

Descartes' error and the path to knowledge

René Descartes was on the right track when he placed the search for truth on a rational basis. But instead of excluding what is wrong, he chose to exclude only what he personally doubted and contradicted an ontological dualism. This ultimately led him to dualism and failed to find a comprehensive approach to reality. However, the true royal road to knowledge lies in Karl Popper's falsificationism, which forms the basis of modern natural science. Popper recognized that we can never achieve absolute certainty about the truth. The only sensible way is to exclude the illogical and contradictory and to subject only what remains logically coherent and consistent to empirical testing and what can withstand is considered proven - even if only provisionally - as long as it is not refuted. But anyone who wants to live for a conviction and find meaning cannot wait forever for ultimate certainties. Such a person must become aware of his axioms, validate them in communicative exchanges and exclude all conclusions that are self-contradictory.

I am guided by these considerations when formulating the following thoughts.

Chains of events and the nature of the present

Every event is the effect of a cause and at the same time the cause of another effect. Such a chain of events necessarily exists when all events taken together arise from a beginning and lead to nothing in the end. In this case everything originates from nothingness and eventually returns to nothingness. Space and time are not the stage on which events take place; rather, they arise as a result of these events.

If each chain of events were completely determined in itself, the future and the past could be completely determined by the current state at any point in time. It follows that there must be different versions of every chain of events in which the chains of events at the starting point in the present moment split into alternative paths from superposition and converge again at the end point. Only the overlapping versions of all event chains would then be fully determined. This separation creates what we experience as the present – the here and now in space and time. (Coincidence, Conscientia, Conscientia, Presence, Hope, Fear, Joy, Suffering, Decision).

The totality of all possible events, i.e. all their different versions, could be described as omniscient. Paradoxically, however, this omniscience would be blind to the moment of the present unless life exists that is aware of this present. Life is not an additional phenomenon, but an integral part of all possible chains of events. Consciousness, in turn, is the co-knowledge - the conscientia - that arises from the knowledge of the different versions of a living being.

In order for nothingness to encompass the totality of all events, all chains of events must arise from a single point. These events must add up to zero and eventually return to nothingness. The end point would then be omniscient. All possible versions of event chains represent what we experience as possibilities. Possibilities are chains of events, and chains of events are possibilities. Likewise: calculations are possibilities and chains of events are

calculations. Life is an integral part of chains of events, and knowledge is an integral part of life. Life is a form of knowledge, and both life and knowledge are becoming increasingly virtual. Complete knowledge is complete virtualization and complete convergence of knowledge and life and complete virtualization of all that is, was and will be and is ultimately indistinguishable from the resurrection.

The knowledge at the end point must be complete. However, this is only possible if there is life that is aware of its presence - with consciousness, knowledge and conscientia. Therefore, the Endpoint must somehow ensure that life exists and that it itself, like us, is conceived, born, lives, loves, suffers, dies and is resurrected.

If the chains of events do not move towards the end point, the knowledge at the end point would be incomplete. This contradiction can only be avoided by ensuring that the end point, space and time are sequences of events and not stages, must be indistinguishable from the starting point and ensure that the chains of events converge towards it. This initiation manifests itself in history as a transcendent experience, as if it led to the founding of a religion.

If individual individuals in their different versions across the different chains of events did not contribute to the evolution towards the end point either through genes or through ideas (memes), the knowledge at the end point would also be incomplete. This contradiction can only be avoided by ensuring that the end point, space and time are sequences of events and not stages, must be indistinguishable from the starting point and ensure that these individuals are linked to it. This connection is experienced by individuals as a personal revelation.

Knowledge and the path to truth

By eliminating the contradictory and illogical, we approach what remains - a reality defined neither by dogmatic certainties nor by absolute skepticism. The path to knowledge lies in constant testing and falsification. Space, time, consciousness and life are not rigid, ready-made concepts, but dynamic results of chains of events that unfold through consciousness. The goal is not complete knowledge, but rather an ever-increasing approximation of what remains after all contradictions have been eliminated.

Ultimately, the end point can only be reached when people exclude the contradictory in order to experience the rest - even if they never fully know what that is.

How we should live

If we assume that everything that is possible exists separately in different versions of reality, we must grapple with the idea that we must confront all possible versions of our lives and our decisions. In such a world, the principle of separation, whether through physical distance, social barriers or conscious exclusion, would ultimately be meaningless. Because even if we avoid each other or even try to eliminate each other, the fact remains that we will meet again in some form - be it in this reality or in another version of it.

This idea of re-encounter and inevitable resurrection means that all conflicts, misunderstandings and hurts must sooner or later be resolved or relived. There is no final escape and no way to permanently avoid suffering or responsibility. Whatever suffering or joy we experience ultimately becomes part of the larger reality in which each version of life has its place.

In such a mode of existence, it would be sensible not to be guided by selfishness or struggles for resources. If we are all ultimately part of a larger whole, it is unreasonable to deny other people resources to survive, because in other versions of reality we might be the ones affected. So the consequences of our actions catch up with us in ways that go far beyond our immediate lives. It would then only be wise to live in such a way that we not only ensure our own survival, but also that of others.

We should therefore strive to see our fellow human beings not as competitors, but as necessary partners on a journey that connects us all - regardless of whether we like each other or not. Because the connection that unites us all is indissoluble. So if we will continue to meet in such a reality and ultimately all be resurrected, then it is crucial to cultivate a way of life based on mutual participation and cooperation.

In this sense, it would be unreasonable to deny other living beings resources that are crucial to their survival. This applies not only to material goods, but also to intangible aspects such as knowledge, compassion and justice. In a world where all possibilities are real and all suffering recurs, it would be wise to act in a way that minimizes suffering and maximizes well-being - not just for ourselves, but for everyone.

By realizing that all lives are intertwined and there is no ultimate separation, we acquire an ethical responsibility towards every living being. We should strive to promote a culture of sharing and responsibility in which no one is excluded from survival. Because in a world where all versions of life are reality, the well-being of the individual also means the well-being of the whole.