

# POSSIBILITY OF COSMOS EVOLUTION.

Milos Abadzic, Belgrade, Serbia, E-mail: milabster@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

*In the work [1] one of the questions was whether the nature of single-use, with suggestions that it is not. This question is one of the fundamental with far reaching consequences on our understanding of Nature. Suggested designation requires serious changes in the approach to observation of nature in general, and especially in defining the initial attitudes already in setting the basic conception its coherent model. Here are indicated the three basic conditions that such a model would have to accept. They were not difficult to set up, but there are two big obstacles for them:*

- *First, to find a natural model of their fulfillment.*
- *Second that such a model would be accepted, because it has significantly deviated from till now based attitudes of the Nature.*

*NMN model [2] provides one such solution, which provides for the possibility of evolution of nature during its life, without interrupting this evolution at the universe's level, but predicts the cyclical changes of its limited space. This article should be viewed keeping in mind [1] and [3] presented at this conference.*

## THREE BASIC REQUIREMENTS.

Before analyze these possibilities I would make a small digression to watching the nature that surrounds us. One of its specificity, which we can easily perceive and register by our senses, is cyclic appearance of the living phenomenon's forms. They birth themselves, do some functions within their dwelling place and die<sup>1</sup>. Between these end-time points they gradually to adapt to possible changes of external conditions in which reside, especially those that are repeated in a certain extent. This process of adjustment represents the Darwin's Theory of natural selection. Without these processes to maintain the sorts by changed conditions, often with drastically changed the values of parameters necessary for life, was difficult and in many cases impossible. Very quickly, according cosmological criterions, every the life would be die out on each planet, which would spread to the entire universe. Prerequisite in the processes of evolution is the existence of cyclical time's changes the conditions in the area and same a kind of "memories" on the previous state and their changes during these periods.

At first sight it isn't related to the dead phenomenon's forms, but they maybe, in certain conditions, have their own "life" also. Perhaps the only question is in our understanding of what is the life. If we would for a short live our homocentric philosophy may be as life could mark:

---

<sup>1</sup> Notions the birth and dying should be understood in a broader sense

*It is a possibility and realization of interactive energetically processes at all levels, that occur in some structures, not by defining in advance which structure it will be and which forms of "life" could be manifest.*

In this case, could be introduced a division on the conscious and unconscious life. With this definition of life could say that in many heavenly objects present a "life" with very long life cycle which is still final, also. Energetically processes within them die out during the time because constantly emit energy in the space of cosmos. After a while, regardless of it will be ten, one hundred or more billion years, it would have to reach the "energetically death" of universe. It would be necessary to avoid some of the cyclical process similar to what happens at the level of conscious living phenomenon's forms if we would like that the whole of Nature is not for single use only.

In order to accept such ideas are needed at least three preconditions:

- Must be able to "memory or remember" on previous state of observed system in space and time and on made changes in the observed conditions.
- Existence of the processes of recovering energy resources.
- Existence of the possibility of correction.

According to the NMN model and defines the nature of non-physic's demos and their fields (menions and global mental field GMF), they are the data base and program of nature that shows the characteristics of self-organized systems. Thanks the ubiquity of this system there is a certain interaction between the cosmos and limited space, especially in its transitional periods of a cycle. This system could be a carrier of this "memory", or otherwise the holder of the organized action of Nature.

Big bang is than a process during which the energy of limited space is regenerated and allows the re-run within it's the processes enriched with new information's.

With this kind of approach Darwin's theory of evolution would have much wider significance and could be extended to the whole Nature through long periods of its development. To estimate how much of such period was so far and how will they be in the future we do not have any database that would help us in this reasoning. After all, it's not important. It will be sufficient for us to achieve an understanding of nature in its complexity in the period related to the duration of our limited space, or even existence of our Sun.

In order to make a seriously assumption about the possibility of broadening the theory of evolution at the whole Nature we must look at what they do mean in this context.

As part of this consideration raises one question more, which is connected with the issue of designing the physical laws and values of physical constants, as estimated today, in such a way that enables the existence of intelligent phenomenon's forms and development of the consciousness, not only on earth but probably around the universe. It seems to me that am present the homocentric philosophy by consideration of this problem too. Come on to try to detach from it and rely on naturocentric philosophy. Its essence would be:

*Intelligent and conscious phenomenon's forms and their structures are need to nature and form themselves according to the current conditions in it<sup>2</sup>.*

---

<sup>2</sup> This "current" is in this case, the extent billions of years.

This "need" is likely to present no matter what we still do not look it, and is an integral part of the behavior of Nature. The general impression is of a high compliance of their joint action, neglecting the short our current imprudent behavior in relation to Nature which, it seems, is not without consequence. It was announced following question:

***"Is this the level of compliance occurred by pure chance or is it a consequence of a long period of common evolution, and probably a certain level of interaction?"***

The first variant me do not seem logical and likely. It would suit the attitude of the single used of Nature, or, even less acceptable, creationism approach to its understanding. Such variant NMN model does not provide. It recommends the cyclic processes within individual limited space. Through as much as any evaluative phase the Nature so far past and what of kind the living phenomenon's forms has been achieved me doubt that we will ever know. But, adhering to this hypothesis, we can be pretty sure that with each new "generation" was present certain positive developments, no matter what it is all meant, as achieved in the conditions so in the realized variants of living phenomenon's forms. Thereby, such a process was not peculiar only for one limited space but all of them across the universe, which periodically passed through the stages quasi static's periods with the eventual appearance of a possible living phenomenon's forms. Achieved degree of evolution of one limited space became the "common good" for all other across the universe thanks to waves of menions and GMF. I don't imagine that this approach is easily acceptable, but to me it seems that it is the closer to reality than many theories based on the various paradoxes and different types of singularity.

I do not give any conclusions because it is only one question from [1], which, among others, required a response in order to set a platform for more real approach to studying Nature in all its complexity. It would be good if with these answers would be achieve basically consensus. I'm afraid that without that, our discussions about possible new models of Nature would be similar as dialogue of the deaf.

NOTE:

In this article, and some other papers I mention homocentric philosophy which means that homo sapience is placed in central events in nature and that is all subordinate to the of his needs. This is to me, one of the basic entry errors that would have let go. It reminds me, for example, the behavior of a cow that we raise it for milk and meat, and it is conceited that we are here because of it. There is put us in the position that homo sapience, and probably other live phenomenon's forms, is necessary to nature and it in a certain extent provides the conditions for living and behavior in accordance with its laws. Here's another question: "What would we do with the cow if it becomes rabid?" I will not answer it, let it all done to themselves, but they have in mind some of the current events.

## REFERENCE

- [1] [2] M.Abadžić: One step back two steps forward, 16.NPA Conference 2009.
- [2] M.Abadžić: Razmišljanja o prirodi Prirode-1: Pojave i procesi; Beograd 2007 (Concerning Nature: Part 1: Appearance and Processes; Serbian text only)
- [3] M.Abadžić: Some Quantization Problems, 16.NPA Conference 2009.