

Tales de Miletus, Hegel, and the Theory of Everything

Alfredo de Oliveira Moraes
Federal University of Pernambuco, Recife, Brazil

The author takes how focus of your reflection the no achievement of the Theory of Everything in the Whole, he indicates that the cause of that frustrated attempts it is the basis of construction of the thought used to, lay emphasis on the inadequacy of the thought supported in the metaphysical from material basis, with roots in Tales de Miletus, in ruling to find a solution, and he presents the metaphysical from relational basis, proto-enunciated in the Hegel's thought, like a possible foundation to think what can be capable to apprehend the effectiveness reality in the flow of its happen, so in the scope of the existence of phenomena infra nanos, so well, in the hyper macros events.

Keywords: metaphysical, theory of everything, Hegelian dialectic

The Theory of Everything or of the Whole has been a dream nourished by the physicians from the beginning of the last century, after the outbreak of new physicians theories that subtracted the Newtonian's Theory of its universality; however, for one and each time more it seems just an impossible dream, for the obstinate is necessary to die trying and to me there is a conceptual solution potential, remaining only its translation for physicians language, of course, that has be done by the physicians. So, what is this solution?

First, before same to announce the answer, it rests to dissolve the incongruity present in the tentative until now failed. My point of start will be an assertive assigned to the Physician Albert Einstein—"The thought that lead us until here, it is incapable of get out from here". Which is the thought underlying of every conceptual construction of the Occidental Science? The answer to this question can lead us to comprehension of the indicated insufficiency in the Einstein assertive. My way to find an answer is, first, to look back in the history of the origin of the Occidental thought and after to move on to the question itself.

The Begin of Everything or of Thought of the Whole

The origin of the Occidental thought or its primordial unifier filter is considered for almost all of philosophers the epistemological turn point made by Tales of Miletus, from ancient Greece. Our cultural ancestor proposed, in direct antagonism with the mythological thought and paradoxically taking it like support, that the origin and unique source of everything that exists is a material principle uncreated, eternal—the water. The word principle (ἀρχή) here must be understanding in a double sense: like origin and like essential substance.

However, it just so happens that ignoring the causes that led Tales to the announce that truth, the wises and philosophers the succeed Tales until nowadays, they delight in just to transubstantiate that principle, without to put up to the material nature or uncreated eternity of the principle. The most brilliant minds of history of the Occidental thought from the Tales contemporary to the actual days just to refine make subtile the

nature of that original material, they have given for that material others denominations (apeiron, fire, air, atom, Be, Nous, God, energy, ether, Universe...), but at least the descriptions in itself of each of that principles or variations of material principle indicate for something figurative or entitative, reified. Even though that in some cases, the argumentative sophistication seems to treat of metaphysical entities, in strict sense.

The Critical and the Continuity

In fact, even 25 centuries after Tales when someone makes critical to the metaphysical thought or to the Metaphysic that had its origin in it still make nor only start of that way of thinking, but limiting oneself to that way of thinking; that critical thinking many times intended not just explain, but to refute everything that was developed in the history of our thinking at the lapsus of time, nothing added; just sometimes asked for something that not was capable to answer and others times asked for something that had be answered.

I do not want give place to misunderstand interpretations, so, I explain that I'm not making little with the relevance of those great thinkers; they did the history that is live inside us, nor deny the enormous contribution of that way of think in the construction of science and its products for elevation of the well-being of the humanity or for elevation of the dignity of the human condition. Also, I am not here to point out mistakes nor negative collateral effects from the scientific and technological development, and nor the disparity between this development and the elevation ethic- moral of the human relationship.

From my point of view, the question is to make an *aufheben* (German word that means to deny, to conserve, and to elevate, and here used with the three meaning concomitantly, forward I explain better), the thought that led us until her in the scope of an amplified reason, capable of to answer to the exigences of the knowledge self that ancient way of think in its developments permitted us to reach. For example, doing an analogy, it is the same process that happens between the contemporary Physical and the Newton's Physic; in others words, the contemporary Physical recognizes the importance of the Newton's Physic but restricts its truth to the reality that it is capable of encirclement. Another way to say, to make a car running is enough the Newton's axioms, but to send the Hubble beyond of the solar system that teachings already not are enough.

I consider, therefore, that the Metaphysic that came from Tales is not the Metaphysic, but just one of the possibilities infinites to think metaphysically; I propose to think metaphysically in other basis or foundation. Clearly, meaning that for all aspects of reality that belongs to the scope of coverage until now embraced and arising from that way to think must remain its value of truth, but for the reality that we begin to unveil or even glimpse from the products of that way of thinking, we must find another basis of conceptual construction that may to answer at the hyper complexity growth even in the level infra nano so in the level hyper macro.

The Metaphysical of Relational Basis Like a Potential Solution

In this point and in this sense, I propose a metaphysical in relational basis, like possibility of no stay in the incongruence stronger, i.e., that of want to think a Theory of Everything or of Whole inside of a dualistic way of thinking. The dualism in the Occidental thought is present from Tales until today, with very rare exceptions (Hegel, for example); in truth, the dualism pervades all handgrip, mastership of the human existence on Earth and not just the scientific thought. And we accustom to the dualism believing that was absolutely inescapable of it, so that assertive from Heraclitus of Ephesus: "the well and the evil are a single thing", resonate for many people like a sacrilege, a philosophical reverie, or an enigma of an obscure man. Even for ones that believes in a God unique like source of all reality, that words it seems a madness.

In consequence, in the thought still present between us, the solution of the problem about the nature of the light, the debate if it is particle or wave, it was “solved” accepting that the light is particle and waves at same time and manifests itself at the effectiveness reality in attending to perspective or expectative of observer. So, keep the dualism as in the manifestation—particle and wave—like in the scission between subject and object (the observer and his influence on experience of knowledge). Here, the Hegelian contribution of the dissolution of scission between subject and object remains still unknown or no-acknowledge.

Indeed, into approach of a metaphysical in relational basis the dualism is run to waste because in this way of think the reality is deepest and consummate itself more beyond of the luminous appearance, and already is not an object of acknowledge in hypostasis—nor particle nor wave—the light is a dynamic totality of relations of relations, like perceptible manifestation for our senses that the light is everything that we can see; in its innermost nature the light is expression of everything we cannot see, that our senses cannot apprehend. Of what is the light constituted? How everything that is perceptible for our senses, by device or not, the light has in its constitution a play set of forces—electromagnetic force, gravitational force, and two internal forces of that we call, lazily, atom.

So, what is force? A force is something that only can be apprehended through of something else and is a dynamic totality of relations, not a relationship between two or more objects, understood like compactions, things in the mean of entities separated, but things understood like totality connectives and connected of relations, becoming everything instable, epiphenomenal. The relationship or the connect would be, then, the smaller unity of possible comprehension and that substantially is present in all existential dimension of the humanity, and insomuch that if we want unify in one theory all this dimensions in its infinitude, i.e., if we search a coherent theory to comprehend together from the supercluster of galaxies until the infra nanos event, we cannot remain in the dualistic thought and urge to think the Uno of the multiplicity and the multiplicity of the Uno. It is convenient to jut that the four forces above mentioned do not correspond at four principles where does everything come from, but each one of these forces is only way of being of the only one force that is the whole; these forces do not exhaust in them all possibilities of manifestation of the whole, which is very possible that tomorrow we will discover many other ways of being of the whole.

If up to now the main difficulty of a Theory of Everything or, like I prefer, of Whole was compatibilizer the events describe in the quantic mechanic with the explanations of the Relativity for astrophysical movements, I think that the point of unification can be in apprehend of effectiveness reality like a play set of relations or connections; we must restrict the use of words particle and wave for the scope of the Newtonian thought and his developments; it seems to me that now we have to think like describe in new words an infinite universe constituted substantially by connections (connects, relations, interlaced relationships, relational unities of effectiveness reality).

In this point, we will enter into the reign of the difficulties; well if changing a simple habit requests a uncommon strength, what can we talk about changing the way own of think and, in consequence, to make the metamorphosis of mean of the language? Just in illustrative way I ask: How many times we know that such we call atom is not indivisible? And yet we proceed saying atom and not simply tom. Or, still worst, how many times we know that is the Earth that gyrates at gravitational field of sun and we proceed saying “what beautiful sunset”? Well, this may seem for someone like something of little importance, but is necessary to remind that the language makes a miracle to permit that the human individual gets out from itself and stays in itself at same time, in the language I express myself, I am for other, I share myself, inform about me, and reciprocally form

myself; this says to me that the linguistic expressions are not empty of consequences. But like teaching us Hegel, “the language is the most truth”.

However, here too, I remember Husserl or more precisely the point of discordance between he and one of his disciple—the transcendental eidetic reduction; conform that disciple, put in suspense the thought to think like getting a jump over own dark, yet, seems to be exactly that must to do to go beyond of the thought that led or unfortunately still leads us until here. If I cannot simply to erase inside me the thoughts that until now constituted me, can I change the basis of construction of that thought? Yes, it is what I defend, and that amount at change the quality of the thought. However, do not put in suspension the thought that came from of Metaphysic of material basis and to think since of nothing, of the empty or absence of foundation, but to recognize the insufficiency of this way of think and replace it, while foundation and guideline, for a thinking or to think that had his foundation in a relational basis.

I do not neglect of what that implies, necessarily, in re-signify all our vocabulary, but, is this other step possible? Easy, we know that not is, perhaps, but I believe that we can do it, not immediate, until because each one of us exists like an entity constituted by mediations, while we are constituted by connects, relationships. I think that we can start by and into the “spirit of time” (the scientific thought of vanguard) for after and with to pass of the time “to contaminate”, to transform the “spirit of the world” (the thought assimilated by the people and became ruling on each moment of History).

How I am not thinking in abstract, everything I said is something that depends, exclusively, of action of each one of us like an I; now, to do this reference requires an enlightenment about of what I understand by I, so, I believe that before to proceed I have the explain, even in short, what is to me the I, and in this matter, how in many others, I share of the Hegelian comprehension: The I is the connection content, the “to connect with all other” and the “to connect with own self”. In other words, a dynamic totality of epiphenomenal expression of self-center connects, relations, relationships.

By way of example, and to stay clear, I insist, I am not speaking in abstract; we remember us of some of the connects, relations, relationships that are inside us in the construction of our own existence; besides of what makes part of original determinations, we have the interaction between the ovule and the spermatozoid that generate us physically, that occur in a context of interlaced relationships between our parents, the intrauterine relations (alimentary, energetics, psychic, cultural), all the apprenticeship relations after the birth, intensification of acquisition of language, the polysemic relationships with the world made through by the others individualities, the use of the hands—in relation to the opposite thumb, the pleasant and unpleasant experiences and its neuronal connects, the psychical development; at long last, innumerable is the quantum of relations, interlaced relationships and connects that constitute each one of us like a single I.

Now, back to the question of language, put like background all implications and consequences, at first seeing it seems that what I propose is absurd; specially, if we consider that the world where we live is, essentially, a dynamic totality of signifies, constructed in the tension existential-dialectic and reciprocal between the human individual and the whole (not the whole in abstract, but the concrete whole—all other in its infinite diversity and multiplicity), in reason of that, we remain tied in the web of the thought thinking (of what is settled for us), without almost ever to dare to exist like someone capable to think by yourself.

Notwithstanding, already we used some expressions that semantically express something of this and in this metaphysic in relational basis; it occurs that sometimes we do not attempt to that we talk, for example, when we affirm that in the quantic theory the concept of field corresponds to the set of mathematical ideas and

technics used to describe physical systems that have of infinite number of grades of liberty, the words “physical systems” if we take in the mean what we use after Norbert Wiener, necessarily, imply that we are talking about physical realities relational and not compact things of more or less density or even so in a sophistic refinement particles without mass.

I understand, also, that we must avoid remaining in a pre-comprehension false or incipient about the effectiveness reality, like is usual to happen when, peoples in the common sense, they read news about astronomy in the journals, such as: any star x standing at 2.5 billion of light-years of Earth; in general, these peoples just seem to have comprehended this distance express in astronomical unit of measurement, but, really the habitual use of the meter or mile like unit of measurement, and do not permit the exact apprehension of this distance, and prevail a vague understanding.

So, when I begin to think these physical systems like physical relational realities I open, effectively, the possibility of taking out the quantic interlacement of its status of chimera or matter of believes, of a know that cannot be correctly explained by the Science, that belongs to the domain of the mysteries and becomes to comprehend this phenomenon like something present in the daily of the web of connectives connected that weave our own effectiveness reality.

Even if the simple and beautiful solutions are more appreciate by the scientific community, nobody unknowns the stubborn reactionary face of the scientific community before something new, at the end, from a long time that community occupies the place of the clerical community of medieval inquisition. So, if something new seems simple and is too much simple to be considered, if overly complex is obscure too much to be taken seriously, but that obvious is sometimes that is so at sight what anybody sees.

In fact, there are trivial things or obvious that sometimes we seem to neglect the signified and, in consequence, we become of hard comprehension others that depend of this for an elucidation or apprehension more properly. We know that the universe is infinite, but now becomes fashion to say multi-universes, this is an equivoque, because the infinite is not a huddle of things put side by side in an endless row, the infinite is not counterpoint to the finite, and in truth, the infinite has in the finite its effectiveness reality. The whole only is whole because constituted by parts, it is wonderful to me see the simulations of the astronomical magnitudes in video, the Earth inside the solar system, the sun inside of Milk Way with its billions of stars and some blackhole, the Milk Way inside the local cluster and...; of course, that is an unilateral vision, maybe, from Andromeda this vision is diverse too much. But what matters is to perceive that in the relative unilaterality of sights each part is a relational physic reality of the Whole.

So, the whole cannot be thought like something separated or like an abstraction of human understood; the finite only exists like momentum of the infinitude. If somebody calls the whole of Absolut, God; and, says that God is unknowable to the human intelligence, this way is not righteous with God and nor the human intelligence. Of course, never we know God in His totality, because this Totality is a moving Self in free realization, where perfection resides exactly in his Liberty to make Yourself eternally, and this to make, how Hegel said: like “a play set of love with Himself”. This way, the Whole gives to know for his manifestations in his manifestations; for this reason, we image and resemblance or, maybe, a holographic fractal of the Whole, and so, nobody can to know entirely itself, because we are still and will be forever in construction of our own essence, absolutely unique, a singularity conscious of itself, despite the swirl of alienating manipulations in which we are living.

If we take any phenomenon, for example, a blackhole or a neutrino, our knowledge about it is not due at one experiential relation with him, but in large scale this knowledge is mediated by illations, suppositions, analogies, in short: theoretical constructions made and assented in a metaphysical in material basis that guides the system of beliefs actual. Thence, this interpretation of what phenomenon or, what is the same, the scientific knowledge about it constructed from a subsystem of the system of beliefs can enter in confront with other subsystem, once that each of these subsystems, in the best hypothesis, takes the object like something in hypostasis and not like a unity of relational effectiveness reality.

In consequence, it is not difficult that knowledges inferentially constructed by subsystems of the system of beliefs, for example, the quantic theory and the relativity, can enter into confront in the description of any phenomenon; it takes like object of knowledge, and thought in abstraction of the totality in which it exists, even so sometimes they try to apprehend it from its relations with others phenomena, but without apprehending it in itself like a dynamic totality of relations, which delimitation or boundary of standard discernible depend of the perceptual limit or epistemological cut is reached by the subject knowing in the act of apprehension of the phenomenon. Now, that with the incompatibility thence arising from becomes impossible to think of a unified shape the theory that can specular, without incongruences and in the comprehensive unity a conceptual description, capable to expound in the coherent speech, simultaneously and in one set, phenomena of the infra nano and hyper macro cosmic dimensions.

In fact, here also enters in play set the logical perspective from which I am situated; in general, the academicians will not think scientifically to put on the horizon of formal logic systems, in its multiplies variant; rarely they perceive that this subjacent logic is like a strait jacket in which they enforce the effectiveness to fit. The great difficulty has been that the academicians not have nor a minimal glimpse of an alternative logic for to think, because when they are trying to systematize the dialects logical in language of mathematical formula, these dialects logical become in rhetoric fantasy or become incoherent philosophical reveries. To me this is a point of relevance and finesse extreme, even as to think another basis for the metaphysic different of the material basis actual I went to search inputs or a proto-enunciation inside the Hegelian thought, also in concern to the logic I do option by Hegel, because his logic engenders in the think a new condition to apprehend the effectiveness reality.

First of all, the necessity to comprehend the simultaneity like one universal constant, i.e., the linearity past—present—future is local existential condition that no exists for infra nanos nor hyper mega astronomical dimensions events; in second place (not in importance, but just expositive), the Hegel's logic supports the contradiction in which each phenomenon is and is not simultaneously—in this logic the contradiction is not solved or abolished, but in it the concept apprehends each phenomenon of the effectiveness reality in the contradiction own that is peculiar; this, because the *Aufhebung* or the *Aufheben* (use the verb *aufheben* like substantive, something usual in Hegel's text) is the spiral movement intrinsic that pervades all effectiveness reality.

Thus, this is the logic that conforms to seem to me, and is adequate to think from of a metaphysical in relational (relation, connect, relationship) basis; to explain, I retake the classical example of the Hegelian logic, like exposed by Hegel own in the begins of his famous “*Phenomenology of Spirit*”:

The bud disappeared in the bloom of the flower, and one would say that the flower refutes it; of the same way that the fruit makes the flower to seem a false being-there of the plant, put itself like the plant's truth at in place of the flower: these shapes do not just distinguish, but also they repel one to other like incompatibles between themselves. However, at same

time, its fluid nature makes of them moments of the organic unity, in which, far of contradict themselves, all are equally necessities. It is this equal necessity that constitutes uniquely the life of the whole. (Hegel, 1990, p. 12, translation by author)

In this famous passage, Hegel does not just disapprove radically reductionist interpretations of his dialect logic, but describes of way almost poetic the effectiveness reality in one of its most beautiful moments and also exalts the necessity to accept the contradiction like inherent to everything that is existent. The bud, the flower, and the fruit in the totality of the plant are intertwined effectiveness, who sees the bud just for an exercise of imagination can see the flower, who sees the flower no more see the bud that in it is contented and consummated, elevated to the plenitude of itself. So, likewise the girl, the young and the old woman; the nebulous, the galaxy, and the star dust that makes each planet or cosmic entity too. At end, everything is only an infinite to connect of totalities or mutant relational unities in constant interaction and interlaced by eternal movements.

In fact, everything is an infinite interlaced of relational possibilities, and by this reason can be thought in a relational unity capable of being collapsed in epistemological cuts realized by the subject that knows. But, I insist that of the same way that what is phenomenon for us has not in itself none independent objectivity of us, and equally is not the free will of an individual conscious that creates the phenomenal reality like a dependent variable of the cognoscente subject.

Urge to open the mind to the complexity of the multilateral and polysemic realities that pervade the relations of reciprocity between the subject (one part that is moment of the whole and not a fragment) and the universe (the whole that manifests itself in singularities infinite) in the generation of the world (dynamic totality of signifies) and in the comprehension of human itself (dynamic totality and self-centered of relations, connects, and relationships in search of sense of life).

There is still one point that I cannot leave aside that some people hastily say that it is not possible to speak about foundation, no more in the time in which we live and they ask: What is the foundation of a net? And they argue that the building metaphor to express the knowledge that emerges of a solid basis cannot be used when concerned to a net, like the web internet for example; but, this is only misunderstand that is caused by the absence of the exercise of patience of the Concept. So, like a chain is only strength as its link more fragile, one net only exists or sustains itself in the power of interactivity that interlaces its relational unities in the shape of discernible boundary of standard that defines it in the infinite multiplicity of the whole.

In fact, the foundation cannot be thought like something solid that stays occult in the sustentation of that show, like the basis of a building under the ground, or still less like an unspeakable being that out of the *ente* or the existent things keeping it in the existence; no, in the perspective of Metaphysic in relational basis the foundation nor is abolished nor is a mystery, but is in the own manifestation or in the own phenomenon, not staying nor beyond nor behind of the manifestation, but I insist it is the own phenomenon.

In general lines, this is the set of challenges that I wish would bring in this little text, and that accrue of necessary, so I think, change of basis or foundation of the metaphysic; this way, we will be not in the what some peoples call of a “new normal” feeding and living under old “pre-concepts”. We never can forget the greatest Tales de Miletus contribution; without his metaphysic in material basis we cannot arrive where we are; perhaps, we have not nor even the educational system that we have if all knowledge accepts like truth and valid still has exclusively your origin attributed for the gods and was expressed by the voices of oracle, gods messages, and illuminates peoples.

Indeed, we cannot continue to highlight the Hegel's importance for the Philosophical History and, paradoxically, do not the effort to think with him; we cannot continue to take him like a Heraclitus of Ephesus of the modern times, the obscure, whom it must leave aside. We cannot, under the high possibility of stagnation and even so the dead of the Philosophy; we conform ourselves to the thought thoughted which has us reduced to be commentators wont to the reflections sometimes mediocre, others fraught of anachronism, others full of dogmatical reverence stretched in arguments of authority, others simply fallacious and others honest too, but that nothing increases to the philosophical texts remarked.

After sharing here my philosophical uneasiness, I kept silence and hope. In the silence I wish to live the exercise of the listen to the other, have ears to hear from a long time the condition of the walk, to put itself in search for the truth; in the wait I wish to live the hope to be heard, to live the experience of the I that is a We and of We that is an I, in the concrete universal that expresses itself in the singularities of self-centered unity mutants and relational, that in the existence act and interact moved by the disquietude that is own and born of the certainty of our own finish is something that we cannot realize, because the essence of all essences is the Liberty. At the end, everything underlies the goal that never we can reach and never we can give up, the ontological desire of each one of us: to be yourself and to experience the life in plenitude.

References

- Hegel, G. W. F. (1990). *Phänomenologie des Geistes*. In *Werke in 20 Bänden*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Moraes, A. O. (2003). *A Metafísica do Conceito: Sobre o problema do conhecimento de Deus na Enciclopédia das Ciências Filosóficas de Hegel*. Porto Alegre: EDIPUCRS.