HOW I SEE IT

1. Questions

People often ask themselves questions and then give themselves convenient answers, only to fill the void of missing serious ones *(the catechesis of children heavily leverages on this, since they do not have the emotional and cognitive capabilities to refuse indoctrination)*.

Key questions:
A. How did the universe create life?
B. How and from where was the universe born?
C. Why, life?
D. Where from, ethics?
E. Sparse questions about learning and consciousness.
I cannot think about any other REALLY relevant questions.

Answers I deem I have found:
A. I waited more than 40 years – from the time I stopped believing to when I read about complexity / emergentism – to have the answer about how the universe could create life.
B. I'm happily willing to wait 400 years longer to know how and from where the universe was born, ...if it ever did (because I'm interested in a serious and sharable answer); in any case, we have plenty of time to find the answer, until the sun dies (if we don't destroy ourselves before).
C. I gave myself a precise answer to the question "why" *(see below)*.
D. I gave myself a good answer to the question about ethics (living together is dramatically important; society is meant to protect the weak, otherwise it is useless: http://www.managementexchange.com/hack/define-%22society%22-first).
E. I have some ideas about learning and consciousness.
I'm particularly interested in life and living together, and the above seems enough.

[God, in all the above, does not appear.]

2. Truth

Truth is subjective, because such is the model / representation that each of us makes of the world:
http://www.ybnd.eu/docs/Abs_rel.pdf

3. Science

Science has the nice feature to provide shared results *(as they are obtained and verified in a shared manner)*, evolvable with time *(as nobody thinks they are final)*.
For someone like me, interested in three key factors – life, living together and learning – it's hard to find something better.
Science must evolve also because the universe is "generative" (it builds – endlessly and blindly – always new behaviors, shapes and structures):
http://www.ybnd.eu/docs/Layman_complexity.pdf

4. Meaning of life

Life has no a-priori meaning. The meaning of life is the possibility to find one for it.
And everyone – who has a different model / representation of the world – may well find a different meaning.

In this respect, religions are absurd, and – most of all – they reap proselytes among those who are afraid of void, i.e. need that someone else finds for them the meaning they are unable to find on their own. If religions last since thousands of years, it is because there's no lack of this type of "customers"... *(incidentally, it's also at the core of the political problem: people buy*

phony prescriptions sold by politicians and media, instead of designing their own future by themselves).

5. Limitations

Nothing can go beyond our capability to understand, ...while everything goes beyond.
The universe evolves: it's its job. It's omnipotent in generating all that has been proved possible and everything that will be proven possible in the future.
Everything evolves beyond our capability to understand.
But nothing can go beyond our capability to understand, because it is the way in which we chase the evolution of the universe in our desire to know.
There is just an evolving boundary (the expressions of the universe) and another evolving boundary (what humans have figured out). There is always something beyond. But there is nothing we will not be able to grasp, sometime in the future.
There's only one limit: our possible self-destruction.
So we go back to the importance of living together *(we need it to be able to evolve)*, which I consider besides life *(ditto)* and learning *(ditto)*.

6. Complexity / emergentism
(http://pespmc1.vub.ac.be/Papers/ThinkingComplex.pdf; http://pespmc1.vub.ac.be/TOC.html)

I.e., from the universe as a "clock" (Laplace), or as partially indeterminate (quantum mechanics), to a "creative" universe (http://www.dailymotion.com/video/xbpcom), capable of generating always new behavioral and morphological / structural variety, and thus "omnipotent" as indicated above.

Emergentism is a hypothesis *...with the non trivial advantage that it explains everything*.
It's doubtful – and possibly even illogical – that an emergence can be explained in deterministic terms (which a determinist would naturally ask for, to be persuaded). I found a partial proof – cf. 3.1 Philosophy in the link "Layman Complexity" – with the search (endlessly carried out by chaos) of the chances to activate autocatalytic cycles (present in complex environments): it is not a full-fledged deterministic explanation (as it is perhaps impossible to provide), but it is a reasonable explanation of how the mechanics of things ...can become creative (and produce all that in the universe we see ...and we don't see yet).

I think that, sooner or later, everyone will have to deal with emergentism *...for the explanatory power it shows*, and with complexity *...which is every day more tangible*.

I do not know whether how I see it is simple.
But, all in all, it just seems so.