

# IN SEARCH OF FIRST CAUSE

How art, football fans, and the big game led to First Cause and the Theory of Everything

---

By Manuel S Morales © 2013

You live, you die, and stuff happens in between. So what is that about? If you're like me, you may have wondered how we came into existence and if our existence has a purpose, a destiny.

As an artist, I have trained myself to look at things from multiple and sometimes unorthodox perspectives in order to see beyond the obvious. So when an unexplainable event took place with the creation and completion of two of my paintings, I found myself compelled to investigate this first cause theory of everything we call destiny, which postulates that all events or series of events are predetermined. This investigation has revealed that a paradigm shift is in order.

The premise was simple, since we are all physical beings governed by the laws of nature, we cannot act in violation of our own physical existence. It was with this mindset that I devised an art experiment based on the premise that selection predetermines existence. Football fans were invited to vote online 24/7 throughout the entire year [1] for their team to appear on the next Tempt Destiny (TD) billboard. The two previous billboards were in support of SB XXI, and SB XXV championship victories, a two-for-two record that served as the benchmark for this experiment. (Note, the artwork presented on the billboards were unfinished so that if the team completed their season by winning the SB, the artwork could then be completed by painting the football silver to reflect the trophy won.) Here's the catch: The team with the most votes would also need to go to the SB in order for the selection to be complete since the sole purpose of the artwork/billboard is in support of a SB victory. This pairing of a single selection with its potential would then give us a direct selection event. In the 10th, 11th, and 12th years of this experiment, I added the event of pairing a selection with *more-than-one* potential which would give us an indirect selection when one of the *two* teams going to the SB had more votes than the other.

After twelve consecutive years of conducting the TD experiment, the empirical evidence was unequivocal by showing that there are only two mutually exclusive and jointly exhaustive acts of selection in Nature. When a selection simultaneously pairs with its potential, then and only then, does a selection come to exist which in turn causes the existence of the events that follows, i.e., *first cause*. When a noncommutative direct selection is made its effect is certain (W). When a commutative indirect selection is made its effects are uncertain (W) or (L):

- 12 direct selection events took place, only *once* did a direct selection pair with the potential of the team going to the big game - SB XLII (W)
- 3 indirect selection events took place, *each time* an indirect selection paired with the potential of the team going to the big game - SB XLIV (W), SB XLV (L), and SB XLVI (W)

*Note: If we conducted indirect selection events throughout the entire 12 year TD experiment there would have been 12 paired indirect selections with a record of (4-Wins) and (8-Loses).*

**Evidence of Absolute Determinism:** What the Tempt Destiny experiment confirmed is that the universe is indeed absolutely deterministic when we understand that to determine is to cause. The unambiguous empirical evidence shows that *when* the two fundamental causal variables come to exist their effectual states are either deterministic/certain or non-deterministic/uncertain which means that both states are determined in order to exist as such. The findings show that determinism is not about effectual states being certain or uncertain. It is about how cause is predetermined. This revelation can be best understood by conducting the coin-in-cup experiment.

**Coin-in-cup Experiment:** Since the acts of selection are universal and independent of time and location, the TD experiment is easy to repeat and conduct for yourself with just a coin and a cup. Let's say that you drop a coin *directly* into a cup (first cause); the effect is certain, for there is only one potential selected - coin-in-cup. Conversely, you drop a coin *indirectly* into the cup by dropping the coin onto the rim of the cup (first cause); the effect is uncertain, for there are more than one potential selected - coin-in-cup/coin-not-in-cup. By obtaining certain effects from a direct selection and by obtaining uncertain effects from an indirect selection, everything has been accounted for, including the non-causal possibilities of having no pairing events take place if the coin landed and remained on the cup's edge or if the cup was removed from being directly selected; therefore, we have addressed all causal and non-causal possibilities. But, what if the coin bounced out of the cup? Then we would be talking about *second cause* by placing cause *second* to effect; the coin-in-cup (effect of *first cause*) bouncing directly or indirectly (cause) out of the cup (effect), i.e., effectual causality (effect causing effect), instead of *first cause* (cause and effect).

## HOW NATURE FOOLED US

You now observe two cups, each with a coin in them - one effect for each mutually exclusive selection event. Can you tell which coin-in-cup effect was generated by a direct or indirect selection? Without knowledge of which mutually exclusive selection caused the two coin-in-cup effects, it is impossible to obtain empirical knowledge/evidence. As demonstrated, if you know what type of selection occurred, you will know in advance if the state of that selection is certain or uncertain, for the two acts of selection determine both effectual states of existence. In other words, states of existence, what we call reality, are not causal. This means that all knowledge based on effectual causality, i.e., second cause, is suspect and thus, will need to be reevaluated.

Take for example fertilization; can a sperm (effect) fertilize (cause) an egg (effect) without the acts of selection? When we assume a sperm fertilized the egg (effectual causality), we are ignoring that fertilization is an effect of the acts of selection. Hence, no selection (cause) = no existence of a fertilized egg (effect).

Another example of ignorance of first cause is that there has *never* been or *ever* will be an experiment conducted without a selection first being made. As I have exemplified in a recent article published in a peer-reviewed fundamental physics journal [2], physics ignores first cause when conducting particle accelerator experiments such as with the recent Higgs boson (a.k.a. God particle) discovery which focused on selection effects (particle collisions, i.e., second cause) as causal instead of which direct or indirect selection *first caused* the particle collision effects which in turn *secondarily caused* the decay product effects used as evidence for their discovery. By

scientific standards, you cannot have an empirical discovery without *knowledge* of cause and effect. Knowledge of effects causing effects can only lead to assumptions, not a discovery.

So you might be thinking that the empirical evidence of first cause obtained by the TD experiment validates the God theory since such a deity is based on the principle of first cause [3]. However, since there are two first cause variables, the question is which selection is good and which one is evil? Then there is the problem of such a deity being all powerful, i.e., omnipotent, which would mean that God is both good and evil. The notion of morality being associated with first cause is clearly a paradox and appears to have nothing to do with the mechanisms of selection.

#### HOW TO CONTEST THE RESULTS – Final Selection Thought Experiment

If unambiguous empirical evidence and distinct causal relationships are not to one's liking, I offer another way for the reader to reconcile the findings to his or her satisfaction by conducting the Final Selection thought experiment. Let's say that one morning upon awakening you find yourself absent of the ability to choose. This means you cannot choose to move your body whatsoever. You cannot choose to take in any fluids. You cannot choose to take in any nourishment. You cannot choose to relieve yourself, et cetera. Nor can you have others *indirectly* choose for you. The outcome is absolute. The effect of a physical system to no longer have the capacity to make direct selections is certain death. The assumption that selection is some sort of option, a freedom of will, is unsubstantiated by the fact that this machine we call choice is how energy works, which is a fundamental necessity, not a metaphysical option, of our physical existence. In other words, *when* a selection exists, energy exists, for they are one and the same. I found that we have the ability to choose because we do not have the ability to not choose in order to exist.

#### FIRST CAUSE THEORY OF EVERYTHING

The Tempt Destiny experiment provided a way to confirm that Albert Einstein was correct about the 'notion' of the existence of hidden variables which would give us a more complete description of reality [4]. However, as the unambiguous empirical evidence shows, the two causal variables of selection are not local [5] as Einstein suspected. As revealed in the "Assumed Higgs" paper [2], the causal variables of selection are not accounted for in the non-causal paradigm of quantum mechanics. The same exclusion holds true for gravity. Since gravity is understood as an attractive force and the acts of selection requires attraction for a selection to pair with its potential in order to exist, I find that the two *causal* acts of selections are reflective of a positive gravitational force (direct selection) and a negative gravitational force (indirect selection) which in turn gives rise to the *effects* of orbital momentum (strong electromagnetic gravitational force) and angular momentum (weak electromagnetic gravitational force). In my paper entitled, "Spin States of Selection: Predetermined Variables of 'bit'" [6], I mapped out the transitions and deduced the equation that energy equals gravity squared,  $E = G^2$ . The findings show that ignorance of first cause gives us the commutative perception that energy cannot be created or destroyed which does not account for the fact that the finite acts of selection do not exist until they do. *When* you have a selection, you then have existence,  $E = G^2$ . *When* you do not have a selection, you then have non-existence, i.e., space without time. Therefore, the existence and non-existence of first cause gives us a complete *First Cause Theory of Everything* and the absence thereof.

## IS GOD FIRST CAUSE?

As touched upon earlier, the notion that a *supreme being* is causal to the existence of the universe requires that such a being is first cause in order for such a theory to be valid. I was indoctrinated as a Roman Catholic from the day I was born to believe in the single God theory which required blind faith since we cannot obtain evidence of such existence. Hereto in science, I found that faith is also required for the belief in theories such as String Theory or M Theory which cannot be tested to confirm their validity. So perhaps you can understand my amazement to find that the fundamental scientific theories of our existence, thought to be validated by empirical evidence obtained in particle physics experiments, turns out to be based on non-empirical evidence instead since it is technically not feasible to distinguish which selection event first caused the particle collisions observed.

In hindsight, our approach to understanding our existence of reality by reasoning or by experimentation both requires existence or the assumption of existence. So it makes sense to assume that only something that exist, such as a God or elementary particle, causes something else, such as the universe, to exist. Such logic gives us the perception that the *effect* of something *causes* the *effect* of something, i.e., second cause. In causal terms, we are effectual beings, as such; we are hardwired to think this way. However, since facts are obtained by knowledge of cause and effect, then facts obtained by effect causing effect cannot be considered as knowledge of cause, but instead, knowledge of effect, i.e., conjecture. The importance of this distinction is paramount to understand that effects are not causal. The assumption that the existence of a God or elementary particle are first cause entities of the universe contradicts the fact that *if* they exist, then it is necessary for them to be effects of what cause them to exist. In other words, the unequivocal evidence shows us that the causal acts of selection do not exist until they do and that they *precede/cause* the existence of the effects that follow, hence, something (existence) from nothing (non-existence). This model of two absolute and all-inclusive *initial* causal variables qualifies such acts as first cause. This means that theories of the existence of a God or of an elementary particle causing the existence of the universe are based on the paradigm of second cause logic, not first cause logic. When we assume that something from nothing is impossible, we ignore the fact that this is what we do each time we make a selection. No matter how deep we dig in our search of first cause, it is impossible to do so without first making a selection.

We are faced with a conundrum. Either we accept Nature on its terms and then apply the first cause paradigm of what is causal and what is not in order to advance our knowledge of the universe; or we can ignore this discovery of first cause as an inconvenient truth in order to maintain the status quo and continue to vacillate in conjecture. As put forth by the Final Selection thought experiment, you cannot exist without the ability to select because selection and energy are one and the same. In light of the evidence obtained, perhaps it is time to reassess *how* we know what we think we know by reevaluating the second cause methods used in scientific, philosophical, and logical inquiry.

## References:

- [1] Morales, M.S. Tempt Destiny web site <<http://temptdestiny.com>> Web. 06 Dec. 2013
- [2] Morales, M.S. "Assumed Higgs Boson Discovery Proved Einstein Right." *International Journal of Fundamental Physical Sciences (IJFPS)*, Vol. 37, p. 44-47. Published in December 2012. DOI:10.14331/ijfps.2012.330035. Cited Available via <[http://fundamentaljournals.org/ijfps/downloads/35\\_IJFPS\\_Dec\\_2012\\_44\\_47.pdf](http://fundamentaljournals.org/ijfps/downloads/35_IJFPS_Dec_2012_44_47.pdf)>
- [3] "first cause". *Encyclopedia Britannica. Encyclopedia Britannica Online*. Encyclopedia Britannica Inc., 2013. Web. 06 Dec. 2013 <<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/208087/first-cause>>.
- [4] Einstein, A., B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen. "Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete?" *Physical Review* 47 (1935): 777-80. Print.
- [5] Bell, John S. "On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Paradox." *Physics* 1.3 (1964): 195-200. Print.
- [6] Morales, M.S. "Spin States of Selection: Predetermined Variables of 'bit'." *General Science Journal*. Published June 18, 2013. Cited Available via <[http://gsjournal.net/uploads/essays/unification\\_theories/essays\\_unification\\_theories\\_science\\_journal\\_4932.pdf](http://gsjournal.net/uploads/essays/unification_theories/essays_unification_theories_science_journal_4932.pdf)>

Revised: 30-Jan-2014