

General knowledge of physics.

In the Duden is to be read, what is to be understood as science: (A justified, orderly, considered for secured) knowledge-producing research activity in a certain area '.

It can be assumed that a science cannot really have an ordered, for sure respected knowledge if there is one or more inconsistencies in the corresponding theories or beliefs.

If we look at the current physics, we have the impression that it has a fairly well-secured knowledge. Does it really have that? It cannot be denied that physicists are currently searching for a world formula that can virtually describe reality in a realistic way. Can physics do that if it does not have uniform models yet?

The fact that the physicists work with different cosmic models can be read in general. One can also read that these models are all not yet consistent and therefore still have any inconsistencies. If that were not so, we would have the so-called world formula and this would be of course already on everyone's lips. But we do not have this world formula yet. So obviously we do not have any secured knowledge yet. Let's look at the general level of knowledge of physics!

Stephen Hawking, in his books, says that physics cannot say whether the material world is a real world or an imaginary world: Quotations:

“This might suggest that the so-called imaginary time is really the real time, and that what we call real time is just a figment of our imaginations. ... So maybe what we call imaginary time is really more basic, and what we call real is just an idea that we invent to help us describe what we think the universe is like.”

Stephen W. Hawking in: a brief history of time

“In real time, the universe has a beginning and an end at singularities that form a boundary to space-time and at which the laws of science break down. But in imaginary time, there are no singularities or boundaries.”

Stephen W. Hawking in: a brief history of time

Note: If the General Relativity Theory (GRT) predicts the big bang by means of mathematical models, but cannot describe the big bang itself because of the singularity because there the math fails, does the GRT then have a real consistency and can it then convey a secured knowledge?

“However, from a positivist viewpoint, one can't ask "which is reality - brane or bubble". They are both mathematical models that describe the observations. One is free to use whichever model is most convenient.”

Stephen W. Hawking in: the universe in a nutshell

"... So maybe we think we live in a four-dimensional world because we are shadows cast on the brane by what is happening in the interior of the bubble. ..."

Stephen W. Hawking in: universe in a nutshell.

Gödel 's theorem, together with Heisenberg's uncertainty principle and chaos theory, form a corset of limitations to scientific knowledge, that came to be appreciated only during the XX-th century.

Stephen W. Hawking in: the universe in a nutshell

These are quotations from which we can assume that they reflect the general state of knowledge of physics. We do not have a secured knowledge yet!!! It is also clear where the boundaries of the previous sciences lie. But it is not that there is no way out of this dilemma. Well-known scientists have always provided indications for this way out. Quotes:

The recognition of truth can only be guaranteed by a determined step into the realm of metaphysics.

Max Planck

"I want to do for metaphysics what Newton did for physics"

Kurt Gödel; Austrian-American mathematician and one of the most important logicians of the 20th century"

"The perceived multiplicity is only an illusion, it consists not in reality"

Erwin Schrödinger (one of the fathers of quantum physics): My World View, Hamburg-Vienna 1961, p. 40.

Now, if we work with the merely physical explanation of the sciences, around which there is obviously a corset of scientific knowledge limitations, what sense does it make to base our exploration on this explanation? The results will then always be such that one can never say that it correspond to reality. They can be as much a mere figment of fantasy that has to do with imagination.

Incidentally, a friend told that as a child he felt that what is experienced during physical sleep is real, and that what happens in the wakefulness of the body is a dream. His parents later told him that he had that opinion. He himself had forgotten how he had felt as a child. If the scientists are no longer sure what is real or what is imaginary, why should this friend at that time, when he still had his 'childlike' opinion, have been so wrong?

But now we are beings who are constantly in search of the truth. Is not this striving the strongest indication that there must be more than just the observed? We ask about the meaning of life and also about the basic principles of life. **But without the inclusion of metaphysics, we will never go beyond the possibility of penetrating deeper into the mystery of our lives.**

Although the sciences are cooped in the mentioned corset, they provide clues that there are more answers. They clearly tell us that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts:

X (sum of the parts) + Y (rest) = Z (the whole)

Where other than in the small-seeming rest $Y > 0$ can the answers be found of all our questions? We're not satisfied with the spongy X, in which we do not really know if it's real or a fantasy. We want to know what's behind the Y.

Interestingly, even Stephen W. Hawking, who was considered a materialist, speaks by representing different cosmic models of how we humans could be shadows cast on the brane by what is happening in the interior of the bubble. Inside there would be something to suspect that we can call light (light-shadow-game). It is clear that there are no shadows without light.

Interestingly enough, by the way, is also the Cave Allegory of Plato (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Allegory_of_the_Cave), also a light-shadow game).

The very idea of Stephen W. Hawking, when we take a closer look at the light inside the bubble, in the truest sense of the word, it provides another starting point for throwing light into the dark. Let us allow ourselves to be the 'runaway' mentioned in the Cave Allegory, who looks at the light. Let's be the runaway from the mainstream sciences, who in turn are content to just scratch the surface.

But as we go further into the depths of being there will be much more to discover. Then we will also be able to recognize that we are far more than we thought we hoped. Since this area is still often unconscious or hidden, we cannot avoid asking what is at home in this area: the light (= the spirit) of the higher order!!!

If physics seems to describe our world quite well, it does not necessarily mean that it can describe reality. This can be seen from the fact that physics works with models that no one has ever seen in reality. For example, nobody has ever seen an electron, proton or quark with his own eyes. Basically, force fields themselves are invisible. We can make visible only the effects of forces acting in the field. Furthermore it is not really provable that this world is real or an imaginary world (statement by Stephen W. Hawking). And an imaginary world can be something like a psycho-energetic Fata morgana. **A Fata morgana gives the impression of being real, but does not have to be real.** And so the material world can be quite a psycho-energetic Fata Morgana, which is quite conceivable from a scientific point of view. **We cannot prove the opposite in the current state of knowledge of the natural sciences.** The models, on the other hand, because they are not identical with the reality to be described, have a lower degree of reality. And if then the reality to be described is itself something like a psycho-energetic Fata Morgana, the models are two times 'away' from the true reality.

Again, it may be true that the sciences are currently able to describe the world amazingly well. But they must be aware of the possibility, that they may only describe an illusion, not the reality. It is probably true that a Fata morgana has something to do with the true landscape (reality). And so it is logical that behind an

illusory world (psycho-energetic Fata morgana) a real world has to hide. If it is conceivable that the material world is such a psycho-energetic Fata morgana, it is possible that there is a reality that has at least a higher degree of reality. **These questions are not clear in the current state of knowledge of the natural sciences and are currently open questions that scream for answers!!!**

So if science has the claim to convey secure knowledge, it is called upon to turn its attention to metaphysics. If it does not do that, or if it refuses, it does not really deserve the name science.