accordingly we throw away this alternative;

(3)-the space is not in motion on either side : in this case there would be no boundary-line; it would not be necessary; all space would be mentalist space; there would be no mass universe; therefore we accordingly throw away also this alternative.

Which alternative is the case is thus very limpid and clear.

There is also identity : equivalence in terms of the Principle of Equivalent : identity q.v. as between the space in the brain organ or equivalent and mentalist space to the extent that there is motion in neither and no occurrence : progression of phenomena and/or enta and/or eventa in either.

The mentalist universe

We humans are in the mass universe from the Rim inwards. Therefore our knowledge : perception of space is that of physicalist space. Empirically we have 'experienced' physicalist space and physicalist space only. We have not experienced mentalist space. We indeed *cannot* experience mentalist space because to do that we have to fall outside of the Rim of the mass universe. And the Rim of the mass universe will not allow us to do that.

The space of the mass universe is a space in motion. And a space in motion is a space *that contains*.

That is, id est : We, enta and phenomena occur : progress only because and in so far as we are contained (in physicalist space). And this containment also signifies *position : location* for the relative enta and/or phenomena – which signifies in turn the *function* of the said enta and/or phenomena.

Indeed I enunciate that :

The rate of [increase of] at which the space of the mass universe is in motion will be as directly proportional to the rate of [increase of] the propensity for that space to contain

And vice-versa

And further:

The rate of [increase of] position : location of any ens and/ or phenomenon in physicalist space will be as directly proportional to the rate of [increase of] the propensity to function of the same [ens and/or phenomenon]

And vice-versa

These Principles enunciated in this Section occur : progress in the 'sector' of physicalist space only; but apply also (and a contrario sensu) to the mentalist space.

Mentalist space hath no motion in it; therefore and accordingly *Contains not and cannot contain enta and/or phenomena in it; and much more so any function(s) of the same (enta and/or phenomena).*

But *otherwise* mentalist space is similar : identical to physicalist space.

But this similarity : identity is *reducing to a minimum* of 'characteristics of space'.

Physicalist space contains within it – and indeed this is to it as the foundations of a building - *the minimum 'basic' sub-stratum of mentalist space* - but is *plus more additional* thereto.

And what is this *minimum of space* that is the equivalent : identity of mentalist space in terms of the Principle of Equivalent : identity q.v.?

I assert the following Eleven Dicta regarding Mentalist Space:

A-To mentalist space the 'occupation' of 'physicalist' space is irrelevant

B-Yet mentalist space can 'unfold' 'ad infinitum' so to say into an ever-increasing 'roll' of physicalist space

C-From A and B conclude that the propensity of mentalist space will be to be' rolled on itself and to stay so till 'unfolded'

D-Mentalist space will 'unfold' only because of and indeed as proportional (directly proportional) to the 'onset' of physicalist space on it

E-The rate of [increase of] at which mentalist space will have the propensity to 'unroll itself' will be as directly proportional to the rate of [in onset : advance of physicalist space on it

And vice-versa

F-Mentalist space need not a boundary (physicalist boundary)

G-Mentalist space need not any shape (physicalist shape)

H-Mentalist space need not any position : location (physicalist position : location)

I-Mentalist space thus is the equivalent : identity of 'geometrical space'

J-Mentalist space can be 'compressed' (like as an image in our brain organ or equivalent; or as on paper as a geometrical figure) or 'extended' 'ad infinitum'.

K-Mentalist space is 'inert' (and what is 'inert' needeth no Creator or 'moving force' of Aquinian terminology)

[Indeed the rate of [increase of] 'inertness' will be as inversely proportional to the rate of [increase of] any 'Controller' 'Mover' 'force' and so on]

The Principle of Inertia of Newton does not occur : progress in to the physicalist universe (because the physicalist universe is not inert and hath not and cannot have any inertia – it is in continual motion everywhere in its parts because of the continual expansion of the Rim of the mass universe) but occurs : holds in the mentalist universe for in this universe there is indeed a 'reign of inertia' which however needeth no Creator, Mover or Force as it hath (and in as direct proportion to) no motion.

What is the Physicalist Universe - Definition

The physicalist universe hath motion and with this it hath (as of necessity – cf. Ideal State) position : location.

We have already enunciated earlier on in this Chapter the direct proportionality as between motion and position : location

And the motion that the mass universe acquires from : at the Rim thereof will be as directly proportional to the position : location of enta and phenomena within it.

The occurrence : progression of enta, phenomena, structure, function and of position : location is *simultaneous* - these 'characteristics of physicality' occur : progress 'simultaneously'.

In other words no one of them antecedes or is the genesis of the other but all occur : progress together at the same time : space

This Principle I term as *The Principle Of Simultaneous Occurrence : progression of the Characteristics of Physicality* q.v.

Indeed as in to the mass universe what is proportional occurs : progresses simultaneously and this occurs : progresses as in direct proportion such that we enunciate that:

The rate of [increase of] occurrence : progression of the proportional will be as directly proportional to the rate of [increase of] occurrence : progression of simultaneous occurrence : progression thereof

And vice-versa

Ideal State

The 'Ideal State' is equivalent : identical in terms of the Principle of Equivalent : identity q.v. to the 'Platonic Ideals'

But whilst the 'Platonic Ideals' stood aloof as by themselves; we 'discover' the kith and kin of the said 'Ideal State' in the goings on and occurrences of 'the world of all of us' 'amongst us' in the empirical sovereignty of enta and phenomena - as indeed was done in Aristotle but with much lesser emphasis on the *strict empirical scientific* as in indeed done and continually in our works.

Practical State

Hence in the Practical State in our works all that occurs : progresses therein has a foundation, its foundation in the s/c Ideal State.

Indeed I assert at this juncture that : *There is no occurrence : progression of enta and/or phenomena in the Practical State that is not directly* founded as on the Ideal State*

*We mean and signify also 'in as direct proportion'.

Hence in our mass universe, in our science, in our works *all* phenomena and/or enta have a 'rational explanation' and their genesis directly in Principle from Principle going up finally to the Principles of Global Balance et

And there are *rare* instances where we do not perceive or rather have not perceived empirically a Practical State but which nevertheless has the 'corresponding' Ideal State.

In this case I conclude that:

- (A)- Since that Practical State and Ideal State are directly proportional and simultaneous;
- (B)- Therefore the occurrence : progression of an Ideal State without our perceiving a 'corresponding' Practical State *signifies only that we have still not empirically 'discovered:experienced' the said Practical State;*
- (C)-Which Practical State (corresponding 'Practical State') nevertheless subsists and is still awaiting our *empirical* 'discovery:experience:perception'.

II

1-The Principle of the Datum of Physicalist Space

Our perception both direct and indirect dictates clearly to us that physicalist space is a datum. In other words without this datum we cannot answer the question How are we here if not in what we term as physicalist space? In what do we move? In what have contact with each other? In what perceive? In what our brain itself?

The answers to these questions are clear : there is a 'container' of all these 'objects' and this 'container' is physicalist space.

We are not led to the Datum of Physicalist Space at once, from the beginning, prior to perception.

But when we perceive – whether directly or indirectly – and indeed as soon as we perceive we arrive at the point of 'locating' the 'perceiver' and the 'perceived'. The 'location' or 'positioning' of the perceiver and the perceived is so imperative that at once we go to the Datum of Physicalist Space.

In other words we do not arrive at this Datum blindly as a matter of faith, of religion – we arrive to it in the same way as Descartes arrived at and to his Cogito.

And the status of 'certainty' of the Datum of Physicalist Space is 'equal to' and 'identical to' the 'certainty' of Cogito.

Just as and in the same mechanics of arriving at Cogito ergo sum we arrive at the Datum of Physicalist Space.

2-The Principle of the Ever-Increasing Propensity to Continuity of Extension of Physicalist Space

The same mechanics of arriving at Cogito Ergo Sum and the Datum of Physicalist Space manifests and establishes the Principle of the Ever-Increasing Propensity to Continuity of Extension of Physicalist space

Here there are two alternatives : either a Physicalist space that moves and then follow the consequences of genesis of energy, then energy : matter then celestial bodies up to life and evolution as we know it.

Or else a static physicalist space where anything from the genesis of energy to evolution would not occur by its own hand but by the hand of a third party that is a God directing from above.

The choice therefore is between a God-propelled universe if space be static and a self-propelled universe if space be ever-extending.

Helping us to make this choice – if help need be – is empirical observation of science that manifests the expansion of the mass universe²

And in a static non-extending universe there would be no energy, motion, energy-matter and so on (much less evolution) – unless there be a God hand propelling the universe.

And the choice is one --- between the explanations of a hand of God and the explanations of science.

My present work manifests that the explanations of science manifest a self-propelling mass universe – what therefore should be the reason for opting for a God-propelled universe?

Also one can *always* explain all things all phenomena by a God-propelled mode. But then we can abrogate all science (it will be superfluous) since that everything will be explainable by the God-propelled mode and there will be no necessity for any other explanations!

Our science manifests ‘all around us’ that phenomena we see are not propelled by any God-hand by their own principles, the principles of reasoning and of science. **Not one and I repeat not one** phenomenon has ever been shown beyond reasonable doubt to be propelled by a God-hand : therefore the expansion of the universe shall be the exception? And why so?

But the blow to the God-propelled universe is in the following.

First of all : physicalist space by its own definition must have a boundary. A boundary-less space is mentalist space.

This is a Principle : All physicalist space must have a boundary.

[This Principle I term as *the Principle Of Necessary Boundary Of Physicalist Space*]

Next [in chronological order] Principle : All that has a boundary can extend

This Principle I term as *The Principle Of The Extendibility of The Bounded*

Next [in chronological order] Principle : A physicalist boundary will always extend into a mentalist boundary

Otherwise and a contrario sensu physicalist space would = 0 and not be because since it would never extend from smaller and smaller to vaster and vaster it would always have remained = 0 or rather mentalist space.

This Principle I term as *The Principle Of Necessary Extension Of Physicalist Space Over To Mentalist Space*]

[I shall note a further Principle namely that : *All Principles that are assertions of the definition of themselves need simply to be asserted and nothing else.*

Their ‘proof’ is a few words lies in their simple assertion and nothing else is required.]

These Three Principles together deal the blow – if any were needed - to the God-propelled universe.

² Since Hubble

3-The Principle of the Identity of Physicalist Space with its Continuous Extension

Given the Datum of the Continuous Extension of Physicalist Space we discover that this same physicalist space is co-terminous with its extension

This co-terminousness has its genesis in the same dynamics of Cogito ergo sum and so on.

For how can there be extension of Physicalist Space without that extension being physicalist space itself?

4-Of the Identity of the Continuous Extension of Physicalist Space and the Genesis of Energy

As space, physicalist space extends over to mentalist space it *moves* : for how can it extend without moving?

And the mere and sheer motion of physicalist space is the genesis of energy, the 'first' (in chronological order) energy.

(Is this the 'background radiation'?)

That is : the mere and sheer motion of physicalist space and the genesis of energy are equivalent : identities.

Now I term the boundary of the mass universe as *The Rim* – it is an ever-extending boundary ever-increasing in extent.

Therefore this is what we mean when we say in our works that : Energy is born at the Rim of the mass universe.

5-Of the Einsteinian Identity of Energy to Matter

Einstein has in $e=mc^2$ manifested and indeed quantified the transformation of mass to energy and energy to mass.

Here the principle of inter-transformation counts : that is energy has an equivalent of mass – any amount of energy has an equivalent of mass, however minimal.

And as soon as energy *moves* then it must acquire mass in as direct proportion.

Now the energy of:at the Rim of the mass universe is in continual motion by the very extension of physicalist space : this very motion is like a *Pump* – in my works this term shall also be found often – that 'pumps' continually energy, new energy and this new energy is then 'piled over' the 'older energy' – the resultant is the motion of the one over the other and in Einstein's terminology the genesis of mass.

(Then : mass leads to mass and more mass leads to more mass).

And 'everything began' at the Rim of the mass universe with the ever-expansion of the physicalist space therein.

6-Of the Syllogistic Principle that Physicalist Space in fine is the Genesis of Matter

The ever-expansion of Physicalist Space at the Rim of the mass universe therefore – and in terms of what we have been manifesting – is **the genesis of the physicalist universe and of all phenomena and matter : energy**

Here then is the genesis of the universe – a prize and an explanation so much sought after by the scientists.

7-Of the Syllogistic Principle that in fine a Principle of Datum (of Physicalist Space) is the Genesis of both Matter and Energy

And in line with what we have been saying the Datum of Physicalist Space is at the genesis of the mass universe.

III

Inter-transformation

1-Of the Continuous Inter-Transformation of Energy to Mass and Vice-Versa in the Mass Universe

Of the Principle that *A substance that has in it a = 0% percentage of another substance cannot transform (either in the Ideal state or in the practical State) in to that 'other substance(s)'*

And vice-versa

And:

The rate of possibility of inter-transformation of these substances will be as inversely proportional to the rate at which the 'other substance(s)' = 0%

And vice-versa

In the mass universe in order that any substance may transform into another substance(s) it must contain within it a percentage however minimal of that other substance.

That is this percentage is minimal indeed near to = 0% but still can never be = 0.

If a substance contains an = 0 of another substance (say substance X) it cannot ever transform to X either in the Ideal state or in the practical state.

Therefore transformation is *the increase of a minimal substance percentage already there.*

In other words emphasis is on 'already there' – this is something like *ex nihilo nihil fit* - and indeed is one of the few instances if not the one instance where the Latin dictum still comes into importance in the physics.

This requisite of a minimality of percentage traverses all the physics.

(Bio)chemical combination is different from inter-transformation and has its own Laws of Combination.

In (bio)chemical combination there is a *reshuffling* of the particles of energy-matter as mixed but each particle is not transformed per se'.

In inter-transformation there is an *alteration* of the constituents particles themselves : to cite the most common we expect either the energy current becomes less current and more particle or the vice-versa the particle becomes more current and less particle.

Indeed inter-transformation is perhaps restricted to these phenomena *specifically* ?

These distinctions are to be explained as the 'tricky' line between (bio)chemical combination and inter-transformation lies in the above just mentioned considerations.

2-Of the Principle that any two or more substances that transform or can transform into each other (like Energy-Matter) there is a Percentage however minimal of each substance (say Energy in Mass; Mass in Energy) in any Substance

So that any reference frame in the mass universe hold there must be a mass percentage and an energy percentage.

In the mass universe all matter-energy has mass percentage and energy percentage; and indeed these lie in adjacency a couple of them in immediate adjacency forming a reference frame.

Therefore too when matter-energy transforms – since that matter-energy – indeed all matter-energy lies in and exists in reference frames – *reference frames transform*.

Indeed we might enunciate that

The transformation of matter-energy is the transformation of the relative reference frame(s).

The rate of [increase of] transformation of all and any matter : energy will be as directly proportional to the rate of [increase of] transformation of the relative reference frame(s)

And vice-versa

And in all and any transformation in the mass universe the relative reference frame is transformed accordingly and proportionately.

Therefore since that transformation of matter-energy requires both in the Ideal State and in the Practical State the transformation of reference frames – and since reference frames must indeed and indeed do consist of mass percentage and energy percentage – so an in as direct proportion substance that transform into each other in the mass universe must have a minimum of each in each, however tiny small and minimal this minimum (percentage).

3-Of How in this Percentage (example : Mass : energy Percentage) there is a minimal percentage (of the other substance(s)) and a predominant percentage (of the substance itself) (For example : In mass there is a minimal percentage of energy; a predominant percentage of mass; in energy there is a minimal percentage of mass; a predominant percentage of energy)

In the mass universe the percentage just mentioned are not equal.

Indeed a minimal percentage of one substance by inverse proportion implies and signifies the prevalent and predominant percentage of the other in the same time-space unit(s) (same time and place).

Thus we can enunciate that

The rate of [increase of] at which a minimum percentage of a quantity-quality subsists in any matter-energy will be as directly proportional to the rate of [increase of] a maximum of the relative 'balancing' quantity-quality that together must form the couple that form the relative reference-frame

And vice-versa

4-Of how the Minimal Percentage though very near to $\rightarrow 0\%$ never can = 0%

The necessity – both in the ideal state and in the practical state – of this minimal percentage is the identity of the Principles of Conservation q.v.

Thus in an atomic bomb explosion mass is transformed to energy but the transformation is never = 100% a percentage however minimal of mass remains.

And it is this percentage that manifests the Principle of Conservation q.v.

5-Of how the Prevalent Percentage though very near to \rightarrow 100% never can = 100%

The prevalent Percentage is always very near to = 100% though never reaching it. Although there is a leeway for the prevalent percentage to vary from case to case yet the vicinity to 100% and at the same time the impossibility of reaching = 100% are requisites that must be satisfied.

In other words an infringement of even one of these requisites would signify the 'breaking' of the relative reference frame(s).

IV

Energy Matter and the Principle of Mass : energy Percentage

1-Of how all Energy Possesses a Minimum Percentage of Mass

Energy transforms to mass and vice-versa and in line with Chapter III of this work energy must possess a minimum percentage of mass.

Were it not so then it will not and cannot ever transform to mass

2-Of how all Mass Possesses a Minimum Percentage of Energy

As enunciated earlier on in this work a reference frame must and may only subsist in terms of a couple of mass-energy percentage : therefore and accordingly all mass percentages however predominant or prevalent must and will have a percentage of energy (energy percentage) attached thereto.

3-Of the Principle of Mass : energy Percentage

The Principle of the Mass : energy Percentage states that :

Any matter in the mass universe is made of an energy percentage and a mass percentage, however minimal.

That is : as we have been saying there cannot be a mass percentage = 100% or = 0% but either → 100% (though never reaching it) or → 0% (though never reaching it).

The same for the energy percentage.

That is : In no matter in the mass universe can mass or energy be completely whittled down – id est to = 0%

4-Of the Principle of Conservation of Matter

What has just been asserted in Section 3 of this Chapter confirms the Principle of Conservation of Matter q.v.

5-Of the Principle of Conservation of Energy

What has just been asserted in Section 3 of this Chapter confirms the principle of Conservation of Energy q.v.

Of Global Balance and Contiguous Adjacency

1-What is Global Balance in the Mass Universe

There are the following Five Principles that hold in relation to the structure or existence of anything and how this structure holds namely:

- i-all structures or existences consist of parts and can be sub-divided ever-increasingly; and
- ii-these constituent parts can either repel each other or stay with each other; and
- iii-if the constituent parts repel each other the structure or existence composed or to be composed thereof would fly or break; and
- iv-therefore and accordingly the rate of [increase of] holding of structure or existence will be as directly proportional to the rate of [increase of] the rate at which the constituent parts hold to each other

And vice-versa; and

v-the rate of [increase of] holding of structure or existence will be as directly proportional to the rate of [increase of] Global Balance

And vice-versa

2-What is Global Balance of the Mass Universe

The Global Balance of the mass universe secures that whilst the boundaries of the same [mass universe] extend in ever-increase all that contained within it from the Rim inwards always remains within its boundaries and the motion at the Rim of the mass universe will result in evolution or internal motion of the mass universe rather than motion trying to escape from the boundaries of the mass universe.

In other words Global Balance secures - in as direct proportion - the evolution of the mass universe.

And the evolution of the mass universe confirms and manifests the occurrence : progression of Global Balance.

3-The Consequence of Global Balance in the Mass Universe relative to its Stability; Boundaries (otherwise these would tear apart or not be); and Continuous Extension itself.

Were the mass universe not to have Global Balance it would tear itself in all directions; its boundaries would break down and parts of the mass universe fly off in every direction into mentalist space in turn each part however small being the genesis of a new mass universe.

The stability of our mass universe has therefore its genesis and spinal chord in Global Balance.

And were it not so the mass universe would not be in ever-continuous extension itself : for how could the mass universe extend if its boundaries break down even if in a few points or even in one position only?

Therefore and accordingly Global Balance is the genesis of the ever-continuous extension of the mass universe.

And indeed – and this is very important – and more than this – the Global Balance of the mass universe is confirmation – if any more were needed – of the propensity of the mass universe to extend as per Chapter II of this work.

4-Global Balance as the ‘Pump’ of the Mass Universe

Thus too Global Balance is the Pump of the mass universe for by keeping in its reins the boundaries of the mass universe ensures that the same boundaries in the continuous ever-increasing motion of their expansion move continually more ‘new’ energy being born at the Rim of the ever-expanding mass universe and in turn being ‘pumped’ into the interior of the same [mass universe] in continuous movement from all sides of the Rim of the mass universe – a motion identical with that of a ‘Pump’ – in this case ‘pumping’ energy continually in to the mass universe – and all this with the consequences of an evolution as the end result of all of this.

5-Global Balance is an ideal and a physicalist datum at the same time

That Global Balance is a physicalist datum is manifest from our empirical observation and perception of the supreme reign and sovereignty of Global Balance around us in structures, functions, motions, proportions in phenomena and Principles and so on.

But Global Balance is also idealist because no physicalist ens or existence can be without its being or ‘existing’ in relative permanency (or prolonged permanency-duration) at least.

The definition of structure, proportion, motion and so on is the ideal quaesitum of Global Balance : that is the definition of structure, proportion, motion and so on and the ideal quaesitum of Global Balance are identities, equivalent-identities.

6-What is Contiguous Adjacency in a Mass Universe

Normally Contiguous adjacency brings together a mass with a surrounding energy. That is a mass percentage together with a surrounding energy percentage.

But that is as regards a single reference frame.

Within the context of a mass universe Contiguous adjacency involves one such reference frame (and by ‘such reference frame’ I mean a reference frame as just described in this section consisting of a mass with a surrounding adjacency) together with an immense (and I say ever-increasing) number of reference frames lying all in contiguity to each other from here in this world of ours right up to the Rim of the mass universe.

7-The Principle of Immediate Contiguous Adjacency in the Mass Universe and the Global Balance of that Adjacency

The term ‘immediate Contiguous adjacency’ is a term of physicalist space. An immediate Contiguous adjacency can and will occur in physicalist space.

Strictly speaking all reference frames touching each other in the mass universe extend from the position of the relative reference frame to the Rim of the mass universe. All of them are in Contiguous adjacency. But in *immediate* Contiguous adjacency are those that *touch directly* the boundaries of the relative reference frame. In other words ‘the next door neighbors’.

These 'next door neighbors' must have their mass percentage and energy percentage balanced and positioned internally in a way as not to infringe Global Balance.

But then by the same yardstick and Principle these 'next door neighbors' in turn have their own 'next door neighbors'.

And so on in ever-increase – this a wider meaning of Global Adjacency and from here to the Rim of the mass universe all have to balance against all.

In other words though 'immediate' means 'touching' there is the 'next touching' and so on till the rim of the mass universe.

And this is Global Balance which must be honored both in its 'immediate' contiguity and in its 'extended' contiguity.

Here we are at one with the findings of the quantum physics and of Bell's theorem in connection therewith.

8-What is a Reference Frame in a Physicalist Mass Universe

Reference-frames are not 'written in the sky'. A reference frame is a site containing matter : energy whose parts balance each other in accordance with Global Balance.

Thus a reference frame will move its boundaries if necessary to maintain its global balance provided that this motion of the boundaries of one reference frame does not disturb other reference frames that presumably will also have to shift their boundaries according to the Principle that the reference frames nearest to the boundary-shifting reference frame will have to adjust most; and the more distant reference frames least; all this in as direct proportion.

All and any reference frames each and individually must have an area of mass percentage generally smaller; and an adjacent area of energy percentage generally larger.

The area of mass percentage is generally larger because of this formula :

Area to be occupied = $\frac{1}{2}$ of area of reference frame divided by the (rate of) (Increase of) density of matter : energy in the area

Thus mass being more dense the area of reference frame to be allotted to and occupied by is smaller (than the notional $\frac{1}{2}$ of the reference frame) by the same amount that the energy area is larger (than the notional $\frac{1}{2}$ of the reference frame)

9-What is the Stability of a Reference Frame in a Physicalist Mass Universe

In the physicalist universe a reference frame will maintain stability as can be evidenced from the formula in this very Chapter V Section 8 above.

VI

The Three Principles of the Mass Universe

1-The Principle of Global Balance

The mass universe holds its boundaries because in it there reigns sovereign the Principle of Global Balance.

We must retain the mass universe – as indeed anything else – as divisible in ever-increase into more and more sub-divided parts.

All these parts have the alternative of either holding together or not.

These parts hold because there is Global Balance in the mass universe.

We observe Global Balance in the mass universe empirically too – around us.

Were there not Global Balance matter : energy would be structure-less and not form and constitute objects, entities and so on.

Everything would fly apart including the boundaries of the mass universe – the *Rim* of the mass universe.

Global Balance is the principle where all parts of the mass universe however ever-increasingly sub-divided hold together and stand near to each other in their position notwithstanding changes and motions in them. Such changes and motions must be limited that is such as not to prejudice Global Balance.

This is the Principle of Global Balance q.v.

2-The Principle of Contiguous Adjacent Reference Frames

In the mass universe all matter-energy must exist and be positioned somewhere : and in reference frames.

Indeed we might consider and retain the mass universe as consisting of and being constituted by an ever-increasing number of Contiguous adjacent reference frames.

Each of these reference frames individually keeps within its bounds (and within and subject to its sovereignty) the matter-energy couple consisting of a mass percentage and an energy percentage.

This is the back-bone of all structure and entities in the mass universe living and non-living.

The body-entities in the life-Processes for instance looks like a copy of all this with cells – that is one cell next to and Contiguous to the other- the whole number of cells constituting the relative body-entities.

And so with all structures and matter-energy in the mass universe.

The Principle therefore can be enunciated thus:

In the mass universe reference frame touching reference frame from part to part of the mass universe in Contiguous adjacency keeps individually and within its bounds matter-energy

The balance of matter-energy as in to the individual reference-frame and the balance of matter-energy of all the reference frames in the mass universe touching and Contiguous to each other are identical, equivalent and the same.

Thus an individual reference frame has to balance in it matter-energy as the mass universe as a whole will have to.

3-The Principle of Mass : energy Percentage

I enunciate the Principle of the Mass-Energy Percentage thus :

All matter-energy in the mass universe is and has to be aggregated and structured in a way that it is collected and gathered into individual reference frames

In each of these individual reference frames there must be a couple of mass-energy percentage

And in the totality of reference frames constituting the mass universe there is a mass-energy percentage of the mass universe consisting of the totalities of the respective mass percentages and energy percentages of all and any individual reference frames added all together; and balancing globally as does any single individual reference frame.

4-Of These Three Principles are the 'Lords of the Mass Universe'

These Three Principles are 'the lords of the mass universe' : these Principles are also the Principles that are the common ancestor Principles of the mass universe : the others descend from them. I assert that there is no Principle (descending from these Three Principles) from the Rim of the mass universe inwards that does not trace its lineage *in fine* to one or more of these Three Principles.

5-Of How These Three Principles are the Common Ancestors of all Other Principles

All that subsists from the Rim of the mass universe inwards lies as on a genealogical map : this whether as to mass percentage or as to energy percentage. And on this genealogical map - as after all in and on all other genealogical maps - *in fine* all Principles even if ancestor Principles themselves go up to the 'highest' level on the genealogical map : and this 'highest level' on the genealogical map and the Three Principles are equivalent : identities in terms of the Principle of Equivalent Identity q.v.

(I shall assert that the Assertion : *Dictum that from the Rim of the mass universe inwards all matter:energies, phenomena et al lie as on a genealogical map* is a Principle which I shall term as **The Principle of Genealogical Map** q.v.

VII

Descent of Principles

1-Of How the Principles in the Mass Universe are Organized As in To a Genealogical Tree

In the mass universe all phenomena are 'married' to Principles and vice-versa.

The phenomena and the principles are sides of the same coin.

But they are so married that even chronologically they move together (they have to to be in direct proportion).

Therefore and accordingly phenomena that occurred in pre-geological periods or in the very earliest geological periods will be 'bound to' and 'married' to 'common ancestor principles'.

That is principles that are 'earliest' the same as say with human ancestors and from whom 'descend' in future time other principles.

The mode of procedure is the same as in human genealogical descent – therefore the concept of the genealogical tree with principles on its branches with the common ancestor principles at the top like as to human common ancestor speaks for itself.

2-Of How Principles Descend from One Another As Human Descendants Do

The principles of the mass universe are proportions.

I shall enunciate that

Any proportion is proportional to any other proportion

That is all the principles in the mass universe are proportional to each other.

I shall further enunciate that

Proportions can only beget proportions

Any proportion can only have its genesis in another proportion – saving that this common ancestor proportions³

In the mass universe All that descends from or ascends to another is proportional thereto – nay must be proportional thereto (since that all the mass universe is proportional and completely filled with proportions)

³ That is : the Three Principles of the Mass Universe and their corresponding and relative proportions

Any proportion is and indeed can only be therefore related to any other proportion either by being its offspring or its parent – that is in the direct line; or else in the collateral line. There is no other alternative.

All these principles manifest that proportions are related to each other; that this relation can be either direct or collateral; that all proportions lie as on a genealogical tree; that proportions come from proportions only; and proportions beget proportions only. (Otherwise if any proportion of the mass universe were begotten or else begets something disproportional, then an in as direct proportion the chain of proportions of the whole mass universe would be disrupted).

3-Of How the Common Ancestor Principles are the Three Principles of the Mass Universe

Of all proportions in the mass universe there are three that are not begot of any other proportion : these are the Three Principles of the mass universe.

These Three principles of the mass universe are in themselves and by definition the proportion of the mass universe.

The genesis of this proportions is from proportion (proportion) itself and proportion itself cannot have its genesis save from its own definition

In other words all this occurs accordant to the following:

In the mass universe anything whose genesis is exclusively in its definition cannot have any other genesis save in itself and in its definition

The genesis of the proportions of the Three Principles is in their definition

Therefore⁴ the Three Principles have their genesis exclusively in their definition and cannot have any other genesis save in themselves and in their definition

4-Of How all Principles in the Mass Universe are Linked as in a Chain to each other

As manifested in this Chapter previously⁵ all proportions – and with them and therefore principles – are begot from each other saving for the common ancestor proportions.

Therefore in the mass universe *all principles are begot as from each other saving the common ancestor principles that are begotten only and through their definition*

Therefore all principles in the mass universe are linked to each other as in a chain like as to the human genealogical tree

All principles on this chain are related to each other as in and on the principles lying on the same genealogical tree

5-Of How the Principles of Non-Living Processes are Linked as in a Chain to the Principles of Living Processes

⁴ And as by syllogistic reasoning

⁵ That is in Section 2 of this Chapter

Amongst the Principles that are thus linked to each other as in to the same genealogical tree are principles relative to (we can say regulating) the non-living processes and principles relative to (we can say regulating) the living processes.

All principles in the mass universe from the Rim inwards are related to each other and lie as on the same genealogical tree.

And principles relative to and regulating the non-living processes are from the Rim of the mass universe inwards.

And principles relative to and regulating the living processes are from the Rim of the mass universe inwards.

Therefore and accordingly principles relative to and regulating non-living processes are related to principles relative to and regulating the living processes.

6-Of the consequent relation (ideal and physicalist) of Non-Living Processes and Living Processes

The relation between the principles of non-living processes and the principles of living processes having been manifested⁶ sequitur that

In the mass universe the non-living processes and living processes are related.

And these processes are related in as equal and similar manner to the relation of their respective principles *since that in the mass universe process is a phenomenon⁷ and as such related to principle as above-mentioned.*

7-Of How the Non-Living Processes and Principles come First Chronologically

In the mass universe all principles that are begotten from other (parent or ancestor) principles have *more than* the 'begetting' parent or ancestor principle.

I shall term these Principles 'more than Principles'.

Now 'more than Principles' are by definition begotten later than their parents or ancestors – that is they come chronologically after their parents or ancestors.

Now when we compare⁸ principle with principle we see that the living process principles are all *more than Principles* when compared to the principles relative to the non-living processes.

Therefore accordingly and as by syllogistic reasoning the principles relative to the living processes are begotten later than the principles relative to the non-living processes.

8-Of How the Living Processes and Principles come Next Chronologically

What and all has been asserted in the immediately preceding Section⁹ manifest how the living processes and principles come after the non-living processes (in chronological order).

⁶ In the previous Section that is in Section 5 of this Chapter (Chapter VII)

⁷ This is established by empirical observation and by definition of terms (process; phenomenon) as well

⁸ Through sheer and mere empirical observation and experiment

⁹ That is Section 7 of Chapter VII

VIII

Common Ancestors Basicity and Arcanness

1-What is Arcanness

In the evolution of the mass universe – especially as regards – the life-Processes there were bodies forms and modes that were the first (or among the very first) to arise in the evolutionary time-table.

These bodies forms and modes are in part reproduced to date in the present day bodies forms and modes of 'higher' 'more evolved' enta.

But a percentage of the 'old' bodies forms and modes remains.

This is like to the requisite of a minimum percentage of transformed substance in the original transforming substance as in Chapter III.

Reference frames in the mass universe are stable by their conservation prowess : indeed an = 0% conservation propensity would mean the violent and sudden transformation of the reference frame.

This conservation propensity of reference frames is in turn derive from the over-riding Principle of Global Balance q.v. infra in the economy of the mass universe.

That is : Global Balance dictates change in a conservation mode only and in no other mode; that is in change the 'essentials' of the previous are retained and their trimmings changed; the reference frame is the home of this 'conservative propensity'. Otherwise the reference frame would be the home of instability and infringement of Global Balance q.v. And as we shall see the infringement of Global Balance in the mass universe is impossible : otherwise than a state of Global Balance the universe would 'blow up'.

2-What is Basicity

Arcanness is directly proportional to Basicity q.v.

Basicity q.v. is the part of bodies forms and modes that remains from the first chronological times of evolution.

Thus we say the hands, the legs, and the trunk in our human body but which have remained in our body-plan over millions of years of evolution because they were basic and because the principles of propensity to Conservation manifested just above in Section 1 of this chapter were at work.

In other words too the basic traits objects or existences are in general common to the greatest possible number of specimens irrespective of species, kinds and evolution (degree of evolution).

The basic is the most common or *widespread* whilst the less basic is *more specific more particular less widespread and more of the relative specific species, kind and evolution.*

3-Of the Principle that Arcanness is Proportional (directly proportional) to Basicity

In the mass universe all that is arcane that is generally the first in chronological succession of development or evolution is also that which is the most basic.

This is a direct proportion thus it is also a Principle

The more arcane, the more basic and vice-versa – in a few words we see at work in this Principle the propensity to conservation mentioned in Section 1 of this Chapter.

4-Of the Proportionality of Arcanness to Common Ancestors

The arcane therefore is right at the beginning. And that is where the common ancestors were.

Arcanness is the typology and description given to the relative body-plan and body-traits and other existences; Arcanness relates to the body; the common ancestor is that body itself in which Arcanness is manifested.

5-Of the Proportionality of Basicity to Common Ancestors

And just as common ancestors are the other side of the coin to Arcanness so also they are the other side of the coin to basicity.

As manifested above in Section 2 of this Chapter Arcanness and basicity are proportional.

Therefore sequitur as by syllogistic reasoning that since that Arcanness is directly proportional to common ancestors so – and in as directly proportional manner and extent – the basicity of existences (especially in the life processes but not exclusive to them) is proportional (direct proportion) to common ancestors.

6-Of the Syllogistic Proportionality of Basicity to Arcanness

This syllogistic proportionality has already been treated above.

7-Examples of Arcanness and Basicity in the Evolution of the Body Plan of Living Enta

The legs the hands the trunk are examples of Arcanness and basicity in the evolution of the body plan of living enta.

The Amoeba had primitive legs and hands which it still manifests to these days over millions of years.

The rate of *primitiveness* of these traits bodies forms and modes even if very high does not detract or diminish in any way from the Arcanness and basicity thereof -indeed the rate of primitiveness is rather irrelevant to this scope.

IX

Living Enta; Protoplasms of Ens;

1-What is Ens

In the mass universe the energy-matter is born at the Rim of the mass universe.

This matter-energy has a large percentage of energy (energy percentage).

But as one goes further and further in from the Rim of the mass universe inwards this matter-energy increases its mass percentage (with fluctuations of diminishing mass percentages – according to the relative (bio)chemical combination(s)).

Ens is matter-energy.

Matter-energy can be non-living or living.

Non-living matter-energy always evolves and has its genesis first; then this non-living matter-energy under the appropriate conditions and environment will transform to living matter-energy.

2-What is Living Ens

When non-living matter-energy is transformed to living matter-energy that matter-energy is called *living ens*.

As manifested previously in this work the principles that are relative to non-living ens are related to the principles that are relative to living ens.

And that is why under the appropriate conditions and environments non-living matter-energy turns to living matter-energy.

This living ens once on foot reproduces itself as well as evolves slowly but surely in its surrounding environment and times.

3-What is Protoplasms of Ens

Protoplasms of ens is the term we use in our works for 'living things'.

This term is used in my work irrespective of species and irrespective of the evolutionary level and other characteristics of the same.

X

The Overthrow of Isaac Newton

1-Of How Newton put Gravity to Link the Rotation of Celestial Bodies Like of our Planet round the Sun

Isaac Newton attempted to explain the rotations and motions of planets and other celestial bodies by putting forth *gravity or gravitation* as the root and origin of their behavior.

In this task Newton had to find the very roots, the lowest roots whence such motions could be explained accounted for and had their genesis.

In other words Newton had to descend to the root of the genesis of motion in the mass universe.

Whilst the empirical aspect is admirable however Newton did not succeed in descending to the root as he tried to do and unsuccessfully.

For *deeper, deeper down* than gravity there is some other stuff that is the genesis of all, not gravity.

Newton himself felt this and expressed his doubts in a very sincere way.

For deeper than gravity the rotations motions et al of heavenly bodies et is under the sovereign rule of the Three Principles we met already in this work : namely Global Balance, Adjacent Contiguous Reference Frames and the Mass-Energy Percentage.

These Three Principles are the root and origin of the motion of the mass universe more than the Three Graces are the sovereigns of aesthetics.

2-Of How Newton himself admitted that he did not know how to define Gravity

As manifested just above in the First Section of this Chapter Newton himself did not know how to define Gravity.

3-Of How the Link between our Planet and the Sun is not 'Gravity' but the Operation of the Three Principles of the Mass Universe Together namely : Global Balance : Contiguous Adjacent Reference Frames and Mass : energy Percentage

The 'link' between heavenly body and another in their respective motions and rotations et al is not gravity but goes more deep than that.

The 'link' is the Three Principles of the mass universe already referred to supra.

4-Of How Therefore the Three Principles of the Mass Universe Replace Gravity

The Three Principles of the mass universe therefore replace gravity not because gravity is 'wrong' (to use the terminology of the Old Science which we shall amend as shall be manifested further on in this work) but because 'gravity' does not go to the bottom to the genesis as the Three Principles do.

In other words the Three Principles of the Mass Universe are 'better' than gravity because they go 'deeper'.

With gravity we still continue to ask : Why this gravity? Wherefrom this gravity? How this gravity?

But it is not the same with the Three Principles of the Mass Universe.

These go 'to the root' and therefore replace gravity not because we make them or because we wish them to be so but because they go deeper as is indeed necessary and vital to do to get the explanation of the genesis of the motion and rotation of heavenly bodies in to the mass universe et

5-Of How this Replacement as in 4 overthrows Newton's Laws

Now Newton's Laws of Motion are built on gravity and the replacement of gravity as above-mentioned overthrows Newton's Laws of Motion.

I must say that the 'overthrow' of Newton's Laws is mitigated and qualified as I shall presently manifest.

For the empirical content of the Second Law and the Third Law are 'correct' although 'not the explanation'.

The different proportions mentioned in the Second Law and in the Third Law are still wonderful tribute to Newton and to his genius.

6-Of How Newton's Law of Inertia assumes a Static Universe – this is contrary to our ever-expanding ever-moving Mass Universe

But Newton's First Law of Motion is 'flawed' (in terms of the old Science terminology).

For Newton is here following the assumption – very well rooted in his days – of a static universe that in fine and in the end will require a God-hand to move it and guide it on.

Accordingly to him the universe by itself does not move; cannot move.

This is inertia – the fruit of the assumption of the static universe.

Newton repairs this 'inertia' to some extent by the 'gravity' that 'accounts for' motion that otherwise would not be.

But this is adding insult to injury.

For where does this gravity of objects come? From their massness.

And whence does the masses come? This and further queries going further and further down to the root will not be replied by Newton (unless in fine one comes to the God-hand that moves this lazy static universe that will not move and cannot move by self-help).

Therefore Newton's cosmology is 'flawed' and this 'flaw' may have contributed to his enunciating his Three Laws of Motion as in fact he did.

7-Of How Newton's Static Mass Universe is Replaced by our Dynamic Mass Universe

The cosmology of the static universe is not 'a thing of the past'.

In a different mode from Newton, Einstein held in it (though in later life on realizing Hubble's discoveries he must have thought differently).

Our cosmology confirms Hubble and the 'dynamic' universe, a dynamic universe that moves on with 'self-help' not needing the help of the God-hand.

And that is a reason too why we started in our work with the cosmology, the foundations of the building.

Newton's building is flawed, defective in its very foundations, from its very foundations.

The upper floors (that is Newton's Laws of Motion) are built on these foundations and the result is what we have seen.

The sincere Newton however seems to have sensed the febleness of his building (including the foundations) and was sincere to reveal to us what his heart told him and what his mind did not ferret out much he wished to do (so).

8-Of How Newton's Inertia is therefore replaced by Our Continuous Flowing Energy : Motion

Inertia therefore is out of tack in a cosmology of the mass universe.

Instead as we have seen in the previous Chapters of this work – especially the early ones – there is a continuous flow of energy from the Rim of the mass universe to replace inertia and with it Newton's Laws.

Instead there is a continuous flow of energy motion from the Rim of the mass universe and 'reaching out' to all parts and kens of the mass universe (including our planetary system).

And there planets and the sun will lie in a 'container' that is not 'static' but is brimming with energy coming from the rim of the mass universe.

This energy is the background for the formation of reference frames between the massy heavenly body and the energy : that is the heavenly body together with the adjacent and surrounding energy together constitute and make up a reference frame which keeps them in their position and motion relative to each other.

They remain so and move so because the Principle of the Mass-Energy Percentage as well as the Principle of Global Balance and the Principle of Contiguous Adjacent Reference Frames are keeping them so.

Indeed after Newton's time there was a 'vortex theory' for the rotation of planets round the Sun in our planetary system.

This 'vortex system' started with Descartes and continued years after Newton's death.

This 'system' does not explain why this 'vortex' and therefore does not go down to the necessary depths as we do.

But it goes 'deeper' than Newton's Laws of Motion and no wonder that it took so much time to replace.

9-Of How Newton's Static Universe with its Law of Inertia would require an 'Overhanging God Hand' to Move It; in our Case No Such Hand is Required.

As asserted previously Newton's static universe – supporting the Law of Inertia - in the end finishes at needing support like a top that needs somebody to turn it on.

Our cosmology is that of a self-supporting self-helping self-implementing universe.

With Newton where could evolution go? How long could it go?

And here Newton becomes the enemy of Darwin too.

For our cosmology and the Three Principles of the Mass Universe that are replacing Newton's Laws of Motion are the foundations of a self-supporting self-helping self-implementing evolution.

XI

Principles and Phenomena

1-Of How in the Mass Universe every Phenomenon moves accordant to One or More Principles

In the mass universe proportion is the guiding word and rules both phenomena and Principles.

In phenomena proportion is as of space for phenomena occur : progress in physicalist space in the mass universe; in principle (s) proportion is as of time.

But space-time (phenomenon-Principle) are dimensions of the same ens of proportion.

In the mass universe phenomena are proportional; principles are proportional; therefore and by syllogistic reasoning phenomena are (equalize) principles and principles are (equalize) phenomena.

The proportionality of both phenomena and principles is observable and confirmable empirically and by observation : the method of former Science.

This method is still well; and must be left touched and unprejudiced; but we must add to it the equally legitimate alternative of *To assert phenomena is equally well*

2-Of How therefore Principles Govern Phenomena; Phenomena Constitute Evolution and the Mass : universe; therefore and accordingly (as by syllogistic reasoning) Principles Govern Evolution and the Mass Universe

Just as matter-energy to balance (in Global Balance) requires a 'container' that is the individual reference frame so phenomena require a 'container' namely the principle.

And just as the 'container' or reference frames regulates the way in which matter-energy is held therein so and equally principles 'hold' the way in which phenomena express and must express themselves empirically in the mass universe.

Principles therefore 'govern' phenomena.

In turn phenomena constitute evolution and the mass universe : this is empirically observable.

Therefore accordingly and as by syllogistic reasoning Principles govern evolution and the mass universe.

3-Of How Principles once Known can be Controlled or Manipulated by Us Humans

The Principles that occur : progress in the mass universe and that contain in them the phenomena of the same (mass universe) are knowable by us humans.

Indeed we have discovered quite a number; in my works some thousands of such principles are discovered; more remain to be discovered by work dedication and sacrifice.

In my works I have set forth a task : once that we know these principles let us utilize them in a way to engineer matter-energy as we want – especially – and without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing – in the areas of disease, ageing and Death and so on.

Our aim is thus Immortality of Ens – this is our target; and the utility and scope of discovering Principles.

4-Of How if we Humans Know All principles we can control and manipulate all Principles

Our knowledge of the principles of the mass universe gives us control over the same.

The knowledge of a proportion and of the phenomena at the two sides of the proportion gives the direct control over the relative phenomenon.

The proportion manifests the conditions under which the phenomenon occurs : progresses as well as the variations thereof – which conditions can be so engineered by us as to ensure for instance in the case of protoplasms of ens to Immortality of Ens.

5-Of How the Human Control and Manipulation of Principles is the Equivalent of Control of the Mass Universe in the Non-Living Processes and Immortality of Ens in the Living Processes

In our works the ‘ultimate’ scope and aim of the human control and manipulation of principles takes two main roads according to whether in the area of non-living ens or in the area of living ens.

In the area of non-living ens in the Ideal State control should be over the phenomena of the mass universe. But the distances of the mass universe from us are so immense – together with other things – ensure that our control of the mass universe in practice (Practical State) cannot be but puny and in any case limited to the world and its immediate environs.

In the area of the living ens in the Ideal State the scope is to arrive at a state where age, illness and Death are forestalled or else whittled down to a minimum with the ushering in of Immortality of Ens replacing the old regime’ and at the same time because a replacement of the old regime’ once removed through human engineering cannot but be the Immortality of Ens.

In the area of living ens the Immortality of Ens will come nearer and nearer through hard work, more discoveries and so on. But here the Practical State is not that distant from the Ideal State as in the case of non-living ens.

6-Of Our Control of the Mass Universe through our knowledge of Principles

In the our task of controlling the mass universe we cannot hope for any great impact as has been manifested in the immediately preceding Section¹⁰

7-Of Our Control of Immortality of Ens through our knowledge of Principles

But in our task of moving to an Immortality of Ens the position is and indeed should be (after all this is the supreme human interest) different.

And this because:

a-in the case of Immortality of Ens our degree of control by engineering is immensely more near more direct more ‘effective’ than in the case of the immense mass universe;and

¹⁰ That is Section 5 of Chapter XI

b-in the case of Immortality of Ens the practical benefit to the human race is much more desirable and

c-in the case of Immortality of Engineering control as we know it (in our works) has tools adequate and far reaching to the desired scope much more than in the case of an engineering of the mass universe.

This notwithstanding and notwithstanding these considerations *a future increased engineering of the mass universe should not be eliminated from our scientific agendas.*

XII

Proportionality as the Genesis of All Principles in the Mass Universe

1-Of the Principle that in Global Balance what occurs in any one reference frame in the mass universe must occur in the next and so on such that the same events occur in the adjacent reference frames – Principle of Sameness

In all reference frames in the mass universe everything that occurs has to and will occur according to the Principle of the Mass : energy Percentage.

Therefore and accordingly all that occurs and has to occur within each individual reference frame is circumscribed by the same parameters.

These parameters ensure that every reference frame individually maintains Global Balance; and since that all reference frames maintain Global Balance individually and adjacent one to the other then globally they maintain Global Balance – the same Global Balance in each and every individual reference frame and in their global totality.

This I term as *the Principle of Sameness* q.v.

2-Of the Principle that Global Balance requires the Principle of Sameness to occur all over the extent of the mass universe (expanding mass universe) – Principle of the Occurrence of the Principle of Sameness All Over the Mass Universe

The Principle of Global Balance requires the Principle of Sameness to occur all over the extent of the expanding mass universe. As manifested in the previous Section the reference frames – all the reference frames in the mass universe observe global balance both individually and globally.

3-Of the Principle that the Occurrence of the Principle of Sameness All Over the Mass Universe and the Occurrence of Proportion in to the same (mass universe) are Identities

The Occurrence of the Principle of Sameness in the mass universe ensures that phenomena occur according to proportion.

For the principle of Sameness is the equivalent of Global Balance in the mass universe and in Global Balance phenomena occur in proportion.

Therefore by syllogistic reasoning the occurrence of the principle of sameness is the identity of occurrence of proportion in the mass universe.

4-Of How therefore and accordingly Proportion has its genesis in Global Balance

Were one to consider a (hypothetical) state of global imbalance there will occur : progress an increasing propensity for enta to have 'abnormal' size shapes functions and so on.

This propensity would in itself have the propensity to be proportional – in other words – the rate of [increase of] global imbalance would be as directly proportional to the rate of [increase of] propensity to a-proportionality of phenomena and enta

And vice-versa

In other words the global situation would be one which we would identify with and term as *chaos*

Linearity of motion – a basic of the mass universe right from the rim of the mass universe inwards would also not occur : progress. Much less less basic more 'evolutive' enta would occur : progress.

5-Of the Principle that in to the mass universe Proportion is directly proportional to Global Balance (and Contiguous Adjacent Reference Frames) and vice-versa

As manifested in the immediately preceding section (section 5 Chapter XII) global *imbalance* is proportionate (directly proportional) to *disproportionality* of phenomena and enta themselves.

The inverse holds in the same proportion: that is the global balance is proportionate to proportionality (occurrence : progression of proportionality of enta and phenomena from the Rim of the mass universe inwards.

Indeed I assert that given that the mass universe is a universe of Global Balance (and of Contiguous Adjacent Reference Frames) the proportionality of enta and phenomena in simply inescapable. It is as if from the Rim of the mass universe inwards all enta and phenomena are 'condemned' (in the Sartrean sense) to proportion.

Proportion therefore accordingly and in as direct proportion is no 'miracle' or 'random' or 'freak' but the *necessary* (borrowing from the Schoolmen terminology) 'channel' or 'Form' (borrowing from Baconian terminology) in which all enta and phenomena are 'condemned' (following Sartre) to occur : progress.

6-Of how therefore Proportion like to Global Balance holds together the Structure of the Mass Universe

As manifested in Section 4 of Chapter XII the non-occurrence : progression of chaos in the mass universe is proportional to and indeed the equivalent : identity (in terms of the Principle of Equivalent : identity q.v.) of the occurrence : progression of proportion in enta and phenomena from the Rim of the mass universe inwards.

As by definition-assertion : The occurrence : progression of *chaos* is the antithesis of *structure*

Indeed I enunciate that :

As in to the mass universe the rate of [increase of] occurrence : progression of chaos will be inversely proportional to the rate of [increase of] occurrence : progression of structure

And vice-versa

I enunciate further that :

As in to the mass universe there must occur : progress in all enta and phenomena a percentage of chaos however minimal

And further:

As in to the mass universe there must occur : progress in all enta and phenomena a percentage of structure however minimal.

But the rates of global balance and proportion in the mass universe from the Rim inwards ensures that the 'chaos percentage' will be → 0% (tnri) and the 'structure percentage' will be → 100% (tnri).

7-Of How All Motion in the Mass Universe Occurs and Must Occur Within the Structure or Form resulting from Proportion and Global Balance

In the mass universe the occurrence : progression of motion is confined strictly completely and absolutely as within the Rim of the mass universe, from the Rim inwards.

Motion cannot escape from the confining and 'absolute' imprisonment of the Rim of the mass universe which confinement brings with it the occurrence : progression of the 'regime' ' of the Principles of Proportion enunciated years ago in our works (on Saint George's Feast Day of 1993).

And and as manifested in our works too Proportion goes hand in hand with Global Balance q.v. – and vice-versa.

8-Of How All Motion in the Mass Universe is the genesis of All (Bio)chemical Combination in the same (mass universe)

I shall at this juncture assert the following Dicta regarding the consequences : resultants of motion as in to the mass universe:

i-In the mass universe motion will have the propensity for matter : energy to 'hit' other matter : energy

ii-The more 'evolved' that matter : energy is the more its propensity to occur : progress as in to smaller and smaller 'chunks'

iii-The more that 'hitting' as per i- occurs : progresses as between smaller and smaller chunks will be as directly proportional to increase of propensity to (bio)chemical combination.

This last Dictum indicates that (bio)chemical combination will occur : progress the smaller the chunks of matter : energy that hit and meet.

But in the mass universe everything is relative – as per our previous works.

Indeed (bio)chemical combination will (in the Ideal State) occur : progress at any level of hitting : meeting of matter : energy*

*even at the s/c celestial level : say gas cloud with another gas cloud; planet with planet; celestial matter with other celestial matter.

But this propensity will indeed be *accentuated* when matter:energies collide and hit and meet with each other as into smaller and smaller 'chunks'.

So that rather we must link up the collision and meeting of smaller and smaller 'chunks' rather with the *accentuation* of the occurrence : progression of the propensity to [bio]chemical combination rather than with the actual occurrence : progression of [bio]chemical combination itself.

9-Of How All (Bio)chemical Combination in the mass universe is directly proportional to the Progression of Evolution in the same (mass universe)

I assert that the accentuation of [bio]chemical combination is the spinal chord of all and any evolution.

Indeed I shall enunciate as a Principle that ;

As in to the mass universe from the Rim inwards the rate of [increase of] accentuation of (bio)chemical combination at any specific time : space site will be as directly proportional to the rate of [increase of] occurrence : progression of evolution

And vice-versa

[Bio]chemical combination further has as its sub-stratum *motion of matter : energy in the mass universe*

In the mass universe therefore all (bio)chemical combination is motion of matter : energy and indeed I will enunciate the Principle

That:

As in to the mass universe from the Rim inwards the rate of [increase of] [bio]chemical combination at any specific particular time : space site will be as directly proportional to the rate of [increase of] motion of the relative 'hitting' matter:energies at the relative particular time : space site

And vice-versa

10-Of How therefore as by syllogistic reasoning from 6,7,8 and 9 Proportion and Global Balance hold together and are the Genesis of the Progression of Evolution in the mass universe

Syllogistic reasoning was and still is a mode of *drawing forth* Principles from other Principles : *provided that the Principles from which other Principles are drawn forth are enunciated a) in line with empirically occurring : progressing phenomena relative thereto and b) are proportionate to the ancestor Principles thereof; as well as to other that is 'cousin principles' (cf. the Principle of Genealogical Map q.v.) and c) trace their lineage in fine to the Three Principles q.v.*

11-Of How therefore all Principles enunciated in regarding to Phenomena in the Mass Universe must all be Proportional : that is directly proportional or inversely proportional.

All principles enunciated in regard to phenomena in the mass universe are proportional.

This we can see for our selves quite empirically by sheer observation.

But we perceive more. We see that these principles are all; related to each other; all are on the same family tree, on the same genealogical tree; and one will and must be 'related' to the rest.

In other words : *Assert proportion(s) and assert well.*

This is the 'criterion' of 'false-true' – indeed it replaces our false-true criterion exclusively dependent on empirical observation.

Not that empirical observation is unimportant or that its sovereign majesty should be prejudiced.

But when we assert proportions even though we have not seen these proportions through our senses and empirical perception these proportions will be well *just as if* perceived and confirmed by empirical perception.

We *are not* eliminating empirical perception or its value; but *in addition to it* assertion of proportion *does equally and without any need for the empirical perception of that proportion(s) asserted.*

In other words : a proportion is well and can be well

Either because we observe it empirically and confirm it empirically *Or* because though not observed and confirmed empirically it is proportional : its proportionality, sheer and mere proportionality is enough to 'qualify' it just the same as if we observed and confirmed empirically.

And this I think *is a small revolution* in our science and philosophy – especially as regards the criteria for 'proof' verification and acceptance of knowledge and discoveries - which revolution might have effects and consequences not so small at all in future civilization.

XIII

Proportionality in Non-Living Processes

1-Of How Phenomena in the Mass Universe can therefore express themselves in Proportion and in no other Way

In the mass universe everything that occurs has occurred or will occur must occur proportionally.

Centuries ago, long ago the Greeks had pointed out at it, and the Romans called it *proportio* in the same spirit as the Greeks.

There is no other way. Everything that occurs within the mass universe is 'condemned' to occur in this way : and there is no way of escape from this 'imprisonment'.

However autonomous the relative matter-energy be (and so far as we know we humans are the most autonomous) still we are not exempt from this Golden Rule that like a benign sovereign holds all in subjection.

I shall say why I said 'benign sovereign'.

For proportion itself is the other coin of that Global Balance that holds the universe within its gentle reins and without of which the universe will fly away and break its boundaries.

This then is the protection and guidance of such a benign sovereign to which we are bound and cannot free ourselves from.

For suppose that we humans managed to do away with proportion first in ourselves, in our bodies.

The result would be the sudden destruction of all of us.

Indeed the workings of proportion as at present has not yet saved us from ill, disease, ageing and death.

How much more destruction then would come our way without the benign guidance and sovereignty of proportion.

Indeed in our works knowing that by itself proportion has so far not secured us against ill, death ageing and the rest we have allied ourselves *with it* so that intensifying it we are more and more in the position of defeating ill, death ageing and the rest.

The noblest of tasks which we plan to carry out and execute in our works will only be furthered by our knowing more of these proportions that the life processes hides – we hope temporarily – from our eyes and discovering the more and more and more of which – we by dexterous engineering means allied with proportion itself will dethrone at last ill, disease, ageing, death and the rest.

For the life process is the shrine where I opine that the greatest number of proportions are temporarily (I hope not permanently) hid from our eyes and knowledge and the discovering of which combined with our human skill and acumen will so accelerate the beneficial effects of these hidden treasures that Immortality of Ens and freedom from ill and disease (or at least their prompt remedy) is not very far off.

For the proportions that are at present hid in the life processes are the key to freedom from ill, disease death and the rest. Only that we must labor with sacrifice to unveil these proportions that

the life process unfortunately hides from us till we by dint of hard labor or acumen or both succeed in extracting from her, her hidden treasures.

And these then are the treasures which I have set my task to unearth from the life processes. Full knowing that by the discovery of some and the addition of more patience and sacrifice we will always be better placed to extract more and more from the hidden treasures all to our favour.

This then too must be the noble task of every one of us who will join in this sacred search for proportions that are bound to lead to the way where we will be freed from ill, ageing and death.

For who will know that there is a gold mine next to his house and permitted by the laws to dig for gold at his cost and sacrifice will not toil night and day to extract from earth its long hidden treasures?

Much so, much more so then should we work and labor in extracting from the life processes that which is the key to our salvation from ill, ageing and death.

This is the task that in my work I have been carrying these years and will carry till strength remains.

For the wealth that is unearthed in and by the discovery of proportions – and these are Principles for each proportion is and I have enunciated as a separate independent Principle – discovers more to our knowledge of how much more there is to unearth.

It is so to say like a spring that up till now the more we draw waters from it to slake our thirst the more and fresher the water will come.

This then is the wealth of principles that are discoverable and have been discovered by me in the examination of the life processes.

For the life processes contain within their hidden folds much more Principles than would account for the motions and all of the non-living processes : the density, or rather densification of Principles that throng the rich forests of life and of the life processes being so varied so numerous (and yet all related on the same genealogical tree) that it is obvious that here, in this part of the field of discovery and learning we must at present direct the more and more fervently our tasks, aims and labours.

2-Of How therefore by Knowing Proportion of any Phenomenon in the Mass Universe we will know how it will and indeed – must – express itself

For in knowing the proportions of the mass universe we hear so to speak the mass universe speaking to us in all its grandeur.

In knowing the principles then our way to know the phenomenon will be easy, nay must follow ‘as the night follows the day’.

For every phenomenon is linked to Principle and once that we know and have discovered the Principle then we know also the phenomenon.

This mode of discovery of knowledge is putting upside-down our previous method of extracting knowledge from the universe.

For by and large the former way in past centuries was that of paying attention through empirical observation and experiment to the phenomenon rather than the principle and the field where principles lay hidden and undiscovered was abandoned.

I have reversed this trend – without in any way condemning, detracting or lessening from the beauty of the path formerly trod by our august intellectual ancestors and scientists - And as I say I have reversed this trend not in any way to diminish the glory and efficiency with which Experiment and Observation be blessed but more so that that this part of the field of discovery which lay unfallowed and unworked for so many centuries and for so long time would be put to good and noble use.

A use which my discoveries of principles in this formerly abandoned part of the field has yielded me rich dividends and more than this the promise grows constantly and continually of more and more rich dividends to come.

I was heartened in my enterprise when I saw the utility and power that the discovery of principles gave me on my discovering them and above all because by discovering the relationship of each to each other and the rest on the same genealogical tree I knew that I could discover more and more from this gold-mine with greater and greater facility.

But more than this what gave most impetus and courage was the fact that I realized that working through this field *I would arrive at the same results as if I had worked directly through experiment and observation. In other words experiment and observation and discovery of principles uncover the same phenomena and knowledge to us. It is like a long ever-increasing road having two ends or ways of entry and by walking steadfastly through either entry arriving at the same results and fruits as in the other.*

3-Of How the Physicalist-Empirical Expression of any Phenomenon in the Mass Universe and the Proportion or Proportions relative to the same are ‘faces of the Same Coin’ and identical.

As just said in the end of the previous Section the Physicalist-Empirical Expression of any Phenomenon and the Proportion or Proportions relative to the same are faces of the same coin and identical.

I shall not repeat the benefits of working in the field of discovery through the discovery of principle as I have manifested just previously.

I shall only re-assert that on a balance of comparisons it is better to tread the way wherein proportions are discovered this being much easier to tread and where fruits for labours expended can be got more numerous relative to the labor expended and with more striking result.

So far for my choice in treading the Road of Discovery through the other way which before me lay abandoned and in neglect for centuries in preference to its sister entrance which was and is still (and duly) full of pilgrims in the service of Science Knowledge and Discovery.

4-Of How therefore the Empirical Expression and Description of any Phenomenon in the Mass Universe and its relative Proportion(s) are Identities

In present science it is a sacred cow that what is considerable as ‘beleivable’ ‘proved’ or ‘verified’ is that which is verified empirically and discovered as by observation and experiment.

The enunciation of Principles is despised and considered as of little worth and as smacking of the tomes of the ‘Medieval Schoolmen’.

But there a difference a very important difference. In the case of the Medieval Schoolmen the assertion, Principles and Dicta that were made were made totally non-linked to empirical descriptions made through observation and experiment. The building of the Schoolmen was therefore built not on the foundations of empirical description and observation and experiment

but on surmise and assumption. Therefore and accordingly the logical : ideal conclusions of the Schoolmen had to inevitably reflect and carry forward the surmises and assumptions on which they were built notwithstanding the brilliance and ingenuity of the upper floors of the building-edifice, of their 'rational reasoning'. The flaw was in the foundations not in the constructions of the upper floors or rather the improvements that were built on this foundation.

In that respect and only in that respect the reasonings and conclusions of the Schoolmen are 'criticable' and 'fall'. But that 'flaw' is not in our reasonings – when we enunciate Principles – for our foundations instead of being built on surmises and assumptions are built on the solid rock foundations of empirical description and observation and experiment.

I assert that while it is not licit to build reasonings (however brilliant in themselves) on assumptions and surmises as was done in the case of the Schoolmen; yet it is not only licit but desirable to build reasonings on the foundations of observation and experiment as indeed we do.

And our upper floors, our reasonings, our conclusions should be respected accordingly and as in equal and direct proportion.

5-Of How therefore the Act of Describing the Empirical Expression of any Phenomenon and the Act of Enunciating of any Principle(s) relative to the same Phenomenon are Identities.

Sequitur from the contents of the above Section 5 (of this same Chapter) that there is an equivalence : identity in terms of the Principle of Equivalent : identity q.v. as between the act of describing the empirical expression of any phenomenon and the act of enunciating of any Principle(s) relative to the same phenomenon.

When one looks in to the mirror it sees the other and vice-versa. One is a mirror image of the other. And both can fall in love together as did Narcissus with his own beautiful image.

6-Of How therefore any Phenomenon in the Mass Universe can be 'tackled' Either by Describing it empirically Or By Expressing – Enunciating its Relative Proportion(s) – as Principles

In the mass universe therefore any eventa and/or enta and/or phenomena can be described either empirically through observation experiment and empirical description or through the enunciation of Principles *linked completely and built completely upon the foundations of empirical observation experiment and description* or both.

7-Of How One Expresses Proportion(s) in Principles; and that is What We Do and Will Do in Our Works.

The mass universe has no tongue as we have and therefore we do not hear it 'speak' as we humans hear each other 'speak'.

But the mass universe speaks too – and very loquaciously too - in its presentation : manifestation of the eventa enta and/or phenomena that it contains before us and to us.

I assert that the 'main' 'chief' way in which the mass universe speaks to us is when it manifests to us its ----- proportions.

There is nothing which is more obvious, more clear, more solemn.

It was this proportion that was first observed and quasi-deified in Greek civilization and that was afterwards consecrated as 'proportio' in Roman civilization too.

And this proportion is also the corner-stone of our works as it is the corner-stone of the mass universe and its workings : occurrences.

And in our works this proportion is the *–logical : ideal description* of that *empirical description* of enta and/or eventa and/or phenomena in the mass universe which is so dear to positivists and empiricists.

That is the enunciation of proportion in our works as through the enunciation of Principles is the *statement as in logical : ideal description* of the empirical description of eventa and/or enta and/or phenomena as through observation : experiment.

Our enunciation of proportion through Principles is so to say the other side of the coin of the empirical description of the mass universe obtained through observation and experiment.

8-Of How therefore by Expressing Proportion(s) in Principles relative to Non-Living Processes We Describe Those Processes

As just manifested in the previous Section (Section 8 of the present Chapter) when we enunciate proportion in Principle(s) we describe in ideal : logical description the empirical facta and description to which the principles and proportions refer and are relative to.

Consequently by expressing proportion(s) in Principles relative to non-living processes we describe those processes.

9-Of How the Expression of Principles as per 8 is the Writing Of the Mechanics, Dynamics and Other Science of Non-Living Processes in the Mass Universe.

The expression of these Principles is the writing out of the mechanics, dynamics and other science of non-living processes in to the mass universe.

XIV

Proportionality in Living Processes

1-Of How Within All Parts of the Mass Universe all Principles are related and on the Same Genealogical Tree

In the mass universe all phenomena move and occur as according to Principles.

These Principles are related to each other : and there cannot be a Principle that is not related to the rest on the 'genealogical tree'.

The position is like the human genealogical tree with the common ancestors and then the 'children' the 'cousins' (collateral lines) and so on. (There is no sexual reproduction).

And since that all Principles are on the same genealogical tree each one of the Principles is related to the rest.

And in proportion – and since that every Principle in the mass universe is specifically linked to a phenomenon – all phenomena that occur : progress in the mass universe are 'linked'.

This explains that change in one reference frame in the mass universe might indeed set up a 'domino effect' affecting all the rest.

And this too links with the findings (at first considered 'queer' and 'weird' and so on – but in the light of the present not so) of quantum mechanics where 'action at a distance' and such like concepts were discovered.

This is in line with Bell's Theorem as well.

A contrario sensu these quantum physics facta confirm the Principles regarding reference frames and so on in our work.

2-Of How the Principles Operating Occurring in Non-Living Processes are the Relatives of the Principles Operating in Living Processes

The relation between any Principle on the 'genealogical tree' and the rest of the Principles thereon also manifests that the hitherto 'unbridgeable' gap between the non-living processes and the living processes was removed.

This 'induced abyss' between them quite reasonably resulted in the perception that the life processes are a 'mystery' that could ill be understood. That is till the advances of present-day science and the contents of this work.

These processes are linked and the principles of the life processes evolved and are derived from the earlier principles of the non-living.

3-Of How in the Mass Universe all Phenomena Whatever must Occur According to Principles

The Global Balance of the mass universe dictates its proportionality.

In the mass universe proportionality is and must be everywhere from the rotation of celestial bodies to the reproduction of living enta.

It is this proportion that renders similar structures similar in size shape function and the rest.

And the greatest proportionality is seen in smaller and smaller sized enta but which have functions motions and descriptions that are the resultants of more and more Principles.

Thus a celestial body has immense size and certainly high degrees of proportion as in the case of its roundness or motion or rotation.

But in spite of its immense size few Principles have to do with its existence and functioning.

Per contra the life processes are the seat of functioning and execution of a plurality of Principles occurring : progressing in smaller and tinier spaces and positions : this is the life process but the basic difference from the celestial body (non-living) lies in the number of Principles at work in the place.

All these Principles whether that or those regulating the celestial body or those regulating the life processes are on the same genealogical tree and relatives of each other : but in the case of the celestial body a few Principles serve over immense distances in contrast to the multitude of Principles that in very short spaces occur : progress in the life processes.

4-Of How therefore Life Processes in the Mass Universe must occur accordant to Principles

All that has been asserted in the previous Section manifests that the life processes in the mass universe must occur : progress accordant to Principles.

There is in other words *a densification of Principles* in the execution of and at the seat of the life processes.

This is a Principle by itself which I shall term as *The Principle of Densification of Principles (To the Life Processes)*

The life processes are thus the supreme manifestors of this densification of Principles and of the Principle thereof and just above-mentioned at work.

5-And How Since All Principles are Related as per above the Principles of the Life Processes are related to the Principles of the Non-Living Processes and vice-versa

In the mass universe all Principles are related to each other from the very Rim where the 'first' energy : matter is 'born' in the 'pumpings' of the Rim to the brain organ or equivalent the greatest pinnacle of evolution as known to us.

The Principle are all 'joined up' together as in one single chain : like the rungs of one single long ladder : the principles relative to the s/c non-living process(ess) are on the 'lower' rungs of the ladder; those relative to the s/c living process(ess) are on the 'higher' rungs of the ladder : but always on the same ladder.

And every Principle on the ladder from end or extreme to end or extreme is related to the rest; and vice-versa.

6-Of How the Expression-Enunciation of the Life Processes through the Enunciation of Principles must be as through Principles similar to and related to the Principles Enunciated relative to Non-living Processes

Following what has been manifested in Section 5 of this Chapter the Principles in which the s/c Life Process(ess) are expressed are the 'relatives' of the Principles in which the s/c non-living process(ess) are expressed.

Indeed the Principles in which the s/c Life Process(ess) are expressed are 'built upon' the Principles in which the s/c non-living process(ess) are expressed and which is the 'foundation' of the building the top of which – to our knowledge – is the s/c living process.

7-Of How the Phenomena of Life Processes Can and Indeed Must be Expressed as through such Principles (Enunciation of Such Principles)

And the phenomena of life processes can and indeed must be expressed as through the enunciation of Principles that are in their turn built on the foundations or Principles relative to the s/c non-living process(ess).

Specific First Principles of the Life Processes

1-The Connected Jar Principle

In this Principle it is assumed that the ens of protoplasms of ens (living things) is constituted by a larger but finite number of jars all connected to each other.

If liquid, energy or any other matter-energy is poured into any jar it will first fill that jar but then will go over to the next and so on till the whole number of jars have been reached.

Now this analogy is not exact : for the body ens of protoplasms of ens consists of cells not of jars : but the principle is the same - and the description of the dynamics and physics is the same.

The inter-connection of functions et of cells in protoplasms of ens is manifest in nerve stimuli, transmission of food, emotions and so on.

And although the Connected Jar Principle is a very 'simple' mode of explanation of the functions motions et that occur in the cells of protoplasms of ens yet it cannot be denied that the basic physics and dynamics of the phenomena relative thereto are as described in the Connected Jar Principle q.v.

2-The Law of Stages

Liebniz had asserted *Natura non facit saltum* - and this dictum is the basis of the Law of Stages q.v.

In other words : in all principles in the living processes there is an ever-divisible number of stages which together constitute the main act, the main phenomenon of the occurrence : progression and execution of the relative phenomenon (even as accordant to the relative principle).

The Law of Stages rather than in its empirical-descriptive aspect is important more in that it reminds us constantly that the phenomena occurrences et that we are observing in the living processes is just the same as a law of physics or dynamics but passing through different exceptionally tiny gradations and sub-divisions which together make the phenomenon.

That is whilst the law or principle is the same for both non-living processes and living processes - the execution of the law or principle in the case of living processes is so *sub-divided* in to various tiny sub-divisions - which in the case of non-living processes is not the case - that this sub-division makes the finer touch, the evolution that 'distinguishes' (though it must be remembered that non-living and living are always relative) the 'living' from the 'non-living'.

Indeed in other parts of my works I refer to *Sub-Division* as a phenomenon which can be used as an engineer tool to Immortality of Ens q.v.

This phenomenon of *Sub-Division* is the other side of the coin of the aforesaid Law of Stages q.v.

3-The Moment of Collapse

In the living process the occurrence of phenomena constituting the process itself is like to a spring in continuous flow, without any intermittence.

This 'continuous flow' is the basis of structure and durability in the life processes.

But as occurs in the life-processes structures break down and durability unfortunately terminates : therefore there is what in our works I term as *the moment of collapse*.

Though at present I shall not dwell on the details of the principle as better described in my works suffice it to assert that the importance of this term is immense especially in relation to ageing, disease and Death et – which after all in the biology the destruction or in the least the reduction of which is the chief aim and scope of our work and of the enunciations of our principles.

The Genesis Of Life (On the Law of Boiling into Protoplasms of Ens)

In the middle of the nineties I drew up a work on the genesis of life.

In drawing it up I drew upon all the Principles discovered and enunciated by me previously in any part of my works that I did not include regarding the s/c non-living process(ess) as well.

I must say that I was fascinated by the motion which I saw as a young boy small worms like round-worms make twitching here and there – and as in later life and when I had discovered and enunciated the Principles that led up to this work - I used to have nearly always in front of me the image of the continuously twitching round-worm in front of me.

With this image in mind and with my previously enunciated Principles I came round to an S-shaped motion that eventually I called or rather termed as *inverted S-shaped motion*.

I contrasted this motion with *linear motion* which is the first motion (in chronological order) at the Rim of the mass universe and even subsequently in the 'celestial spaces'. It is the shape of the motion of light as well.

Therefore here motion had a change a revolutionary change from linear to not just a-linear but a determined particular specific S-shaped motion. This in my retention was the 'borderline' (although I hold that everything in the mass universe is relative and 'shades into the other') between the s/c non-living process(ess) and the s/c living process(ess). The inverted S-shaped motion was also my scientific empirical observable image: figure for the ancient image : figure of the 'fire of life'.

In my later scientific work especially in the genetics this continuously moving figure is referred to the gene particles, the motion of the gene particles.

The motion of the gene particles however is not indicated as an S-shaped motion but rather a furious 'rattling' of the gene particles here and there.

This is the gist of the *Principle Of Rattling of Genes q.v.* enunciated some years ago but in this century.

Not that this motion actually occurs : progresses in the s/c life processes and in protoplasms of ens as at present. It is a wish, an engineering remedy, and the door to s/c Immortality of Ens.

In my works I had noted that in pre-Cambrian times this Principle of Rattling of Gene Particles in fact occurred : progressed in the continuous and furious and blind mixing of even different species with different species.

The occurrence : progression of the Principle of Rattling of Genes q.v. in pre-Cambrian times was not so much as is desired or as in enough to reach up to s/c Immortality of Ens q.v.

But it occurred : progressed *more than as nowadays*.

In fact in the pre-Cambrian times the body-plan of protoplasms of ens was still in the making continually being changed here and there and to this and to that in the most flexible way just like elastic. In pre-Cambrian times *elasticity* (relative elasticity) of the body-plan of protoplasms of ens prevailed; but then in the Cambrian the body plan became fixed; there was an abrupt drop and decrease in the occurrence : progression of the Principle of Rattling of Genes q.v.; species mixed with the same species – the mixing of protoplasms of ens thus became restricted as the body plan became. Surely more stability was gained but certainly evolution distanced itself from s/c Immortality of Ens and came nearer to s/c ageing, disease and death et.

The *Principle of Shifting of Genes* q.v. though not as 'drastic' or 'furious' in the proceedings as the *Principle of Rattling of Genes* q.v. is in the same vein and spirit.

The New Meaning (Additional Meaning) Of Verification in Science

1-Of How We Verify By the Examination of Empirical Description of Phenomena

Since Renaissance times science verifies chiefly by observation and experiment.

That is prior to my work of to-day only *one* road lay that led to the verification of the phenomena of the universe.

Now after my work there are two roads that lead to the verification of the phenomena of the universe.

One is the previous one of verification by observation and experiment – this has remained unprejudiced and still must remain so; the other enunciated in my work is that *once that a proportion (any proportion) is discovered it is confirmed and verified by the mere fact of its being a proportion and insofar and as directly proportional to its being a proportion (proportio).*

2-Of How Empirical Description of Phenomena and the Enunciation of the Relative Principle are Identities

Previously in this work I have asserted and described how there is identity between the empirical description of phenomena and the enunciation of proportionate principles (or principles of proportion).

3-Of How therefore we can also verify from the Enunciation of the Relative Principle(s) *as well as* from the examination of Empirical Description of Phenomena.

Therefore we can verify *both* by the ‘old’ method of the ‘old’ science of observation and experiment; and by the new method enunciated in our works that bases itself on the proportion of the discovered and enunciated knowledge (principle).

And now it is obvious that we humans are by far indeed in a much better position that we were or could be using the ‘old’ method of verification only.

For inasmuch as the limits to empirical perception are considerable – and given that the ‘old’ method depends totally on empirical perception and observation – therefore and accordingly and in as direct proportion the advance of scientific knowledge as verified was sternly limited.

Which limitations now are reduced considerably : the use of the present ‘new’ method which does not rely heavily (much less exclusively) on empirical perception and observation And therefore is not that much affected by the limitations of the ‘old’ method.

Which ‘new’ method of verification has ushered in an accelerated enunciation of Principles in my works especially in the biology¹¹ : where I hope that such advances have been thus made which would otherwise not have come along at all or in the least took an immense time to arrive at by the ‘old’ method of verification.

¹¹ I refer here to thousands of Principles enunciated by me in the Biology over the years

XVIII

In the previous Chapters of this book Global Balance q.v. and Reference frames q.v. were manifested, described together with their respective principles.

Their significance in the new physics and science put forth by me has also I hope been briefly elucidated.

It remains to say a few words as regards the significance and import of Global Balance q.v. and Reference frames q.v. with reference to the (bio)chemistry.

Now all diseases and ills (to Death et) that beset us humans have their *(bio)chemical dimension*

In this dimension too lie the remedies – always from the line of this dimension – to all diseases and ills.

That is a specific (bio)chemical combination is relative to specific disease or ill at the relative situs in the human.

This specific (bio)chemical combination(s) is ‘remedied’ by a ‘contrary’ specific (bio)chemical combination(s). *Indeed this is the basic Principle of remedies that our science has followed and is following.*

That is the specific (bio)chemical combination(s) of ills and diseases is ‘set off’ against the relative ‘contrary’ ‘specific’ (bio)chemical combination(s) which the remedy thereto.

This Principle of ‘(Bio)chemical Set-Off’ in Disease-Remedies q.v. is a corollary of Global Balance and Contiguous Adjacent Reference Frames.

And the genesis of the Principle (of (Bio)chemical Set-Off in Disease-Remedies q.v.) is Global Balance and Contiguous Adjacent Reference Frames.

The which manifests to us that *as to every specific (bio)chemical combination(s) of ill, disease et there is a ‘contrary’ ‘set off’ combination(s) of remedies*

To every I say because the Principle does not make exceptions (like Principles, all other Principles).

Therefore we do have around us the remedies – through the (bio)chemical combination(s) dimension – of all ills, diseases et.

Therefore too and in as direct proportion we should be on the way to Immortality of Ens and freedom from disease.

That we are still not there is because of all the ever-increasing but finite ‘list’ of combination(s) of remedies scientists know only a specific number which unfortunately is less than the whole.

But the Principle and its consequences are there.

And that is why – till the fortunate and much prayed-for day when science will have unfolded to us the ever-increasing ‘list’ of the (bio)chemical combination(s) - we try – as in our works – to ‘by-pass’ this lack of specific knowledge in the (bio)chemical dimension – by moving much more ‘directly’ particularly through the engineering of rays in the physics dimension.

A physics dimension which for the reasons above enunciated is bound to succeed earlier than the (bio)chemical dimension albeit that the worth and value of both dimensions in the attack upon ills, diseases and so on are equal

XIX

The Philosophical Basis Of My Works

My scientific works of which the *First Principles* are hereby being presently enunciated are built on foundations of philosophy which I developed in the late seventies of the past century.

George Berkeley had said : *To be perceived is to exist* which Dictum has been evolved in German philosophy particularly Hegel who is the direct ancestor of my system *Mentalism* which however is apart from its parent.

In our philosophy we say : *To be asserted or to be assertable is to exist.*

This is further elaborated in our philosophy of science wherein we assert that : *To be proportional is to be verified.*

(In terms of the old science we could say : To be proportional is to be correct – And in terms of the ‘old’ philosophy - To be proportional is to be ‘real’)

As we have seen in this work all the mass universe is proportion *and everything that exists in the mass universe is proportional and being proportional stands on the genealogical tree of Existence : therefore any proportion whatever in so far as it is proportional lies on the Genealogical tree of the mass universe – whether of phenomena or of principles – and therefore accordingly and in as direct proportion ‘is verified’.*

We also saw in this work how ‘rational reasoning’ in itself is not only licit in the formulation-enunciation of scientific Principle and theory but indeed *necessary* - the Schoolmen too used this ‘rational reasoning’ to perfection very often. But their results were very often – not to say always – criticisable because *they built on foundations of assumption and surmise.* We on the other hand use and practice ‘rational reasoning’ as our chief weapon as the Schoolmen did with the difference and here is *the great difference* - that we build on foundations of empirical facta verified observed and experimented by other before us.

As manifested earlier in this work I retain the enunciation of my Principle s in my works as ‘verified’ for several reasons like:

(a)-we have established very clearly that in the mass universe everything (that is every eventa and/or enta and/or phenomena) occur : progress in proportion to each other forming part of one whole suit, one whole texture, one whole edifice that is the ever-expanding ever-evolving ever-increasing mass universe; and

(b)-the enunciation of a proportion by itself is part and parcel of this edifice, a stone in this edifice; and all stones in this edifice are ‘valid’ (in terms of the ‘old Science’) and ‘verified’

(c)-every proportion, every Principle enunciated not only links up and is proportional to the rest (including Principles already enunciated by the other scientists which too are important stones of this great edifice) but is itself built not only on its sheer proportion but also on its *correspondence : linkage* to the relative and specific empirical scientific description already discovered admirably by the other scientists.

In this sense our works are *complementary* very very often to those of other great scientists and researches who often and unfortunately after admirably discovering one or indeed several of new hitherto unobserved and undiscovered empirical descriptions by observation and experiment stopped there and drew not the conclusions that we draw in our works feeding so to say as the butterfly does on the nectar of these wonderful flowers.

And ‘scanned’ as in another direction, as from another side, our works commenced first with the physics, then we sallied to the chemistry (and (bio)chemistry) and from there we came to the

wonderful country that lay before us to conquer – the sovereign and splendid realm of the biology – the realm the conquest of which has to be the most prized to us humans.

And my procedure I think was in the right direction for thereby I treated all the sciences as unified, as one, as of one woof as indeed they are and moreover in the evolution of my own works there was paralleled the evolution of evolution itself from the Rim of the mass universe inwards to the s/c life process(ess) id est the ‘highest’ ‘noblest’ evolution known to us, humans.

My wishes – and these wishes were great and continuous – as I have carried on with my works were to attain progress in at least three main areas namely:

Firstly – in the area of disease ageing and so on. Through the Principles that I have enunciated through all the years I hoped and hope that by increasing the knowledge of the occurrence : progression of these phenomena and eventa through the enunciation of the appropriate Principles I could lay the foundations for the engineering of the same (that is ageing death et) in a way to eliminate them. Naturally if this very fortunate and desired objective be attained the state that would follow would be ever-increasing health life and well-being : this I termed as Immortality of Ens. This term became about me as some sort of idol, I became quasi-obsessed with it, but I think that the ideal is worth this obsession of mine.

Secondly – the enunciation of the Principles yielding us the knowledge of these eventa, enta and phenomena will direct us to engineering remedies which I think can be attained by utilizing the already existing remedies (like surgery, therapy, X-rays, chemotherapy, acupuncture and so on) though improvements on the already existing machinery would be most welcome

Thirdly – the stretch of my works from the genesis of the mass universe to the genesis of the life processes and the remedies for ageing, death et was always in my mind, and I will always in future continue to work in the same fields on the same plan with happiness.

XX

The Brain Organ or Equivalent

During the last years (in particular over the three year period 1999 – 2002) I laid down a number of Principles whereby the mechanics and dynamics of the brain organ or equivalent were enunciated and manifested – in the same manner as physicalist events or phenomena are manifested in books and text-books of physics, mechanics and dynamics.

For whole centuries till now a whole web of mystery lay around the brain organ or equivalent. There are some exceptions which are not direct however. For instance the great work of Freud in the Interpretation of Dreams and other psycho-analysts. These are not 'direct' enunciations of how the brain organ or equivalent works but threw a light on certain aspects of its activities like dreaming interpreting in a highly scientific and original mode. For once the workings or rather the occurrences of the brain organ or equivalent in part always were unveiled a little.

In my works the veil nearly goes off if not at all. To my knowledge none of the former works ever attempted to enunciate the workings of the brain organ or equivalent in terms of Principles and Laws like those of dynamics and mechanics.

It is to be remembered that for whole centuries too before Newton and other pioneers the workings of the celestial spaces and 'bodies' were clouded in sheer mystery as much or nearly as much as the mystery that clouded the mechanics-dynamics of the brain organ or equivalent prior to my works.

Therefore we need not wonder that the brain organ or equivalent remained so long shrouded in mystery till my works.

Other Works

I can only mention and indicate by name a limited number of areas on which I worked and enunciated Principles during my works. I shall mention 'inter alia' the following:

The Relativity of Autonomy Theory – this was first enunciated in my early philosophical work *The Spirit Of Metaphysics* in 1977. At that time it was a philosophical theory but in subsequent work in the late eighties and in the nineties of the last century the independence of matter : energy from a Controller, a force, a God was enunciated but which had its function : motion as from its mere position in to the mass universe was manifested especially following the 1992 work *On the Origination of Things* q.v.

The Idea of Infinity – following the Cartesian Cogito in 1979 I had enunciated and manifested that the human brain could reach the greatest heights possible once that it could have *the Idea of Infinity*. This showed the infinite capacity of the human mind.

The Elimination of True-False – this too was first enunciated in my philosophy in the seventies of last century but was also enunciated in the scientific works years ago.

The Moment of Collapse – this moment showed the organization and collapse of all structures both in the s/c non-living process(ess) and – especially - in the s/c living process(ess). This term and the Principles around it should also be considered in relation to the Law of Stages q.v.

Polarity - this was treated to a very large extent in my first works on physics a very large number of Principles was enunciated. But the most important was the introduction of polarity as part of the s/c life-process(ess) and of the Principles relative thereto. In this way also cancer(ous) growths could be forestalled and/or eliminated.

New Principles of Chemistry

1

After any specific (bio)chemical combination all (bio)combining matter:energies take on a definite specific particular configuration

[Principle Of Definite Configuration : Shape Of All (Bio)Chemical Combination]

2

The 'definite' shape of all (bio)chemical combinations when 'ready' and 'finished' is essential to the positioning of the same ((bio) chemical combination(s)) into the respective reference frame(s).

3

The occurrence : progression of the (bio)chemical combination(s) is the foundation of the building of the Emotions q.v.

Without these foundations the building of the Emotions cannot rise or shore itself up.

4

The occurrence : progression of (bio)chemical combination will be as directly proportional to the rise in temperature during the occurrence : progression of the same ((bio)chemical combination)

5

Where more than one (bio)chemical combination(s) are occurring : progressing the relative chunks of matter : energy will position themselves such they would constitute together one whole reference frame

Other Principles :

Other Principles enunciated especially in my early works are defined in the Glossary at p.134 et seq and are here under listed :

Proportionality as the Genesis of all Principle in the Mass Universe

Proportionality in Non-Living Processes

Proportionality in Living Processes

The Connected Jar principle;

The Law of stages;

the Moment of Collapse

New Principles in Genetics :

Principle of Shifting Genes;

Principle of Rattling of Genes;

The New Meaning (Additional Meaning) of Verification in Science

The Genesis of Life (On the Law of Boiling into Protoplasm of Ens).

Remedies (to Diseases et)

The Contribution of The Philosophy To the Science

1. Ancient Ideas – where Philosophy and Science were joined up.

In ancient times there was little if any distinction between philosophy, science and religion. This is manifest in Ancient Egyptian civilization but also in the civilization of Assyria and other Eastern civilizations. In ancient India too there was little detachment between philosophy, science and religion.

When we say ‘science’ here we mean principally cosmology for in those ancient times science was limited to man’s thirst to find the genesis of the earth, the universe, of what he saw around him.

This history manifests is the first wish in the long chronological list of wishes of the thirst of man for learning. Nor it is surprising that this wish came foremost. The foremost and most ancient desire of man to know the genesis of his universe is still about him to-day and that scientist or physicist or cosmologist who explains the ‘final draft’ of the genesis of the universe and of things around us may be said to be the rightful winner of the palm of science of all times and ages.

With us this problem remained notwithstanding the vast advances made in the science not the least in astronomy since the Renaissance. But the works of Copernicus, Kepler, Newton and the rest had not succeeded to unlock the key to that marvelous door of knowing the genesis of our universe, of the things the phenomena, the matter-energies and the rest we see around us.

I feel great humility for my totally undeserved place in being the one to have found the magic golden key to open that door when in 1992 at the age of 37 I composed *On the Ultimate Origination of Things* q.v.

When the key unlocked the door I discovered that the rift that had grown and been blown up between science and philosophy since the days of Francis Bacon’s critique of Aristotelian philosophy was not so deep – indeed I found the more I thought and pondered that the rift between philosophy and science was not justified at all.

And to-day I say with emphasis that philosophy, philosophical reasoning itself and only is the foundation of the palace of science. There is no other type of strong foundation that we can build upon if not this foundation. The scientific building must always rest its feet on philosophical first reasoning (and by first here I mean also chronologically first).

2. Renaissance Philosophy – Bacon and the Attack of Aristotelian Philosophy for the Sake of Experiment and Observation – How Bacon was justified Partly because he should not have attacked Philosophy as a Whole and Made a Rift with Science - Rationalist and Empiricist – the Genesis of the Rift between Philosophy and Science – how the Empiricists widened this Rift by holding Doubts on the Possibility of Knowledge

The rift between science and philosophy which I mentioned and which I now hope to have dispelled arose principally since the Renaissance. The reaction to the philosophy of the Schoolmen was something that at point of time was overdue, justified and long expected. The call of Francis Bacon for our ever-prodding examining, observing, doubting, thinking, and the rest is still of immense value to-day now that all modern civilization follows the path first outlined by him in *The Advancement of Learning* To-day I still am in the habit of having the honor and the pleasure to read and re-read at my sweet will parts and excerpts from that great work the spirit of which should be in the breast of all men of learning and lovers of wisdom for all times. But the unfortunate attacks of Bacon on the philosophy as something that science should do away with

and disparage led to a dangerous rift which might have been the main reason for our not finding the golden key that finally opened the door in 1992 on the genesis of the universe, of matter, of evolution.

The Enlightenment of Locke, Berkeley and Hume though in itself one of the most brilliant and wonderful things to occur in our civilization, in all civilization served to further this rift : namely : man's ability to know and perceive well was being challenged by philosophy. That is the spirit of observation and experiment which was since Bacon and indeed has to be the spine of all scientific endeavor was faced with the guns of a philosophy that were denying validity to that very root of science and scientific advancement namely observation and experiment.

3. My Philosophy of Mentalism tries to eliminate the Rift between Science and Philosophy whilst maintaining the Caution of Bacon and the Legacy of Method and Doubt and Caution of the British Empiricists

When in the late seventies of the last century I embarked upon the series of articles in the *Daily News* that I termed as *The Gallery of Distinguished Thinkers* I initially had the intention to outline in brief the mainstream thought of each of the thinkers I chose to write about. But initially only. My usual and habitual cast of thought told me that I could insert and intermix my own opinions vis-à-vis the philosopher and thinker that I was treating. After all I never intended the series to be a text-book or lecture notes – so my primary aim indeed became that each article in the series generally served as the mouth-piece of my thoughts. Article by article I saw that if the different parts or rather fragments were or could be put together a fairly unitary system of thought would result, a system that I coined as mentalism, from the Latin mens for mind.

Now to-day I realize that this term might have been a bit misleading. Certainly my system of thought was practically the diametrical opposite of Berkeley and Hume who reduced existence to what was in the mind – whilst I – first through my Idea of Infinity q.v. and then through my doctrine of Specificity q.v. made it clear that outside of the mind there is the world outside and we perceive well and correctly that world outside. In other words the senses do not play tricks on us as Hume retained; if they did so and what was in the mind was just an inmate of the mind could be changed, transposed, or otherwise maneuvered at will by the mind itself - the mind is sovereign; there is a sovereignty of the mind within itself that is proven by and since the Cartesian Cogito and that not even Hume himself dared to or could assail (Hume was too brilliant to do fall to do such a thing).

So I said through the Idea of Infinity we know infinite space but not –indeed we cannot – know specific data like motion, change, phenomena and other specific data in the universe around us. Through specificity - as I said above – the perceptions that entered the human brain could not be changed by the brain itself and this proved beyond any doubt that these same perceptions corresponded to things that indeed were outside of the brain namely outside of the brain which the brain had no authority whatever to change. For the limit or jurisdiction of authority of the brain did not extend beyond its confines.

Therefore these perceptions were the impositions unchangeable and clear from the outside world on the brain. What a far cry for Berkeley and also from Hume!

These reasonings arguments and writings in my short series so attacked the skeptical empirical position that I found that the trust of the human in the capacity to know was restored. Therefore no longer was the carrying out of any observation, experiment or similar act in doubt any more in doubt because of the 'epistemological problem' unfortunately created by the brilliance of certain philosophers.

At this point therefore I cleared the guns of philosophy for science after long centuries. I must here credit other thinkers and philosophers that before me set upon this laudable and necessary task especially the Rationalists – Descartes, Leibniz, Spinoza, and then German Idealists like Kant and Hegel. But that does not mean that I am a Rationalist or their follower in any way. They just came very close to finding the right key to the right door. They also succeeded in opening doors very near to the door I opened eventually but somehow or other – despite their immensely superior intellect over mine – failed to open the door I opened. So I must indeed consider myself lucky in that regard.

After clearing the guns of philosophy against science I went further.

I saw that spatiality was divisible in two : both as we perceive it ourselves **but also** (and this 'but also' is very important) as it is in fact. That is there is infinite spatiality. We know the infinity of this infinite spatiality from the Idea of Infinity q.v. itself. This infinite spatiality in itself is static, uneventful, with no specific date, no motion, no evolution. I termed this the mentalist universe. (I used 'mentalist' here again because I saw and wanted to emphasize that the mind the human mind through the Idea of Infinity knew this spatiality). But then there was the finite universe we perceive – through spatiality which I had treated earlier – around us. This universe is finite but unlike the mentalist universe is ever-expanding (for can infinity expand? Otherwise it would be a finity) is dynamic, eventful, with specific data continually coming to us through the process of specificity, full of motion, and brimming with evolution in direct proportion to its rate of expansion. I termed this universe the physicalist universe : and I saw that being finite it was and it indeed had to be contained within the mentalist universe. And consequently too its expansion would be in to the mentalist universe.

And so through this account of my philosophy (my first works much prior to my first scientific works) I saw that the genesis of the universe of science was manifested-explained by philosophy. And it could not be explained otherwise. Science itself has no foundations but the hard solid bricks of philosophy, the philosophy that I enunciated in the late seventies of the last century.

And then years after finding out and discovering the foundations of what was to be the palace of Science I realized that the foundations that I had laid ten or more years before in my philosophy were **the** foundations on which I could and indeed thereafter built science.

I must admit that I was lucky here too in having the advantage over practically every other scientist that I only had access to these foundations. So in the race with other scientists I had placed 'in pole position'. I had a lot of luck and some merit as well.

4. In my words Philosophy is the Foundation of the Science – and it is a totally necessary Foundation without which the Edifice of Science (The Palace of Science) cannot be built

I have already stated above that the foundations of the scientific building are philosophical. I have shown that in a certain detail above which I need not repeat. Suffice it to state that the history as well as the content of these foundations is outlined above. Both pointed in the same direction.

5. Of How in future we should Proceed as in 4 and avoid Re-making a Rift between Philosophy and Science –

And this how in future we should proceed. All I say : Let's look at the building which I built stone by stone, word by word, principle by principle over long years over that foundation of philosophy built in the late seventies of the other century. The result, the ideas, the theories, the principles will speak all for themselves.

6. Of How Philosophy and Science have Common Ancestry in the Rule of Proportion

On Saint George's Feast Day of 1993 I outlined a number of Principles in which I clearly manifested the inherent proportionality of the mass universe. In other words the proportionality of the mass universe (that is the physicalist universe; in science I started to use the term mass universe as the equivalent : identity in terms of the Principle of Equivalent : identity q.v. of the term physicalist universe of my philosophy) is something the universe itself cannot escape; something to which it is chained and imprisoned; something which it can neither have will nor power to change.

Now in Law we have the Rule of Law : here in science enshrined there is what I term as the Rule of Proportionality.

The Principles I discovered in that now distant Saint George's Feast Day years ago manifested the logical necessity and genesis of the Rule of Proportionality. But more than that the thousands of proportions subsequently enunciated by me over the years enshrined this Rule of Proportionality – indeed instead of true/false, instead of induction and other methodologies – as **the** Rule of Verification of Principles enunciated or to be enunciated in science.

This Rule of Proportionality I really equiparate with the 'fabled' well of eternal life : and indeed finally it led me to the equivalent of that well not 'fabled' this time but that could be touched and more than that engineered : namely, the Principle of Immortality of Ens q.v.

7.Of How Philosophy and Science have Common Methodology in the Rule of Proportion

In this Rule of Proportion Philosophy and Science have common methodology. In Science I have manifested this; in Philosophy it might indeed be bold to replace Induction by Proportion : but is not Philosophy referent to that same universe or universes as Science refers and therefore should not methodology be common?

8.Of How the Marriage of the Common Ancestry and the Common Methodology of Science and Philosophy are the Parents of the Offspring Common Content of Philosophy and Science

From the union or combination of this common ancestry and common methodology of science and philosophy there springs the healthy child which I term as **the common ground of both Philosophy and Science.**

We have come full circle to Egyptian and Assyrian times and also ancient Indian civilization : but with a difference : there is the addition and fruit of the labours of a vast multitude of brains over centuries that we see in Philosophy and in the advancement of Science nowadays.

9.Of How Finally Philosophy and Science should be brought as much as possible to a Common Content

This common trend towards the commonalty of Philosophy and Science should be a propensity but never an absolute. In the mass universe nothing is absolute : so we learn in my Science. And in philosophy too nothing is absolute : so we learn in my Philosophy.

My Early Philosophy as the Basis of My Science

1. The Idea of Infinity.

In the last years of the seventies of the last century I discovered the Idea of Infinity q.v. in the same way and by the same methodology as Descartes discovered Cogito ergo sum.

At this point in both me and in Descartes the innate and the empirical are one just as philosophy and science are one.

So at the point of genesis innate idea and empirical factum are indeed one. This was a point which obviously was overlooked by both the Rationalist philosophers and the Empiricist philosophers in their subsequent 'intellectual wars' between them.

The Idea of Infinity q.v. manifested to me the infinite capacity of the human brain. There is no larger capacity than that and there cannot be.

2. The Knowledge of Infinite Spatiality from the Idea of Infinity

We humans discover from the Cartesian Cogito that our Ego is to be confined, contained, placed somewhere – and that that somewhere is what we term as physicalist space or rather space. The Idea of Infinity gives humans the idea of an infinite never-ending (at the same time never increasing). Taking these two together namely the discovery that we humans make of physicalist space or rather space combined with the idea of infinite from the Idea of Infinity q.v. we arrive at their offspring namely infinite space. In science as in human engendering the union of any two phenomena or matter:energies will produce the relative offspring.

3. The Division of Spatiality in to Mentalist Universe and Physicalist Universe

Philosophy only is and can be the material for a sure foundation of the building of science.

For instance about the genesis of physicalist spatiality the datum of physicalist spatiality is the fruit of philosophy, just as is the Idea of Infinity. If one can call that science as well then at that point – but then even subsequently – philosophy and science are equivalent : identities in terms of the Principle of Equivalent : identity q.v.

Now I must admit that in my manifestation of the genesis of physicalist spatiality I am in debt to Descartes and to Saint Thomas Aquinas as I shall presently manifest.

That *as at present* physicalist spatiality exists sequitur from the same methodology – and arrives as the same assurances – of the Cartesian Cogito. In other words once that I establish:manifest the indubitable 'I' or 'Ego' this 'indubitable' 'I' or 'Ego' (even if just a Humean bundle of perceptions which we have manifested through and in our *Doctrine of Specificity* q.v. that it is not) *must of necessity* be placed in the container of physicalist space. Therefore the proof of the Cogito carries with it the proof of the Ego; and the proof of the Ego carries with it the proof of physicalist space, the container of the Ego.

Therefore the *present* Existence of physicalist space is stage one (or in terms of drama let us say Act One) of the proceedings.

The next Act is this : *Before and in place of any physicalist space there is and must always be physicalist space; and so on 'ad infinitum'.*

Thus the 'ad infinitum' part makes me recall the Five Ways of Aquinas : I must acknowledge my debt to this great philosopher.

But in any case that is the 'proof' of and for physicalist spatiality.

4.Our Knowledge of the Mentalist Universe is from the Idea of Infinity

This has already been explained under 2 supra.

5.Specificity.

We humans have the faculty to receive specific data from our apparatus of sense organs. This act of receiving these specific data I term as specificity.

David Hume had retained that whenever we humans receive such specific data the senses betray us and cheat us and therefore what we see does not correspond to the 'external' world around us.

In my philosophy I divided with discernment perceptions that could be received in to the brain organ or equivalent into two : namely (1) the Humean perceptions which are supposed to trick the senses and which in fine are just 'bundles of perceptions' : but the human mind is sovereign (not even David Hume challenges this) and therefore if this were the case the human mind would change these received specific data at will; and (2) perceptions that we receive into the brain organ or equivalent : these however cannot be changed by the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the brain organ or equivalent : therefore they are totally independent of the brain organ or equivalent and manifest to the brain organ or equivalent correctly and clearly the 'external world outside'.

Therefore specificity is an act through which the brain organ or equivalent receives specific data correctly and clearly and precisely depicting the 'external world'.

These specific data are equivalent : identities of the objects and matter:energies from the 'external world' that we perceive and receive.

6.Our Knowledge of the Physicalist Universe is from Specificity but Clear and Reliable.

As has been manifested in 5 supra our knowledge of the physicalist universe is from specificity. (i) Specificity as a process presents to us and makes us humans receive clear distinct and precise ideas (ii) : consequently by syllogistic reasoning our knowledge of the physicalist universe from specificity is clear and reliable.

7.Our Knowledge of the Physicalist Universe from Specificity is Limited

But the perceptions:receptions that we receive through specificity are always in finite number even if ever on the increase and even if we consider that we be continually exposed to new phenomena and matter:energies in speedy continuity.

Now I enunciate that the rate of [increase of] finity of the number of these perceptions:receptions is as directly proportional to the rate of [increase of] limit to our knowledge from the same

And vice-versa

This Principle I term as **the Principle of Finiteness : Limit Proportion of Human Perceptions** q.v.

Therefore and accordingly our knowledge of the physicalist universe from specificity is limited.

8. Our Knowledge of the Physicalist Universe is to be increased as we are Prodded by our Idea of Infinity

But the Idea of Infinity never leaves us quiet : in it we see as in a mirror the ever-increasing immensity of evolution which albeit finite we cannot directly reach. Therefore our mind attempts to bridge the rift or distance between the point that we cannot reach by specificity but which the Idea of Infinity q.v. prods us continually to reach and the point that we have reached by and through the receipt of perceptions:receptions through Specificity q.v.

9. Of How the Mind Reproduces and/or Extends Specific Data ex-Specificity to Further Specificity

The mind thus devises a method or methodology as to how it can bridge the rift above-mentioned : the wishes and prodding of the Idea of Infinity q.v. are to be satisfied and are thus finally satisfied in this manner. Consequently the mind will have the propensity to reproduce and/or extend specific data ex-Specificity to Further Specificity. The mind pays attention that in so doing it does not strand itself from the sure rocks on which the received perceptions are built : consequently in its methodology it only reproduces or extends the original specific data already received.

10. Of how the Process in 9 is done as through the Theory of Inexhaustible Hypotheses

This process is the process by which we humans attain to knowledge of Hypotheses, Theories, Principles et similia. This process is the process of increase, ever-increase of scientific knowledge. It is scientific history. It is also that same process that in my early philosophy (in the late seventies of the last century) I termed as *The Doctrine of Inexhaustible Hypotheses* q.v.

11. Of How the Process in 9 and the Process of Scientific Enunciation of Theory, Hypothesis and Principle are Equivalent : identities in terms of the Principle of Equivalent : identity.

As already manifested there is identity in terms of the Principle of Equivalent : identity of the Process of Scientific Enunciation of Theory, Hypothesis and Principle and the process by which the mind extends and/or reproduces originally received specific data as through Specificity. And that is why in 10 supra (immediately supra) I wrote the sentence 'It is scientific history'.

The Value of Hypothesis and Theory

1.Of the Methodology of our Assertion of Hypothesis and Theory ex-Specificity

The methodology of our Assertion of Hypothesis and Theory ex-Specificity established in our works (as per above) is very rigorous and cautious – and so has to be – and this in line with our general trend to study and treat everything with extreme skepticism and cautiousness.

2.Do Hypothesis and Theory Differ or are Equivalent : identical?

In the light of what will be asserted herein under I opine that it is superfluous to differentiate as between Hypothesis, Theory or even Enunciation of Principle as in fine and so long as in fine they lead to and arrive at Infinite Realty et in accordance with and as per the methodologies described herein under.

3.The Principle of Equivalence of Inexhaustible Hypotheses to Infinite Reality et q.v.

I shall at this stage enunciate this Principle :

In to the mass universe the rate of [increase of] construction : enunciation of hypotheses will be as directly proportional to the rate of [increase of] the equivalence (in terms of the Principle of Equivalent : identity q.v.) to actual occurrences: progressions, motions, phenomena and 'realities'

And vice-versa

I term this Principle as **the Principle of Equivalence of Inexhaustible Hypotheses to Infinite Reality** q.v.

4.Scenario

Now take the scenario where there be an infinite number of hypotheses : these together will equal and be the equivalent : identity of 'reality'.

At this point 'hypothesis' and 'actuality' and 'reality' are equivalent : identities in terms of the Principle of Equivalent : identity q.v. and equal and exactly similar : identical to each other.

5.Impossible Scenario?

But since *infinite* hypotheses cannot ever be reached : *the infinity of number making it impossible to be reached by a finite enunciations of hypotheses, however numerous, however increasing, because there will always be a further number.*

Therefore and accordingly the scenario where Inexhaustible Hypotheses q.v. equal Reality et can never occur : progress.

6.Moving to Reality et

But the Principle above-mentioned (that is the Principle of Equivalence of Inexhaustible Hypotheses to Reality q.v.) can be *constantly and continually neared* : hence hypotheses are

constantly and continually near to 'reality', and *the more hypotheses we enunciate the nearer we are to 'Reality' et in as direct proportion*

And vice-versa

7.The Principle of Equivalence of Finite Hypotheses to Finite Reality et.

But in themselves and insofar as they refer to finite phenomena or finite sets of phenomena, hypotheses can and indeed will equal reality provided that the global finity of the hypotheses exceeds or is equal to the finity of the relative phenomenon or phenomena.

In other words if finite hypotheses relate to finite Reality et and the quantum of (extent of) finity of the finite hypothesis exceeds or equals (at least) the finity of the 'reality' relative to it : then at that point *finite hypothesis equals finite reality et*

This Principle I term as **the Principle of Equivalence of Finite Hypotheses to Finite Reality et** q.v.

This Principle limits the Principle at 1.

8.Globality of Finite Hypotheses

Now since that the mass universe is finite, the number of phenomena, motions and other realities in it cannot but be **finite** : therefore and accordingly the mass universe can be described **by the globality of an immense number of finite hypotheses as per Principle at 7 (the Principle of Equivalence of Finite Hypotheses to Finite Reality et** q.v.]

9.Principle of Necessity of Ever-Increase of Enunciation of Finite Hypotheses

But since that the mass universe too is ever-extending the rate of [increase of] enunciation of Hypotheses as per Principle at 8 (the Principle of Finite Hypotheses to Finite Reality et.) must be ever-increasing by at least an amount in excess of or at least equal to the rate of [increase of] extension of the mass universe

And vice-versa

This Principle I term as **the Principle of Necessity of Ever-Increase of Enunciation of Finite Hypotheses** q.v.

10.Principle of Extendibility of Finite Hypotheses to Infinite Reality et as by Proportion q.v.

In the mass universe all that occurs : progresses is proportional (Vedi the Principles of Saint George's Day of 1993).

Therefore and accordingly **any finite hypothesis is proportional to infinity to any other finite hypothesis : that is any finite hypothesis is proportional to a notional infinity of hypotheses that (in terms of the Principle of Equivalence of Inexhaustible Hypotheses to Infinite Reality et as at I) equalises to Infinite Reality et.**

Therefore and accordingly through the use of Proportion any finite hypothesis or hypotheses can be **extended to Infinite Reality et**

This Principle I term as **the Principle of Extendibility of Finite Hypothesis to Infinite Reality et as by Proportion** q.v.

Through this Principle therefore Infinite Reality et. is reachable even by finite hypotheses.

11.Assertion:proof Percentage

In the light of the Principles enunciated in the previous sections of this Chapter I shall state that all facts, all sentences, all Hypotheses, Theories, Principles, and so on whatever the state or situation they are in at that particular time : space moment as per above will all have an assertion percentage, however minimal, and a proof percentage, however minimal.

That is we normally expect Principles enunciated for instance to be proven not just asserted. But as manifested in the preceding Sections of this Chapter there are indeed circumstances where and when rather than proof assertion and enunciation is required and useful.

In a state where there is an immense number of Principles all proportional to each other as required by the Rule of Proportion – the proof percentage will tend towards the minimal because the multiple assertions (all proportionate to each other) are in themselves proof of their own assertions. As was manifested in the Principles previously enunciated in this Chapter.

In these cases the assertion percentage rises higher and higher and indeed it rises higher with the number and multiplicity of assertions made.

Thus I enunciate:

That :

The rate of [increase of] assertions multiplied by the rate of [increase of] their respective proportionality is as directly proportional to the rate of [increase of] the assertion percentage

And vice-versa

This Principle I term as **the Principle of Assertion Percentage Genesis** q.v.

In equation form it runs thus :

Let A = rate of assertions

And

Let P = rate of proportions as between : of the same [assertions]

And

Let AP = propensity to (genesis of) of assertion percentage

Therefore

And accordingly

$AP = A \times P$

And

As by algebraic transformation

$A = AP$ divided by P

And

$P = AP$ divided by A

I shall further enunciate that :

The rate of [increase of] occurrence : progression of the Principle of Assertion : Percentage Genesis will be as directly proportional to the rate of [increase of] acceleration of the same (Principle of Assertion : Percentage Genesis)

And vice-versa

This Principle I term as **the Principle of Acceleration of the Principle of Assertion : Percentage Genesis** q.v.

12.The Principle of Assertion : Proof Percentage

There thus occurs : progresses a Principle of Assertion : Proof Percentage q.v. similar to the Principle of Mass : energy Percentage q.v.

13.Assertion Percentage inverse to Proof percentage

At any one specific time : space absolute moment the assertion percentage will always be as inversely proportional to the proof percentage

And vice-versa

14.Towards a high assertion percentage

In both my philosophy and my science I have advised and directed towards a higher and higher assertion percentage. It is the inborn desire of man to attain to as complete a picture of the mass universe as possible in the shortest possible time. This desire has led man to great scientific desires. But – and rightly so – his desire and thirst for more and more knowledge – and with it intellectual power – has never been whetted – and my prayer is that indeed man's thirst continues to grow in accelerated mode in all succeeding times.

15.Final Stage : Assertion rather than proof.

In the scenario where more and more progress is made in enunciation and assertion the scenario where 'proof' is required (as we understood it formerly) begins to disappear more and more subject to the minimal percentage as required by the Principle of Assertion : Proof q.v. And this minimal percentage too has a beneficial effect in that whilst we increase in accelerated more our thirst for more and more knowledge we will not relax in any way or amount our traditional caution and skepticism (investigative skepticism) at any time.

The Descent of Evolution

1. At the Rim of the Mass Universe

Evolution, the onward ever-progression of motion, change, phenomena, formation, re-formation, transformation et alia of matter:energies and similar processes are 'the order of the day' and 'routine' from the Rim of the mass universe inwards.

But more important than that each are respectively *proportional* to the other; and each respectively inter-transform as into the other. The method and dynamics-mechanics of all these inter-transformations is proportion, the Rule of Proportion itself.

But it is well to say that in the mass universe besides this Rule of Proportion which is the sovereign of the mass universe there are the 'princes' of the mass universe namely evolution, the onward ever-progression of motion, change, phenomena, formation, re-formation and transformation et alia as abovementioned.

All these start at the Rim of the mass universe their genesis being the onward pushing and superimposition of the physicalist layer of space over the mentalist layer.

This and the subsequent happenings in the mass universe from the rim inwards I manifested previously in my works.

2. The Genesis of Fisei

The genesis of the mass universe and the genesis of fisei are co-terminous and simultaneous. I say simultaneous because the expansion of the Rim, the genesis of energy with this same motion of expansion, and the genesis of Fisei with the genesis of this energy ex-motion of expansion by the Rim all occur : progress (and *have to occur* : progress) at the same time. These three acts can be retained as three different acts but due to the simultaneity of their genesis and occurrence : progression they might also be retained as one act.

3. Expansion of Rim must result in Evolution

Once that the expansion of the Rim of the mass universe and the genesis of Fisei are practically one act due to the above-mentioned simultaneity of their occurrence : progression I shall include in this one act Evolution.

Evolution included in this 'one act' is not properly speaking the *end-result of the process of Evolution but rather the initium-genesis of the same (process)*.

4. The Direction of this Evolution is Prevedible, Inevitable and Irreversible as Expansion at the Rim Itself

Within the confines of the mass universe evolution is imprisoned, regulated, and directed by the Rule of Proportion. The real sovereign of the mass universe is this Rule of Proportion not Evolution. For it is the Rule of Proportion that is at the initium and fundament of every phenomenon, motion and matter : energy. Evolution is rather the end product of this Rule of Proportion.

It might be said that the Rule of Proportion will not move onwards unless prodded by Evolution.

But the Rule of Proportion too is born at the Rim of the mass universe and is one with the one-act that has the simultaneous occurrence : progression of the expansion of the Rim of the mass universe, the genesis of energy with and ex this motion of expansion, and the genesis of Fisei.

5.The Common Ancestors Laws are found in all Branches of Science to the Biology and thus Manifest the Descent of Evolution

Whatever the level of Evolution in which any phenomenon, matter : energy et similia lies the Common Ancestor Laws (that is the Principle of Global Balance, the Principle of Adjacent Contiguous Frames, and the Principle of the Mass : energy Percentage) are all manifest. And the manifestation or rather rate of manifestation of the same Common Ancestor Principles in independent of the relative level or quantum of Evolution.

6.The Descent of the Physics of the Stars to the Physics of the Earth

Due to the genesis of Fisei at the Rim of the mass universe the celestial spaces and the stars and other heavenly bodies are the situs of the demonstration : manifestation of Fisei. For immense distances this remains the only situation : but once a planet like Earth is reached the Physics of the Stars change to the Physics of the Earth.

We might here describe the Physics as a plant adapting to the environment when its environment is changed, radically or otherwise.

The Physics has the *propensity* of : to the unchangeable but it is subject to Evolution : there are here two Principles in quasi-contra-position. One is the propensity to unchangeability of the Physics; the other the subjection of the Physics to Evolution.

In similar circumstances the methodology we adopt (following Hegel to a certain extent) we 'marry' the two quasi-contra-positions and see their off-spring. Like genetic offspring the offspring is bound to manifest approximately equal doses of both Principle in a Third and new Principle.

Thus in the Third or new Principle I would note *polarity, magnetism et similia* which are more proper to the Earth than to the stars though they should and in fact occur : progress all over the mass universe. But the situation on Earth warrants their occurrence : progression more.

7.The Descent of the Physics of the Earth to the Chemistry of the Earth

The stars and heavenly spaces have their chemistry but their situation warrants a relatively low *percentage of density to propensity of combination*.

I shall explain this percentage of density to combination by the following formula :

Number of chemical combinations occurring : progressing

_____ X 100%

Area of the situs of their occurrence : progression

[The number of chemical combination should be measured in unit number one per chemical combination.

The area of the situs of their occurrence : progression should be measured in square kilometers]

Now in the celestial spaces the relatively low density of chemical combination gives way to relatively higher percentage of densities of chemical combination

If this applies to the combinations between the Elements, the more so should this apply to the combinations between Compounds.

Thus I enunciate the same formula but for the percentage of combination of the Compounds thus

Number of Chemical Compound combinations
_____ X 100%

Area of the situs of their occurrence : progression

I shall also at this juncture draw a further Enunciation namely the following Principle :

The rate of [increase of] percentage of Chemical Combination multiplied by the rate of [increase of] percentage of Chemical Compound Combination will be as directly proportional to the rate of [increase of] propensity to vicinity to the genesis of the s/c life process(ess)

And vice-versa

This important Principle I term as **the Principle of Genesis of Life Processes ex Chemical Combination** q.v.

If expressed in equation form:

Then :

Let C = rate of percentage of density of chemical combination

And

Let CC = rate of percentage of density of compound combination

And

Let L = rate of propensity to genesis of life processes ex chemical combination q.v.

Therefore and accordingly :

$L = C \times CC$

And

$C = L \text{ divided by } CC$

And

CC = L divided by C

I shall also here enunciate another Principle namely :

The rate of [increase of] percentage of Chemical Combination multiplied by the rate of [increase of] percentage of Chemical Compound Combination will be as directly proportional to the rate of [increase of] propensity to vicinity to the genesis of the s/c (bio)chemistry

And vice-versa

This important Principle I term as **the Principle of Genesis of (Bio)chemical Combination ex Chemical Combination** q.v.

In equation form this Principle and its transformations are thus expressed :

Let C = rate of density of chemical combination; and

And

Let CC = rate of percentage of density of compound combination

And

Let BC = rate of propensity to genesis of (bio)chemical combination ex-chemical combination

Therefore and accordingly

$BC = C \times CC$

And

$C = BC \text{ divided by } CC$

And

$CC = BC \text{ divided by } C$

8.How the Chemistry of the Earth descended to the (Bio)chemistry of the Earth in the Operation of the Law of Boiling in to Protoplasm of Ens

All the Proportions and Principles enunciated in 7 supra manifest that

The rate of [increase of] propensity to genesis of the life processes ex-chemical combination is directly proportional to the rate of [increase of] propensity to genesis of [bio]chemical combination

And vice-versa

This Principle which I term as **the Principle of Proportion of Life Processes Genesis to Biochemical Combination Processes** q.v.

This Principle leads us to the Operation of the Law of Boiling in to Protoplasms of Ens q.v. which was referred to earlier on in this work.

9.How the Biochemistry was married to Stimuli with Emotions as the Offspring

In line with a Principle by which – similar to the Hegelian dialectic – I ‘married’ two quasi-contradictions to obtain their offspring, a third position or Principle I will ‘marry’ the Biochemistry to Stimuli - the offspring are the Emotions.

The further increase of the Emotions is directly proportional to the quickening of the cyclical re-occurrences of the ‘marriage’ of Biochemistry to Stimuli

And vice-versa

This Principle I term as **the Principle of Genesis of Emotions ex-Biochemistry to Stimuli** q.v.

10.How the Triad of Biochemistry Stimuli and Emotions evolved to the s/c Living Process(ess)

The further occurrence : progression of the Principle just enunciated further ‘quickened’ the genesis of the s/c life-Processes.

I thus enunciate :

The rate of [increase of] occurrence : progression of the Principle of Genesis of Emotions ex-Biochemistry to Stimuli q.v. will be as directly proportional to the rate of [increase of] propensity to the vicinity to genesis to : of the s/c life-Processes

And vice-versa

This Principle I term as **the Principle of Genesis of Emotions ex-Biochemistry to Stimuli as the Genesis of Propensity to the Vicinity to Genesis to : of the s/c Life Processes** q.v.

11.On the Genesis of the Living Process(ess) to Present Evolution

In the genesis of the living processes to present evolution or rather to human evolution I say that the occurrence : progression of Principles of the s/c Life Processes occur : progress the same and equally in all stages and levels of evolution.

12.Of the Descent of the Physics to the Quantum Physics

Matter : energy sub-divides itself as accordant to Principles already manifested in our works. In these sub-divisions the ‘chunks’ of respective matter:energies get tinier and tinier till the level is reached when the reign of quantum physics starts. In other words physics does not descend infinitely into sub-divided matter : energy at some point a limit is reached and physics yields to quantum physics. This manifests as well the limit that ever-increasing sub-divisions of matter:energies impose on the Physics and its laws excepting however the Basic Laws of Global Balance; Contiguous Adjacent Reference Frames; and the Principle of the Mass : energy Percentage q.v.

13.Of the Rule of Proportionality (cf.the Rule of Law) as the Rule in all the Descents of Evolution above mentioned

In all descents of evolution as above-mentioned the Rule of Proportionality q.v. is the supreme arbiter of the mass universe.

At this juncture I must mention that in our civilizations since ancient times we have indeed expressed proportion especially in the mathematics and the mathematical sciences (including applied mathematics especially in post-Renaissance times). I shall state that this *expression of Existence as through the mathematics is the equivalent : identity of expression of Existence as through proportionality.*

I shall term this Principle as **the Principle of the Equivalence of Proportion and Mathematics** q.v.

The history of science – especially in regards to the applied mathematics – has shown especially in the last few hundred years that practically all the scientists were *using as the medium of their expression of proportion, the tool of mathematics.*

Thus *the utilization of the mathematics made in the past and still made to-day by scientists as the tool of discovery and expression of Existence is the equivalent : identity of the use in my works of the Rule of Proportion q.v. as the tool of discovery and expression of Existence.*

But why am I justified in using the tool of Proportion rather than the tool of the Mathematics in my works? Or not?

I think that I am justified for three reasons :

1-First of all I must confess that I am not an expert mathematician; therefore and accordingly I had to express myself and to find some other tool. Proportion was simpler to me, more handy, more congenial. And it was also just (if not more) as powerful and efficient.

2-Second reason is that I felt that Proportion is a more malleable tool than the Mathematics : it itself the Mathematics still has some constraints that do not serve the flow of Evolution in the mass universe as Proportion does. And this is also evident if we observe that Proportion reflects the expression of the universe *as it is in a more natural way* whilst that mathematics though practically the same and equally precise *expresses the mass universe in an artifact human way. In other words mathematics is not written in the skies as proportion is; and that is why perhaps it does not have the same flexibility as proportion.*

I should express a rather loud simile here when I say that whilst Proportion is the language of the gods (I mean no offense to Christianity here – just a simile) mathematics is the artifact language of men.

When you speak and enunciate in Proportion you speak and enunciate in the language of the universe itself.

3-The third reason derives from the second : I found that I could use Proportion to discover one discovery after another with greater ease than I could do with the mathematics.

And history of science perhaps shows – and I think that this my position will in future be confirmed - that the mathematical methodology of the other scientists did not allow them as much ease as the methodology I used to make one discovery after another by the same means and methods in principle but in fact in an easier and therefore more rapid and definitive way.

(After all a large number of mathematicians also had expressed their discoveries in Proportion-Form as I do and had done; but obviously not as much. On the other hand I myself on many an occasion use simple algebra to express the Proportion I have just enunciated in Proportion form and more than that to derive simple algebraic transformation therefrom because I find this ‘more handy’ to this particular task and in this particular circumstance.)

14. Of the Vital Import of the Rule of Proportionality in the Increase of Knowledge of Evolution in all its Stages of Descent

Thus the expression of knowledge of the mass universe through mathematics (without prejudice also to the considerable number of Principles that in the history of science were expressed in the direct language of Proportion) was just the expression of the same as through Proportion.

After all mathematics and Proportion are like two languages expressing the same concepts. But as with languages sometimes one language suffers from constraints that the other does not : it cannot help it. And the same with mathematics and Proportion.

But otherwise mathematics and Proportion are the 'princes' of that Sovereign Rule that I termed – in the manner of the Rule of Law in the legal field – the Rule of Proportion q.v.

It is no wonder that in all the stages of descent from the Rim of the mass universe inwards all phenomena are proportional and expressible or expressed in proportions whether *Proportions Proper* or *Mathematical Proportions*.

I think that the constraints which Mathematics shows and has vis-à-vis Proportion Proper should be studied more in future.

15. Of the Vital Import of the Rule of Proportionality in the Increase of Engineering Knowledge in all the Matter:energies and Protoplasm of Ens in the Different Stages of Descent of Evolution

In my Doctrine of Inexhaustible Hypotheses q.v. way back in the late seventies of the last century I had underlined the emphasis the human has a thirst to satisfy namely (1) when as through specificity (and through Baconian Observation and Experiment) he observes and assimilates specificity, that is specific data, or in the language of the empiricists, empirical facts or data (empirical data) – the human – prompted by his Idea of Infinity realizes the insufficiency of these specific data. In other words, these specific data though always ever-increasing do not whet the appetite of man that the Idea of Infinity prompts him to; and (2) therefore he finds ways and means to 'bridge' the vision show him by the Idea of Infinity q.v. and the vision (limited finite vision) show him by the receipt of the specific data albeit ever on the increase; and (3) therefore – and here for instance is the birth and genesis of science et similia – he devises ways and means to bridge the two visions shown and present to him as in (2) – to do this since Renaissance times the human and the scientist used Induction and then more Mathematical Proportion; in my words I preferred to use Induction and Mathematical Proportion as little as possible. I used instead Proportion Proper as a tool and the results are evident. So much so that I extended the methodology of Proportion Proper into the engineering field not to replace methods like Surgery, Chemotherapy et al but to supplement these with an ever-growing stronger engineering leading and pointing to the ambitious goal Immortality of Ens. I think I showed that however ambitious this goal it is definitely possible – for me this goal is *an absolute must* - depending on our future scientific discoveries and works, especially in the engineering.

Of The Five Scientists

1. Of the Experimental Laboratory Scientist.

I must here pay tribute to the men and women who labor in laboratories to establish and discover empirical facts and specific data – and (why not?) also Principles for us.

I admit that when I was a boy I used (in my fertile imagination) to think of scientists as white-clothed bespectacled people standing up working in laboratories all day or at least for long hours with fumes and smokes and other emissions emerging from here and there.

As a boy I always had an inclination for thought rather than action-research as I call the laboratory work. Consequently though I looked upon these men and women amongst my first heroes, I did not look to imitate them.

I also thought that I did not have and would never have the ability to imitate them. At a later stage as a university graduate in law I thought of the laboratory as a place where it was important to work but where there were restrictions and limits to the possibilities of discoveries. Restrictions and limits which I ruminated would not be in the vast immense panorama of the human mind when used as a laboratory of ideas itself. I calculated in terms of scientific economy that if I used my mind as my laboratory I would be having so much more ‘absolute freedom’ and wider vistas and panoramas – and therefore I reasoned, opportunities for discovery – that I developed a shunning (but not aversion) from laboratory work. Consequently I always had the inclination to move my work in the direction of thinking – and consequently in the direction of theory, reasoning, hypothesis, and enunciation of Principle rather than in the ‘drudgery’ of laboring to establish and observe this or that ‘empirical fact’.

But this ‘drudgery’ is as important as any other process in science. For without observation and experiment of empirical fact and the provision of the ‘ammunition’ of empirical fact to the mind ready for enunciation and/or theory I also observe that the chances of discovery of Principle would be remote.

And though the mass universe itself is the most wonderful and vast laboratory for our observation and experiment the ‘closed building’ laboratory is nonetheless important, nay vital, in many aspects as above manifested.

It is true that the discovery of the Rule of Proportion (and therefore with the consequent and resultant enunciation of Proportion from Proportion) renders less the import of laboratory work and also of direct Observation and Experiment : but whatever the success in our utilizing the tool of the Rule of Proportion as an instrument of discovery (and this utilization must be intensified in the future) yet the ‘old’ ‘conventional’ methods of laboratory work and of Observation and Experiment must not be replaced or diminished but rather increased as supplementary help and aid in the least.

Nor should we forget the number of Principles discovered and enunciated in the laboratory. The laboratory therefore is much more than the routine and ‘drudgery’ of discovery of just empirical fact and specific data.

2. Of the Theoretical Scientist.

When I spoke about my inclinations – and subsequent decisions – in 1 supra I think that I have manifested the figure of the theoretical scientist.

Another example that comes to mind is Albert Einstein. Similar to me Einstein was attracted to philosophy at approximately the same time, if not before, as the carrying out and execution of his great scientific works. And I too had my first phase in philosophy and then after years embarked in science. I think that all this manifests and illustrates as well as gives the reason for the inclinations of both myself and Einstein for this inclination to be theoretical scientists.

I deem the theoretical scientist to be the apex of all laborers in the scientific field. Not that all the other workers in the scientific field are not important. But the end result of all the labour and toil that is carried out in the fields of science is the work of the theoretical scientist or its equivalent. I shall not exaggerate when I say that the theoretical scientist is already and will (I hope if we work in the direction of Immortality of Ens) be the savior of humanity, of all of us.

And the work of theoretical scientist together with the work of the thinker and the philosopher and the spirit-seer of the poet, I deem as the crown of all our civilization.

3.Of the Mixed Breed Scientists from the Union of 1 and 2.

As I had observed in 1 supra not inoften there were researchers and scientists who working in the 'drudgery' of the laboratory discovered the empirical facts as well as enunciated Principles themselves.

Apart from the fact that at times the proportion in the empirical fact discovered is so obvious – and consequently easy to extract and discover - there were discoveries and enunciation of Principles in the laboratory itself.

We should indeed encourage this 'mixed breed' of scientists to grow more and more rather than not aid them.

Their contributions are as invaluable as they are vital.

4.Of the Mathematical Scientist

Now the theoretical scientist has two alternatives ways of proceeding and proclaiming : expressing his results. One is that of Mathematical Proportion; the other that of Proportion Proper.

In the works of scientists from the Renaissance (in especial) even to our times the methodology of the Mathematical Proportion has been chosen; and this with great success given the equivalence : identity (in terms of the Principle of Equivalent : identity q.v.) of Mathematical Proportion and Proportion Proper.

There were other scientists (but these are really few) who enunciate directly through Proper Proportion.

I have chosen to make my methodology of scientific discovery that of Proportion Proper for the reasons and circumstances I have already described in this work.

Even when I occasionally insert and express in simple algebraic equation form I normally enunciate the relative Proportion first through the methodology of Proportion Proper; then for dexterity's sake and brevity's sake I introduce the simple equation relative thereto together with its transformations.

5.Of the Scientist of Proportions and Observer of the Rule of Proportion in All Science

About this matter and the excellence of the methodology of Proportion Proper I have spoken such earlier on in these works that I refer to the same.

GLOSSARY OF INTELLECTUAL TERMS

Idea of Infinity –the ‘Idea’ that is in the minds of all humans and that manifests to all humans that in the brain they can reach to an infinite and therefore ever-increasing all-comprehending capacity

Specificity-the genetic set-up of the human organs whereby perceptions are as of definite specific things which cannot be changed at the will of the perceiver and therefore ‘subsist’ ‘independently’ of the perceiver

Doctrine of Inexhaustible Hypotheses – the faculty of the human brain is not limited to observing empirical data only but from these to ‘construct’ for instance through the Principle of ‘proportio ex proportio’ other data which though not empirically observed by the human are as ‘subsistent’ as data empirically perceived by the human organs.

Principle of Necessity of Physicalist Space – in this Principle the necessity – and therefore the genesis – of Physicalist Space is a ‘datum’ – that is there cannot be either in the Ideal State or in the Practical State any State in which there is not physicalist space – it is the same as saying ‘ $1+1+1=3$ ’

Principle of Necessity of Mentalist Space – in this Principle the necessity – and therefore the genesis – of Mentalist Space – that is the space that must exist as a boundary around Physicalist Space is also a ‘datum’ exactly as with the case of the Principle of Necessity of Physicalist Space

Mentalist Universe - or the space : area occupied by Mentalist space

Physicalist Universe – or the space: area occupied by Physicalist space

Mass Universe – that part of the Physicalist Universe which is occupied by mass; by a percentage of mass, however minimal; now since that even energy has a mass percentage, therefore and accordingly mass percentage extends all over the physicalist universe and its boundaries are co-terminous with the boundaries of the same (Physicalist universe)

Rim of the Mass Universe – as manifested before Physicalist Space is by necessity limited; therefore it has to have a boundary which is termed the Rim – outside of this Rim is the Mentalist Universe; inside of this is the Physicalist Universe.

Overlapping of Physicalist Space on Mentalist space – Physicalist Space ever-extends on mentalist space thereby energy has its genesis in the motion of ‘overlapping’ of the physicalist space into the mentalist space. In so doing, that is in the genesis of energy there is also the genesis of mass since following Einstein’s $e = mc^2$ - and my Principle of the Mass : energy Percentage q.v. - all energy in itself and by itself has to have a mass percentage however minimal.

Ever-Continuous Extension of the Mass Universe – the mass universe is co-terminous with the Physicalist Universe – as manifested above – and also as manifested above as of necessity the Physicalist universe extends continually – and with it therefore and accordingly – and since being co-terminous – the mass universe extends in ever-increase with the Physicalist Universe

Principle of Global Balance – this is the Principle whereby everything from the Rim of the mass universe inwards has to balance and co-subsist with its ‘neighbor’ – any infringement in any part of the mass universe will result in and lead to a ‘ripple effect’ extending to the very Rim of the mass universe – and therefore the mass universe – or rather the co-terminous Physicalist Universe – instead of extending uniformly and equally from all sides into the mentalist universe – as it should do as by necessity – would extend in one particular part or parts as ‘bulging’ into

mentalist space – which it cannot be by necessity – and therefore accordingly and in as direct proportion the Principle of Global Balance is of necessity to be observed and to hold

Principle of Contiguous Adjacent Reference Frames – all parts of the mass universe having different specific mass : energy percentage – subsequent to and proportional to the evolution thereof – specific part has to ‘balance’ with immediate Contiguous specific neighbor – the couple making up a ‘reference frame’

Principle of Mass : energy Percentage – in this Principle following $e=mc^2$ all matter : energy from the Rim of the mass universe inwards must consist both of a percentage of mass and a percentage of energy, however minimal, together

Reference Frames- In turn reference frames ‘stick together’ and ‘balance together’ as ‘neighboring couples’ in the same way and for the same reasons as the parts of each reference frame stick together

Newton’s Laws of Gravitation – in these laws Newton assumed and resulted in a ‘static universe’ as exemplified for instance in his Law of Inertia; when in fact the mass universe being in continuous expansion in fact results in continuous motion and evolution, not inertia as in the Newtonian universe which incidentally has ‘fixed’ boundaries – thus continuous motion and evolution ‘turn down’ completely the Newtonian universe together with its Laws especially Inertia. Moreover the Newtonian universe does not make the necessary distinction between physicalist (mass) universe and mentalist universe – which distinction as we have seen supra is of necessity and cannot be avoided

Replacement of Newton’s Laws of Gravitation – this replacement of Newton’s Laws of Gravitation is the resultant of the ‘turning down’ of the Newtonian universe as manifested above.

Closed Universe-this is the Newtonian ‘closed universe’ which has been ‘turned down’ as per the immediately preceding; Einstein also held a ‘closed universe’

Elimination of the Closed Universe-as has been manifested supra in our replacement of the Newtonian universe

Building of Science-a metaphorical illustration of how human knowledge is perceived stored and gained bit by bit like to a building being built from its foundations; in this building though the floors ‘above street level’ are scientific yet the foundations are of necessity ‘philosophical’. However since that in any building the foundations and the buildings over them are ‘one’ so science and philosophy are relative to each other and ‘one’ each with the other.

Rule of Proportion-in the mass universe – following Global Balance; Adjacent Reference Frames and Mass : energy Percentage; - all phenomena have the propensity to occur : progress as proportional; this proportionality has its genesis in the ‘logical’ dicta of rational necessity that are the foundations of this proportion; therefore too, the ‘rationality’ of this proportion and the ‘necessity’ of this proportion as well as the ‘total widespreadness’ of occurrence : progression of this proportion all over the mass universe

Philosophy as the Foundations of Science-as manifested supra Philosophy is the Foundations of the ‘Building of Knowledge’; the buildings above that Foundation are Science : in this Metaphor – which like to Plato’s Metaphor of the Cave is revolutionary – the the bridges and rifts between Philosophy and Science are eliminated and their respective relation placed in its just perspective Identity of Empirical Fact and Innate Idea at Point of Departure-the totality of empirical facts equals the totality of ‘innate ideas’ and these ‘totalities’ are equivalent-identities q.v. in terms of the Principle of Equivalent : identity q.v., but more than this the Doctrine of Specificity q.v. links also not just the totality of the one with the totality of the other but specific part or unit of one with specific part or unit of the other.

Rift between Science and Philosophy-as manifested above the rift between Science and Philosophy is eliminated especially in the Metaphor of the Building of Knowledge as per above q.v.

Proportionality in the Enunciation of Principles –in enunciating the proportionality of Principles one would be ‘uncovering’ the ‘inherent and necessary’ proportionality of the mass universe as per the above.

Proportionality Proper as a Tool of Discovery-as a tool of discovery proportion is the easiest and most reliable because in enunciating and ‘uncovering’ proportion one has only to assert Mathematical Proportion as a Tool of Discovery – mathematical proportion is part of proportionality but is not co-terminous with it; and is limited; whilst proportionality is not

limited; hence the 'edge' of proportion proper as a tool of discovery over 'mathematical proportion'

Proportion as Verification in : of Science (Scientific Principles) – the widespreadness, reliability and easiness of assertion of proportion makes it the most verifiable of assertions by the mere assertion thereof, that is the assertion of a proportion as related to the other proportions which together making the 'Reality' (in terms of the 'Old Science') of the mass universe

Evolutional Descent from Physics to Biology – from the Rim of the mass universe inwards Principles evolve as proportion from proportion in ever-increase till from the situs of the Rim where there is Physics we arrive at the much inner (from the Rim inwards) situs of the Biology; that is the more that proportion from proportion is made in ever-increase the more we move from the realm of the Physics in to the realm of the Biology; however this manifests at the same time that the two realms are united relative and eventually 'one monad reign'

Rule of Proportion the Same in All Stages of Evolutional Descent –this has just been manifested in the immediately preceding paragraph; the necessity – both in the Ideal State and in the Practical State – is also therein manifested

Rule of Proportion remains always Sovereign, Constant and Continuous in All stages of Evolutionary Descent – this has been manifested in the immediately preceding paragraphs

Rule of Proportion common to all types and levels of Evolution – this has been manifested in the immediately preceding paragraphs

Principles of Mind – these Principles are Proportions which are the highest level of Proportions so far enunciated; by 'highest level' we mean that level of enunciated Proportions which is 'proportion of proportion of proportion' type and so on

On the Law of Boiling into Protoplasms of Ens – this is the title of a scientific work of mine wherein I manifested, put down and enunciated a number of Proportions through which the life processes would 'of necessity' have their genesis

Hypotheses and Theories vis-à-vis Enunciations – the sovereign importance of proportion and the equivalent : identity of enunciation : assertion with verification as per above manifests that this is the equivalent : identity in terms of the Principle of Equivalent Identity q.v. of the 'necessary' identity of hypotheses and Theories with Enunciations so long and to the extent that - as the derivation of 'proportion from proportion' is observed in the assertion : enunciation thereof

Value of Hypotheses and Theories- for this see the immediately preceding paragraph

Hypotheses, Theories et as the Equivalence of Infinite Reality et -

Since that hypothesis theories et are equivalent : identities insofar as asserted : enunciated through proportions ('proportio ex proportio') and these proportions make up the mass universe therefore accordingly and in as direct proportion they make up 'Infinite Reality' (of the 'Old Science').

Proportionality as the Genesis of all Principles in the Mass Universe -

Proportionality in Non-Living Processes –

Proportionality in Living Processes –

The Connected Jar Principle – the Principle whereby especially in protoplasms of ens and in the s/c life process[ess] matter : energy whether in the form of prevalent mass percentage or in the form of prevalent energy percentage passes through channel to channel as is in fact manifested in the body of say humans.

The Law of Stages –

The Moment of Collapse -

New Principles in Genetics –

Principle of Shifting of Genes –

Principle of Rattling of Genes –

The New Meaning [Additional Meaning] of Verification in Science –

The Genesis of Life (On the Law of Boiling into Protoplasms of Ens)

In the Genetics Principles akin to the Principles of Mechanics (as for instance enunciated by Newton in his *Principia*) are 'the other face of the coin' to the whole coin of Genetics and indeed are the key – should be the key – towards opening the doors of the Genetics more than the present continuous collection of empirical data, of empirical observation and experiment. Not that the present continuous collection of empirical data, of empirical observation and experiment must not continue : these indeed must be accelerated and their discoverers given more due than presently given to them : these discoverers are the fuel that must light the fire that must be the genesis of enunciation of Principles, desirable as above-mentioned.

13/12/2007

Republic Day

7.31 A.M.

APPENDIX 1

GENERAL DICTA REGARDING THE MASS UNIVERSE

- 1-Everything exists within the confines of a universe
- 2-All that exists must lie spatially within the confines of a universe
- 3-There are two universes : mentalist and physicalist
- 4-The mentalist universe has no confines and can have no confines but is and must be spatial that occupying space
- 5-Space is the existent thing that requires the least physical data (physicality, physicalism) in it
- 6-The mentalist universe has just this minimum amount of the physical – that is space
- 7-Space need not be perceived
- 8-Space is *known* by the human mind or mens
- 9-That space is known by the human mind or mens is ‘proven’ by the Idea of Infinity
- 10-The space that one knows in the mind and the space of the mentalist universe cannot but be the same space – because
- 11-The space known by the human mind is the Idea of Infinity and
- 12-The space of the mentalist universe is the Idea of Infinity
- 13-The space of the mentalist universe is therefore infinite
- 14-The space of the (physical) Physicalist universe is finite
- 15-The infinite contains all finites
- 16-Therefore and accordingly the space of the mentalist universe must include the space of the physicalist universe or universes