

About Temporality, Physic Laws, and Existence

George Georgiadis

Attorney at the Supreme Court; graduate of the Law School of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki in Greece

***Corresponding Author:** George Georgiadis, Attorney at the Supreme Court, graduate of the Law School of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki in Greece.

Submitted: 08 October 2026

Accepted: 14 October 2026

Published: 21 October 2026

Citation: Georgiadis, G. (2026). About Temporality, Physic Laws, and Existence. J of Research and Reviews in Economics and Management. 2(5), 01-10.

Abstract

*Modern science in the fields of physics and mathematics is built upon the concept of a monistic and rather nihilistic inertia and on statistical estimates derived from infinitesimal calculus. (Several philosophers—both past and present, such as Giambattista Vico, Friedrich Nietzsche, Martin Heidegger, and Karl Popper—have identified this fact.) Hence it is epistemologically accepted that (in Newton, Galileo, Descartes, etc) the oppositions like action-reaction and the opposite signs are balanced out on a nihilistic foundation, resulting in a general degradation of the dynamic kinematics of the entire field (although important thinkers like Heraclitus and Friedrich Hegel have supported a unified dynamic that leads in a higher realm). This orientation is accompanied by certain contradictions, given that it disregards the authentic ontological cosmic rhythm (highly expandable) which constitutes stability in motion and is based in an ideal *Dasein*-unified dynamic and psychological field that crowns the conventional phenomenology and coordinates it's constituent and uncertain and scattered phases.*

Keywords: Absolute, Relativity, Coordination, Mathematics, Time, Temporality, Evolution, Gravity, Calculus, Calendar, Astronomy, Probability, Phases, Binary, Infinite, Zero, Random, Quantum, Experiment.

About the Essence of Time

A state of extremely delicate balance calls to mind the modern chaos theory pioneered by Henry Poincare, according to which, due to overall interconnectedness, a minor event can trigger major consequences, even in distant locations. It also points to a psychological willpower of a timeless origin as a tangible factor that normally seals the scientific methods. Every major event hangs by a thread as Napoleon used to say. Many philosophers and Albert Einstein considered that time is actually an illusion something that leads to an Olympian field above the titanic clash of the opposing cosmic forces. There the Apollonian element of order and the Dionysian chaos harmonize in high balance [1].

It is the combination of specialized technique and intuitive general knowledge that produces the correct perception. From antiquity, the skeptical philosophers argued that you cannot typically define at what exact number of grains a heap of sand grains is formed. The issue is intuitive rather than strictly quantitative. (That's exactly why the mathematization of philosophy by intellectual circles like the Vienna circle was finally abandoned, just like the formalistic scholastic philosophy of the Middle Ages). A more authentic, intuitive, and volitional prism is emerging in the understanding of the phenomena. We must notice that major phenomenological contradictions would arise without the su-

prascientific and institutional principle that the positions of the moving bodies are, in general, mutually acknowledged: When, regarding a body considering itself to be at position A, another body is at position B, then -generally speaking- regarding the second body, it is itself at position B and the first is at position A [2].

This Immanuel Kant-style mutual rather absolute acknowledgment points to a coordination field, yet it is quite general: relativity concerns the fact that, due to the continuous flow, spatiotemporal positions are not strictly absolute, although the aforementioned absolute character of coordination always remains in the fields of science and philosophy, although not having to do with an absolute space or an absolute time [3].

The theory of relativity is, therefore, generally successful although it has some weak points that show that essentially the theory must be placed within a broader framework that goes beyond typical science. (For example the relative time differentiation is automatically proven by the Doppler effect if we define time as the path of each individual pulse of the light frequency -as in the 1.905 article-, but the James Bradley phenomenon of the aberration of light accepts that each body (that receives the light rays from a star) is also in motion and is not a purely

inertial system, although the Internet descriptions of the issue are superficial) [4].

Also the Michelson-Morley (M-M) experiment in which the Earth based observer feels that the Earth does not move, does not align particularly well with the Foucault's pendulum experiment and the Coriolis forces where the Earth based observer feels that he is moving, something that also happens when he sees planets retrograding. (By the way, in the Foucault's experiment, the infinitesimal oscillation occurring the moment that the pendulum is set in motion could influence its subsequent vibration, causing the deflection that points to an Earth's motion) [5].

It is also noteworthy that the two arms of the Michelson-Morley (M-M) device cannot be constructed to be exactly equal in length but there are infinitesimal differences in many points, a fact that introduces some uncertainty regarding the supposed simultaneous road and return of the two light beams : one could argue, given the use of white light by Michelson and Morley (characterized by very short wavelengths and very high frequencies), that at the return of the beams, wave cancellation occurs at some points while wave contribution occurs at others, and that so the experimenter simply observes the latter having this way the impression that the return was really simultaneous. So a profound study of relativity reveals implications that lead to a higher realm above technical Physics that harmonizes the absolute and the relative element [6].

For example suppose that the pointer of a wristwatch, the large pointer of Big Ben, and a satellite orbiting the earth (as a huge pointer), complete a 24-hour cycle together, even though they move at different speeds. Here we see that there is no time delay in the faster as Minkowski's space-time diagrams would predict, while again absolute temporal coordination (of an Immanuel Kant or Carl Jung type) is proven, while in other cases (e.g. in the Doppler effect) there are relativistic times if we define the path of light as sec and consider that the speed of light does not (directly) depend on the speed of the light source as Einstein did : here in the moving light source the size of the light sec will be modified in relation to the stationary one. So it is obvious that this is a synthesis of absolute and relative elements within the framework of a broader "Dasein" field where time is completed in eternity according to Aristotle [7-10].

Aristotle in his book "Physics" did give a very good philosophical approach to the issue of the nature of time although his view was not perfect . (The ideas of the philosopher Zeno regarding infinity and the fluidity of spatiotemporal intervals, troubled him although he did not take them very seriously as he should. Nevertheless, he was influenced by these ideas) [11].

So Aristotle proposed that time is related to movement but is not completely identical with it. Thus he proposed that there is a single rather absolute time (although not as a Newtonian standard vector) which is completed in eternity (of a continuous timeless Present). This way he influenced the Newtons approach in the issue of time. Despite the removal of absolute time by the theory

of relativity this view about a time moving vector or a dimension outside the bodies also influenced the Hermann Minkowski diagrams although Einstein never seemed to essentially really accept them [12].

Also, Einstein in the theory of relativity dealt with the issue successfully from a physical scientific point of view, practically accepting that different movements indicate different times, that there are many relative times and that the single coordinating factor is the speed of light. In a broad, simple and comprehensive examination of the issue (and beyond the technocratic diagrams in which a vertical dimension of time is independent from the individual movements, as a (weak-willed) harrow leading to an unknown direction, namely towards an indefinite future) we must conclude the following : obviously time is a type of movement. So it is not a stable dimension in a diagram (of any type) within which the bodies are supposed to move. For the same reason time is not a moving vector outside each body's movement. So since there are many movements, there are many relative times. These times are phases coordinated in the timeless united framework of a luminous psychological synchronicity collective dimension which is the dynamic resultant of the individual temporal movements and it is the source of the generally unified psychological sense of temporality on our part [13].

So there is the absolute element but there is also the relative. To put it very simple it is relative if Hercules was stronger than Samson (or Theseus than Achilles), but it is absolute that both were stronger than Thersites or than an average person. Correspondingly, in science many things are fluid and relative. There are a lot of examples of this kind and often many theories for the explanation of a physical phenomenon. We will not quote many of them here, but let's give a simple example: e.g. a body that falls due to gravity accelerates. Newton proposed that force $F = \text{mass } m \text{ times acceleration } a$ ($F=m*a$). Thus for Newton there is a force in gravity (because of the acceleration) while for Einstein who has given another interpretation of gravity, there is no force there. So the question that rises is to what extent is Newton's formula $F=m*a$ valid [14].

Among the various relevant interpretations, we must select the most correct, since science relies on the choice of a particular interpretation. The main issue is which is the criterion for choosing the most satisfactory theoretical approach. The English Franciscan monk and scholastic philosopher William of Ockham, who studied at Oxford and was a pioneer of nominalism, proposed as a methodological principle the so-called "Ockham's razor" according to which the interpretation that should be chosen is the most economical [15-20].

For example, here we would say that Einstein's interpretation is more satisfactory today, while $F=m * a$ is not exact on some cases and that force does not exactly have the external pressure character that Newton attributed to it but a rather internal "cool dynamic". However, Ockham was condemned as a heretic by the Catholic Church. The reason was that the ecclesiastical discourses were disturbed because they realized that based on the

economic choice, one could consider the trinity of the Christian God as redundant and would choose a more economic interpretation like Judaism or Islam. Occam's razor is therefore a useful criterion for discrimination, but the choice based on it causes a collateral accumulation of a critical mass (of the dissatisfied) that could someday constitute an explosive fuse. The razor is therefore not an absolute criterion in every case, but a dynamic signpost for choice that leads to a hyperscientific field [21].

About Gravity, the Laws of Motion, Astronomy and Calculus Definitions

The same things apply to the gravity theories. Newton, like other thinkers (such as Thomas Aquinas, etc.) believed that gravity refers to an inner essence of a psychic type. Indeed, according to Galileo two unequal masses fall into space generally together. (Here we say "generally" because Galileo with his falling formula seems to give a double falling rhythm of 5,15,25,35,... and 5,20,45,80,... m in each next sec). Anyway, the larger inertial mass resists the gravity push more and thus, according to Newton, receives a greater gravitational force. However, the major question arises as to how the Earth knows how much inertial mass has each body in order to attract it accordingly [22].

Such considerations apparently made Einstein realize that gravity is not a typical pressure force and propose another interpretative scheme. For this reason the Albert Einstein's General Relativity (as an extension of Gauss, Riemann, János Bolyai, and Lobachevsky etc non-Euclidean geometry where two parallel lines do intersect, and as a continuation of Euler's network circuits) must be considered a good epistemological description in the gravity issue, because each Quantum gravity theory as a gravity pressure theory also has a problem similar to the aforementioned Newton's gravity pressure theory [23].

Besides, the ancient Greeks in their own ways also believed that the whole is spheroidal, and the General relativity, which considers that mass curves the space around it pulling like a gravity well, is a fairly successful approach. However, here rises the issue why the Earth falls towards the Sun while Earth also has its escape velocity (thus staying in orbit due to these 2 influences), given that the Earth curves space more than the Sun in the Earth's local neighborhood (with the result that bodies there fall towards the Earth and not towards the Sun). So this is also an issue that refers to a field above standard Physics (and even if the future scientists "explain it" with some space-time tunneling approach, etc.) the issue remains essentially [24].

In important issues like these the known philosopher Karl Popper put forward the interesting proposition that many prevailing theories have falsifiable elements. This falsifiability of the typical views shows the wider Cool united Force that emerges. The principle of equivalence of General Relativity (in conjunction with Mach's principle), deeper than the typical curved space description phases, also shows to the direction of the united fundamental rising power behind attraction [25].

In general, the kinematic dynamics that led to the formulation

of Newton's three laws of motion were widely discussed from antiquity onwards by scholars in Alexandria and by later thinkers such as Jean Buridan, Rene Descartes, Robert Hooke, and others. So according to Newton there is a reaction equal and opposite to action and the body that is finally pushed back is the one with the less inertia. This is a logical proposition and there is truly reaction to action, but we must also see that such an absolutely and typically counterbalance in all points would lead to zero outcome or to a phenomenologically downgraded form of movement. Here we also find important philosophical idealistic dynamics to enter the issue, like a Heraclitus and Hegel dialectic thesis-antithesis alignment progression in a higher level above the typical scientific terms [26].

The history of strategy gives us many important examples where the psychological factor of the personality is placed above the passive inertia of the masses: eg, at the battle of Munda (Taking refuge in the crowd constitutes a form of fearful complacency, whereas the individual's detachment from objective reality—accompanied by a Kierkegaardian agony—leads to existential voids of the sort described by Jean-Paul Sartre. The correct path, acting as a "golden ratio," is the harmony of the individual and the collective within the framework of an objective subject) [27].

Moreover, it is well known that a typically linear contradictory reversibility in motion would nullify the phenomenological arrow of time eliminating the phenomena and their teleological integration, but this does not happen implying that (as Ilya Prigogine would argue) the linear motion is merely apparent, whereas the underlying dynamic is exponential and above the apparent technical laws of thermodynamics. (Despite the fact that there are some particles that move back in time, the general arrow of time has a forward upward direction [28-30].

It also seems logic to assume that a body that leaves our accelerating throwing arm (or launcher) accelerates in the first moments after the throwing (or launch). (Newton's philosophy that has to do with a stable motion after the throwing (in a frictionless environment) is based in a logical stability philosophy that is truly important, but someone could argue as well that the acceleration initially remains for a few moments, until the universe gravity forces influence the movement [31].

So the conflict of the opposite conflicts and signs (+ -) that seem to lead to a momentum nihilism as Rene Descartes and Christian Huygens proposed, is apparent and not essential. In fact the reverse powers go together in a higher canonic road-field without this implying the pantheistic dimension of Hegelian metaphysics (and Taoism philosophy). Speaking strategically, within a formation, one side defends while other attacks: yet, overall, there is a general forward dynamic without gaps [32].

We must also state that experiments that deal with Newton or Galileo issues have to do with close range conditions of a medium scale. Eg, modern scientists speak of speeds higher than the light's—as the very distant galaxies speeds—. Such examples are

not against the theory of relativity but they definitely seem that there there are important extentions and implications that lead to a higher and wider field in which relativity is included) [33].

Similar apply to the approximate propositions of projective geometry (of Blaize Pascal, Poncelet, and other important thinkers), to the ancient astronomical statistical measurements (that had their gaps), the trigonometry and other modern methods in the statistical measures of the distances of distant stars and to the (also rather productive) calculus statistical mathematical definitions of the gravity constant G, the acceleration of gravity g the speed of light C etc. (It is obvious that the reasoning of the old light speed measures by Ole Roemer, James Bradley, Armand Fizeau and Leon Foucault is weak. The modern measures propose logically that light speed = wavelength times frequency, but the very high frequencies and very small wavelengths in the electromagnetic spectrum are defined, in the sense that productive subjective parameters also enter their selection too, and they are not entirely inductive) [34].

Similarly, (even with myopia glasses) it would have been difficult for Cavendish to determine an approximate value of the gravitational constant -specifically, the infinitesimal oscillation of hanging masses exerting an attractive force on one another-with precision in the 19th century. To a certain extent his method was also based to the productive definition practice. Finally, we must point out that the Galileo terms of the stable or instantaneous speed of an accelerating body are instrumental because in fact there is no stable or instantaneous moment in a body that accelerates [35].

About Probability Theories, Math Nihilistic Propositions and the Dynamic Dasein Elevation of the Field

Napoleon once asked his officers, "What are our chances of capturing this hill?" and when they replied, "50%," he answered, "Then, forward." This demonstrates that dynamic choices pave the way toward a decisive higher realm that unites and transcends a standard nihilistic balancing of the opposites, with the psychological chooser always taking precedence over each typical prescribed path that has been selected. To be precise, Socrates did not use to say "I know one thing: that I know nothing",

but he used to say "I know one thing : that I know nothing, except for erotic matters", thereby implying that he knows a great deal and pointing towards a higher force rather than a nihilistic monism [36].

In fact there are no typical probabilities but dynamic capabilities: Many mathematical theorems as the Pierre de Fermat's theorems point to a nihilistic field or to the existence of a limit (like the light speed in physics) but associated with "infinitesimal change" within a rather nihilistic framework. This also points to an ontologically degraded realm and is quite deceiving, so the all field needs to be elevated. As we show here, the gate that leads out of it is the dynamic towards a dasein higher dimension (and not towards a typical linear direction) [37-45].

The famous French philosopher and mathematician Descartes proposed in his book "La Géométrie" that, to establish satisfactory correlations between equations, their terms must be equated to zero (0), a concept introduced into mathematics by the Indians through the prism of Hindu philosophy, which intertwines and equates "being" with "zero" [46].

Friedrich Nietzsche who also rejected modern European nihilism, (despite the extremes to which he was led), deeply desired the creation of a "joyful science" that transcended nihilistic terms, as well as a dynamic scientific philosophy. However, we have already spoken about the exit from such a labyrinth. Pascal's construct (which, alongside Fermat's work, laid the foundations for probability theories) is strong and useful. However we shall criticize it here: as is evident, his particular triangle embodies the Fibonacci analogy, strong correlations and proportional relationships. For instance, in the triangle, each number is the sum of the two numbers directly above it. The triangle also describes the number of distinct combinations, pairs, or probability outcomes that a given number of things can produce when combined in various ways. For example, 3 things produce 3 combinations (eg the things A, B, and C produce the combinations AB, AC, and BC), 4 things produce 6 combinations, 5 things produce 10 combinations, and so on. (Eg, the things A, B, C, D produce the combinations AB, AC, AD, BC, BD, and CD. That is why we said that 4 things produce 6 combinations. And so on [47].

```

      1
     1 1
    1 2 1
   1 3 3 1
  1 4 6 4 1
 1 5 10 10 5 1

```

.....

However, the triangle -a more wide visualization of which can easily be found online- whose base constantly widens downwards (towards infinity), is not perfectly symmetrical through-out : for instance, in this case, the 6 combinations represent the

sum of 3 and 3 that are also things and combinations. The number 10 is the sum of 4 -representing things- and 6 -representing combinations- thus, 10 can be viewed as both things and combinations as also the number 2, and indeed, ultimately, any number

within the triangle. This gives rise to a collective Dynamic that transcends the numerical terms that otherwise would collapse into a void, leading to a meaningless nirvana. From this we can see that their mathematical propositions are very strong but theirs not so much. Eg in the Bertrand Russell's set theories as in his article «On Denoting» some of his axioms are refutable [48].

In an example that deals with probabilities, scientists (like the Hungarian mathematician Andrew Vasoni) made propositions like the following: suppose that we have 3 doors, A, B, and C. If we choose the correct one, we win a prize, whereas we lose with the other two. Suppose that we choose the door A that remains closed. Suppose also that then the door C -which does not contain the prize- is opened and it is not the lucky one. What is the best course of action from this point on? Is it better to stick with door A or switch to door B? Initially, each choice has a 1 in 3 probability. Thus, even after the door C is opened, the door A still has a 1 in 3 chance, meaning door B has a 2 in 3 chance. However, it must be said that this proposition seems rather weak: once the door C is opened and two doors A, B remain, someone can argue that from now on both A and B have a 50% probability. It can be said that we alter the dynamics and act decisively if we stick with A with a determined will [49].

(Objectively, here the prize is located at a specific spot, so the issue is not one of probability. Probabilities regarding finding it arise only due to the chooser's subjective lack of knowledge. The initial line of the Vasoni's reasoning here is that the chooser is ignorant and this leads to the conclusion that his position is inherently weak. The correct initial premise, however, is the existing knowledge and consequently, the proper approach is to make choices based on the best available informations and not by luck without any information or strong intuition. This method gradually leads to success and, in this context, may suggest that playing games of chance is not advisable. So the correct initial thought is the capabilities and not the probabilities) and the objective subject as we shall show [50].

Also, the further extension of the definition of probabilities proposed by the French mathematician Abraham de Moivre -according to which the probability curve is half the square root of the number of a coin tosses- also appears quite refutable (utilizing infinitesimal calculus). (There are indicative correlations here, but no concrete, rigorous proof.) There are many such examples. Similar apply to some other theories. For instance, in the Galois - Cauchy group theories and in the panels of the British mathematicians Cayley and Sylvester, there are some alchemistic propositions that are based on some tricks that can be easily spotted by a observant researcher. Similarly in Hamilton's theories, and in advanced mathematics, $A \times B$ is not equal to $B \times A$. Such views can be proposed intuitively but always move within a rather vague environment [51].

Very interesting is the Erdős-Kac theorem -in which the integers that are smaller than a number N , have on average, the same number of prime numbers distributed according to a bell curve- is powerful to a certain extent. Larger integers involve more

prime numbers than smaller ones, and prime numbers become scarcer as the magnitude of the numbers increases. (A prime number is a number that is divisible only by 1 and itself e.g. 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13). This indeed appears to cause a gathering of the numbers, though not strictly in the form of a bell-shaped average distribution curve. However the theorem is clever and useful: the fact that the bell curve of the average here is not particularly symmetrical, yet leans in a specific direction—namely, that larger numbers contain a greater quantity of prime numbers—reveals a coupling of the rational and the irrational, opening up a higher dasein dimension [52].

As we mentioned above, the criterion in the chosen theories is never absolute but is a dynamic signpost, and this way leads to a hyperscientific field: the fact that something could be a certain way does not mean that it necessarily is so. It is a valid choice, yet it leaves open other possibilities, revealing that the scientific choice is often conventional, thereby pointing to a broader, more authentic, and substantive path. Eg, on a constantly rotating sphere like Earth, it is difficult to pinpoint exactly in which geographical point the 24-hour cycle begins. Thus, it appears that the designation of the island Kiribati as the first country in the world to welcome the New Year (by the international scientific society) is rather conventional [53].

Let's also have a look at the Western Calendar issue that shocked the western world and divided the churches at the last centuries creating a lot of political and scientific frictions: the modern Gregorian calendar followed by the Western world is a modification of the older Julian calendar: it was proposed by the Italian physician Aloysius Lilius and instituted by Pope Gregory XIII in 1582 AD. However, the change in the calendar provoked strong reactions, and Russia continues to follow the old calendar. From a phenomenological and astronomical perspective, the essence of the dispute is as follows: for an observer in the Northern Hemisphere, during the era of Julius Caesar—using the old Julian calendar (which corresponds to the current Russian calendar)—the vernal equinox occurred at the boundary between Aries and Pisces, whereas today it falls around March 8 (within Pisces, moving towards Aquarius). However, given that the Russian Old Calendarist and the European New Calendarist that are in the same place (eg in Poland) and observe the vernal equinox on the same day -that is, simultaneously- have to do with different calendar dates (the Russian on March 8th of the Old Calendar and the European on March 21st of the New Calendar), the tropical year (that is the period from one vernal equinox to the next) should always end at the same time for both, rather than ending now 13 days earlier for the European. (The so-called "sidereal year" (365.2563) is, as is well known, closer to the Old Calendar 365,25 anyway [54-56].

The relevant values can even be seen by anyone online: the tropical year is 365,2422 and the New Calendar's value is 365,2425. Those values change by time, but it is unknown what were the values at the middle ages etc, so the main issue remains). So although the new calendar seems to deal with technologically more advanced observation methods, it cannot be considered re-

ally better from an ontological point of view, and another issue of philosophical significance rises again here . revealing an inherent contradiction within the conventional phenomenological scientific view [57].

About the Phases of Evolution

Some scientists have talked about, biology fluctuations that drive a collective co-evolution of species, in the sense that changes in one specie foster changes in another, amidst shifts that range from the gradual to the rapid. Indeed, the universality of such evolutionary phases reflects the dynamic of a more unified collective field, one of higher significance that stands as a truly pivotal dimension. This represents a supra-scientific dynamic, duly balanced in its very essence. Thus, the followers of the philosophy of Heidegger and Plato (although his idealism needs a bit of grounding) would argue that the (shadow) phases of evolution are reflections and conscience fragments of the complete higher ideal field [58].

As we know, science operated exclusively within this purely idealistic climate until the 19th century, when Charles Darwin -with well-substantiated arguments- proposed that humans descended from animals and advanced the theory of the evolution. It is known that Darwin gathered illustrative biological and paleontological evidence from the Galápagos Islands and the jungles of Brazil during his voyage aboard the steamship Beagle [59].

However, the evolution theory is not without weak points that lead to idealist concepts that transcend a standard linear progression of time, hinting at a higher field. For instance, from a mathematical and statistical perspective, the following holds true: There are mathematical theorems like the Erdős–Kac theorem that we mentioned above that show that the numbers are gathered in a form that looks like an obvious frontal “bell-shaped average distribution curve” (although as we said this description is not exact). Since the years that pass are numbers, this proves that the temporality is not linear but exponential. The reactive, counter-acting force that “blocks” the typical linear motion, does not lead to a nihilistic counter-balance, but rather to an elevating rising dynamic (since as we have said it is not a typical average curve but a rising cool force) [60-65].

Further, most people are neither siblings nor close relatives. Consequently, two individuals living today do not typically share the exact same number of ancestors in a past era , say 1000 AD. The one individual probably has more ancestors in that time than the other (since not everyone reproduces at the same age). Furthermore, many of one person's ancestors are not ancestors of the other. Yet, this implies that the human population in 1000 AD would have to be larger than the current population—a conclusion that contradicts the facts [66].

Moreover, given that the children in a family resemble their parents -and each other- more closely than the parents resemble one another, it follows that as generations pass, descendants will bear a stronger resemblance to each other than their ancestors did. This suggests a powerful convergent tendency that seems

to prevent the transition to a different specie. Consequently, in a first approach, it seems highly doubtful if a mule resembles it's donkey parent more than it resembles the other mules, although geneticists will probably argue that a DNA test could shed light on the case [67].

Finally, it is worth noting that according to Darwin's theory of evolution not all modern humans are exactly *Homo sapiens*, nor are they the same kind of *Homo sapiens* : Individuals -whether humans or animals- do not reproduce at the same age. Among our ancestors, some reproduced at a very young age, while others did so at a much more mature stage. Consequently, tracing back to the *Australopithecus* of the past (our ancestor according to the theory of evolution), we do not all share the same number of ancestors connecting us with the *Australopithecus* : some have more, while others have fewer. Thus, according to the Darwinian theory of evolution, not all modern humans are exactly *Homo sapiens* -or the same kind of *Homo sapiens*- because some are closer to *Australopithecus* while others are further removed from him [68].

About Zero and Infinite in Math, Quantum Possibilities and the Binary System

In mathematics, the Babylonians—who solved equations geometrically by shifting and adjusting squares—led the way. (They did not only deal with Chaldean magic). These people were followed by the Egyptians. Subsequently, the mathematical science flourished greatly in Greece. It is said that the Chinese, who followed their own scientific path were familiar with negative numbers before the Indians (and also the Chinese «Book of Changes» - «I Ching»- inspired the Leibniz's binary system), while the medieval Arabs developed algebra and the Indo-Arabic numeral system [69].

The ancient philosopher Zeno was probably the first who made very important thoughts about the infinite. Among other remarks he proposed that every distance can be divided, so as we move there is always a smaller distance that we have to cover between us and another object, so we never actually reach the object, so movement is an illusion. (This reminds the unreachable speed of light. Of course, essentially the true limit is not typical and there are no limits to the potential and capabilities) [70].

The infinite infinitesimal-zero intervals proposed cleverly by Immanuel Kant to answer Zeno's paradoxes would lead to any conceivable kinetic outcome, thus, conventional motion remains illusory and Zeno is not completely answered by this. The proper answer to Zeno is the authentic exponential Dynamic that is a concept superior than conventional motion and is the choice of a higher, volitional nature [71-75].

Continuity exists in equilibrium with discontinuity: pure continuity would stagnate, whereas a strictly quantized, discrete discontinuity between two neighboring spaces would imply additional intervening space gaps, thereby causing Zeno's paradox to resurface. The Pythagoreans were aware of the existence of infinite irrational numbers, that is, numbers with an infinite num-

ber of decimal digits. Hippasus the Pythagorean, for instance, discovered that the square root of 2 is an irrational number. It is a fact that many mathematical structures in nature reveal this coupling of order and chaos—that is, of perfect straightness and sinuous curvature (like the snowflakes or on fruits placed next to each other or in a football). For instance, the well-known number π (3.14...) represents the average ratio of the actual "fractal polygonal and infinite" length to the straight-line certain distance, pointing to a dynamic harmonization of regular symmetry and chaotic asymmetry. (A crystal sphere is considered alchemistic because it is morphologically imperfect) [76].

In the East, the Hindu mathematicians after the Chinese introduced the negative numbers. However, later the following question arose: what is the square root of -1? One cannot simply say it is 1, because both $1 \times 1 = 1$ and $-1 \times -1 = 1$. (The same applies in the square root of -16 etc). Thus, the existence of so-called "imaginary and migadic numbers" was proposed, moving however within an intuitive environment of dynamic productive choices [77].

In the western world, after antiquity, the ideas regarding the infinite held by strong thinkers like Albert of Saxony -one of the significant medieval logicians-, Galileo and the 14th-century French bishop and philosopher Nicole Oresme, were also very important and generally correct. Bernhard Bolzano -a mathematician, philosopher, and priest from Bohemia- presented clever arguments to support the view that all infinities are equal, but Georg Cantor's theory that there are large and small infinities must be considered correct (in its general framework) [78].

Consider, for example, the infinite series $S = 1-1+1-1+1-1+1-1...$

If we group the terms as $S = (1-1)+(1-1)+(1-1)+(1-1)...$ we get $S = 0$.

But if we group them as $S = 1+(-1+1)+(-1+1)+(-1+1)...$ we get $S = 1$. Here someone could argue that $1=0$. Such correlations are proposed even in modern fractal theories due to the fact that infinite things seem to unite, and for this reason, the famous Norwegian mathematician Niels Henrik Abel (1802–1829 AD) later described such -Hindu style- infinite series as "diabolical."

For instance, the English philosopher James Thomson, drawing on such series, proposed that if we constantly and rapidly flip a switch on and off, after a certain period the light is neither on nor off, resulting in a hypothetical monistic and infinite "absence of discriminability." However due to the fact that as Cantor showed there are broader gradations in infinities, such infinite series are not strictly identical and impersonal. The phenomenological unification dynamic is not impersonal but morphological [79].

So we must point out that the known proposition of the famous Indian mathematician Brahmagupta in 628 AD that 1 divided by 0 = infinity and that 1 divided by infinity = 0, a concept that has since prevailed as a foundation of mathematics is actually Hindu in nature and does not actually align with the theology of a

personal God. Also, the Eastern philosophies -such as Buddhism and Hinduism, used also by Arthur Schopenhauer- are not volitional in nature, so they don't possess the internal free will that comes from the aforementioned unifying idealistic dynamic that is free from "external" compulsions. Although many scientists avoid admitting it, significant theological issues are involved in these matters : according to theology, God created nature ex nihilo (out of nothing) rather than through an emanation of His own essence : in other words, zero possesses no substance and represents absolute non-existence [80].

However, -given that infinity is considered to possess a form of physical substance and if 1 divided by 0 = infinity (meaning 1 is equivalent to zero an infinite number of times) as Brahmagupta proposed, then zero acquires material substance (as a quantum vacuum) and becomes implicated in physical phenomena : consequently, nature becomes an Hinduistic emanation of a "monistic" Nirvana state of a rather inertia "nihilistic" character. And it is true that many mathematicians in order to "prove" their propositions use the number zero with such a questionable manner, in other words by giving it some material substance. Consequently, since such a "material" zero is not real non existence, the mathematical use of zero (as well as that of other concepts and axioms) is largely conventional rather than purely ontological. It is also a crucial fact that the initial mathematical definitions ($10^0=1$, $-10 \times -10=100$, $-10 \times 10=-100$, $10^{-1}=1/10=0,1$, $10^1=10$, $10^{-2}=0,01$) are productive logical propositions rather than inductive [81-85].

Thus, for obvious reasons the humanitarian factor, with its productive proposals, is the essential and holds the central position within the contradictorily abyss of the alternating semiotic-digital elements and the chaotic conditions. The computer Matrix net cannot replace the free human choices. Modern computers rely on the equations of the ancient mathematician Diophantus -even though the ancient Greeks viewed the concepts of zero and infinity with skepticism- and thus, the person who devised the binary system based on 0 and 1 was the German philosopher and mathematician Leibniz, a genius and a multifaceted intellect. Anyway, despite the invention of the digital binary system by Leibniz, the base remains the decimal system. Eg, the binary system is said to be based exclusively on 0 and 1 [86].

For example, to convert the number 16 to the binary system, we take the following powers of 2 (for large numbers we also take others) : $2^0 + 2^1 + 2^2 + 2^3 + 2^4$ (i.e. 1, 2, 4, 8, 16). To get 16 as the sum of these powers we multiply some by 1 and others by 0 : 0x1, 0x2, 0x4, 0x8, 1x16.

Placing these numbers from right to left we see that 16 in the binary system is equal to 10000. That is, for the conversion to the binary system, the above use of powers of 2 is necessary, which is decimal. That is why Wilhelm Leibniz chose the decimal digits 0 and 1 for the binary system and not (for example) # and \$. Thus, a binary number, for example, 111 (which is the decimal 7), consists of both binary and decimal digits, with the result that the binary system is just helpful and instrumental and

not fundamental [87].

Consequently, it must be noted that, the binary nature of probability and gambling theories, the binary digital system, and the John Nash game theory rest upon an initial apparent and virtual “rupture” of the trusting collective Force, thereby embodying an inherent Faustian quality. (For example, Nash puts his famous prisoner dilemma quite well, but only provided that the trust shared by interrogators and prisoners has been disrupted. If it is not disrupted, no false dilemma arises. (Also the John von Neumann gunfighters issue applies only from the moment that all three of them decide to duel, shattering their dynamic relationship) [88].

The modern quantum mechanics also studied the aforementioned possibilities issues in a much more scientific way : in the famous double - slot experiment (experiment of Yang combined with the well known example of the cat of Schrodinger) it is considered that if the particle passes through the one slot, a mechanism will be activated so that the cat will die, and if it passes from the other slot the cat will live, and if it passes from both slots like a wave the cat will be living dead until the wave collapses in a particle accidentally and practically until we see what happens [89].

Here the following applies : First we must notice that many possible parallel universes may exist, but don't have to do with the rather superficial Hugh Everett's parallel universes theory. (Besides in Everett's theory there would be no waves but just particles with each one of them going to infinite different universes). Alexander did not lose the battle of Gaugamela in a parallel universe [90].

Further, the discontinuous and spasmodic Copenhagen view of Niels Bohr (a wave that collapses random and by chance in a particle) is not exactly proper, and (since there are wave phenomena) the theory of a deterministic quantum potential (were there is just a particle that moves completely in a deterministic way and it is informed through an accompanying quantum potential of what happens so it is selecting the slot of the transit) is not proper either [91].

In fact we have a united “particle/wave” phaseform , hence a morphological “waveform” that in it's "road" "heads" to the slots. Further there is a phenomenological emphasis in favor of one direction because of the waveform's communication with the all environment. Thus the "cat of Schrodinger" within the device will not be living dead, but always it will be either alive or dead. The wave and the particle are fragmentary aspects of this united waveform that has the higher morphological extensions that we present in this study [92].

Essentially there is not determinism but a higher Reason : if we throw a coin 10 times , perhaps we can take 8-2 (8 the one side and 2 the other) , but if we throw it 1000 times we will probably never take a lucky result like 980-20. We shall take about 450-550 etc. So the "luck" does not have a true existence. There

is an unbreakable rule middle balance of the (action-reaction) mountains and the valleys of the "luck" waves). (In this "road" according to the successful Feynman's theory the rest roads are canceled and the light follows the shorter simpler straight road. -Euclid and Fermat had made similar propositions-. So the Richard Feynman's theory is not similar to Bohr's theory). The wave and the particle are fragmentary aspects (phases) of this combined morphological waveform. The environmental aspects and are coordinated in a higher field (by a rather priori way) [93].

So the Aristotelian Principle of the excluded third (it is white or black and not gray) applies certain only when it is enough grounded in the environment (having also measured the gray that "participates") and it is not completely cut out from the environment. Also the principle of Aristotelian Logic $A = A$ is true but not completely cut off from the rest environment. $A = A$ because the L,P,H, etc. are also involved in the A (alpha) which communicates with the environment. (After the “Tractatus Logico-philosophicus” era, Ludwig Wittgenstein admitted this also and accepted a more simple philosophical word above wooden technical typicalities). Hence the criticism of the typical logic by many philosophers[94-104].

Conclusion

The quantum mechanics, forcefully raised an issue that had been intensely debated by medieval scholars as well as by later philosophers such as Berkeley and Kant, namely, whether an object truly exists independently outside the subject's sensory experience, and it's relationship to a Platonic-idealist realm. The answer is that the man does not need to have everything in his immediate sensory experience and typical knowledge. It is also the subject's intuition that organizes the “vague” object lying “beyond the sensory experience” making it felt, resulting in the revelation of the thing -in-itself as a collective objective subject of higher extensions : the "unclear" object that is out of the experience is settled clearly through the subject's proper objective examination and communication with the other aspects of the environment, something that elevates the subject to the broader condition of the objective, authentic self where idealism, empiricism and realism come in a higher balance and unity (and the Thing in itself is revealed despite Immanuel Kant's view that considered it inaccessible) [106].

Besides, in order to properly understand the structure and function of a thing such as our brain, we must consider it objectively, placing ourselves "outside it" and objectifying it (while maintaining “contact” with it). This reveals the collective suprabrain spirit which productively activates the objective consciousness alongside the sensory perception and above it within the framework of the overall “contact” and the Godpleasing sincere voice of conscience [107- 109].

References

1. Marcus du Sautoy, “The Number Mysteries”
2. Marcus du Sautoy, “The Music of the Primes”
3. Gregory Chaitin, “Meta Math”
4. Mark Buchanan, “Why Catastrophes happen”

5. Keith Devlin, "The Man of Numbers Fibonacci's Arithmetic"
6. Masha Gessen, "A Genius and the Mathematical Breakthrough of the Century"
7. John Barrow, "The Infinite Book"
8. Bruce Schechter, "My Brain is Open: The Mathematical Journeys of Paul Erdős"
9. Aristotle, "Physics"
10. Aristotle, "Metaphysics"
11. Aristotle, "Organon"
12. Aristotle, "On the Heavens"
13. Aristotle, "Politics"
14. Aristotle, "Rhetoric"
15. Plato, "Timaeus"
16. Plato, "Symposium"
17. Euclid, "Elements"
18. Euclid, "Phenomena"
19. Euclid, "Optics"
20. Ptolemy, "Almagest"
21. Robert March, "Physics for Poets"
22. Newton, "Principia"
23. Einstein, "1905 Paper"
24. Einstein, "1915 Paper (General Relativity)"
25. Einstein, "The World As I See It"
26. Einstein, "How I See the World"
27. Einstein, "Autobiography"
28. Clifford M. Will, "Was Einstein Right?"
29. Jeremy Bentham, "Einstein"
30. Ludwik Kostro, "Einstein and the Ether"
31. Werner Heisenberg, "Physics and Philosophy"
32. Werner Heisenberg, "Encounters with Einstein"
33. Jonathan Powers, "Philosophy and the New Physics"
34. Lewis Epstein, "Relativity Visualized (Special Theory / General Theory)"
35. Lewis Epstein, "Thinking Physics"
36. Sir James Jeans, "Physics and Philosophy"
37. Alkinoos Mazis, "Physics"
38. Stephen Hawking, "A Brief History of Time"
39. Stephen Hawking, "Black Holes and Baby Universes and Other Essays"
40. Russell Stannard, "A Thousand and One Mysteries of the Universe"
41. Igor Novikov, "Black Holes and the Universe"
42. Richard Feynman, "QED: The Strange Theory of Light and Matter"
43. John Gribbin, "Quantum Physics and Reality"
44. John Gribbin, "The Big Bang"
45. John S. Hagelin, "Quantum Physics, Vedic Science, and Consciousness"
46. David Ruelle, "Chance and Chaos"
47. Fritjof Capra, "The Tao of Physics"
48. J. Bronowski, "The Evolution of Man"
49. Peter Coveney and Roger Highfield, "The Arrow of Time"
50. Sir Fred Hoyle, "The Ten Faces of the Universe"
51. Fred Hoyle, "The Universe: Cosmic Life Force"
52. Nikolaos Salmanlis, "On the Chessboard of the Universe"
53. F. David Peat, "The Philosopher's Stone"
54. Alastair Rae, "Quantum Mechanics: Illusion or Reality?"
55. Abdus Salam, "Unification of Fundamental Forces"
56. Isaac Asimov, "The History of Science"
57. Jayant Narlikar, "The Lightness of gravity"
58. B. Russell, "On Denoting"
59. Wittgenstein, "Tractatus"
60. Wittgenstein, "Philosophical Investigations"
61. Immanuel Kant, "Critique of Pure Reason"
62. Immanuel Kant, "Antinomies of Pure Reason"
63. Hegel, "Phenomenology of Spirit"
64. Heidegger, "Being and Time"
65. F. Nietzsche, "The Birth of Tragedy"
66. F. Nietzsche, "Thus Spoke Zarathustra"
67. F. Nietzsche, "Aphorisms"
68. F. Nietzsche, "Twilight of the Idols"
69. F. Nietzsche, "The Gay Science"
70. F. Nietzsche, "Human, All Too Human"
71. Kierkegaard, "Repetition"
72. Descartes, "Discourse on the Method"
73. Panag. Dimitropoulos, "History of Philosophy"
74. Ch. Theodoridis, "Introduction to Philosophy"
75. George Politzer, "Elementary Principles of Philosophy"
76. Bible (Old and New Testament)
77. Augustine, "The City of God"
78. Panagiotis Christou, "The Mystery of God"
79. Athan. I. Delikostopoulos, "The Evolution of Mystical Theology"
80. Fr. Dumitru Stăniloae, "God, the World, and Man"
81. Muhammad, "The Quran"
82. Helmuth von Glasenapp, "The Philosophy of the Indians"
83. Marios Verettas, "The Dead Sea Scrolls"
84. Plutarch, "Alexander"
85. Plutarch, "Julius Caesar"
86. Anthony Livesey, "Great Generals"
87. Emil Ludwig, "Napoleon"
88. Decharme, "Greek Mythology"
89. "World Mythology"
90. Montesquieu, "Considerations on the Causes of the Grandeur and Decadence of the Romans"
91. Hobbes, "Leviathan"
92. Carl von Clausewitz, "On War"
93. Sun Tzu, "The Art of War"
94. Michael Lee Lanning, "The 100 Greatest Battles of All Time"
95. Mao Zedong, "On Guerrilla Warfare"
96. Robert Greene, "Power"
97. Robert Greene, "War"
98. F. Engels, "The Communist Manifesto"
99. Gustave Le Bon, "Psychology of the masses"
100. Adam Smith, "An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations"
101. C. Jung, "Synchronicity"
102. C. Jung, "Analytical Psychology"
103. S. Freud, "Group Psychology"
104. Niccolò Machiavelli, "The Prince"
105. K.G. Georgoulis, "The Philosophy of History"
106. World Cultural Encyclopedia, "Biographies. The great men"

of all time.”

107. Greek Educational Encyclopedia: Religions

108. Greek Educational Encyclopedia: World History

109. C. Darwin, “The Origin of Species”

Copyright: ©2026 George Georgiadis . This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.