Humanity, Uncertainty, and the Mathematics of Reality

Abdulqasem Bakhshi

Disclaimer: This essay is a philosophical and historical exploration of how human civilizations have understood and managed uncertainty. It is not an attack on any religion, culture, or people. References to religious traditions, civilizations, or modern states are analytical rather than moral judgments. The intent is to examine ideas, tools, and historical conditions—not to assert cultural superiority or deny the ethical value of religion. All claims are open to questioning, including those made by the author. The essay itself should be treated as a hypothesis, not a doctrine.

Humanity exists within a reality defined by uncertainty. Conscious thought itself arises from the necessity to act without knowing outcomes. From crossing a street to founding a civilization, human beings operate under conditions of incomplete information. Life is not merely accompanied by uncertainty—it is structured by it. To live is to make decisions without guarantees, to gamble not recklessly but inevitably, with one's own existence.

Before humanity developed formal tools to model uncertainty, civilizations relied on ethics, morality, and absolutist principles to manage risk. These systems provided stability in a world that could not yet be measured. They narrowed the space of permissible action, replacing probabilistic reasoning with categorical rules: permitted and forbidden, sacred and profane, righteous and sinful. In doing so, they reduced psychological and social exposure to uncertainty, even if they did not eliminate uncertainty itself.

In the ancient world and through much of human history, uncertainty was not understood as randomness but as fate, divine will, or moral consequence. Risk was addressed through obedience, tradition, ritual, and ethical restraint. These approaches were not irrational; they were adaptive responses to limited cognitive and mathematical tools. The Islamic Golden Age, like other great pre-modern civilizations, achieved extraordinary advances in mathematics, science, and philosophy without possessing a formal theory of probability. Risk management existed, but it was qualitative, experiential, and moral rather than quantitative.

Keith Devlin's account of mathematics helps illuminate why this matters. Mathematics, he argues, is not merely calculation; it is the study of patterns. It makes the invisible visible. Geometry reveals patterns of shape, calculus reveals patterns of motion, and probability reveals patterns of chance. Probability, then, is not simply a European invention for gambling or finance—it is a conceptual technology that allows the human mind to perceive uncertainty as a structure rather than a mystery. Crucially, probability emerged very late in human history. While arithmetic and geometry are thousands of years old, probability theory developed primarily in early modern Europe. This timing matters. Civilizations before probability were not deficient in intelligence or morality; they simply lacked a formal language for reasoning about uncertainty. Even in Europe, probabilistic thinking was slow to be accepted. Thomas Bayes' work lay largely ignored for nearly two centuries before its significance was recognized and implemented. Adaptation itself was uncertain.

The development of probability coincided with another transformation Devlin describes: the shift from procedural thinking to conceptual thinking in mathematics. This shift mirrors a broader civilizational change. Rather than merely following rules, societies began modeling systems. Rather than avoiding risk categorically, they learned to manage it. Modern finance, insurance, engineering, logistics, and governance are all built on this probabilistic worldview. Risk is no longer denied; it is quantified, distributed, and optimized. This raises a difficult but necessary point. Ethics provides values; probability provides models of reality. One without the other is incomplete.

Ethics tells us what we care about. Probability tells us how the world behaves. Ethical systems alone cannot model complex environments, just as probabilistic systems alone cannot determine what ought to matter. When ethics attempts to replace models of reality, it becomes brittle. When probability attempts to replace values, it becomes dangerous. Survival and flourishing require integration, not substitution. This tension is visible in modern religious states, including those that identify as Islamic, Jewish, or otherwise governed by religious moral frameworks. If such states wish to maintain their ethical commitments while effectively managing reality, they must acknowledge uncertainty explicitly and embed probabilistic reasoning into their banking systems, social institutions, and governance structures. This is not a betrayal of morality; it is an acknowledgment of reality.

The relative weakness of many post–Islamic Golden Age states in dealing with modern complexity is not a moral failure, nor is it primarily a religious one. It is, in part, a historical consequence of timing. These civilizations developed before probability and did not fully adapt when probabilistic reasoning later transformed European institutions. The issue is not belief, but adaptation. The same critique applies to any state—religious or secular—that attempts to manage complex systems using absolutist principles alone.

Europe's eventual success in this domain was not inevitable, nor was it without cost. The standardization of mathematics, particularly through French and German traditions, enabled unprecedented precision and coordination. At the same time, it introduced its own excesses. French mathematical culture often emphasized expressive formalism; German traditions pushed abstraction to extremes. In some cases, abstraction became so detached from lived reality that meaning itself was obscured. The difficulty many readers encounter in the works of figures like Karl Marx reflects this danger: abstraction without calibration can become opaque, self-referential, and socially destabilizing.

Mathematics, for all its power, is not neutral. It shapes how people think. As Devlin notes, mathematical notation and formalism can become bureaucratic or dogmatic if treated as truth rather than representation. Mathematics is a language, not reality itself. Like all languages, it improves communication but never guarantees understanding. We invented language to transfer thoughts with high integrity, yet misunderstanding remains endemic. Mathematics reduces ambiguity, but it cannot eliminate it. This brings us back to uncertainty—not as a problem to be solved, but as a condition to be acknowledged. To live is to act without knowing. To deny this is to live blindly. To accept it is not nihilism; it is clarity.

Religious traditions themselves often gesture toward this humility. If one takes religious language seriously, no human-made system—religious or otherwise—should be treated as absolute truth. That includes doctrines, states, ideologies, and even this essay. Everything must be questioned and recalibrated against reality as it evolves. Those who adapt survive or thrive. Those who refuse adaptation face consequences, regardless of moral certainty.

Albert Einstein once said, “The measure of intelligence is the ability to change.” Taken seriously, this statement applies even to Einstein himself. Intelligence is not correctness frozen in time; it is responsiveness to reality. To be intelligent is to accept that one may be wrong, and to remain capable of revision. Ultimately, probability did not replace morality—it revealed uncertainty. Mathematics did not eliminate meaning—it made patterns visible. Ethics without reality is blindness; reality without ethics is chaos. Humanity’s task is not to choose between them, but to hold both without illusion.