The One Savior Paradigm

Zeps, Dainis

Institute of Mathematics and Computer Science. University of
Latvia

27 September 2009

The One Savior Paradigm

Dainis Zeps[1]

dainis.zeps@lumii.lv

Institute of Mathematics and Computer Science

Riga, September, 2009.

Abstract

The one savior paradigm is discussed not only as doctrinal aspect of religious teachings but as one of mostly manifested aspect of our psychic that should be adequately investigated. We suggest simple idea that could serve as starting cognitive model for the one savior paradigm, that might give effect in considering global aspects of humanity, e.g., such as global economy and exact sciences in more friendly connection with religious thinking.

Key words: religion, theology, science, art, society, global economy, noosphere, accessibility to information

Introduction

Idea to save the world or like mighty thoughts comes in our heads with greater ease than something else sufficiently moderate what would pertain to our everyday life. If we carefully look around in the world of ideas the ideas that come close to the simple idea to save the world are all around. Today we see so many moves whose main idea is nothing else as to present another more story with the savior of the world as the main hero. The movie may be thriller, or cartoon, or romantic story, or whatever else, nevertheless the main idea of a hero as a savior would come to ground floor sooner or later if only author of the genre has correctly captured the idea of savior and implemented it correctly, with certainty, in the artistic form of the genre.

All religious movements are grounded upon one and the same paradigm, namely, the one savior paradigm. Many observers of the fact uses it as counterexample or conterterm against the religion, trying in it uncover human aspect of the idea, and in the same moment to oppose it with the idea of the divine origin of the religious paradigm. But we could seriously ask to ourselves: "Must we always oppose idea of one savior with the as if divine origins in the cores of religious ideas? Don't we have other ways to interpret the idea of the one savior which may turn be more compliant and concordant with the essence?" After all, if God

---

[1] Author's address: Institute of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Latvia, http://www.lumii.lv/, Riga, Rainis av., 29, Latvia, LV - 1459

created us according his "image", what unnatural in the fact if we try, unconsciously or else, to imitate God in his own most privilege in suggesting patterns in so many ways to play the savior paradigm in some role on some stage thus staging our own genesis once more. By the way, we are too closely related with the one savior paradigm in sense that we can't live without it, so the best is to find ways how to live with this in peace and with maximal benefit of this our hard to determinable quality – virtue or vice or too deep quality of our psyche to be determined at all. Another way is to see in this paradigm whole dimension of our psyche that has its own depth with, maybe, apex of virtue, and, maybe, apex of vice, too. What we attribute to what – it remains our belief and our private religion.

Negative assessment of religion paradigm via one savior paradigm

Religious traditions as a rule employ some divine origin in their doctrinal base. What are these divine roots have proper sense only within the religious system itself and doesn't have any sense outside the religious system; in this sense these roots are in point of fact completely inner traditions. Believers are urged to believe in these roots, but unbelievers from their side may use them on purpose to unearth the religious system from outside, or even undermine just from under the roots, how they would think, even though from outside (or from beneath) these ideas don't have any or much sense.

If considered from these points of view negative assessment of religious paradigm via one savior paradigm is robed of any sense. Nevertheless, any constructive critic, even of paradigms of religious traditions, is possible, but it must use some productive methodology which try to reconstruct religious genesis in some adequate way. Thus the one savior paradigm may just be one of connections between inner systems of doctrinal nature and anthropic interpretations based on common sciences.

Savior in religious system, science and history of society

Aspirations to subdue other human beings in order to get control over, or to come to ultimate state of guaranteed peace, or to save all society from common evil or alien power may be of one and the same psychic origin, or, in terms of one savior paradigm, different levels of one and the same ambition of the psyche of human being. For us it is crucial to observe that in one or other way these are one savior paradigm manifestations. Of course, the use of the term itself – one savior paradigm – would suggest that we use term in more or less appropriate conditions, when savior's aspect is manifested directly when we may speak about definitely positive intention or ability. But, after all, we don't know why God forbade us to eat from the tree in the middle of the Garden. We don't know what we knew in case we were obedient.

Most definitely one savior paradigm reveals itself in religious systems, but our intention is just to bring this term outside religious realm both retaining its very religious meaning within religions too. What we want to show is that one savior paradigm in other fields of human life doesn't crucially differ but have common cognitive ground. How to come to idea to unite these somewhat different realms, religions and social and even scientific frontiers?

Let us imagine that aspect of savior has two ends, one to believe in one's ability, and second one's objective ability. Our experience tends to make great difference between these two terms, and it has all rights for that. But in part of human being which presents as if its best essence both things should not differ at all. If we had many instances of the savior paradigm being applied with different outcomes with, maybe, most cases with negative result, but some cases with positive, we could just this last part consider as paradigmatic which characterizes the assumed savior in his/her essence. For them intentional and actual (as factual) aspect doesn't differ as much or almost not at all.

Let us look on history of religions, sciences, on historical events of great importance for nations. The main players in all there seems to be people of great names, but why? History as sequence of events is made only by single persons? Not just so simple, if we do not want to loose objective conditions (caused by other persons) for these persons to act as factual they do. But historical processes in whatever aspect, scientific, religious, from whatever social aspect, beside others reveal with mighty forms of manifestations persons that may stand for saviors on their stage in their time. Thus the manifestations of such persons as the saviors work with incredible force. It is as if we most easy understand this language in terms of the one savior what turns in some common language both from side of the actor, namely, the savior, and the observer, namely, the history.

Cognitive model of the savior

What should be the savior if considered in one person? To start with we may observe that each human being is potential savior in the setting of eventual abilities necessary for that purpose. No superman may be savior due to lack of chance to come into existence in reality. He/she must be, at least in the beginning, human being. Like Jesus Christ, who firstly should had to come into being just as human being in order to claim on all other arguments of his teaching afterwards and thus, from the doctrinal part of the story, play adequately, with divine testimony the role of the Savior.

But not all humans in history prove to have been saviors in some visible aspects if we want not to confine the term itself to something very narrow, say, mother for child or like. What makes savior become savior? It is the aspect due to what it should be called savior. For example, in mathematical science Everest Galois may be claimed for such title because of the extraordinal contribution for particular science. Thus, the aspect in its extraordinarity makes the savior to become savior. If country should be saved, and there finds a person who does this, the effect of the whole matter makes the person to be called savior. Like Joseph in Egypt in Genesis.

Let us use this principle further to come to a cognitive model of the savior. Let us take all human beings and let attribute for each some aspect which may claim to be relevant for other civilization in whatever aspect of its existence. Let us assume that for reasons we may not be able to explain only part of these claims would become manifest in some visible or observable way for other human beings. Depending on the degree of these manifestations we then would tend to denote, and accordingly name, some of them in some aspects, places and times, as our saviors.

What we would gain with starting our cognitive model just in this way? For us it is relevant that there could be many cases when some persons would claim for some considerable contribution as savior, but because of some conditions that didn't occur. For example, let us assume that Galois didn't write his notes in night before the duel, and we never would know this name standing for great mathematician. Evariste Galois would remain unknown to world, and mathematics were to find other ways to start group theory.

But we want to build our cognitive model as if taking into account these cases too, i.e., when some persons were able to do something granted them from higher providence, but obstacles forbade that to do. Why? Let us assume, within our model and as some pure aspect of our model, that there exists, or reveals itself as if existing, actually some higher providence which endows somebody with some crucial for all society ability and, this providence doesn't bother whether the person puts into effect this ability or not because of conditions maybe necessary for this effect; the only what the providence bothers to do is to choose a person who maximally would be able for that reason. The ability would have two ends too, to claim providence for receiving, say, type of grant, and to come to be visible for providence because of providence being providence. In case of Galois, providence gave ability to Galois, and happily Galois used this ability, but there could be other outcome of events and we were to discover group theory in other times under other conditions. Providence would wash hands in innocence.

What gives us such model of cognition and what for we need such? It makes, or it should make at least, us to be very careful against possible losses which we may suffer because of loosing eventual our saviors. But how to know what knows providence? Of course, it is impossible and we can't return all lost people in history which would have given us so much in case they were lived with grants of providence. All this we speak in order to become more reasonable in future, because past reveals to us in so much in other ways with appearance so clearly expressed via Old Testament statements and via Jesus Christ words "You have killed all your prophets" and like.

What to do in future in order to correct what we have possibly lost?

Jesus Christ as Savior and the teacher about the state of being savior

Let, before going forward, us consider what told to us about this subject the person whom Christian world calls the Savior. Religious tradition tends to name Christ Savior because of his teaching and his promises which he made before leaving the world. Christ is Savior because he named himself so with divine confirmation and corroborated it with his teaching.

But here it would for us be useful to observe that Christ may would have been intent to learn us about the being the saviors ourselves much too. At least nothing contradicts such our claim. Christ said that we should be perfect as our Father is. Christ's teaching unambiguously is oriented to teach us to follow Christ in all and to be followers of his teaching and in his life philosophy in all aspects. Let us see *Tomas de Kampis* and his *De imitatione Christi* (1). But in the same time we take more seriously the idea that Christ wanted us to be careful against savior paradigm and try to interpret it mostly deeply, similarly as we try to interpret ten commandments' tradition taken over in New Testament for the Old Testament. From today's

point of view, If we want to understand teaching of Christ we should accept that it might be intent for modern society as much as it was such for societies of his time.

The consequences of one savior paradigm for modern people

What today would mean a savior? We are interested in the aspects that follow directly from our supposed cognitive model of the savior. First of all we must observe that world have become global. It is global in whatever aspects of human life here on the earth, were it information space as Internet, or economy, or scientific society, or socio-political environment, or blogging, chatting and twittering world. Would it be economy, we where mostly using terms like global economy and so, but this applies to science and for other realms of human being, for religions of the world mostly too.

Ignorance, in part or complete, of the one savior paradigm in today's world might be reason, or at least one of the reasons, of world economic crisis, see (2; 3). How to support such argument? Very simply. We relay on persons whom we name mostly eminent persons of society but who doesn't have any credit of providence to claim for grants of providence. Mostly manifested this is in politics and world economy (2; 3), but, as sadly it may sound, in sciences too, where we would tend to think that science people gain their reputation only via their abilities. What we want to say be this that there doesn't exist any realm on our planet where the savior paradigm were not ignored. Only in religious doctrines the savior paradigm is kept mostly with substantial significance for most easy understood able reasons, because otherwise religious systems might loose their primary sense.

What are people with credit of providence? Yes, we do not know them. Yes, we can't replace existing persons of importance with persons chosen by providence because of simple fact that we do no know them. We even do no know simplest ways how to get to such knowledge. What to do? What we could invent in these conditions where we are to live? How to gain some knowledge about ourselves when we know that we live in global society (as in some big family, let us start to remember Vernadsky and his noosphere (4)), but actually we live according the same rules as we lived hundred and three hundred years ago, maybe, even, three thousand years ago?

If for us idea that we are brothers and sisters seems vulgar, let us read William Saroyan's short play "Coming through the rye" (5). Or read NT, John, 17th chapter (6). But for persons who disdain religions or literature as not being scientific we could remind that there might be scientific explanations that our detachment into individual persons might be more illusion than reality.

What we could do to cure the situation in general what concerns the one savior paradigm?

There are some simple things possible already today. One such thing is to make possible all people on the world receive all whatever nature information that humanity possesses. Why so? Because we do not know who would need it because we do not know the name of the savior. Of course, we may always rely on providence that it would find ways how to provide grants for necessary persons supplied with all necessary information. Similarly as in case of Galois. But why not to help from our part too? Why we should be only "the killers of our prophets"?

Is such idea too naive? Maybe, but let us imagine how simple is this idea and how deep it is and how simple to formulate but maybe how hard to make it working properly. But it could serve as some starting point. We know that information via Internet is more than ever acceptable and for almost all people. But not for all. First, we should come to conditions where every human being on this planet has access to Internet and, next, to all essential information too. It is all. But it may be start for something more too. What type of start? For the first time we must accept these things as working principles in most general sense and then start to look over how to come to them working alive.

Next step would be connected with observing ourselves and whatever balances in ourselves what concerns us as conscious beings in global society of other conscious beings where we live all on the same conditions that are granted us by God and most differ only because of our ignorance of the grace and proper will of the same God.

Support for sciences that might support investigation of the one savior paradigm

Next to access to information is the proper acquiring of this information. This means that we as conscious human beings should facilitate development of sciences that would facilitate better understanding of the one savior paradigm.

Let me name only some possible examples (7; 4; 8; 9; 10; 11; 12; 13; 14; 15). And more (16; 17; 18; 19; 20; 21; 22; 23).

Conclusions

The one savior paradigm is not relevant only for religious teachings, it may turn out to be most relevant for our global society if properly studied too.

References

1. **Tomas, de Kampis.** *De Imitatione Christi, part I.* s.l. :
http://www.ltn.lv/~dainize/inform_theol/IMITATIO_I.htm.

2. **Zeps, Dainis.** *World's Economy: what is money. Physicists approach to tendencies in world's economy.* Muenchen : MPRA Paper No. 14416, 2009.

3. —. *Answer to question what is money: gauge freedom. Physicist's approach to tendencies in world's economy.* Muenchen : MPRA Paper No. 14453, 2009.

4. **Vernadski, Vladimir.** *Biosphere and Noosphere (In Russian).* Moscow : s.n., 2002.

5. **Saroyan, William.** Coming through the rye. Short play.

6. *Novum Testamentum Graece, Nestle-Aland ed.* Stuttgart : Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2001. 27. revidierte Auflage.

7. **Berkeley, George.** *Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge.*

8. **Ouspensky, Peter.** *Tertium Organum. Key to the Enigmas of the World. In Russian.* 1911.

9. **Whorf, Benjamin Lee.** *Language, Mind and Reality.* 1952. pp. Vol. IX, No 3, 167-188.

10. **Bohm, David.** *Wholeness and the Implicate Order.* London : Routledge, 2002.

11. **De Chardin, Teilhard.** *The Phenomenon of Man.* 1975.

12. **Prideaux, Jeff.** *Comparison between Karl Pribram's "Holographic Brain Theory" and more conventional.* bez viet. : Virginia Commonwealth University, 2000. http://www.acsa2000.net/bcngroup/jponkp/.

13. **Radin, Dean.** *Entangled Minds. Extrasensory Experiences in a Qauntum Reality.* s.l. : Paraview Pocket Books, 2006.

14. **Tipler, Frank J.** *The Physics of Christianity.* s.l. : Doubleday, 2007.

15. **Dlyasin, G.** *Azbuka Germesa Trismegista ili molekularnaja tainopis mishelnija.* 2002.

16. **Steiner, Rudolf.** *Die vierte Dimension. Mathematik und Wirklichkeit.* Dornach : R. Steiner Verlag, 1995.

17. **D'Aquili, Eugene and Newberg, Andrew B.** *The Mystical Mind: Probing the Biology of Religious Experience.* s.l. : Augsburg Fortress Publishers, 1999.

18. **Penrose, Roger.** *The Road to Reality. A Complete Guide to the Laws of the Universe.* New Yourk : Vintage Books, 2007.

19. **King, Serge Kahili.** *Urban shaman.* s.l. : A Fireside Book, 1990.

20. **Huang, Kerson.** *Fundamental Forces of Nature. The Story of Gauge Fields.* Singapore : World Scientific, 2007.

21. **Hu, Huping Hu and Wu, Maoxin.** *Spin as Primordial Self-Referential Process Driving Quantum Mechanics, Spacetime Dynamics and Consciousness.* New York : Biophysics Consulting Group, 2003.

22. **Zeps, Dainis.** *Quantum Distinction: Quantum Distinctiones!* Leonardo Journal of Sciences : (LJS), 2009 (8), p. 252-261. Issue 14 (January-June).

23. —. *The Double Rotation as Invariant of Motion in Quantum Mechanics.* Riga : s.n., 2009. http://www.ltn.lv/~dainize/idems.html.