

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/258959904>

# God, the Creator of the multiverse. The theory of concomitance

Conference Paper · June 2013

CITATIONS

0

READS

3,021

1 author:



**Cosmin Tudor Ciocan**

Universitatea Ovidius Constanța

55 PUBLICATIONS 11 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



DIALOGO Conferences & Journal [View project](#)



2ND VIRTUAL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE DIALOGUE BETWEEN SCIENCE AND THEOLOGY [View project](#)

# God, the Creator of the multiverse

## The theory of concomitance

CIOCAN Tudor Cosmin

Faculty of Orthodox Theology “St. Ap. Andrei”

“Ovidius” University

Constanța/Romania

furnici@yahoo.com

**Abstract** – It has always started from the premise that the pattern of scientific knowledge is incompatible with the religious one; it was assumed that the models of modern scientific Cosmology – including theories of *Big Bang* and, especially, *M-theory* – cannot be explained into a theistic version. Moreover, it has been argued that these patterns of scientist thinking (under acronym ST inside the paper) may not include even presumptively the concept of God-the Creator. Though, modern science, in her unyieldingness quest to achieve an unifying theory encompassing all human knowledge itself earned till present, can no longer ignore the answer provided by religion in the great problems of mankind, i.e. *What is the universe, since when is there life, what is man?* On the other hand, the religion can no longer remain indifferent and devoid of a documented response to theories of modern Cosmology; we see this in all sorts of attempts of some adventurers’ theologians, who have been trying to “placate” the two visions into mixed, but inconsistent formulations (i.e. *Scientific Creationism* or *theological evolutionism*). If there are contradictions in your own thinking, blanks, incoherent ideas or inconsistent stance, we will not be able to set on the coordinates we engage in these discussions. Removing these inconsistencies may be made through *theory of concomitance* that I broadly sketch out here, due to the small size of the paper, while addressing the possibility of acceptance of *M-theory* by theology and by providing undeflective premises for strengthening of this *theory of everything* (TOE), a self-contained mathematical model that describes all fundamental forces and forms of existence. The theory of concomitance complements and offsets the other theories addressing the relationship religion-science, but also applies to the various cosmogony and cosmological theories – i.e. *Creation ex nihilo*, the *big bang* theories and *string theory* – showing how it should be applied or viewed in such a *theory of everything*. The element of novelty brought by the present study consist the possibility of the new scientific cosmological paradigm co-habitation with the one of religious thinking consists.

**Keywords** – *theory, concomitance, paradigms, gestalt, religion, cosmology, universe, God*

### I. INTRODUCTION

The awakening of human consciousness meant the birth of the essential questions – like *what is life, what is its source; what is the origin of the universe; what is man and what is his role in this universe?* – that were given, at the same time, various responses from the three levels of human knowledge,

religion, philosophy and science<sup>1</sup>. The definition of the scientific method and its object – as being exclusively a part of the figurative domain<sup>2</sup>, pursuing only the material (naturalist) aspects – has conferred to science a distinct path from the other two *gestalts*, non-figurative. But now science is opening to *mystery*; it recognizes its origins, its foundations that aimed precisely to this destiny, not to stop from researching the mystery, of ineffable, despite all the evidence and physical discoveries that it finds: *the road to mystery is sprinkled of physical evidence*.

The opening of the new scientific paradigm to the *mystery* (see e.g. music of the worlds in *M-theory*) demonstrates the ability of science to climb into another level of comprehension, along with philosophy and theology, that through correct and consistent knowledge of the creature, to reach glorification of the Creator. Among first proofs – forced by the time stewardship – of crediting this rational possibility of knowledge of ineffable by the scientific thinking – that was received from the Roman Catholic Theology – it is expressed in the words of *Second Vatican Council*, “God, the beginning and end of all things, can be known with certainty from the reality created by the light of human reason (see Rom. 1: 20); but teaches that it is through His revelation that those religious truths which are by their nature accessible to human reason can be known by all men with ease, with certitude and solid with no trace of error, even in this present state of the human race” (1965, *Dei Verbum* 6).

### II. THE CONCOMITANCE OF THE VISIONS OF SCIENCE AND RELIGION. IT EXIST AN ONLY REALITY

#### A. *The new theory in the face of those already enshrined*

The possibility and necessity of an open dialogue between theology and modern science was established by both sides to be a real benefit, both for a better and more complex understanding of reality, and also because this cohabitation, science-religion, would reunify human personality – at the same time soul and body – giving it a chance not to splinter between two artificially opposed explanations and being

<sup>1</sup> Because of their particular thinking and their development amplitude I’ll just name these three level with the name *gestalt* (see the term’s meaning in German psychology).

<sup>2</sup> Into the *figurative* domain knowledge is offered by an immediate relation between the mental representation and the real object, involving all known scientific methods: observation, analysis, experiment, practice etc.; while in the *non-figurative* domain the object thought is missing as a direct presence, but not as a real existence.

always forced to choose between them because their exponents do not allowed so far a cohabitation. The theological vision of the world, as well as the current and the future scientific theories, look towards a common reality, and the simultaneous acceptance of several viable exposures are only broadening the perspective, not narrowing it – as the principles of optics demonstrates this. By accepting each other there is no risk that aspects of each vision to be put into a cone of shadow by the other one, if each retains coherent its exposures and try to develop their own doubts. This is an essential condition to cohabitation: as long as each vision is internally coherent, without gaps and discontinuities, there is no danger that one to absorb the other. Each must assume its aim, object and methods and continue this discussion into an own fluency without feeling any threats by the other vision; there is no competition between them in order to dominate the world and to offer a single explanation over *reality*. It can even be foreseen that this need for “other” (vision), as a partner in an ontological dialog, they both felt – which entitles us once again to affirm their complementarity. For this purpose must be understood why theology have tried to give various explanations, specific to sciences, or sought to support its faith into The Boundless God on rational arguments, in order to infer the presence of the divine in this world. At the same time, frame sectors or some scholars of the exact sciences are trying to use their scientific discoveries and new directions of research to substantiate a *new* theology (genre *New Age*). These attempts prove themselves to be mistakes that such a dialogue needs to be aware off and take a firm and fair stand towards them to deter them, emphasizing at the same time the uniqueness and identity of every path of knowledge, scientific or theological.

The combination between science and religion has always been regarded as a very natural human desire to have a unified vision of the world. “Instead of respecting the major differences between science and religion, the *combination* weaves them into a single fabric, in which they lose each other, becoming close to undistinguished”<sup>3</sup>. Jan Graeme Barbour (b. 1923), Professor of science and religion at Carleton College, promote – in his first book, *Issues in Science and Religion* – the term “critical realism”, through which argues that the basic structure of religion is similar to that of science in some ways, but different in crucial points. *They both are parts of the same spectrum and each presents subjective and objective characteristics. The subjective ones include informational theories, the resistance of comprehensive theories to forgery and the absence of some rules of choosing between paradigms. Objective characteristics include the presence of common data, proof (pros and cons) and independent criteria of paradigm.*<sup>4</sup> He proposes four models of interaction between science and religion: *conflict, independence, dialogue, integration*. On the other hand, John F. Haught proposes other four models – *conflict, contrast, contact, confirmation* – with a desire to complete the pattern proposed by J. Barbour.

<sup>3</sup> John Haught, “Science and Religion: From Conflict to Conversation”, Bucharest: Eonul Dogmatic, 2002, p. 26.

<sup>4</sup> Jan Graeme Barbour, (2011, 07 Sept.) “Philosophy and theology”, in “Critical Realism. 27 Wikipedia Articles”, p. 61. [Online]. Available: <http://www.bahaistudies.net/asma/criticalrealism-wiki.pdf>

## B. *Is this the only possible existing world?*

Even if the proposed approach – the *theory of concomitance* – would seem to fall into the pattern of *contrast* or *conflict* between science and religion – the models already proposed by Barbour and Haught – and that it doesn't bring anything out of such patterns, however this approach doesn't follows closely the rigor of both types, being rather a peculiar pattern, emerging more or less of the theories of mentioned authors. The linking of the two gestalts appear to be the correct one as described in phrase “provocative model”, because at present ST – raised in the *nonfigurative* level of representations and expressions of Philosophy and Religion gestalts – challenges them to prove their validity. ST leaves aside its own method – involving hypothesis, experiment, validation – that doesn't allowed her to work far beyond the material and figurative world, and turns today toward this plan of *nonfiguration*<sup>5</sup>, of “the realm of infinite possibilities, implicitly superior, but invisible, that can no longer be approached by our senses, a transcendent domain, source of all visible things”<sup>6</sup>. Climbing at nonfigurative level, ST would like to have with religion and philosophy a figurative dialogue – which demonstrates the gaps that it came in this nonfigurative level with – and where ST is forced to recant its own definition, that its descendant, philosophy, gave it when he formulated, for example, the principle of *parsimony*, as a fundament of the scientific method. Here “there is no longer but an only one sacred truth: (that) there is no sacred truth” (Carl Sagan, +1996).

In the foreground both science and theology start from the reality of the universe which they assert and explain. Empirically, none of them can't speak about the physical universe other than declarative, by affirming its real existence. But after the philosophical intervention of the interrogative sentence *is this world the only reality?*, each of the two paths are distancing from each other, through their own methods of investigation, in order to respond to it in accordance with their own point of view. Therefore, despite the fact that it regards the same world – this one, our material universe – each gestalt explains it through its method –scientific-materialist or spiritual-religious – producing these visions that I've spoken about. In its depth, every vision is incompatible with other, and while being so close one another – through the object shared in their demonstration – they remain untranslatable one through the other.

However, representatives of both gestalts agree that the universe cannot be explained singular, from a unique perspective – materialistic, ignoring the spirit (consciousness, feeling, confidence, compassion, art or morals) or vice versa, only spiritual, ignoring the matter – because it would produce a fragmented vision of reality. That's why the proposal of *concomitances* is looking to eliminate this fragmented unipolar

<sup>5</sup> The level of *figurative* (thinking) is about understanding the world with knowledge implied by physical objects, while *nonfigurative* level doesn't imply necessarily the physical object we came to understand. First pattern is assimilated with exact sciences, second with abstract ones, i.e. philosophy and religion.

<sup>6</sup> Deepak Chopra, and Leonard Mlodinow, “War of the Worldviews: Where Science and Spirituality Meet”, version in Romanian language, Bucharest: Editura Trei, 2012, p. 28.

world image and to allow both gestalts to reproduce themselves throughout their splendor, without having to dismiss one another, to exist independent or to be included in a mixed formula, one of compromise.

C. *We opt for a solipsistic or holistic vision for understanding the co-habitation of two gestalts? Comparison with medicine.*

The Cosmo-genesis process must be reconstituted into an integrative vision, overall and not partial, explaining the whole through a fragment. The easiest way to understand this is to use the comparison with medicine today: abstracting the anatomical glands we'll arrive to an independent discipline, endocrinology, that studies in detail the functioning, the positioning and the physiognomy of the glands, but only re-entering them into the human body, its specificity can be respected and known accurately and coherently; otherwise, we have to deal with a disparate discipline that studies, analyzes and investigates – with all techno-logical procedures within reach – a biological excerpt, possibly “worshipping” this organ through a solipsist approach. The same thing should be understood by any other scientific endeavor: we cannot have a paradigm resulting exclusively from scientific investigation; it must be a synthetic solution of the scientific questioning – regarding a scientific domain or overall – but, above all, to contain an integrative vision of several factors outside the discipline. Going back to the earlier comparison, the targets of Endocrinology can be applied and understood with real help of: risk factors (for diabetes), ovarian failure (in acne), hypothyroidism (in anemia), etc. I chose this example because it demonstrates perhaps the best the organic complexity that must be understood in, accumulated and applied the scientific knowledge and especially the fact that integrating them into holists systems thinking is not just a real help, but a *must be*.

Moves of this kind have begun to emerge, not only as simple reactions, but even as independent disciplines who seek to find integrative explanation as many external factors – extern to their specific research area – recognizing the interrelations that exist or can be created between man – with all its components – and the universe. This integrated research is done today by *functional medicine* that approaches differently the patient-disease relationship versus conventional medicine, seeing the patient as a unique entity (biochemical, psychological, social, religious etc.) that must be counterbalanced to reach the true state of health. Such a holistic approach is needed today by this gestalt of human knowledge in order to be able to free itself from the materialist-nihilistic ideology and to *deconstruct* (in Derrida's parlance) science of atheist thinking, integrating the man in a universe that is no other than God's creation.

The assumption that we are not alone in the universe – extended from relevant proposal of heliocentrism that there are multiple planets, solar systems and galaxies to the proposal of the existence of other beings, beyond the limits of this universe known to us – has always inspired minds. Only the possibility – offered by an affirmative answer to this supposition – and still arouses a deep chill to anyone that stops from its way through the existence, chill that implicitly urges a contact with this *the other* that “share” existence with! On the other hand,

the negative answer – *no, there is no other living and rational beings into the existing!* – makes man equally responsible for what he knows and “masters” in the universe; to be the only existence is by far the greatest responsibility that a rational being might have: increasing awareness of proximate space, of its the transfiguration and improvement. Or precisely those values must be underlined by religion too: presenting nature as God's creation and the man to be in charge of the transfiguration of this creation it can make this the latter one to respect nature and get out from the ecological crisis in which sinks.

The goal of religious exposures is not to physically found the foundations of the cosmos, nor of the ST to overcome its method of experimental accumulation of data and logical inferences that can afterwards supports the theories of physical laws etc., in a word, logical-scientific constructs in general, without discontinuities and inconsistencies caused precisely by the impossibility of combining physical laws with theological exposures. The concomitance of both gestalts is postulated by the very existence of the universe and by rationality of man that “fills” the universe.

In this way, religion is exempted from the rational specification of all physical phenomena in the universe, and it is incumbent on science to deliver these explanations exclusively physical, material, without ever returning to the mystical exposures where the limits of rational thought can no longer break through; the beginning of concomitance between the two paradigms was made by ancient thinking of the Greek philosophy, and their branching, like any separation, was made with constraint, clumsiness and the risks involved.

### III. THE CONCOMITANCE OF THE MULTIVERSE. INTEGRATIVE VISION

#### A. *Could it be otherwise*

*Our universe is perfectly tailored for life. That may be the work of God or the result of our universe being one of many.* Being aware of this true many Christian theologians have always invited people to seek and know the world God made, because only thus the most staunch atheist could reach to the worship of the Creator. “The universe is a place that inspires awe, especially for those who know something about it”<sup>7</sup>. We know from hundreds of recent studies carried out in the field of Astrophysics and quantic that the smallest differences introduced into the current state of things of our universe would let it to no longer be able to support any existing order in the universe, and, much less, life itself. Taking few significant examples highlighted in the book by Martin REES, *Just Six Numbers: The Deep Forces That Shape the Universe*, we can notice along with it that the evolution (both physical and biological) of our universe is remarkably sensitive to the values of six numbers. If any of their values was “untuned,” there would be no stars and life as we know it in our current universe. If those protons were just 0.2 percent more massive than they actually are, they would be unstable and would decay into simpler particles. Atoms wouldn't exist; neither would we. If gravity were slightly more powerful, the consequences

<sup>7</sup> D. Chopra, *Op.cit.*, p. 26.

would be nearly as grave. A beefed-up gravitational force would compress stars more tightly, making them smaller, hotter, and denser. Rather than surviving for billions of years, stars would burn through their fuel in a few million years, sputtering out long before life had a chance to evolve. There are many such examples of the universe's life-friendly properties – so many, in fact, that physicists can't dismiss them all as mere accidents.

As a conclusion, if our universe is so fine “granted” to bear not only the perfect order, but also life up to its most *evolved* forms – the man, why would we stop with the assumptions here? Why couldn't we assume – noticing in the same way both the perfection and the omnipotence of the One who made all those things – that it is possible for the same miraculous and perfect opera to have been repeated for *n* times, concomitant with ours?

*B. Is there a possibility of acceptance the multiverse in religious thinking?*

One of the earliest attempts to “unify” gravity and electromagnetic forces came in the form of Kaluza-Klein theory, a short-lived theory that attempted to unify the forces of nature by introducing an extra space dimension. In this theory, the extra space dimension was curled up to a “microscopic” size. Though the theory failed, many of the same concepts were eventually applied in the study of string theory. Extra dimensions have changed the way physicists think about the Universe. And because the connections of extra dimensions to the world could tie into many more well-established physics ideas, extra dimensions are a way to approach older, already verified facts about the Universe. The pluridimensional proposal of a single universe has turned recently, much more believable and more widely accepted, into the *theory of supercords*, in which the term “dimension” has received a new conceptualization, “fantastic and scientific, but not science-fiction”, about *another* universe, parallel to ours.

Without a conceptualization so profound, Greek philosophers, however, initiated the same formula of existence with 23 centuries ago. Around the year 400 BC the Greek philosopher Democritus (c. 450 – 370 BC) presented for the first time a theory about the universe based on his previous assumptions, namely that all matter is composed of atoms (*atomistic* theory). Democritus was starting from the pertinent assumption that the complex nature of the world (*cosmos*) could be explained if all things would be made from different kinds of unchangeable atoms, each kind with its own shape and size<sup>8</sup>. He said of the *cosmos* that was formed when a group of atoms *were brought together* in a certain structure<sup>9</sup>.

According to his theory, the *Cosmos* consists of the Sun, the Moon, five planets and the stars revolve around the Earth. Even if this theory is one of the many other *geocentric* theories, however it is worth noticing here that to Leucippus

<sup>8</sup> Don Hainesworth, “Philosophy of Science and Religion. Concerning the nature of Humanity and of Reality”, 2nd edition, Bloomington: Author House, 2012, p. 266.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Timothy Kusky, PH.D., “Encyclopedia of Earth and Space science”, New York: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data, 2010, p. 817.

appears the idea of parallel worlds, multiple (*kosmoi*, gr.), even in an infinite number, between which there are unequal distances, in varying degrees of progress, development and, hence, and of sizes... “In one direction lies more worlds, in other fewer, some worlds are increasing, others have reached the peak of its development, some are about to disappear”<sup>10</sup>. One of the many features of this “infinite worlds” in his conception of Leucippus is borrowed by Stephen Hawking, a proponent of the theory of supercords, “occasionally (these words, N.N.) are born, in other parts disappear; the extinction of one world can come from a clash with another. Some worlds are devoid of plants, beings and any moisture”<sup>11</sup>. What is certain is that, for atomists, “in our Universe the Earth arose before heavenly stars”. Democritus himself spoke of *a large number* (not infinite) of worlds that have been formed *spontaneously from diffuse matter in space, and then turn off*<sup>12</sup>. This picture – originally rejected – it was recurring after more than 23 centuries, today being found into what we know as the theory of *supercords* or *theory M*.

The promoters of this theory claim that cannot be supported any acceptance of God, that “there almost certainly is no God”<sup>13</sup> in this variant of existence. However the theory of *concomitances* will allow me to contradict this “almost certainty”, showing which are the issues that M-theory ignores or omits them, also helping it to accept God's existence.

This new understanding of the typology of “M-theory” gives us the opportunity to administer veridical responses at all levels of the humanity (psychological, philosophical, religious, and scientific/rational) of the same unique truth, God-The Creator of the Multiverse. This theory I promote isn't by far a euphemism of the *concordance* attempt to “fit in” science with religious dogmas, to force things in so that it coerce the adjustment and the correspondence of scientific ideas and the assumptions of the ST with religious dogmas and enactments. Therefore, I don't regard nor the exposure levels of human thinking – named here “the alternative cognitive solutions”, i.e. philosophical thinking, the religion or the scholar ones, to which we could add as well, as a valid and unique direction, the psycho-analytical thinking – as steps or stages of evolution of the same understanding, forcing a knowledge of increasingly complexity as we see in the self-declaring inefficiency of the “fathers” of M-theory.

For me all these levels are merely paradigms (complex and complete *gestalts*), without competition, ambivalence or mutual exclusion, but only *concomitance* (like in the theory of the third included – per acad. Basarab Nicolescu)<sup>14</sup> and mutual validation. That's why I don't understand that each paradigm

<sup>10</sup> Ion Banu, “Greek philosophy until Plato”, II vol., I part., Bucharest: Scientific and Encyclopedic Press, 1984, p. 428, fr. 40.

<sup>11</sup> As per Stephen Hawking, “A Brief History of Time. From the Big Bang to Black Holes”, New York: Bantam Books, 1998.

<sup>12</sup> D. Hainesworth, *Op.cit.*, p. 266.

<sup>13</sup> Richard Dawkins, “The God Delusion”, London: Bantam Press, Reprinted by permission of The Random House Group Ltd, 2006, p. 111.

<sup>14</sup> B. Nicolescu, “Methodology of transdisciplinarity – levels of reality, logic of the included middle and complexity”, in „Transdisciplinary Journal of Engineering & Science”, Vol: 1, No:1, (December, 2010), pp.19-38. [Online]. Available: [http://basarab-nicolescu.fr/Docs\\_Notice/TJESNo\\_1\\_12\\_2010.pdf](http://basarab-nicolescu.fr/Docs_Notice/TJESNo_1_12_2010.pdf)

relies on another cognitive solution to express themselves or to validate its assumptions, neither that each one would talk about something else, in a parallel independence; it is simply about a concomitant exposure of the same truth with the specific possibilities of each cognitive solution. None are beneath to none, none more false, or excluding another one.

It will not be possible nor a development of a meta-knowledge which would involve a transdisciplinary approach – or a transdiscipline that involve a meta-knowledge – all (three gestalts) being incompatible, therefore cannot be any longer valid the Freudian possibility of *cognitive evolution*, meaning that religion would represent only a phase, a stage of human knowledge that are moving towards something else, and that the scientific phase would repeal it, being itself turn canceled by the stage of philosophy of science.

Thence we can say that each meaning given – in the history of human thinking – to the world (*kosmoi*) is equally valid and non-contradictory if you look in-itself, in light of the context in which it was stated and not from a different perspective – like in the idea of human *thinking's stadiality*.

In this case we will understand that (1) “*geocentric universe*” hypothesis is a healthy option if you affirm the centrality of the vitality of the Earth inside our dimension (universe); (2) that the assumption of “*heliocentric*” universe is a premium version of the scientific solution about the atomistic organization of matter, followed by the impact of the micro and macrocosm discoveries after the same “*heliocentric*” pattern (e.g. the distribution of the nucleus and the electrons in the atom, the organization of galaxies, the cast away from the Big Bang center of the universe, etc.); we will understand (3) the functionality of the *Big Bang* hypothesis as a coherent and valid alternative to respond to the problem of originating this universe and, in the end, we will understand (4) nonexclusively the *M-theory* as a solution of explaining our existence concomitant with other worlds created by the same God. Each of these nonexclusive theories presents the same reality under other aspects, and therefore there are so different one from another, without ever being under competition. They are the only multiple faces of the same truth. Nor the *Big bang* hypothesis` promoters or *M-theory's* should “see” (operate) themselves in opposition, competing for supremacy or (even) prevailing, because each one regards and specify – from the evidences it has (unique, by the way) – another inference about the origin of the universe, while the *M-theory* will have to confine to references over our concomitance with other worlds only. The disappointment of both theories` promoters that future evidence will no longer be able to validate one or the other of the two theories – because the universe will expand beyond the limits of our technology – and we`ll lose the initial information, must fall with this double, nonexclusive understanding of those two approaches: *Big Bang* – the origin of the universe, *M-theory* – its concomitance with other universes. Even if, compared to others, none of those theories cannot be considered as absolute – because they are incomparable, uncompetitive – does not mean neither that inside itself, each theory is absolute and does not have any mistakes, omissions or the need to complete or correct itself.

The possible mistakes of *M-theory* – in addition to the fundamental error that she wish to explain, in competition with the *Big Bang`s*, the origin of the universe – could be the consideration of *multiexistentialism*, i.e. the vision of *The One* (the James Wong`s movie), meaning that each living being has *n* correspondents, one in every dimension. It is wrong to think that the other dimensions are actually other facets of your universe, linking them forcefully with this one and artificially creating a “natural” inter-dimensional correspondence! If other universes would actually be all the same “us”-selves, but in a *multi-alterity* – as the promoters of M-theory are wrongly trying to handle their understanding over the multiverse –, then the anthropocentrism arrogance of ST would be far greater than that of religion`s which they have accused to be unjustified. You cannot refute the (religious) theory that *the universe it has its reason for existence in Man* and promote, on a similar nonfigurative basis, the idea that in all other universes exist variations of the same *me*<sup>15</sup>, without being suspected of anthropocentric arrogance. Or, the concomitance of our universe with other universes should have opened – with at least the same hypothetical odds – the possibility of the existence of other beings, without any connection with *us*, those from this universe.

So, how could a theory like the multiverse one – in which its promoters claim the “near” inexistence of God – placate with the theistic view over the existence of the Whole? My answer comes from a correct understanding of the **matter**, which was not created as a *barrier* to the spiritual world (but became so when the original Sin broke the gracious link between the two worlds); it isn`t at the edge of the spiritual world (universe). The matter should not be understood as being “beyond”, at the end of the spiritual world, because then we`ll run to the edge of the material universe – with the hopelessness of unfulfillment – to arrive at the beginning of the spiritual dimension. God has not put the bodies to stem the souls (Platonism), but He has made yet another world, another dimension, that will enjoy the shining of His light.

Thus understood, the material world is indeed one of many dimensions of the same reality, one of the many worlds created by God, in each co-existing other beings, but precisely in this lies the deep love and the profound meaning of the Christian understanding of the Whole: each being putted to “rule” every of these worlds (dimensions) – man over the universe material, the devil over hell, the Angels over heavens and so on – is not confined in his dimension, condemned to be and remain trapped in his world. If mankind were able to become aware of other dimensions, this is not a threat of “breaking” the balance of the multiverse, of looking at something taboo, not allowed, but precisely now we`ll understand, at rational level, what we only felt and assumed at the empirical and spiritual level till now: the presence of “the other” or, better said, *the others*, of many “others” that coexist simultaneously with us. Now we`ll understand increasingly better and rationally that the existence of a “someone else” should be accepted and that this someone else (another one for each dimension) could exist, but not in this very universe – no need to talk about “aliens” – because

<sup>15</sup> G. F. R. Ellis, U. Kirchner, and W. R. Stoeger, “Multiverses and physical cosmology”, in *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* (MNRAS), Oxford University Press, (2004), vol. 347 (issue 3), p. 925.

“here” they would only be variations on the same theme, *man: a diversity in the same unity*. This is already demonstrated with the thousands creatures that surround us and that science has found endless similarities with. That’s why neither the discovery of alien life in this universe, in this material world, is no longer striking for a man of science, nor to the Church or to the man that correctly understands God and His revelation about Creation: “glory be to Thee, One who have surrounded ourselves with thousands and thousands of creatures!” (*Acathistus of thanksgiving*). All the creatures created in this material universe prove our dimension unity; they are the evidence that this dimension has the coordinates and characteristics already found in large part. So we understand contextually the similarities and particularities between species; similarities because all creatures that exist in this universe have certain characteristics in accordance with the features of their universe, with the laws that govern it – gravity, space, time, motion etc. We will not be able to discover truly “something else”, no matter how deep we’ll look into this world, because everything here is determined by the same laws that govern this *building* (I Corinthians 3:9; Psalm 104:25). In other dimensions, things are the same: their creatures have features that enframe with the laws of their universe.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

This presentation is only one relative, framed by the “possibilities” of quantum mechanics on the one hand and the “accuracy” of the revealed Christian religion’s statements on the other. If it is possible or not that through this approach of concomitances to “placate” the modern vision of the *theory of supercords* with the paradigm of religious thinking – this depends only on the *translation* of one or more of the aspects of one of these gestalts into the language of the other.

Mutual influence between dimensions – assumed by quantum mechanics, but contested through the theory of general relativity by Einstein in 1935 with two younger colleagues, Boris Podolsky and Nathan Rosen, initiative intended as an attack on quantum theory – is one of the possible explanations from the perspective of the Christian paradigm too, and fits into the words “I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance” (Luke 15:7).

On the same pattern of quantum thinking the sensitization of some dimensional points for inter-dimensional communication is in accordance with the conception of Holiness or sin, of inspiration and revelation as frequency trimmings and mutual influence between two different dimensions/universes etc. We can also approach with the same caution many other dogmas – not to comply them with the new scientific paradigm, but to test the validity of this theory of concomitance – i.e. the problem of divine grace which pervades the universe imbuing it entirely along with other dimensions at the same time; also the generic problem of the Holy sacraments as a manifestation of inter-dimensional divine grace that “keeps all (universes, n. n.) by hand” (cf. Revelation 2: 1) not leaving them to fall apart or to overlap more than they are allowed” and so forth.

But perhaps the most interesting and important theological issue possibly accepted (not supported!) by the cosmological configuration of M-theory would be the Incarnation of Christ. Would this be still possible if such a theory would officially be proven as valid? The answer is positive, the incarnation it’s very real, for the penetration and manifestation of someone extra-dimensional into another dimension imply its transformation congruent to the matrix of this new dimension. That imply an incarnation for anyone who wants to penetrate and manifests into our dimension (the appearance of angels into this world, i.e. Daniel 4:13; Genesis 19; 22:12; Acts 12: 8, 9 etc.).

The implications of these features of quantum mechanics for our picture of reality are a subject of ongoing research. Normally, spatial separation implies physical independence. If one wants to control what’s happening on the other side of the football field, he have to go there, or, at the very least, he have to send someone or something (air molecules, a flash of light to get someone’s attention, etc.) across the field to convey your influence. Otherwise he will have no impact or influence, since intervening space ensures the absence of a physical connection.

There are many other issues which would be not only interesting, but also useful to approach transdisciplinary – the problems of religious paradigm being interpreted and explained under the incidence of the current cosmological formulations of ST – but the limited space of the published paper do not allows me to expose them here.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Basarab Nicolescu, “Methodology of transdisciplinarity – levels of reality, logic of the included middle and complexity”, in *Transdisciplinary Journal of Engineering & Science*, Vol: 1, No:1, pp.19-38, (December, 2010). [Online]. Available: [http://basarab-nicolescu.fr/Docs/Notice/TJESNo\\_1\\_12\\_2010.pdf](http://basarab-nicolescu.fr/Docs/Notice/TJESNo_1_12_2010.pdf)
- [2] Deepak Chopra, Leonard Mlodinow, “War of the Worldviews: Where Science and Spirituality Meet”, version in romanian language, Bucharest: Three Press, 2012.
- [3] Don Hainesworth, “Philosophy of Science and Religion. Concerning the nature of Humanity and of Reality”, 2nd edition, Bloomington: AuthorHouse, 2012.
- [4] G. F. R. Ellis, U. Kirchner, and W. R. Stoeger, “Multiverses and physical cosmology”, in *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* (MNRAS), Oxford University Press, (2004) vol 347 (issue 3), pp. 921-936.
- [5] Ion Banu, “Greek philosophy until Plato”, II vol., I part, Bucharest: Scientific and Enciclopedic Press, 1984.
- [6] Jan Graeme Barbour, (2011, 07 Sept.) “Philosophy and theology”, in “Critical Realism. 27 Wikipedia Articles”, pp. 60-63. [Online]. Available: <http://www.bahaistudies.net/asma/criticalrealism-wiki.pdf>
- [7] John Haught, “Science and Religion: From Conflict to Conversation”, Bucharest: XXI: Eonul dogmatic Press, 2002.
- [8] Richard Dawkins, “The God Delusion”, London: Bantam Press, Reprinted by permission of The Random House Group Ltd, 2006.
- [9] Stephen Hawking, “A Brief History of Time. From the Big Bang to Black Holes”, New York: Bantam Books, 1998.
- [10] Timothy Kusky, PH.D., “Encyclopedia of Earth and Space science”, New York: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data, 2010.