

Causality

In bridging mind and matter, we have to climb the Eiger North Face of philosophy: Causality. Any phenomenon possesses structure and property. Causality is property. Structure is the condition of perceiving of the property. When searching for a sufficient cause we search for, and analyze, structure. If the phenomena studied are varied and numerous, the structure established consists of factors, i.e. we perform a factorial analysis. If the phenomenon studied is a singularity, the structure found is a symmetry. Singularities and sets that neither yield a factorial structure nor one of symmetry we call amorphous. Factors and symmetries are the fundamentals of nomothetic knowledge, while amorphous phenomena are the objects of idiographic descriptions.

Thus, three levels of epistemic description exist: Two of them, symmetry and factorial structure, are symbolic, in that they are more condensed than the phenomenon. The third one is sequential. It either is of equal length as the phenomenon, or is incomplete. If none of these options of description apply, then the phenomenon does not exist. For causality to exist at all it needs to be grasped by either one of the 3 patterns of description.

Causality is a singularity. Only a symmetric or an amorphous description is possible. The latter one is the one by which causality is known to date. All we can hope for in solving the enigma of causality is to find a description that would reveal a yet unknown structure of symmetry.

In studying a singularity in search for a nomothetic description we spread the phenomenon either in space or in time, or both. The defining feature of a singularity is that exactly this is impossible to do, because otherwise it would not be a singularity. This is certainly true for causality, too. Therefore, instead of studying causality as such, we study phenomena that are singularities in time or space, and on them we perform the operation mentioned, i.e. spreading them in space and time.

In the previous chapter we introduced a twofold and therefore possibly confusing use of the term singularity, denoting an abstract concept of doubtful ontology as well as an observable phenomenon. As long as we keep this twofold use in mind we may as well adhere to the term.

The vicarious use of a phenomenon for a concept implies the assumption that both are necessarily related. One might maintain that singular phenomena are not caused, which then would exactly be why they are singular. This, though, is a circle. If there is "a reason why" then there IS a reason. So, while singular phenomena may be caused or may not be caused, their relation to their pertaining concept is a necessary one. In Platonic terms this would mean that methexis is necessary, while ordo is not necessary.

Nothing has been decided yet as to whether the singularity to be studied should be a phenomenon taken from the humanities, or from the sciences. The concept of a singularity should pertain to both, unless the structure of causes differs in them. So far, we must assume, though, that a cause is a cause, regardless of what is being caused. Therefore, studying a black hole or a singular historical event - if such one can be found - is of equal relevance to causality. As nothing much of black holes is known we might as well decide for the latter. A historical event constitutes a singularity, if it constitutes a discontinuity in the sequence of history.

[...
In the paragraph skipped here it is explained how from Goedel's undecidability theorem it follows that for causality to exist a region of the physical reality must exist where causality does not rule, and where physical reality comes into being, uncaused.
...]

A theoretical physicist might wonder if all this is leading to is advertising the Higgs field as THE causality field. Wrong. Reductionism IS wrong, or else mind and matter belong to different worlds.

The problem of causality cannot be solved by thinking, but only by doing. We need a technological frame to model our understanding of the matter, need to realize this frame, then to see if it "works" in a very literal sense. This technological frame is what we are after. - This scientific process is different from science as the latter has been being performed so far. The largest cyclotron is still a pair of scales, or a clock, i.e. a measuring device. Doing science technologywise differs from this tradition ... [to be continued]

(c) 2007 by Walter Ratjen, webmaster@consciousness.de