Lancelot Law Whyte Unitary Field Theory

Roger J. Anderton
UK
e-mail: R.J.Anderton@btinternet.com

The development of Einstein and his co-workers on Unified Field Theory has been mostly ignored. I will be dealing with some of the work that has gone into that area. Lancelot Law Whyte introduced the idea which he called Unitary Principle to unify physics and the rest of the science. The basic idea is that of an organizing process at work in the universe; an idea that has a long history.

1. Introduction

Lancelot Law Whyte's obituary in the British Journal for the Philosophy of Science goes as follows: [1]

> "Lancelot Law Whyte who died on 14 September 1972, was the fourth Chairman of the Philosophy of Science Group of the British Society for the History of Science, as our Society was then called, and held office from 1953 to 1955."

And thus with his death, his work was allowed to be mostly forgotten. The way the Mainstream Academia seems to work is – to promote certain theories and allow others to be forgotten when the person behind that theory dies.

Whyte's theory was the Unified Field Theory, which he worked on with Einstein. The obituary continues: [1]

> "In the later 1950s Whyte became very interested in the ideas of Boscovich, particularly his concept of point-like atoms."

Whyte was promoting Boscovich's theory; which he modified in his development of Unified Field Theory. Since Whyte was the main promoter of Boscovich's theory, after Whyte died Boscovich's theory was also allowed to be mostly forgotten. I.e. there is a tradition of work on Unified Field Theory, and it's allowed to be mostly forgotten.

The main workers on it die – Einstein dies, later Whyte dies, others associated with this die, and Mainstream Academia's response is to let it be mostly forgotten. It is a fairly big tradition of theorizing, but Academia decides not to promote it, hence only a few people end up working on it and then it dies with them.

This allowing a theoretical tradition to practically die out is related to a Principle as noted by Planck [2]: "a new scientific truth does not triumph by converting its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it." In the case of Whyte, enough opponents killed off any generation from being allowed to keep the tradition going.

Einstein refused to accept the quantum revolution as noted by Time Magazine: [3]

> "But he was stubborn on other scientific issues. As he admitted in his later years: "I have become an obstinate heretic in the eyes of my colleagues. In Princeton, they consider me an old fool." He had earned this new reputation by his continued objections to what had become the basic conceptual tool for studying atomic structure: quantum mechanics, a statistical way of looking at the atom that Einstein himself had helped develop by using Planck's quanta to explain the nature of light."

His being dismissed as an "old fool" was how the publicity mechanism managed to dismiss Einstein later work and the work of his colleagues on Unified Field Theory. The obituary of Whyte sums up the basic idea: [1]

> "He {Whyte] was particularly fascinated by aspects of form and he edited a work with that title. In the Unitary Principle in Physics and Biology he argued that it is a fundamental principle of nature that asymmetry decreases and gives place to symmetry."

This idea of the transition from asymmetry to symmetry is an organizing process; as time passes structures become more organized. Further detail in the obituary: [1]

> "In his last years, Whyte turned his attention to evolutionary biology and the development of a hierarchical order in nature. He believed that in living creatures an internal organizing principle operated and that natural selection and Mendelian genetics were not the sole factors at work."

2. The Unitary Principle

This organizing process he called the Unitary Principle and claimed it unified the different branches of science (unitary meaning unified). This idea of organizing process goes back to ancient times, at least as far as Aristotle. Whyte says: [4, p22]

> "The idea of a formative process is latent in ancient thought, but was perhaps most clearly expressed by Aristotle, who conceived the world process as a striving after form. His conception of the realization of potential form is also relevant, though limited by its special philosophical context. These vague suggestions of a formative tendency reappear two thousand years later, and acquire increasing precision in Goethe's conception of the Gestalt, Blumenbach's Bildungstrieb (nisus formativus) of the organic realm, Haeckel's and Roux's formative process, the morphogenetic studies of recent exact biology, and the orienting forces involved in the formation of molecules and crystals and in organic synthesis arid organization."

Whyte calls the idea the unitary principle and explains it: [4, p22]

> "The following aspects of the unitary principle have already been recognized: the vague conception of a formative process; the view of process as a movement from instability towards stability; the interpretation of instability as due to

differences and the association of stability with symmetry; the possibility of one-way causation; and the importance of asymmetrical relations. Each of these has been discussed separately during the last hundred years, but it is only through their fusion in one constructive principle that their full significance becomes evident."

Whyte believes it unifies science in the context of physics: [4, p29]

"…as regards the six main branches of fundamental physical theory: Atomic Theory, Classical Dynamical Theory, Field Theory, Relativity Theory, early Quantum Theory, and Quantum Mechanical (Statistical) Theory. The purpose is briefly to indicate how each of these theoretical methods may have owed both its success and its limitations to the fact that it took account of certain limited aspects of the unitary process. In order to represent process the intellect must assume some."

The math modeling process: take a simple model, then update. I take it to mean by update to these branches of physical theory to include unitary principle; then they start looking more unified.

The Unitary Principle needs to be contrasted with entropy. Eddington using entropy for the origins of the universe gives us the conclusion that God exists as follows: After worrying about the universe running down as given by the thermodynamic law of entropy, Eddington says: [5]

"Travelling backwards in time into the past we find a world [he means –universe] with more and more organization. If there is no barrier to stop us earlier we must reach a moment when the energy of the world [universe] was wholly organized with none of the random element in it. It is impossible to go back any further under the present system of natural law."

I.e. under the natural law of entropy where everything is getting more disorganized, we can conceive of a starting point to the universe where there is perfect organization and we can't conceive of anything before this. Eddington continues:

"I do not think the phrase 'wholly organized' begs the question. The organization we are concerned with is exactly definable, and there is a limit at which it becomes perfect. There is not an infinite series of states of higher and still higher organization; nor. I think, is the limit one which is ultimately approached more and more slowly. Complete organization is not more immune from loss than incomplete organization.

There is no doubt that the scheme of physics as it has stood for the last three-quarters of a century[writing at 1928] postulates a date at which either the entities of the universe were created in a state of high organization, or pre-existing entities were endowed with that organization which they have been squandering ever since. Moreover, this organization is admittedly the antithesis of chance. It is something that could not occur fortuitously.

This has long been used as an argument against a too aggressive materialism. It has been quoted as scientific proof of the intervention of the Creator at a time not infinitely remote from today. But I am not advocating that we draw any hasty conclusions from it. Scientists and theologians alike must regard as somewhat crude the naïve theological doctrine which (suitably disguised) is at present found in every textbook of thermodynamics, namely that some billions of years ago God wound up the material universe and has left it to chance ever since." [5, p 84]

I.e. based upon assumption of entropy we have idea that universe started from perfect organization before random chance started to make it disorganized; and setting the universe off in perfect organization suggests a God doing this.

The entropy idea is just of course an assumption; so taking it as part of way to look at universe it gives that consequence; but of course there are other ways of looking at universe e.g. of self-organizing effect; and that self-organizing effect might be interpreted by some as God. Any way going by entropy model of universe, Eddington says: "This should be regarded as the working hypothesis of thermodynamics rather than its declaration of faith." I.e. we look upon it as a math model rather than interpret it as being absolutely true; it is only our approximation in attempting to describe physical reality. Eddington: [5, p 85]

"It is one of those conclusions from which we can see no logical escape." I.e. if the assumption of entropy is true then it leads to the consequence of a God - only it suffers from the drawback that it is incredible.

"As a scientist I simply do not believe that the present order of things started with a bang; unscientifically I feel equally unwilling to accept the implied discontinuity in the divine nature. But I can make no suggestion to evade the deadlock."

Clearly, then the Unitary Principle might be used to overcome this difficulty with entropy; usually scientists don't want to overcome a difficulty with theory by invoking God to fix the theory; and instead want some other explanation. In the Unitary Principle – the nature of the universe is that it is self-organizing; the sub-atomic particles are forming into ever more organized patterns (or is it more complicated patterns?) – As asymmetry changes into symmetry. Entropy is that the subatomic particles are becoming more disorganized in the patterns they form. Instead of that posit that, we posit that they become more organized. This overcomes the difficult –of why if entropy says more disorganization occurs, is there organization occurring? Which implies an answer of God to fix this fault with entropy not being able to fit the facts as we seem to observe them.

Of course the problem with Unitary Principle is that some people would interpret that as God at work. And that is the history of the formative idea that some have thought of it as God. The basic idea of Unitary principle has gone by many names.

18th - 20th Century Researchers

Anamorphosis	Ludwig von Bertalanffy
Astral Light	H. P. Blavatsky
Biomagnetism	George De la Warr
Bioplasma	V. S. Grischenko
Elan Vital	Henri Bergson
Eloptic Energy	Thomas Galen Hieronymus
Etheric Force	Radiesthists
Etheric Formative Forces	Rudolf Steiner
Gestaltung	Johann Wolfgang von Goethe
Integrative Tendency	Arthur Koestler
Kirlian Energy	Czech
Lebenskraft (Vital Force)	Samuel Hahnemann
Libido	Sigmund Freud

Life Fields (L-Fields)	Harold Saxon Burr
Life Force	Luigi Galvani
Morphogenetic (M-) Fields	Rupert Sheldrake
Magnetic Fluid	Anton Mesmer
Magnetoelectricity	William T. Tiller
Negative Entropy	Erwin Schroedinger
Noetic Energy	Charles Muses
Od, Odyllic, Odic Force	Karl von Reichenbach
Orgone Energy	Wilhelm Reich
Primary Perception	Cleve Backster
Psi Faculty	J. B. Rhine
Psi Plasma	Andrija Puharich
Psionics	John W. Campbell
Psychotronic Energy	Robert Pavlita
Synchronicity	Carl Gustav Jung
Synergy	Abraham Maslow
Unitary Principle in Nature	L. L. Whyte
Universal Energy Field	Barbara Brennan
Universal Intelligence	Chiropractic
Will to live	Western Medicine

There are various articles considering this Life force as God such as: "Liberated Theology: God as Life Force, Power as Energy, and Integrity not Morality as the Governing Principle" by Michele Toomey [6-7]

Another issue to note is the association of this idea of Life force with ether, as its use as noted above as "Etheric force". The way that it is interpreted needs to be considered as subjective in the following way: People are all different; they go through different thinking processes; we can construct a thinking process based on starting from accepting different initial assumptions; hence create different philosophic points-of-view.

Hence the way that some people would think; they would think Unitary Principle was God at work, while others might think it just a property of nature. All depends thus on philosophy. What is natural to one person because of their personal beliefs is not interpreted by another person with a different set of beliefs.

Science itself has been affected by different philosophic points-of-view; it leads to conflict in interpretation of experiment etc. The way of proceeding is math modeling – we form as simple math model as possible and look to see if it fits experiment, if it does not then update is required.

That is the method we pursue since Galileo, but some refuse to do it that way and that leads to conflict and contradictions in the different ways people talk about science. And also there are other issues that need to be addressed like – whether the assumptions that the math model is based on is contradictory or not – if a math model is contradictory then some people appear to accept it if it agrees with experiment. But a math model that is contradictory predicts more than one result to an experiment, so people who accept such a model must probably be ignoring the contradictory result from the model that does not agree with experiment. According to Baranski: [8]

> "L.L. Whyte of England set forth, in 1949, UFT which claims to be the latest belief matrix of pure science. This means that UFT claims to be the most fundamental and most encompassing current unifying theory of pure science. However, in order to earn its right to this title, the concepts of UFT when fully developed must both withstand challenges from the totality of methods of pure science and prove that it can solve all the yet unsolved problems of pure science."

Theodore Roszak's explanation follows: [9] "…he [Whyte] was already in the grip of a grand, holistic vision of nature. He called it "the unitary principle."

His vision was pinned to the fundamental fact of hierarchy in nature: the qualitative ordering of ontological levels. He looked for a truth that unified without mechanistic or materialistic distortion; something that could be independently and manifestly perceived at all levels of nature and which worked *its way up* toward completion at the higher echelons of the natural hierarchy. He found what he was after in the dynamics of form.

Whyte pits this "universal hierarchy of morphic processes" against the entropic tendency which is conventionally held to be carrying all things inexorably toward dissipation and doom. It is one of his main purposes to dislodge the second law of thermodynamics from its central position in science. At the time of writing there were two cosmological theories – Big Bang theory and Steady State theory. Roszak says: [9]

> "He [Whyte] observes the obvious, but much neglected contradiction: that in a universe supposedly governed by entropy, the two cosmologies astronomers now offer us are antientropic. Either the universe holds to a steady state, or it is exploding outward from a "big bang" that followed the superconcentration of some primordial cosmic dust. In either case, the universe is characterized by order, not entropy."

3. Conclusion

That fairly sums up the situation- there is a Unitary Principle at work (which goes under various different names) that counteracts entropy and is being mostly ignored by the mainstream. Many go through mainstream training in physics, they are informed there is no unified field theory and so some of them decide to go and invent their own pet theories; they do this rather than realize that there is an existing tradition that can be tapped into; merely their education system had decided to not mention it to them.

References

[1] "L. L. Whyte, 1896-1972" *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* **24**(1):91-92 (1973); doi:10.1093/bjps/24.1.91, http://bjps.oxfordjournals.org/ cgi/pdf_extract/24/1/91

[2] Sharon G. Levin, Paula E. Stephan, Mary Beth Walker, "Planck's Principle Revisited: A Note", *Social Studies of Science* **25**(2): 275-283 (May 1995), http://www.jstor.org/pss/285535.

[3] "The Year of Dr. Einstein", *Time*, (Mon., Feb. 19, 1979) http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,912381-10,00.html.

[4] L. L. Whyte, **The Unitary Principle in Physics and Biology** (Cresset Press,. London, 1949), http://www.dpedtech.com/UNITARY-PRINCIPLE.pdf.

[5] A. S. Eddington, **The Nature of the Physical World**, (Cambridge at the University Press, 1929, based on 1927 lectures).

[6] "Life Force Energy in World Cultures", http://tombender.org/bolchaps/apxa_lifeforcenergylist.pdf.

[7] Michele Toomey, "Liberated Theology: God as Life Force, Power as Energy, and Integrity not Morality as the Governing Principle" (2008), http://www.mtoomey.com/Liberated_Theology.html.

[8] Leo J. Baranski, "An Outline Summary of Unitary Field Theory", *Culturology* **1**(1) (June, 1968), http://www.dpedtech.com/_UFT-sum.pdf.

[9] Theodore Roszak, "The Rehabilitation of Natural Philosophy", *Manas* **28**(25) (Reprint June 18, 1975), http://www._manasjournal.org/pdf_library/VolumeXXVIII_1975/XXVIII-25.pdf.