Философия науки и техники
2019. Т. 24. № 1. С. 145–158
УДК 115

Philosophy of Science and Technology
2019, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 145–158
DOI: 10.21146/2413-9084-2019-24-1-145-158

Naseeb Ahmed Siddiqui

Beyond the coincidental fine-tuning of the universe: The ontology of Essential Time

Naseeb Ahmed Siddiqui – Ph.D. student. University of Ontario Institute of Technology. Oshawa, 2000 Simcoe Street, North Oshawa, Ontario, L1G0C5, Canada; e-mail: siddiquinaseeb@gmail.com

The first part of this research discussed a theoretical framework of a new theory of time which was systematically proposed, developed and defended. Time was exposed to a natural categorization that calls forth two different real times; Existential and Essential. The current paper which is the conclusion of the research deals with the ontological dimension of Essential time. Contrary to the fine-tuning of physical constants of the universe by coincidence, this article tries to establish that "coincidence" in itself depends on time. The Essential time provides a timeline of creation which starts from absolute uniformity to dis-uniform universe and coincidence is planned. Hence, essential time is uniform, formless and powerful to facilitate the creation of the universe by forming dis-uniformity to everything that was uniform. The question that why essential time is able to do that and what is the source to trigger dis-uniformity brings the discussion to the ontology of essential time. This ontological being in essential time will be proved by two premises. The article argues that why the interpretation based on essential time must be considered instead of "coincidences" of modern science, "Demiurge" of Plato and "unmoved mover" of Aristotle to explain the final cause of the universe. By doing so the fundamental flaw in the anthropic principle is revealed and argued that it does not present a convincing answer to the "why" question of the universe. The combinations of scientific, philosophical and metaphysical arguments establish a conclusive interpretation about the ontological being in essential time without any deviation from the universal facts of the universe. This might end the creation dilemma which is, why did the universe come into existence.

Keywords: The cause of the creation, Theory of everything, Time and Essential time, anthropic principle, fine-tuning of the universe, Big bang, Multiverse

INTRODUCTION

The Fear of deficit

The paragon of all causes, the search of the cause for essential time is the black hole of the universe, people fear to indulge in it. With no "numerical values" in hand, it is being advocated that there is "nothing before" big bang singularity. Indeed, the fear is obviously inspired by the supposed inclusion of metaphysical arguments defining the universe. The outcome of that fear in the words of Stephen Hawking:

> To as universe began is like asking for a point on the earth at 91 degrees north latitude. We are on the inside of the great sphere of space and time, and while we can see to the boundaries, there is nothing beyond to see ifonly because there is nothing beyond. One should just say: the Universe is [Hetherington, 1993, p. 133].

Scientific methodology requires empirical data to explain any phenomena. Given this hurdle, science has no data to comment anything before the singularity. So ultimately broke down only explaining existential space-time continuum which is subject to change[1]. The fear Hawking's statement evinces is the very question of defining the question of creation. It does not make sense to convert logical question into smart question by saying "there is nothing beyond" because science always struggled to find the answer of that logical question "why did the universe come into existence?" [Athearn, 1994; Torretti, 1999] not "the universe is". Surprisingly, when it comes to the initial point of creation with no data to hypothesize something, it is propagated that just believe "the universe is" without further asking why? What sort of analogy does it spell, where science is demanding to stop questioning because it does not have data to answer the question? Needless to say, those first curious questions of our existence came out not because of observational data but through natural reasoning. Hence, there were many philosophical and metaphysical systems existed throughout history and still exist based on rational arguments [Iqbal, 1908]. Does modern science want to break her rule by smartly altering the question of creation? On the name of achieving truth, an eternal war of methodology became almost equal to reality itself. In result, reality does not come to be naturally, in contrast, it is replaced by the self-created output of methodology. Moreover, this war of defining what the nature of reality should be has hijacked the long-standing human struggle to know the ultimate reality into the ocean of material progress by abnegating all the hope.

The absence of data cannot rule out the objective reality of the universe by scientific realism [Psillos, 1999] or anti-realism [Wray, 2013] whose objective is to uncover the truth. Modern science explains observation and phenomena of nature by proposing some entities that no one knows exist in real or not. After Newton, some scientists believed that light is made of a wave created by the very fast vibration of

[1] Please refer the first part of this article to know more about the Existential and Essential time [Siddiqui, 2018].

"aether". Based on this hypothesis Augustine Fresnel proposed that light will create a small spot at the center of shadow if it passes through an opaque disc and surprisingly it met the prediction. This hypothesis was quite accurate to explain interference, polarization and other optical phenomena. Similarly, Dalton's concept of the atom as an indivisible entity and claim that all things are made of atoms was correct but he was wrong about the relative weights [Cruse, 2003]. However, it is established that there is no aether which was believed to exist but accidentally explained phenomena correctly. Also, Dalton's atom exists but divisible, hence the wrong prediction. Such undeniable facts were must to believe for realist philosophers as part of a true theory but accidentally their beliefs were proven to be only a belief, not knowledge. On the contrary, anti-realism adopts no secondary entity to explain phenomena other than what is experimentally proved [Braver, 2007]. The constructive empiricism claims to adopt the first part of the premises of realism to consider identities at face value but it denies that theories must be believed to be true. It is enough for a theory to explain the phenomenon without considering it true or false because the science is constructive hence cannot be firmly established [May, 2016]. The adequacy of explaining a phenomenon includes the unobservable observable identities but it does not at all reveal the truth. This inclination becomes an advocate for plenty of unobserved entities which have been taken for granted like dark matter, dark energy, electron, Gravity, mass and force fields etc. In a basic sense, it's just saving the phenomena method with some logical differences. The major shift is that now, empirical adequacy rather than truth became the aim of science.

The claim that science contrary to superficial beliefs adopted human reasoning to decide what must be reality based on data. In reality, the use of reason is also not real but restricted to the methodology. The reason is summoned to behave like a slave without any authority. The reason is not allowed to naturally propagate the real truth of nature; it is even not allowed to naturally develop its own framework to reach ultimate reality. The love between reason and reality is blocked by the methodological reason. The conclusion reached by methodological reason was always confronted with something more arcane then previous beliefs. The force of nature has given clues to methodological reason that there are altogether different oceans of knowledge to be explored but it developed more complicated methods to avoid those clues.

In the philosophy of mind and body, it was believed that Human is composed of body and soul. The external body consists of material and our thoughts or souls are immaterial [Clarke, 2003]. It was then questioned how an immaterial substance communicates with a material substance. The methodological reason, a slave of matter transformed that very logical clue to material answer by negating the immaterial part that gave birth to Physicalism hypothesis and claimed both the substances are material, the so-called identity theory [Crane, 2000]. Similarly, another clue emerged when neuro correlates established that every specific religious experience has its corresponding pattern in the brain. Such an interesting revelation again summoned methodological reason to explain and it was concluded that no metaphysical dimension should be added in this. Nevertheless, the activities of the brain during religious experience are interlinked but it does not claim to know

the prime cause, as to what is causing what. It is the experience, which is changing brain neural or change in brain neural causing experience [Schjoedt, 2009]. The famous EPR paradox posed a serious clue as to how one electron is aware of a partner's choice [Einstein, Podolsky, Rosen, 1935]. To counter such anomaly hidden variables hypothesis was proposed [Rae, 1986].

This denial of possible routes to reality is so unfair that few people considered it sin to continue the way of methodological reasoning. Modern science now struggles with its own conundrum theories which forced many scholars to abandoned single methodology inference. In result, dualistic methodology came into existence proposing more than one way to reach the truth of nature. The contemporary of Thomas Kuhn, Feyerabend included sacred scriptures in pluralistic methodology [Feyerabend, 2010]. Numerous clues posed by modern physics triggered physicist like R. Oppenheimer, E. Schrödinger, and others to turn towards oriental doctrines for dilemmas solution [Capra, 2010; Schrödinger, 1951]. As Feyerabend said: "the events, procedures and results that constitute the science have no common structure" [Feyerabend, 2010; Preston, 2013, p. 171].

Creation cannot be the cause of its own existence; its very nature negates such possibility. Existential space and time where all the physical theories works, has no existence in reality without a cause. Even the theory of quantum gravity which is supposed to predict what is behind the plank era cannot predict anything other than what existential space and time have. Maintaining the methodology of modern science, as argued before, it is proposed that existential space-time continuum cannot explain its own creation or the cause, which by theory and logic demands some other entity to explain that gap.

That entity is the essential time which exists in reality. Based on nature's observation, the proposed hypothesis explained all the possible questions of the universe including start and end[2]. The fear that one should not ask about before the creation has been overshadowed by the logical question because the proposed hypothesis by necessity extends the question before the creation without deviating from scientific methodology. Even for the sake of scientific methodology, one cannot stop curiosity to know about the real cause of existence. Based on this claim the ontological discussion of Essential time will be based on two premises followed by a conclusion.

However, this article does not indulge in the discussion of pre-eternity of creation and creation ex nihillo because that belongs to the question, how the universe came into existence. On the contrary, the article is trying to answer the question, why did the universe come into existence and its relation to ontological essential time.

[2] Please refer to the first part of this two series article.

1. THE CAUSE BEHIND CREATION

a. On the first premise

Essential time being *uniform* precedes *dis-uniform* creation providing the timeline

Dis-uniformity is impossible without uniformity. This is a postulate for current theory.

The problem is to define whether these two opposites are opposites of contrary or opposites of privation and habit [Aristotle, 1985 (Cate.), 11b 15–20]. The contrary is defined in terms of real existence like "good" or "bad" as they can be defined. For privation and habit like "sight" and "blind", one is clear existence like sight but whether blindness is real existence or not is a dilemma. In the case of disuniformity, its existence is well evident in the world. The law of entropy convincingly proposed the disorder within the universe. Birth, growth, and death are the most beautiful truth of disuniformity. There is no uniformity even within the planets as they differ in terms of speed, mass, orbit and sustaining life. Similarly, Humanity is full of dis-uniformity without a doubt. So, dis-uniformity is real existence. Uniformity is also evident in nature and human society without which there will not be any progress. The order in the universe is self-evident. That is why Einstein had to say "the eternal mystery of the world is its comprehensibility" [Einstein, 1936, p. 351]. There can be absolute uniformity but it is impossible to have absolute disuniformity in nature and human.

It follows that there must be an identity opposite to generation and corruption to prove an independent identity opposite to dis-uniformity. That identity will be opposite to dis-uniformity, it means, it will have no parameters and reference to name something dis-uniform. Suppose if I say "I know mathematics", will there be any change in my knowing? No, because my knowledge is so uniform that whatever I know about mathematics is none to compare. That claim does not necessitate any dis-uniformity in my knowing. On the contrary, if I say "I do not know physics", that unknowing will generate change in my knowledge and my knowledge will not remain the same due to dis-uniformity brought out by my ignorance. In the presence of uniformity between hydrogen and helium, the chemical reaction in the stars will be impossible to start. It is a must to create dis-uniformity to initiate the reaction. The possible creation of the universe by singularity would not have been possible if the very constituents happened to be in uniformity. Without dis-uniformity, the then abundance of the so-called initial seconds of the universe would have been totally unconscious of their own caliber. To provide consciousness of disuniformity is the sole point of becoming a creation.

It would be a frustrating question for a physicist to explain why did singularity explode exactly that moment only, why not before or after? Because the claim that singularity exploded 13.8 billion years ago means there was something not existing in singularity before 13.8 billion years ago. The near-uniform universe was proposed at

the cosmic age of 400,000 years. The link between large scale structure and early near-uniform universe were simulated on large scale computers [Hawkings, Mlodinow, 2010; Springel, Frenk, White, 2006]. Similarly, as per the second law of thermodynamics, an isolated system exposed to a natural process will end in increasing disorder or entropy of the system [Çengel, Turner, 2005]. Both universal laws attest to the proposal that an initial dis-uniformity disturbed the long-existed uniformity. Hence, it must be clear that uniformity and dis-uniformity are two independent contraries which exists in real but are interlinked. The creation is a result of dis-uniformity which must, as a pre-condition, proceed uniformity. The Essential time being uniform is out of change which is followed by a change that is dis-uniformity; starting of the creation. This is the first premise of the argument.

Uniformity is formless contrast to the form which is the principle of change [Aristotle, 1985 (Phy.), Ch. 1–2]. Anything exposed to uniformity contends unexplainable reality of structure. As per zeroth law of thermodynamics, bodies naturally acquire thermal equilibrium. In this state differentiation in terms of "hotness" cannot be realized or actualized, as the very "concept" of heat replaced the uniformity. If all the bodies are in uniformity, what can be said about the structure of the heat itself? It is not the body which is responsible for the uniformity but the heat; a real formless being. Analyzing the different types of species would lead us to recognize the uniformity in terms of structure, another characteristic may differ. In this case, the symbol of uniformity will be structure itself, but it cannot be defined a form. A structure is a systematic connection of components; on the contrary, form need not follow that logical rule. A sentence must have a form but that can be without structure. Music note must have a structure, but it is impossible to suffix any form to the tunes originated from a structured note. Uniformity directs the universe in one direction and seems to be unchanged at a particular time until unless some reference is called for clarification.

With same inspirations, ontologically speaking, essential time being uniform does not require any form. The absolute uniformity is self-denial of form. This denial confirms the limit of dis-uniformity to be born. Once dis-uniformity becomes the second latest ontological being, the essential time comes to a form. The ultimate form of essential time is existential time evident but without structure. The first ontological being uniform holds on not to indulge in creating dis-uniformity. This natural selection between uniformity and dis-uniformity grab us into another natural question, how does essential time hold on dis-uniformity? This will be our second premises.

b. On the second premise: Nothing changed without Power, so Essential time needs the Power to provide a timeline

The core task of essential time is to create existential time or in a more specific term, the role of uniformity is to create dis-uniformity which is creation. As per Newton's first law of motion, *"everybody perseveres in its state of rest, or of uniform motion in a right line, unless it is compelled to change that state by forces*

impressed thereon"[3] [Galili, Tseitlin, 2003, p. 48][4]. Initially, Newton considered an innate force or impetus as a cause of motion but later replaced it by inertia force and also excluded circular motion from a state of balance like linear [Galili, Tseitlin, 2003]. The point is, in this universal law an innate force or impetus or inertia is compulsory for every becoming. However, the core enlighten of his philosophy is gravity about which he said:

> Gravity must be caused by an agent (acting) constantly according to certain laws, but whether this agent be *material or immaterial is a question* I have left to the consideration of my readers [Newton, 2007, p. 7–8].

Newton was not convinced with the idea of action at distance being essentially causality natural philosopher. During the 17–18th century to explain the electric and magnetic phenomena three causal hypotheses, motion through an ether, imponderable fluids and actions at distance were in circulation. Not in vain, masters of physics were involved in this debate [Athearn, 1994]. Positivist philosophers of science struggled to reduce knowledge to pure sciences based on what can be seen and measured devoid of any metaphysical entities. But they were failed and the existence of unobservable entities like an electron, photon etc., doubted their own methodology because the so-called "unobservable" entities are the primary substances of the sciences.

The upshot of above narration reserves the motivation to find out the mechanistic causation of those puzzling questions as part of scientific methodology. Ambiguity reflects in isolating the already adopted "unobservable" identities to become a universal adventure. The answer to the essential time's power source lies in the very answer of the logical question asked above. In the philosophy of science from Greek to modern, three[5] kinds of argument were posed to solve the puzzles of causation, which is nothing but the power to initiate creation.

As per modern science, the creation of the universe and the possibility of life depends on some basic physical constants. The possibilities coincidently are very sensitive to the numerical values of these constants [Carr, Rees, 1979]. This fine-tuning of physical constants is plausible and strange to be ignored. The primordial elements hydrogen, helium and some amount of lithium transformed the whole universe we see. However, for life to grow, carbon is must, so the natural laws had to

---

[3] It is to be noted that, this definition is included by Newton in his third & last edition of "Principia" because he was not sure about the actual motive for the motion. He initially called it innate force or inertia as cause to motion, but at the end he changed inertia to define both innate force and mass for second law.

[4] Isaac Newton before his final version of first law considered circular motion as a state of balance and included it in his first law of motion. He accepted force in two separate domains, first he called external which is gravity and second is inherent which has two parts. For linear motion he considered impetus force as a cause and for circular motion cause is the centrifugal force. But after 20 year of struggle he dropped circular motion from first law. See [Steinberg, Brown, Clement, 1990]. Why he dropped that condition is open for debate, but it can be argued because Newton wanted to give circular motion with the help of Gravity and his law. So, if in nature, circular motion is by default present then what is the need of any attraction force to move planets around the sun, if initially all planets got balanced through that circular motion? This is very unusual to accept.

[5] The methodology of Plato and his Demiurge, Aristotle and his unmoved mover, The Anthropic principle of modern science.

intervene in a very precise fine-tuning to create an environment for carbon development. This carbon should be stable for billions of years to create life. These heavy elements were formed in the cores of stars, so natural laws should fine-tune the environment to do so. This fine tuning must allow then stars to explode at the right time to disburse heavy elements into space and remnants should be allowed to recondense in the form of the star [Hawkings, Mlodinow, 2010]. That, without the fine-tuning of initial conditions, the expanding universe, would have been different than what we observe today [McMullin, 1993]. Various structures of universe coincidently show fine-tuning with other small or big structures. The ratios are puzzling; like the size of a planet is geometrical mean of the size of the universe and the size of an atom. The mass of a human is the geometrical mean of the mass of the planet and the mass of a proton. The ratio of the size of the observable universe to the size of an atom can be compared with the ratio of electrical and gravitational forces between elementary particles [Carr, Rees, 1979].

The building block of the universe consists of quarks and leptons supposed to get mass from quantum fluctuation through Higgs boson with compulsory related natural forces, electromagnetic, strong, weak and gravitational. The coincidental fine-tuning of physical constants depends on these building blocks [Greene, 2010]. It is argued that if protons were 0.2% heavier, they will destabilize atoms and if the mass of the quark changed by 10% there will be very few stable nuclei to support life. That means quark masses are also fine-tuned to create the largest number of stable nuclei. For fundamental particle Higgs boson, if it were just 5 times heavier, the carbon content could not penetrate through the chaos of the universe [Hawkings, Mlodinow, 2010; Wolchover, Byrne, 2014]. The observed value of cosmological constant must be one that facilitates the creation of galaxies in the universe [Weinberg, 1987a]. The value calculated through quantum effects to explain why the value of the cosmological constant is non zero turns out to be 120 orders of magnitude stronger than obtained through observation of supernova. This error conjured doubt in the very calculation and observation, as to how this tiny value of cosmological constant remains intact. One thing is certain if the value of the cosmological constant is supposed to be larger, the universe would have exploded before the creation of galaxies. The notion that physical constant emerged from the very natural process of physical laws turned out to be not following its natural way, rather these physical constants are resulting from some improbable cancellations. Otherwise, the energy infusing from vacuum space is tinier in order of few trillions than theories predict and that the mass of Higgs boson falls short of 100 quadrillion times than actual. However, such bizarre unnatural consequences of fine tuning seem inevitable, but it cannot be left without explanation too.

To resolve such gargantuan disparity of fine-tuning of the physical laws, themultiverse idea was put forward. Nobel laureate Stephen Weinberg argued that the value of cosmological fine-tuning could only be explained considering multiverse[6]. That, from the various universes ours is the only one which got the right amount of cosmological constant to let galaxies form and life emerged. Surprisingly, the most

[6] It has inspiration from the quantum behavior of photon or electron that follows a probabilistic route which rendered to be different paths to different world as Feynman claimed and Schrodinger's cat experiment touched the core idea.

fundamental blocks of the universe remain unobserved and to prove their interrelation unobserved multiverse is called. It seems that fear of deficit still prevails. The sole purpose of conjuring multiverse is to devoid the universe of any intelligent design by an intelligent designer. Because the only universe and it's fine-tuning strongly demand a "cognized" universe knowing its framework of working by some other identity, so here theist could argue for God. Modern science cannot admit such direct intervention of any metaphysical identity. Hence, they argue, as the fine-tuned environmental factors of our solar system shaped the life without reserving any privileged within the various universe. Our universe is also a result of a coincidence that it got the right amount of fine-tuned physical constant at the right time among the multiverse.

All such extraordinary philosophical inclusions are not ex nihilo, they are the result of the so-called "anthropic principle" [Carter, 1974]. Since its first formulation in 1979, it grew to three kinds, weak, strong and final anthropic principle [Barrow, Tipler, 1988]. There is variance in the definition; the latest can be considered by Stephen Hawking's:

> Weak Anthropic Principle: "Our very *existence imposes* rules determining from where and at what time it is possible for us to *observe the universe*. That is, the fact of *our being restricts* the characteristics of the kind of environment in which we find ourselves*"* [Hawkings, Mlodinow, 2010, p. 154],

> Strong Anthropic principle: "The fact that *we exist* imposes constraints not just on our environment but on the possible form and *contents of the laws of nature* themselves*"* [Hawkings, Mlodinow, 2010, p. 155].

Though seems convincing, common to both principles is a circular absurdity. There are two premises, first, the existence, second the universe that concludes, why the universe must be a result of fine-tuned natural laws. The mere truth that Human exists at a certain specific time of the universe does not establish the fine-tuned coincidences of the physical universe. Why must we think the multiverse in terms of the carbon cycle or life cycle as per our own version? It might be possible for each universe to have a peculiar framework based on fine-tuned physical constants. The emergence of life could be due to some special dimensions unknown to us. Once admitted for each universe some fine-tuning of physical constants, what uniqueness our own universe deserves in terms of collective attributes of the multiverse? If only life gives us privilege than our solar system must follow the same rule that the existence of Humans follows, which further comes to the point that we are alone in the universe. If that's the case, why do we need at all multiverse to show coincidences? Due to such reasoning, the existence of humans remains no more existence but a mere reflection of a cosmic mirror where universe reserves the power to create life to proclaim its magnanimous attribute. But unlike human with reason, animals will be a mere illusion as they do not comprehend their relationship with the universe.

It elucidates the consequences of analyzing the fine-tuning of the universe without a purpose which demands power to carry out that task. Hence, as per modern science that was the power of coincidence that the universe began to exist. Neither

coincidence nor fine-tuned values are without cause, but modern science does not worry about the cause. However, for people like Plato and Aristotle it was without doubt that all the explanation must result in a cause which cannot be further reduced and for that reason, Plato considered Demiurge and Aristotle ended up with Unmoved mover to solve apparent miracles of nature.

However, the philosophy of coincidence does not exclude the creation dilemma. When it is said the right value of primordial particles to form carbon, it is actualizing the role of time very deeply. To initiate the fine-tuning of these primordial elements time plays a more important role than ever because it has to deliver the right kind of fine-tuned constants for further reaction. So, what will be the right time to fuse hydrogen and helium so that 13.8 billion years later we can ask the question as to when the first reaction happened? Any deviation in that starting right value of time will have serious consequences because it contains inflation at right time, the formation of carbon at right time, an explosion at the right time without which life cannot exist. It also needs the power to persuade elements to indulge in a natural collaboration. This collaboration cannot be coincidence otherwise it would be impossible to explain till now what stopped them. These unconscious elements came in a relationship through some other persuasion to give birth. This initial cosmic marriage cannot be without a facilitator. The mere coincidence is nothing but the very choices made by the Essential time to initiate first dis-uniformity which then handed over to Existential time. It is the peculiarity of time, which gave the right values to grow in succession with upcoming right values. Right values and coincidences are integrated into time, which provides the right values for coincidence for some specific thing. That's why nature is not natural, it has its own way, and it is this thesis the first part of this article has defended which discusses apparent paradoxes.

The core philosophy of coincidence actually denies the coincidence. Something is said to be in coincidence when the agent of coincidence unconsciously recognizes the coincidence at some moment of time. This recognition emphatically entails the previous isolation from each other's existence. It simply means, there must not be any interdependency between Human existence and the existence of the universe. On the contrary, the observation of the universe tells us a totally different story. Universe facilitated the life to emerge and life facilitated to recognize the existence of the universe. Creation is giving air so we must use it so that the universe recognizes its worthiness. If we do not use the resources and discuss the cosmic birth, growth, and death, the universe will be unconscious forever of its own capability and generosity. This natural collaboration is so inherent that whole philosophical, metaphysical and now the fine-tuning of the universe attests to its reality without any flaw. It entails a prior framework on which both the existences are working.

When it is established that modern science can take the help of unobserved identities and use philosophy as a tool to convey the apparent miracles of the universe without explaining a source of those apparent coincidences and fine-tuning which demands right time and power to initiate creation. If it is proved that the Essential time is powerful enough to carry out such an extraordinary task, it would be without choice for anyone to ignore the real consequences of it. This evidence will be the conclusion of two premises.

c. The Conclusion from two premises

The ontological being in Essential time is a direct claim of God, he said:

> I am the time and in my hands are the nights and the day [Al-Bukhari, 1997][7]

The statement is the biggest mystery of this universe as to how Time is controlling each and everything and why it cannot be bypassed; one has to admit the presence of time from the first coincidence till the last one. This is the most attractive alternative to base our universe and human existence in a purposeful way. It gives both Human and Universe a purpose as to why they exist. It simply rules out the circular argument of the anthropic principle by explaining that the Universe has been created for Humans and Humans are created for God. If the purpose is ignored from the explanation of Humans and universe then this infinite journey of natural laws, the fine-tuning and the right values of constants serve us nothing more than science fiction. Science deals with the question of why we are here, now if anthropic principle and its consequences are taken for granted, we have totally lost our consciousness of being "reasoned" because that principle asks Human to believe that they are accidentally here. The exasperating illusion is the claim that in the methodology of science purpose has been analyzed that is why Humans reached this level of understanding but accidentally that purposeful struggle is replaced by the mere "coincidences" of the cosmic struggle of elements. By considering the role of God which is proposed in light of modern science and philosophy through the Essential time gives us more purposeful existence than the anthropic principle.

These are a critique of *methodological reason* by the pure reason that does not accept such cosmic battle shedding blood of physical constants at some locations in space to accidentally initiate the multiverse. Rather it demands not to surrender the human ego to some sort of matter and forces and their love affairs giving birth to us. The ego prohibits condoning such notions and identity that human themselves can call to work and enslaved; the pure reason is not ready to serve those masters which were entitled by mere accidents. Strictly speaking, the pure reason and ego demands to consider identity which cannot be call forth to serve us, that cannot be observed but realized, that cannot be particularized but is universal, and that with his attribute of time is close to us every moment, a powerful identity that gives purpose to both human and universe.

In this philosophical and ontological sketch, it has been proposed that the Essential time is followed by two premises and one conclusion to establish its uniform role:

a. Essential time being *uniform* precedes dis-*uniform* creation providing a timeline;

b. Nothing changed without *power*, so Essential time needs the power to provide a timeline;

c. God says: "I am the time and in my hands are the nights and the day".

---

[7] Bukhārī, Tafsīr, 45:1, Tawḥīd, p. 35; Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, Alfāẓ, pp. 2, 3; Dārimī, Adab, p. 169; Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, II, pp. 238, 272. However, it must be noted, it does not mean that time is equal to God, neither in sense of essence nor in sense of existence. Time may be taken as an attribute of God like others.

3. CONCLUSION

Following the thesis defended in the first part of this article, the current article claims to break the fear of avoiding the question, as to why the universe came into existence. It then dealt with eternal war in the methodology of science that replaced the struggle of objective reality to mere empirical adequacy. The intentional conclusion is the result of applying strict methodological reasoning. It was conjured that the reality of Essential time can be proved by two premises and one conclusion. First premise claim that Essential time is uniform preceding dis-uniformity. The second premise is that to initiate dis-uniformity or change it needs power. The defense of second premises reveals that the modern notion of fine-tuning of physical constants of the universe by coincidence does not explain the unnatural nature of the universe. Moreover, the so-called anthropic principle and call to the multiverse to avoid the intervention of any intelligent being end in absurdity. These two premises conclude that the Essential time can easily explain such fine-tuning and coincidental physical constants because essential time has the power to do so. At last, it is claimed that the ontological being inherent in the essential is the claim of God "I am the time", that provide all the sense as to why essential time has the power to initiate dis-uniformity after long uniformity. Most importantly it answers the question of why universe came into existence by providing a purpose.

References

Aristotle, 1985 (Phy.) – Aristotle. "Physics", in: *The complete works of Aristotle*, ed. by J. Jonathan. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985, pp. 315–446.

Athearn, 1994 – Althearn. *Scientific nihilism: on the loss and recovery of physical explanation*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1984. 387 pp.

Carr, Rees, 1979 – Carr, B. J., Rees, M. J. "The anthropic principle and the structure of the physical world", *Nature*, 1979, vol. 278, no. 8, pp. 605–611.

Barrow, Tipler, 1988 – Barrow, J. D., Tipler, F. J. *The anthropic cosmological principle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988. 738 pp.

Braver, 2007 – Braver, L. *A thing of this world: a history of continental anti-realism*. USA: Northwestern University Press, 2007. 516 pp.

Capra, 2010 – Capra, F. *The Tao of physics: an exploration of the parallels between modern physics and Eastern mysticism*. Boulder: Shambhala Publications, 2010. 368 pp.

Carter, 1974 – Carter, B. "Large Number Coincidences and the Anthropic Principle in Cosmology", in: *Confrontation of Cosmological Theories with Observational Data*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 1974, pp. 291–298.

Çengel, Turner, 2005 – Cengel, Y. A., Turner, R. H. *Fundamentals of thermal-fluid sciences*. McGraw-Hill Companies, 2005. 1206 pp.

Clarke, 2003 – Clarke, D. *Descartes's Theory of Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. 276 pp.

Crane, 2000 – Crane, T. "Dualism, Monism, Physicalism", *Mind & Society*, 2000, vol. 1, pp. 73–85.

Cruse, 2003 – Cruse, P. "On Scientific Realism", *Richmond Journal of Philosophy*, 2003, vol. 3 (Spring), pp. 1–8.

Einstein, 1936 – Einstein, A. "Physics and reality", *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, 1936, vol. 221(3), pp. 349–382.

Einstein, Podolsky, Rosen, 1935 – Einstein, A., Podolsky, B., Rosen, N. "Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Reality Be Considered Complete?", *Physical Review*, 1935, vol. 47, pp. 2–5.

Feyerabend, 2010 – Feyerabend, P. *Against method*. London: Verso, 2010. 336 pp.

Galili, Tseitlin, 2003 – Galili, I., Tseitlin, M. "Newton's First Law: Text, Translations, Interpretations and Physics Education", *Science and Education*, 2003, vol 12 (1), pp. 45–73.

Greene, 2010 – Greene, B. *The elegant universe: superstrings, hidden dimensions, and the quest for the ultimate theory* (Second ed.). New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2010. 447 pp.

Hawkings, Mlodinow, 2010 – Hawkings, S., Mlodinow, L. *The Grand Design*. New York: Bantam books publication, 2010. 208 pp.

Hetherington, 1993 – Hetherington, N. S. *Encyclopedia of cosmology: historical, philosophical, and Scientific foundations of modern cosmology.* New York, London: Garland publishing, 1993. 686 pp.

Iqbal, 1908 – Iqbal, M. *The development of metaphysics in Persia – A contribution to the history of Muslim philosophy*. London: London Luzac and company, 1908. 147 pp.

McMullin, 1993 – McMullin, E. "Indifference principle and anthropic principle in cosmology", *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A*, 1993, vol. 24 (3), pp. 359–389.

Newton, 2007 – Newton, I. *Original letter from Isaac Newton to Richard Bentley (Normalized Version)*. *189.R.4.47, ff. 7–8,* Cambridge. [http://www.newtonproject.ox.ac.uk/view/texts/normalized/THEM00258].

Preston, 2013 – Preston, J. *Feyerabend: Philosophy, Science and Society (Key Contemporary Thinkers).* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013. 256 pp.

Rosen, 2016 – Rosen, G. "What Is Constructive Empiricism?", *Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic tradition*, 2016, vol. 74 (2), pp. 143–178.

Psillos, 1999 – Psillos, S. *Scientific realism: How science tracks truth*. New York, London: Routledge, 1999. 368 pp.

Rae, 1986 – Rae, A. *Quantum physics: Illusion or reality*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 1986. 155 pp.

Schjoedt, 2009 – Schjoedt, U. "The religious brain: A general introduction to the experimental neuroscience of religion", *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion*, 2009, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 310–339.

Schrödinger, 1951 – Schrödinger, E. *My view of the world*. London: Cambridge University press, 1951. 121 pp.

Siddiqui, 2018 – Siddiqui, N. A. "A new theory of Time connecting differentiated cum undifferentiated universe", *Filosofiya nauki i tekhniki*, 2018, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 103–121.

Springel, Frenk, White, 2006 – Springel, V., Frenk, C. S., White, S. D. M. "The large-scale structure of the Universe", *Nature*, 2006, vol. 440 (April), pp. 1137–1144.

Steinberg, Brown, Clement, 1990 – Steinberg, M. S., Brown, D. E., Clement, J. "Genius is not immune to persistent misconceptions: conceptual difficulties impeding Isaac Newton and contemporary physics students", *International Journal of Science Education*, 1990, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 265–273.

Torretti, 1999 – Torretti, R. *The philosophy of physics*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1999. 512 pp.

Weinberg, 1987 – Weinberg, S. "Anthropic Bound on the Cosmological Constant", *Physical Review Letters*, 1987, vol. 59, no. 22, pp. 2607–2610.

Wolchover, Byrne, 2014 – Wolchover, N., Byrne, P. "In a Multiverse, What Are the Odds?", *Quanta Magazine*, 2014, 8. [https://www.quantamagazine.org/the-multiverses-measure-problem-20141103, accessed on 22.04.2019].

Wray, 2013 – Wray, K. B. "Success and truth in the realism/anti-realism debate", *Synthese*, 2013, vol. 190, no. 9, pp. 1719–1729.

За пределами случайной тонкой настройки Вселенной: онтология эссенциального времени

Насииб Ахмед Сиддики *– аспирант. Институт технологии Университета Онтарио. Канада, L1G0C5, Онтарио, Северная Ошава, Ошава, Симко-стрит, д. 2000; e-mail: siddiquinaseeb@gmail.com*

В первой части данного исследования были предложены и обоснованы теоретические рамки новой теории времени. Время было подвергнуто естественной категоризации, в ходе которой было выявлено два типа времени: экзистенциальное и эссенциальное. В данной статье, которая содержит заключительную часть проведенного ранее исследования, речь идет об онтологическом измерении эссенциального времени. В противоположность представлениям о тонкой настройке физических констант Вселенной как возникшей в результате случайности, в данной статье производится попытка показать, что эта «случайность» сама по себе зависит от времени. Эссенциальное время предоставляет хронологию творения, которое начинается от абсолютного единообразия и следует к многообразной Вселенной, и случайность оказывается запланированной. Таким образом, эссенциальное время единообразно, бесформенно и обладает особой силой, обеспечивающей творение вселенной через создание многообразия из того, что было единообразным. Вопрос состоит в том, почему эссенциальное время способно сделать это и что является источником, пробуждающим многообразие – все это вызывает дискуссию об онтологии эссенциального времени. Онтология эссенциального времени рассматривается с помощью двух предпосылок. В статье обосновывается, почему данный способ объяснения целевой причины Вселенной является предпочтительным по сравнению с представлением о «случайности» в современной науке, «Демиургом» Платона или «Перводвигателем» Аристотеля. Таким образом выявляется фундаментальный недостаток антропного принципа и показывается, что с его помощью не удается дать удовлетворительного ответа на вопрос о том, почему Вселенная существует. Сочетание научного, философского и метафизического аргументов создает убедительную интерпретацию относительно онтологического бытия в эссенциальном времени, не отклоняясь от универсальных фактов о Вселенной. Это может быть ответом на вопрос о том, почему возникла Вселенная.

Ключевые слова: причина творения, теория всего, время и эссенциальное время, антропный принцип, тонкая настройка Вселенной, Большой Взрыв, мультиверс