

ALWAYS
OTHERWISE
OTHERWISE
NOTHING

“Why?”

“Because you can”

“I’ll believe it when i see it”

What compels a 25 year old to write a paper about the origin of being? Is a question you may rightfully ask. I've always had a keen interest in any matter of the mind, with great emphasis on matters which are as of yet unresolved, or problems that are possibly inherently unsolvable. Although I do not claim to be right or claim that I have anything near the experience required to get a full view of what life might mean, I do claim that my views will help you progress yours. That is the reason I wrote this.

It is not really going to be scientific, but it will remotely resemble a scientific paper. I do not believe in the APA style or other such nonsensical rules for explaining ideas, if my idea has merit it should speak in any form or language.

The fact that I believe my views might help you, originates from my experience of the current world and the way people behave in it. Over the past decade a feeling slowly started to creep up on me, a feeling, I believe, many share with me. This feeling of directionless despair, all options open but none worth pursuing more than the other. In the current time, riddled with scientific discovery and "progress" it seems we've lost meaning. All that progress is well and good, but for who, and why and are we even progressing in the right direction?

If I feel lost, I feel that I can assume others must feel the same way, especially in the so-called "west" the people who share (at least in part) my culture, upbringing and values. That sense of being lost may be explained by the Nihilism that results from following the current scientific knowledge to its extremes and also the loss of credibility from the church. In the "West" we currently don't have an all-encompassing life Philosophy that gives reason to live, to hope. One that leaves some mystery and uncertainty, but puts all our noses in the same general direction. A Philosophy that will make you want to be a better person for yourself and for others.

This is what I am setting out to achieve, an all encompassing theory that creates new values to adhere to, but is also aware that those values are open to change. A Philosophy where difference is celebrated and utilised as being the most effective and productive thing we can do.

To do that, I must surpass the Reasoning of Science and I must present a more effective moral than Religion can. Annihilating Nihilism, which arose as a result of scientific views, is also part of the to do list.

"How are you going to that though?", might be your question. "That is impossible", you might also say. The only way to find out if your disbelief is founded is to give this paper a read. So now that I got your full attention and you are ready with an open mind, Let's get into it! Oh and any critiques you might have, they are more than welcome, but don't start sending them right away, wait till after you're done reading, thanks!

INTRODUCTION

THE STATE OF MEANING

WHAT IS SCIENTIFIC VALUE

NEARLY NEEDLESS NIHILISM

A FRESH START

DIFFERENTIALISM

PRAGMATIC DIFFERENTIALISM

THE FUTURE & SELF-CRITICISM

DEFENITIONS

INTRODUCTION

In this piece we'll try to put my thoughts about the cause of meaning and being into words. We will do this by critiquing the currently supposedly value enabling and making theories, beliefs and philosophies. We'll also do this by my description of what I believe the cause of being and meaning is while also basing it around a steady Scientific and Psychological (Mental) basis.

First we'll go over the current state of meaning as given by Religion, what it means and why it doesn't work or might even be dangerous. We'll also come across other "-isms" who try to create(or destroy) value in their own way and we'll discuss how they fail.

After which we'll make a couple of strides into Science, which has a bloated confidence in it's own truth and doesn't seem to see it is a disadvantage or sees that it might even be it's downfall. The Core principles of Science are useful and right, but currently the consequences and excesses are not necessarily beneficial. Especially concerning claims of absolute truths and values, there is still much to be said.

We'll continue by devaluing Nihilism, which as a frame of thought, originates from the assumption of the futility of human life, based on the current Scientific Paradigm. Then we'll explore the needlessness of this idea and how to dismiss it as such.

After having broken dismissed or evaded everything in our way, we can now start anew. We'll go as close to "the start" as we possibly and reasonably can. From that place we'll start building a foundation for meaning and thereby give a plausible reason to live (in other words: hope).

Then we've found meaning, but then this meaning has to be enacted, experienced and lived, so we'll go into the how and why of Pragmatic Differentialism.

Finally we'll spend some time, to do some self-criticism and paint a picture of all the directions the future might possibly take us. This philosophy prescribes itself to be false eventually, so we need to be aware of its weaker points so we can change and improve them, whether that's me or you. And also to show that this theory of reality is not defined absolutely and indefinitely, but it is definitely an Invitation for more definitions and predictions.

THE STATE OF MEANING

Throughout Western Europe, church visits are in decline, more and more people do not identify with the values presented by the church anymore. Nevertheless Christianity and other Religions provide something that Science can't. A moral code, some form of perceived security, a distinction between good and evil and a reason to live a good life. Then why are we massively leaving the church behind? And are all the people that left the church now completely convinced atheists? Or are people truly comfortable in the agnostic position of limitless doubt?

A significant number of people have started to search for meaning elsewhere, whether that is in Spiritualism, Activism, Nationalism or some other "-ism". Are those then the new religions? Do these perspective and meaning creating philosophies really work, or are they bound to corrupt themselves? Do all of these have built within them the inevitable possibility of extremism that causes violence, misunderstanding and despair?

Let dive into a few philosophies (in my personal definitions) that seem to be on the forefront:

- **Materialism** : The acquiring and retaining of goods and other forms of wealth as the road to fulfilment in life.
- **Egoism**: The elevation of the self above all others, since being above everyone must be the best position and therefor will bring fulfilment
- **Spiritualism**: The belief in a greater something than ourselves, that connects everything, a different realm
- **Nihilism**: The belief that human life is meaningless as related to the current scientific paradigm of the negligibility of human life as compared to the scale of the universe.
- **Nationalism**: The belief that love for ones nation and the defence of that nation is each inhabitant's greatest goal and that it grants superiority over other nations and inhabitants originating from other nations
- **Activism**: The belief that anything not accepted by your group should be battled against or at least demonstrated against. Value gained from a supposed moral high ground and the forced achievement of "good".

All behaviours can be corrupted by extremism, but 4 of the examples given will likely cause the most harm when followed to the extreme, since those philosophies place their goal within the lifespan of a human. Or said otherwise, there is something to achieve within the lifetime that can be graded or compared to one's surroundings and or peers

Activism, Egoism, Materialism and Nationalism are all philosophies in which the individual is aiming to prove itself by judgement from the group. The more extreme you are the more celebrated of a group member you become or should become. This type of self-enforcing group driven views are very dangerous and have proven to be so throughout history. If an absolute truth is decided upon and then followed, extreme results will inevitably follow. This also goes for Religion, with the exception that the judgement is not in the hands of your peers but in the hands of an omnipotent being who is unperceivable, but always perceiving you.

Without positive feedback on extreme behaviour, people tend to lean more on their own reasoning. Moreover, the judgement of your actions is not proclaimed or noticeable daily, or even within your life, it is at the end of your life, with everything taken into account. So you can have an off day and you don't have to take it up a notch every time you interact. Being the most religious is therefore not necessarily beneficial, so extremism is less likely. It is only when you and your peers see social benefit in being the most religious that it causes extremes. Examples of such situations include the sale of so called "indulgences" by the Catholic Church. The supposed reducing of punishment by god gained by paying the church or by being the most pious through prayer or some other form of penance. If specified rituals or activities will reduce or eliminate punishment in the after life it will cause extreme behaviour by those who are most insecure, or by those who feel it exempts them from their wrong doings. Presuming a more beneficial judgement by an all knowing but unperceivable being after death based on some minor activities is absolute nonsense of course. The other 2 examples that still remain have another basis for their value, namely an unprovable absolute subjective truth. Which is to say, they have a belief not founded on a claimed external authority, such as a book, but on an experienced or reasoned internal conviction.

- **Spiritualism:** A personal belief in a greater being or beings that exist in an another realm, maybe even a felt experience of that realm, a realm that connects us all or is apparent in everything.

- **Nihilism:** A denial of a purpose to life. Or in the words of Nietzsche: The highest value devalues itself.

Both are a form of individualistic belief or conviction since both start from personal experience (subjective empiric evidence) and reasoning to ground and give value to the belief. Which is not to say they do not try to legitimise themselves with external proofs gained through science. Nihilism partly arose as a possibility from the current scientific paradigm. The fact that in the grand scheme of the universe, the life of a human is so insignificant it is not worth anything. Also, no absolute truth is ever achievable since no reasoning creature will exist forever and only reasoning beings can hold absolutes. Without science and the continued investigation of our universe and our place in it, these views would not have been possible.

When we look at spiritualism, it also tries to grasp some of the current scientific understanding, for instance from biology. If you believe in the intrinsic connection through a greater being/realm, you can point to networks of information and nutrient exchange between trees and plants. Or when you want to say that everything is connected since the big is built with the same code as the small, you can point to the fact everything's made of atoms or the similarities between star clustering and fungus clustering.

All in all, the conclusion seems to be that scientific argumentation or rather, the possibility of proof has become increasingly important to validate beliefs in the West. At the very least, a belief has value if can't be directly disproven by science. If Science is that important, what creates that value of judgement?

WHAT IS SCIENTIFIC VALUE?

Science is the method in which we try to build absolute knowledge based on repeated empiric evidence, through excluding as many variables as possible. Nonetheless, however powerful these truths may prove, they are never definitive as is prescribed by the method itself. New empiric evidence may come along at any time and discredit a whole theory. Then why is most scientific proof presented as the only truth and why does it usually function as such as well?

Most of the theories presented as truth have value, since they have actual pragmatic predictive power. They really seem to be able to predict events in advance; this is what gives Science value. This ability and the possibility to be disproven are two unique features that are not apparent in most Religions and therefor science is seen as more valuable.

All pragmatically true theories may be assumed the truth in such a way that you are allowed to build new truths on the previous ones. As long as the underlying theories hold up you can extrapolate new “knowledge” by adding to it. This feature of science is it’s greatest strength and it’s greatest weakness. Allowing oneself to build on assumptions and supposed truths in any form increases the speed of progress. On the other hand, if a basic theory proves to be inaccurate or false, the whole branch of science built on that theory now has to be re-explained. This creates friction with those who are invested and depending on what was previously the truth, which in turn will slow acceptance of the new evidence and the related paradigm.

In that specific way Science increasingly looks like a Religion. The value of existing knowledge increases over time, while seemingly almost losing the ability to be discredited. Hierarchical structures, external financial interests, traditions and dogma’s all built around a “scientific consensus” slow the progress and flexibility of sciences. In the field of Physics for instance, there is some knowledge that is so dogmatic you cannot question it anymore, such as the laws of thermodynamics or the existence of gravity based on attraction of mass.

You might think, well there is a reason for that, the theories hold up, the predictions are accurate, it works. This is exactly the issue, the theories work pragmatically, but the assumption that the fact that they work also makes the theory right is wrong.

From Statement:

The street is wet after it rains

And Empirical truth:

“the Street is wet”

Does not logically follow:

“It rained”

But in theory, “it rained”, is a valid explanation and also the most likely, so it has value, but it isn’t necessarily correct.

Finally, Science is Reasonable but lacks Ethics, which is to say: Sciences makes claims based on Repeatable Empiric evidence by means of reason, while excluding emotion. Therefor Science can't say anything useful about random or constant change or about the difference between good and evil (if there is any) and also concepts like beauty. In an experienced world of constant all encompassing change no absolute value is possible. The inability of science to create meaning is one of the reasons that bring us to Nihilism.

[Every (scientific) truth is a paradox explanation]

NEARLY NEEDLESS NIHILISM

In the current scientific paradigm, the influence of humans or even humanity is so small it is insignificant. Since whatever you do in your life, it doesn't really change anything in the grand scheme of things. Looking out from this paradigm, it makes a lot of sense, you can even proclaim it true, as far as we know a human life is indeed way shorter than that of a black hole, or a star. This is the truth Nihilism prescribes, but that truth has no value for a human, since it denies value as a result of insignificance. Therefore it is a useless and needless theory, if it doesn't do you any good or give you any explanation, then why adhere to it? If you see Philosophy as a search for meaning it cannot end in a meaningless place, life was already meaningless, this is why we started searching in the first place.

Moreover, our sphere of influence is the place where our values are created, the place where we exchange values. The vast majority of the visible universe is outside this sphere of influence, therefore not important to us to define our worth, it is unproductive or even counter productive. For example, I can say that most likely no one who reads this will ever experience the heat death of the universe, so why should the reader be bothered by it? That scientific paradigm is, as said before, just a theory and will most likely be disproven in the future.

That is not to say there is no possibility that it will ever matter to us, since maybe at some point humans might reach that level of influence where they can reach for the stars and affect their reality on that scale. If that happens those theories will then be valuable to help decide our own worth and responsibilities. Our future is undecided and that is exactly why you can't devalue it. Just like a bike messenger has little influence over the UN, the UN also has little influence over the day to day life of the bike messenger. Value comes from context and our effective context is not the entire universe, yet.

The fact that we experience on a smaller scale that the biggest fathomable scale doesn't devalue our experience. Science should be fully aware of this since it prides itself on researching the small parts to understand the big parts. It is also aware of the effect a small change can have on the overall result. Examples of this are the search for "new" particles by statistic anomaly over many thousands of measurements, where one new measurement can change the entire result and also, the effect of and energy released by one of the smallest "parts" we know when they are combined or split (Nuclear Fission and Fusion)

Conclusion? Nihilism is unproductive and senseless, or rather; Nihilism is a worthless paradox. Nothing means Nothing, great work! Now that we've got that out of the way, we are still no closer to a solution, we still haven't found a basis for meaning. We've only disproven that there is no meaning. So where to next? Where can we find value in our ever-changing experienced reality?

A FRESH START

What is “I”, What does “I” do? That is exactly what “I” does; It observes, questions and judges. This is what makes the human a thinker. The foundation to this lies in the empirical evidence that each and everyone has, the fact that we have empiric experience, the fact that we receive/take in/experience. The fact that we feel ourselves a separate entity from all else, the acknowledgement that outside of our experience there are also others experiencing. Since, to understand the self, you must understand there is another.

This is what observation/experience is: The acknowledgement of difference between one thing and the next, the split between subject and object, between I and all other things. Observation is the consequence of difference.

Let me give an example, Imagine: You are floating in a completely white environment, there is no distinctions to be made. No space, no time, no touch, no smell, no gravity there is nothing but you and white. “being” in this environment means nothing, for there is no difference to be observed or judged. But then, imagine a black dot appears, all of a sudden this one difference causes the existence of space and time, for if you turn your vision the black dot will now move through your field of vision, giving you a before and after (what has passed is in between is what we call time) and you get a concept of distance, since that is the frame of reference in which you judge the difference made between before and after. So, the only reason you are able to even be aware of the concept of turning, and therefor time and space, is this black dot

The causation of being, you can therefor be abbreviated to this scheme:

- 1: All
- 2: All and I
- 3: All, I and Something

A
A-B
A
| \
B – C

If by this reasoning, we can say; “Difference is the cause of meaning and the cause of being.” Is it advisable or even useful to try to unify all difference, to try and abbreviate or explain everything with absolute truths and theories? Or is that more likely the road to denial of ones own existence, value and self worth? We cannot not put an end to change, so we can’t limit change within absolute rules. That is not to say that science doesn’t have value, but it is saying science should refocus its priorities, away from the search of an all encompassing theory based on absolute values, towards a system of theories built for change.

Really, if difference is the cause of meaning and being, is it not our goal to create more of it? And is that not what we are already doing? I feel we subconsciously

already now what means the most to us and what creates value. Namely the difference we can make for ourselves and the people around us, while we are alive. For one person it might mean helping a family member, friend or neighbour, for another it means reaching a position of political power and for yet another it means excelling in a certain sport or activity. All of these ways of life at their core share one thing, they made a difference, for themselves and the environment they interacted with.

Since every moment you exist you are making a difference, whether you want it or not the fact that you exist is already a difference with great influence. Also, every second there is more difference than the second before, even trying to stop difference from happening is making a difference. But if you make a difference no matter what you do, then what is your influence on that change? Your influence lies in the direction and magnitude of that change, or in other words: The who, what, where, and when of your change.

So if our goal is to create difference, where is our common ground? That is where you take difference as basis for our equality, the thing that connects us. You are equal to me because you are different and make difference in your way, as I am different to you and make difference in my way.

Eventually, you are done differentiating, you made you difference, it is time to make the last difference and die. If your actions had any retraceable effect on the grand scheme of the universe, is unimportant. The only person who experiences and decides the value of your life are you, so you are the one to steer that feeling in the right direction and make it as good as you can.

In the end even the Universe will most likely be done changing, or maybe as a Physicist might tell you, the universe will reach complete entropy. This is the result of continuous differentiation and interaction between all particles. In this stadium of heat death all energy is spread equally and only a "soup" of similar particles remains.

DIFFERENTIALISM

So now we've taken difference as our grounding principle, but how can you give direction based on difference, how can you build a moral? As we previously determined, things are as a consequence of difference, now the question is how to make the next difference? And how do you judge a new difference? I propose to do it through differentialism.

When thinking from the paradigm of differentialism, you assume that everything will always differ from your original expectations. Nothing ever goes 100% according to plan, and no stereotype is ever completed to perfection. This doesn't mean your expectations are worthless, on the contrary! Your current pragmatic truth works, you can make somewhat accurate predictions and what is different from your expectations is where you learn. Your current truth will inevitably change or rather is always changing, so you can never assume or claim to be completely right, you have to be open to the fact that you are wrong. After accepting that you are wrong it is up to you to decide which truth contains the least mistakes and then to stick with that truth until you come across a better one, that proves itself based on empiric evidence.

If you assume difference, you must also assume that whatever you try to do or say, it is most likely misunderstood at least to a degree. Since all thinking entities that experience you and your actions form their own thoughts and opinions about the things they experience and do. Those people will also share their view of the world in their way, that is likely misunderstood. So somehow the real meaning of something is never found.

So as a Differentialist it is important to understand that the pragmatically true experience of someone else, has different values as a basis and therefore also has different conclusions and opinions. The fact that all humans are always wrong at all times is no reason for cynicism but rather for mutual understanding. That is as long as it is understood that mistakes are made on both sides.

The fact that we differ so much from each other also brings me to the next point. The idea that there is an idea: "HORSE" as Plato seemed to proclaim, is not really true in the exact sense it is understood in by scholars today. There is no Ideal perfect horse in a realm beyond, there is a concept of horse based around some features of that horse. That means that we all have a different image of horse in our heads, informed by all the instances of "horse" we've seen throughout our lives, the combination of those instances necessarily different from everyone else's instances. So the idea horse in your head is the imperfect idea and you use a broader non-visualizable concept of horse to be able to speak with others about horses. This collection of features agreed upon by consensus is what enables us to talk about horses, but the image in our head is always a single example of each of those features that define horse. We can talk about phenomena when we agree on certain properties of those phenomena.

An example of such interaction in a structured way is the scientific method; we will both observe a similar situation with similar and agreed upon preconditions

and features, after which we can use those features and preconditions to talk and give value to our experience. We try to exclude as many variables that may be of influence to the situation and its explanation in an effort to get as close to the shared reality as possible. This is exactly what makes science so valuable, the ability to change your personal beliefs through structured observation and reasoning of the features of a certain phenomenon in cooperation with others. So if I want to convince others of the effectiveness of differentialism, it must hold up in a scientific mind-set as well. Therefore we'll continue into these 2 examples.

In the current scientific paradigm the big bang is assumed the likely start of our universe. Here I will condense this idea as follows: "In the start all was compressed into 1 point" Since there is little sensible to say about a moment where everything is in the exact same spot and a moment where time doesn't exist, we'll leave that point behind, but will take the very first step away from that. The Big bang only starts "banging" at the moment of the very first split, the very first difference between all is one and all is two. This moment likely didn't last long but it is the cause of meaning. A moment before when everything is one, you might compare to being on a swing at it's apex, that miniscule moment all forces seem to balance out for a second, where it seems you are weightless, to then continue in the opposite direction.

We've also stated that just existing, just observing, makes a difference. This is also a statement that needs proof to gain some validity. Luckily, Science is already way ahead of us in that respect, exemplified through the discoveries of quantum mechanics. Without claiming to be in any means an expert on the subject, there is one claim I definitely understood. A quantumbit in superposition is only in superposition till measured, till observed. Which means everything is possible till you observe and it matters when you observe what state the particle is going to be in. This is direct proof that observation causes reality to take a value. And since everthings unknown till observed, there is always something new to discover. "If you search, you'll always find something new"

This should also help clear up some the struggles in the debate between objective and subjective truth. The solution to that debate is not completely on one side or the other (it rarely is). There is not just 1 objective truth outside ourselves that we all experience and can find out eventually, there is also not just subjective truths created by your mind. No truly what is real and dependable is the relation between your subjective truth and our shared reality, a relation through observation. Since that is truly the only thing you can say for certain, I experience, I observe. I don't know who the real observer is or if what I'm observing is real, but I am observing. Even better, I observe an external and internal world and they have a relation since they are different form each other and exchange values. It is the first difference, between me and the rest, its "The Difference"

PRAGMATIC DIFFERENTIALISM

Now, pragmatically speaking, how do you make valuable statement in a system based on the fact that you are always going to be wrong, a system where everything is always different? I think very few people if any can discredit the value of the scientific method, since it progresses knowledge through the only means we have, experimentation. Pragmatically speaking it works, it can “predict” future events with a closer accuracy than any other method I currently know and we’re allowed to build on previous assumption to try to expand our ability to predict. Nonetheless, you know that all theories will eventually be disproven, than what is the place of value between pragmatically working truths and the fact they’ll be proven incorrect?

Lets call it Contextually Functional Truths; A combination of observations and judgements over those observations, that at that point in time are useful to explain or predict such observations and new ones. Or slightly more general a Pragmatic Truth, it is true as long as it works, we’ll use it till it breaks.

Important note, this doesn’t mean that everyone’s subjective truth is always contextually functional, on the contrary, most of the time your subjective truth will not be adequate. Think for example of mentally challenged or ill people, they can have observations that are very true to them, but they can’t necessarily use them to make valuable statements about the reality (experience) they share with others. As long as no one acknowledges value in the statements they make, their explanation is not a contextually functional explanation. The main reason for disbelieving these types of truths is that delusions don’t usually result in reasonable predictions of the future in the shared reality. Nonetheless, even delusions can create Contextually Functional Truths as long as they’re not disproven, for instance, I could believe in Aliens based on some stories I’ve heard and I can talk to others that hold the same belief and have a valuable conversation. During that conversation with someone of similar beliefs my truth is unchallenged therefor contextually true and functional. The fact that a truth has validity in one context doesn’t increase its value for other contexts or even in general, since value is dependent on 1 context. So therefor I shouldn’t expect my truth to get accepted based on the fact that it is true to me, moreover if I want to convince others of my truth I need to talk to them with arguments that are sensible and true within their Contextually Functional Truth.

The process of changing truths and beliefs in conversation I see as follows:

- 1- You or I says we believe something
- 2- The Other agrees, doesn’t, or asks a question
- 3- One shares the observation that seem most convincing for beliefs
- 4- Either see the worth in those observations or choose to dismiss them
- 5- Converge your truths and mine by asking questions about the values in others truth and finding where they overlap, this way we create or find common ground through which we can make valuable statements to each other.
- 6- Your Truth (and the other’s) has been adjusted, that was inevitable, the important question is how did it change? Are you more convinced of your

own truth or did you shift your opinion away from your original position? Anyway you use this method it will be effective in effecting change to the truths of others.

That is how Pragmatic Differentialism works, changing is understood as the goal and the method applied is interaction. The more you interact with different truths, the more you differentiate and the more difference you will encompass within your own truth.

This is the main benefit of increasing the variety of functional truths you can understand/hold/believe/occupy, since it increases the size of the context in which your truths are (and have to be) functional. When everyone increases the size of their context they also increase the chance that their contexts will overlap and then you can start sharing values. Being aware of the fact that there is always a reasonable opposite position to yours and that to the person holding that opinion it feels as valuable as your opinion feels to you. This is the realisation that will enable you to understand and exchange value with people that hold those extremely different opinions and to use those oppositions to improve your context.

We are all observers, that is the premise and reason for meaning.

I

I Observe

I Observe Difference

I Value/Judge Difference

I Assume Knowledge

THE FUTURE & SELF-CRITISISM

For now, this is how far we'll take it, because before you can form valuable criticism, you have to accept something, internalize it, make it part your you personal truth. This is a process that won't happen without experimenting, trying these new values out in real life. Therefor, I will, together with you the reader enact my interpretation of these ideas, until this theory like all theories will be changed or abandoned. Luckily it won't take any effort, since by reading this you've already changed your views, which means the difference has been made.

Even tough this explanation aims to show the cause of being and tries to show where meaning comes from in our lives, namely the making of difference, this theory doesn't explain the cause of the "First Difference". It this first split inevitable? Is everything instable, or did it get a push? This is a question that will likely remain out of reach since it tries to explain something about a moment where there was no time to judge things by. No time means nothing happens, therefor it is unexplainable.

What this theory also doesn't do is explain the difference between physically enacting and mentally enacting(observing to make difference). Can you equate Observing and Intervening? If just observing already makes a difference, is that the same type of difference as doing it physically? Or is there no definite distinction, so the two interact in a flexible relationship? Also, can you make a physical difference without first making a mental one? All in all I believe there will remain enough new questions to be answered.

For always different, otherwise it makes no difference.

Always otherwise, otherwise nothing.

Difference = Meaning

