

# Essay by

Salah al-Din Ahmad Lavasani

## A Philosophical Dialogue

### The Philosopher & The Questioner



#### The Questioner:

Greetings and a pleasant night to you. It is, of course, quite late, and I shall not take up much of your time this evening. I hope, however, that we may have the opportunity to engage in a more extensive discussion on this matter at another time.

#### The Philosopher:

Good evening to you as well. Although here, it is still only 4:12 in the afternoon.

#### The Questioner:

We are close to one o'clock in the morning here. May I ask, at what hours are you usually available?

#### The Philosopher:

I am retired; however, due to my research work—particularly in the field of applied mathematics—I am frequently traveling to attend conferences. I have a budget at my disposal and no superior authority overseeing my work. For many years now, I have been studying

Western philosophy, especially German philosophers. In addition, whenever possible, I attempt to rewrite these ideas in simple language so that they may be accessible and useful for children.

### **The Questioner:**

Greetings. It is a great privilege to engage in dialogue with both a mathematician and a philosopher—especially one who is also active in the field of children’s education, where we share common ground. I hereby express my full readiness to collaborate in developing collections that are comprehensible to children and adolescents across the world, not limited solely to the children of our own land. I am inclined to engage in discussion on subjects related to the foundations of existence, concepts of being, the world of awareness and consciousness, as well as the luminous world and the dark world—the latter of which I decidedly regard as prior to the manifest world. I have written a preliminary text, which you may or may not have had the opportunity to read. With your permission, I intended to post it on your page as an opening to our dialogue. This proved impossible, as your page appears to be closed. Therefore, I shall reproduce it here.

### **The Questioner:**

*The Dark World Precedes the Big Bang*

A discourse by Salah al-Din Ahmad Lavasani

Contrary to the belief held by many scientists, the Big Bang could not have been the origin or beginning of the vast and boundless universe of existence. In truth, one may say that not only is the Big Bang not an ancient event, but that it is, in fact, a relatively recent and posterior occurrence. A few simple examples and arguments may suffice to demonstrate this claim.

Naturally, this question arises: if, with a few simple examples and arguments, one can deny that the Big Bang is the point of origin of existence—a theory that forms the foundation of philosophy, mathematics, physics, chemistry, and astronomy—then where have all these theorists and scientists erred? How have they produced so many research papers, analyses, and tangible results? Can such a monumental error truly have occurred?

Indeed, it can. Throughout the historical evolution and expansion of human knowledge, we have repeatedly witnessed such errors and oversights. Thus, it is reasonable to expect that we may commit them again.

From the earliest formation of human cognition and perception of the surrounding world, humanity has continuously expanded the scope of its knowledge through experience and error on one hand, and thought and inference on the other—what we call science.

Along this path, time and again, the results obtained from research and reflection have been found invalid or indefensible, and new, more acceptable conclusions have replaced them. This process has occurred not only in the empirical sciences, but also in the social sciences, as well as in philosophical and mystical thought.

A brief glance at history reveals figures whom the Western world considers founders and continuators of human knowledge—whether rightly or wrongly is not our concern here. Figures

such as Aristotle, Ptolemy, Socrates, and Hippocrates in antiquity; Copernicus, Galileo, and Newton in the medieval period; and Einstein, Hubble, and others in the modern era—each, step by step, critically examined and invalidated the prevailing knowledge of their time, opening new doors of awareness to humanity. All have been regarded as contributors to the forward movement of knowledge.

To better understand the continuous negation and correction of human knowledge, it suffices to recall a time when scholars, based on the Ptolemaic system, regarded the Earth as the center of existence, and even the slightest doubt in this belief was grounds for accusations of heresy.

Recall how a few equations by Copernicus, and a few small and crude lenses with which Galileo constructed his telescope, transformed millennia of accumulated scientific thought into nothing more than the vapor of illusion.

Or consider how Newton's scientific achievements challenged and transformed the entire intellectual infrastructure of his era.

And what Einstein did to the previously unquestioned knowledge of his predecessors with a single five-character equation:  $E = mc^2$ .

These transformations have always emerged from individuals who examined the world with a meticulous eye and refused to accept what they knew as immutable truth.

I have read of a great painter who held an exhibition of his works in Paris. Among the visitors, a simple rural man caught the painter's attention, standing deeply absorbed before a painting of nature. The painter wondered what could possibly captivate a man who encountered such scenes daily. Approaching him respectfully and without introducing himself, he asked the reason for his prolonged contemplation.

The rural man replied in simple and sincere language: "I am astonished that a painter so talented and great does not know that when a sparrow sits on a tree branch, it has weight, and that weight must cause the branch to bend ever so slightly. Look at the sparrow and the branch—there is not the slightest indication of bending."

The painter was first stunned by the man's precision of observation, and then deeply affected by his own negligence in overlooking something so simple and evident. He thanked the rural man as an intelligent critic.

For many years, in all my speeches and writings, I have emphasized one point: truth is a vast concept, and each of us sees only the portion that lies within our angle of vision. We understand according to how we see.

Angle—

The difference between your gaze and mine

At the moment of understanding.

And mutual understanding means

Reducing the span of angles  
With a smile.

A change in one's angle of view can lead to completely contradictory conclusions, each of which may be supported by strong and convincing arguments affirming its certainty.

A simple example: in Iran and in many parts of the world, we can swear that the average length of a day is twenty-four hours, half of which is day and half night. We can prove this with countless rational and traditional arguments. Yet on this very Earth, there are people who, both through experience and scientific reasoning, can swear that a single day lasts one year—six months of night and six months of day, approximately.

Now imagine a scientific debate between two individuals from these different regions, neither of whom has ever experienced the day and night of the other's land, and who possess no knowledge of Earth's axial rotation or its tilted axis. What would be the outcome? Reflect on this for a moment. We shall continue this discourse shortly.

**The Philosopher:**

Mr. Ahmad Lavasani, due to my respect for you and my relative awareness of your achievements, I consider it my duty to briefly state the following points: First: The concept of the Absolute Mind is endorsed by the vast majority of Western philosophers. Second: Belief in the existence of an Absolute Mind does not necessarily entail acceptance of monotheistic religions. Third: In general, philosophical systems do not seek to annihilate one another; rather, they preserve previous philosophies within their own evolutionary trajectory.

**The Questioner:**

Greetings and gratitude, Professor Habibi, for your attention and for the points you have raised. At the outset, and without any particular intention either to reject or accept the concept of the Absolute Mind, experience has taught me that near-unanimous agreement and majority consensus do not always testify to truth and reality. Occasionally this may occur, but it cannot be generalized to all times, all matters, and all conditions.

We remember—and still do—that the overwhelming majority of intellectuals across various domains, including Western philosophers, prior to the demonstration of the Earth's sphericity, believed it to be flat and the center of existence, constructing all their decrees and viewpoints upon this axis. Yet one day this belief was challenged by a few individuals and its invalidity was proven—albeit at the cost of the lives of some of these pioneers, among them Copernicus.

And thereafter...

You stated that belief in the Absolute Mind does not exclusively or necessarily imply acceptance of monotheistic religions. In this regard, I agree with you to some extent. However, my opposition to the notion of an all-encompassing intellect is not merely due to my opposition to divine religions—which I consider false—but rather lies in the very root and content of this concept itself, and its clear and fundamental contradiction with the extraordinary phenomenon of cause and effect.

This contradiction is even more pronounced within monotheistic religions. The phrase “*He begets not*” stands as a clear symbol of this grand deception. My opposition to religions—all of them, not only their so-called divine versions—is far deeper than a debate over the Absolute Mind, and I shall address it in its proper place should the need arise.

As for your third point: I sincerely and wholeheartedly state that I have never devoted my efforts to erasing or annihilating past philosophical schools. While I consider many of them ineffective and sterile, I nonetheless regard them as mirrors of admonition—mirrors that clearly show contemporary theorists how profoundly the mind can deceive human beings and lead them astray.

In truth, I consider intellectual museums to be the most suitable refuge for such ideas, serving as lessons to be observed and reflected upon.

Most of these theories—though not all of them, especially excluding modern, progressive ideas not founded upon the Absolute Mind—serve as valuable indicators for careful logical scrutiny in the pursuit of truth.

May you remain joyful and lofty in thought.

**The Philosopher:**

Professor Lavasani, my objective is to explain the practical dimension of philosophy in simple language and to demonstrate its application through examples drawn from various sciences, so that it may be useful to everyone. For the moment, I shall confine myself to a few remarks concerning the Absolute Mind. I define the Absolute Mind as an intellect that contains all truths and all discovered relationships among them from the beginning until now. From a certain perspective, it is indeed relative, because there still exist truths of which we are unaware. This Absolute Mind exists in an approximate sense and is rapidly expanding. I would be interested to hear your opinion on this matter.

**The Questioner:**

I am fundamentally opposed to this notion. That said, I do not reject it outright when addressing the general public. On occasion, in order to demonstrate its nonexistence, I first prove its existence and then, by presenting stronger arguments, conclude that it cannot exist.

**The Philosopher:**

Why can it not exist?

**The Questioner:**

Without delving into the ultimate cause of existence, I believe one can more easily contemplate and address the present and the future. The simplest foundation is the rational relationship of cause and effect. No effect in existence can occur without a cause.

**The Philosopher:**

According to the definition I have provided, it does exist.

**The Questioner:**

What effect is the Absolute Mind the product of?

**The Philosopher:**

The Absolute Mind is the effect of information and the relationships among that information.

**The Questioner:**

How did the universe come into being? Do you accept spontaneous self-creation? By what logic can such a notion be rationally comprehended?

**The Philosopher:**

The Absolute Mind is the effect of information and the relationships among that information. This statement bears no connection to the question of the origin of the universe or similar matters. It is merely a definition.

**The Questioner:**

By what necessity has this relationship been defined in this way? A definition acquires legitimacy only when it manifests in concrete reality.

**The Philosopher:**

According to this definition, the Absolute Mind may be envisioned as a machine that knows everything that is knowable—up to the present—and is also aware of how these pieces of knowledge are related.

**The Questioner:**

For example, how would you explain the creation of the universe and the necessity thereof by means of a mere definition, without considering its functions?

**The Philosopher:**

By “relationship,” I mean, for instance, that it knows that humans are mortal, and that Aristotle is human—and the relationship between these two pieces of knowledge is that Aristotle is mortal.

The Absolute Mind, as it presently exists, includes discovered information concerning the creation of the universe and other matters—no more and no less.

**The Questioner:**

Does this concept have dominion over all phenomena?

**The Philosopher:**

The notion of “dominion” is a religious concept, not a scientific one. No being possesses superiority over another.

**The Questioner:**

Then why did this Absolute Mind, prior to the Renaissance, regard the Earth as flat and as the center of existence?

**The Philosopher:**

Because human knowledge at that time was incomplete—and indeed, it still is. As I have already stated, the Absolute Mind is relative. It moves toward perfection but will never be complete. This relativity has been extensively examined by philosophers.

**The Questioner:**

So long as you regard the Absolute Mind as relative and confine it to a definitional circle of relationships, I have no issue with it. My objection concerns the use of the word absolute, which alters the very meaning of the concept. Absolute signifies a concept without opposition and stands at a great distance from relativity. You have not sufficiently considered my point.

You invoke the authority of philosophers and their terminology, yet I ask you plainly: can you provide a single example of something that is absolute and yet relative? Go beyond definitions. In my view, the concept itself matters more than its formal definition.

**The Philosopher:**

The absolute idea refers to the complete concept of an entity within the mind—that is, knowing all information about that entity. This absolute idea is itself relative, because from time to time new knowledge about that entity emerges, resulting in a new absolute idea. In everyday life, we speak of absolute light or absolute darkness, though we know these too are relative.

**The Questioner:**

What you have offered is a common analogy and cannot be used as a genuine instance of a relative absolute. Why is there such insistence—on your part and on the part of philosophers—to label something that is inherently changeable as absolute? Can the meaning of a word be altered at will?

Absolute has a clear meaning, and relative has a distinct meaning. These two are not compatible, nor can either be subsumed into the semantic domain of the other.

**The Philosopher:**

Absolute vodka is another example.

**The Questioner:**

This example, too, is a colloquial expression and cannot serve as valid evidence in a rational discussion. Wordplay and sophistry may be the special craft of philosophers, but you are a mathematician—why do you engage in this?

**The Philosopher:**

Professor, your statements are no longer clear to me.

**The Questioner:**

Do you consider me ignorant to such an extent? Do you truly believe that I do not understand what I am saying, and that you understand that I do not understand?

You stated that you are attempting to rewrite philosophy in the language of children. Yet you cannot answer this supposedly foolish middle-aged man who asks: how can something be both absolute and relative?

Which part of my remarks is unclear or ambiguous?

In my view, this is precisely the problem with philosophers: playing with words and constructing conceptual labyrinths in order to evade matters over which they themselves lack mastery.

In my estimation, existence and its interstitial processes are far simpler than you imagine, and than the philosophy you construct around them.

Unlike you, all of your statements are entirely clear to me—but I do not see a firm logic behind them. I believe these so-called definitions must be reexamined so that they may be demonstrated through logic, reasoning, and above all, rational proof.

Although I received no answer from you, I nevertheless continue to express my respect. I hope your silence is not a sign of displeasure or withdrawal. I remain ever ready to continue this constructive dialogue.

**The Questioner:**

Salah al-Din Ahmad Lavasani

27 Dey 1391 (Solar Hijri)

---

**Summary of the Article: "The Dark World Precedes the Big Bang"**

This article presents a philosophical dialogue between a mathematician-philosopher and a questioner exploring the foundations of existence, the nature of knowledge, and the concept of the Absolute Mind. The discussion challenges conventional scientific and philosophical assumptions, particularly the notion that the Big Bang marks the absolute beginning of the universe.

The questioner argues that the universe is far older than commonly assumed and that cause-and-effect relationships provide a more rational framework for understanding existence than abstract notions of an Absolute Mind. The dialogue illustrates how human knowledge evolves through trial, error, and the reinterpretation of empirical evidence, citing historical examples such as the Ptolemaic model, Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, and Einstein.



The discussion critically examines the concept of the Absolute Mind, highlighting its inherent tension between being termed "absolute" while being necessarily relative due to the limitations of human knowledge. The questioner emphasizes that philosophical debates often involve complex terminology that can obscure reasoning, and that clarity, precision, and logical rigor are essential for philosophical inquiry.

Ultimately, the dialogue underscores the importance of approaching existence and knowledge with critical thinking, careful observation, and the recognition that even long-held beliefs can be overturned through reasoned analysis. The article also stresses the relevance of philosophy to practical thought, demonstrating that rigorous dialogue can clarify understanding without resorting to dogma or authority.

- Philosophy of Science
- Cosmology
- Big Bang Theory
- Dark Universe
- Metaphysics
- Cause and Effect
- Absolute Mind
- Epistemology
- History of Science
- Scientific Dialogue
- Rational Inquiry
- Children's Philosophy
- Philosophy for Young Minds
- Western Philosophy
- Philosophy of Knowledge

