



Senatorius Sacerdos
Harpyiae

Senatorius Sacerdos Harpyiae

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law

LIFE WAS

Let us assume that all of our views are clouded by our own egos.

Our perspective is that of a single organism on an essentially insignificant orb in a not particularly significant location in the universe.

There are no certain limits, physical or otherwise to the universe.

Our ego, our sense of self, needs us to be special so that we can feel some degree of security.

What if we look at ourselves as among the least probable things to happen in a universe of simple causality?

Chance rolled the dice with the random spontaneous emergence of matter in the void.

The future of that mass/energy packet was then entirely mechanical, with chance modifying the course as a result of encounters with other random quanta.

As complexity grew the impact of chance encounters diminished.

Clear branches of complexity became apparent.

With a near infinite domain to play in, near infinite improbabilities become relatively commonplace.

It's funny to think that by asserting that an improbable event is unique, its improbability is actually increased.

We came to exist because the constituents and conditions for our chemistry exist at this particular point in the life cycle of this locality within the universe.

"That which is not deemed unlawful shall be known to be lawful".

If a higher level of complexity could be achieved, if the basic physics of the universe permit a particular combination, that combination will be achieved.

It is the nature of all dualities to seek union. The concept of emergent complexity assumes that complexity will increase as soon as conditions permit. It is therefore the conditions that moulded our form.

Life as we know it is carbon-based with hydrogen and oxygen (plus a few other essentials) as the key components.

We would only occur in an initial environment with the optimum carbon content. Wherever there is a region of optimum carbon content with all other prebiotic conditions met, we will occur.

Carbon readily forms a wide range of compounds under many of the conditions found on earth. Indications are that these reactions will only occur within specific ranges of conditions.

We will only occur when the environmental conditions are favourable for the particular reaction. We will always occur when the chemistry is correct.

And we speak of chemistry in love.

I am not aware of any other group of elements that fall in the appropriate atomic weight range for early synthesis that can replace the hydrocarbon molecules for their potential for complexity.

No hypothesis for non-carbon 'life' has satisfied me as the elegance of carbon has.

A side note of interest is that these atoms plus nitrogen are numerically balanced – H=1,1 C=6,6,6 N=7,7,7 O=8,8,8. 666 the mark of the beast, the mark of man.

This permits us to accept that while we are probably (The Milky Way is an old galaxy!) amongst the very highest levels of complexity in the universe, it is actually more probable that we are very common.

One set of chemicals within a specific range of conditions will lead to life. We know this because it has.

Our science suggests that no other group of elements seems to show any likelihood of being pre-biotic under any conditions we have subjected them to thus far.

We know that these conditions can exist because we exist. Our science suggests that there is nothing particularly special about earth or its time and place in the universe, that the elements we know locally are the same as anywhere else.

Every step in complexity occurred because every possibility was attempted. If the union is lawful it proceeds. And so it goes on.

As complexity increases the number of lawful recombination's diminishes. I am sure that if it were surveyed, that a similarity in DNA would be found between people of similar beliefs – genetic predisposition to religion and politics.

There's still a mighty large chunk of DNA yet unmapped – some 97% often referred to as 'junk DNA'. The correlations will be there to be found.

So, I would assert that life is not uncommon in the universe and that where it occurs it is essentially similar to us – same initial conditions, same problems, and same solutions.

We are simply the result of 'emergent complexity'. Place the right ingredients in the bowl, mix properly and cook under the optimum conditions and you will have life as we know it.

And on then, to the darker side of our chemistry. Why do we seem to have 'will'? What is this 'sentience' thing?

Our brains, the greatest among many species, is clearly the most complex thing within our region of the universe.

While the faith of many requires that we be more than our chemistry, there is little real evidence that this is so.

No one knows why the brain does what it does, but it does seem to do what it does through electrochemical means.

That would suggest that every 'thought' you experience is one of the possibilities that can be mixed with the chemistry available – remembering that the brain chemistry is constantly being modified by outside influences via the senses.

In a quiet part of the brain, 'thoughts' and 'feelings' can be evaluated, subject to the attention demanded by the outside world. At some point a chemical cocktail is mixed that triggers the 'action' command to the body and off we go.

It is our memory that gives us the illusion of having made choices. We recall all of the alternatives considered and have the impression that we dismissed them under will.

The simple fact is that none of them led to the right chemical combination to trigger action.

The fundamental particle, from the moment of its spontaneous emergence, has no autonomy whatsoever. It will interact in accordance with the universal law of particle interactions.

All probabilities will be tried, those that are possible will occur.

We are conscious of the process and confuse that with control.

I would suggest that 'intelligence' and 'sentience' are a function of memory capacity and retrieval efficiency. Language is the indexing system.

Societal code is based on the dominant interpretation of the language.

Words have more than their intrinsic meaning, they also have the societal value attached.

Very little of our own idea of 'good' and 'bad' is self-originated – it has been imposed.

Those outside of the dominant group, those who have either a different 'feel good' chemistry, or who have unusual methods of achieving their 'feel good' chemistry, are, naturally, marginalised.

The bell curve begins to become very well populated as complexity increases. There will be a significant 'norm' in the range of each characteristic, but with many points on the spectrum represented.

I would suggest that sentience is an illusion; that we do not 'think', we only remember, correlate, and form new patterns out of existing experience.

Our notion of thought and feeling is purely a physiological reaction to our internal chemistry.

All outcomes that are possible will occur.

- **Adamas 161**

Love is the Law. Love under Will