

## Conclusion

At the start of this book, I asked you to look again at an ordinary mug. It held its shape while a great deal went on inside it. After a journey through quantum events, gravity and the universe, that small puzzle still holds my attention. Things last, although their parts remain active and their surroundings change. I want to understand what makes that possible.

For me, PDT begins with the thought that relationships may help make a thing what it is. Its identity could depend on a pattern that keeps working through change. That would give us a deeper question to ask about matter. What must its relationships maintain, and what happens when an encounter makes their present arrangement impossible to continue?

The survivor proposal carries that question into a particular event. It assumes that, under the required conditions, one remaining allowed continuation becomes actual. A physical law must still explain how the alternatives are excluded and why repeated encounters produce the measured proportions. I find the possibility compelling, but the answer cannot come from my conviction. It has to come from doing that work.

A lasting record then connects one event with the next. The detector changes, another instrument responds, and eventually we read the result. We belong within that history. I find something rather wonderful in the thought that the world can contain instruments and people capable of asking how it works. Explaining a record is one part of that inquiry. Explaining conscious experience remains a further question.

Gravity and cosmology stretch the same ambition much further. A shared starting point must account for actual clock readings, distances and the behaviour of matter. The mathematics has made parts of the proposal precise and exposed where more is needed. We still need rules for physical change that work together across these different settings. A collection of promising pieces must eventually become a working whole.

The engineer in me finds that requirement familiar. A drawing can be elegant, but sooner or later the structure has to carry a load. My philosophical confidence gives me a reason to keep building and checking. It does not give me permission to ignore a failure. If an essential claim fails, I want to know what failed and follow where that answer leads.

I hope you can now see why I think this approach deserves examination. You may share the picture, doubt it, or find a better question within it. Any of those responses is useful when the assumptions are clear. The appendices offer a closer look at the arguments. My responsibility is to make them open to scrutiny, including scrutiny that changes my mind.

For now, return to the table. The mug is still doing its job, quite unconcerned by our discussion. A clock ticks nearby. Somewhere, a detector has just left another mark. What allows things to keep holding together, and what makes one particular event happen? That connection brought me into PDT. I hope it leaves you with something worth wondering about too.