

# African Journal of Religion, Philosophy and Culture (AJRPC)

ISSN 2634-7636 (Print) ISSN 2634-7644 (Online)

Indexed by SCOPUS, IBSS, EBSCO and SABINET

Volume 6, Number 1, March 2025

Pp 5-14

## Infinilineality: The Quintessential of Reality at Its most Fundamental

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31920/2634-7644/2025/v6n1a1>

**Mindaralew Zewdie, PhD.**

*Department of Philosophy, Addis Ababa University*

*mindaralew.zewdie@aan.edu.et*

*251911199801*

---

### Abstract

This research is meant to examine the various metaphysical positions taken in the history of philosophy as regards the ultimate reality and show their respective drawbacks in view of the new perspective touted in this research as infinilineality. What is more this research is geared towards showing the salencies that define and the quintessential that outline Infinilineality. Pursuant to this overarching goal of the research I used the rational and critical methods that are home to a philosophical research undertaking. The conclusion drawn from this metaphysical undertaking holds that, reality at its most basics is infinilineality. In other words, reality at its most fundamental is an instantaneity predicated on all rounded, unlimited, time and space defying connectivity otherwise known as infinilineality.

**Keywords:** *infinilineality, infinilinealism, unilinealism, bilinialism, polilinealism, matrix of resonance.*

### Introduction

***Infinilineality: the Quintessential of Reality at Its most Fundamental***

The way nature metes out its processes, absconds its secrets and reveals its mundane facades, among other things, beckons at humans such that it

gives them all the reason to inquire into its nature. A question of formidable essence, from the rank of these inquires, is home to metaphysics. The quest for the ultimate reality, which through time picks different colors and names, appears to be a riddle that preoccupies the minds of the philosophers and engages those of scientists. A class of thinkers, popularly known as the pre-Socratic philosophers, were the first to approach, handle and tackle the very question by probing the matter at hand under the metaphysical topic titled: The One and the Many. Aristotle gave the plaudits to this bevy of thinkers as the first philosophers in the following passage;

The first philosophers...thought the principles which were of the nature of matter were the only principles of all things. That of which all things that are consist, the first from which they come to be, the last into which they are resolved, this they say is the element and this the principle of things, and therefore they think nothing is either generated or destroyed, since this sort of entity is always conserved, as we say Socrates neither comes to be absolutely when he comes to be beautiful or musical, nor ceases to be when he loses these characteristics, because the substratum, Socrates himself remains. Just so they say nothing else comes to be or ceases to be; for there must be some entity – either one or more than one – from which all other things come to be, it being conserved (Aristotle in Mckeeon 1941:983).

Breaking away from the mythos mode of thought also known as the myth-interspersed way of thinking, the pre-Socratic philosophers committed themselves to the goal of ferreting out the ultimate reality, the One from which the Many come into being and in which they assume their particular forms, and into which they jolt their final journey. Thales of Miletus was the first Western thinker to have the philosophic genius to grapple with the quest for the fundamental reality which he ultimately decided to be water (Magee 2000). His choice of water, which rests on a number good sounding physical grounds, earned him the right to be a philosopher for what he did was to try explaining reality by a part of it, for what he accomplished was to pull himself away from the tradition of the mythos way of thought which is noted for explaining nature by supernatural forces, gods, miracles, et cetera. Donald Palmer writes in this connection as follows:

Thales' question assumes that if there are "many" then somehow there must be a "one" behind the many, Furthermore, Thales' question assumes that the human mind is capable of fathoming that unchanging one behind the many, and having fathomed it, the mind would

understand what makes the center hold, would understand the sense in which things hang together (Palmer 1991: 7).

The aforementioned was Thales' mammoth concern and so was it of his predecessors as it is the concern of present day philosophers and scientists. This reveals on its own one inescapable fact: The way the problem of the One and the Many, or what is the same thing to say the search for the ultimate reality was handled and thereby addressed in a faulty way. Put otherwise, to respond to the question of the One and the Many by saying, the ultimate reality is water for Thales, the indeterminate substance for Anaximander, air for Anaximenes, fire for Heraclitus, number for Pythagoras, earth, air, water and fire for Empedocles (Mckeon 1941, Miller 1984) is to succumb into the mistake of either unilineality, or polilineality. To try to explain reality by tracing things and processes to a single or double or multiple substances as the origin of the things and processes in question is to sustain the philosophical mistake of unilineality or polilineality. In a world that is highly intertwined to the point where an event can be at any places, mind you it is PLACES with S, without being in between in ways and dints that defy starkly time and space, to try to pin the ultimate reality to one or two or many material/physical substances is to commit an outright metaphysical mistake (Heisenberg 1958, Puthoff 1990b, Puthoff 2010). In other words, all philosophical attempts meant to explain reality by one or two or four substances suffer incurably from the myopia which falls short of the mark. Best case in point is the Cartesian cleavage of reality into two mutually exclusive substances, the substance that thinks and the substance that extends, in a word mind and matter. To put the issue at hand in a shade different way, Descartes' metaphysical attempt is one of tracing reality at the end of the day to two lines which upon being followed would finally let us land on either matter or mind, That is exactly what I mean in this research by bilineality. Nowhere is bilineality comes clear and unequivocal than it does in Descartes' dualism. In the wake of Descartes' division of reality into two mutually exclusive substances, the substance which thinks *res cogitans* and the substance which extends *res extensa* (Descartes 1969) humans are not only separated from and stand aloof to the material world, they as well stand separated from their own body and the rest of the world. A human being stands apart not only in reference to the rest of the world but also to itself. Humankind has thus become alien to herself/himself, standing as an outsider to himself/herself where one's body is no longer considered as an essential part of oneself. So humanity stands in total aloof to itself, to

say nothing of the rest of the world. “I am not more than a thing which thinks, that is to say a mind or a soul or an understanding or a reason... I am, however, a real thing and really exist; but what thing? I have answered: a thing which thinks” (Descartes 1969: 173). Constantly fed by and deeply rooted in this philosophical basis the chasm separating human being in terms of two mutually diametric substances has led humans to consider themselves as strangers standing in total disconnection to their bodies. In strict resonance with the point being discussed the argument set forward by Palmer is worth quoting:

“The self is defined as mind or soul and the body is not an essential part of the self. ... Descartes’ argument... leads to this strange conclusion (strange because most of us have always assumed that our bodies are rather essential aspects of our selves and not baggage we take along with us when we go out)” (Palmer 1999: 62).

The way reality has been approached, handled and pulverized by dualists like Descartes and his successors can’t help us have a way out where problems of reality as regards human beings are concerned, let alone those problems regarding the whole of reality. To make it clearer, the Cartesian attempt to define reality in terms of two substances that can never ever see eye to eye would only drop us and leave us in a totally disconnected situation where we human beings can no longer be at one with ourselves since we are cut from ourselves by a big canyon on one side of which stands hopelessly and helplessly mind and on the other body. So we stand aloof from ourselves helplessly forced to associate ourselves only to our mind and nearly denying our body the berth of importance we attach to our mind when it comes to identifying ourselves with. Sadly, with bilineality which traces everything and anything to two ultimate building blocks that have nothing to do with each other, human beings can no longer see themselves as a whole organism. The point raised by Capra perfectly resonates with my argument:

Descartes’ famous sentence “Cogito ergo sum” – “I think therefore I exist”- has led Westerners to equate their identity with their mind, instead of with their whole organism. As a consequence of the Cartesian division, most individuals are aware of themselves as isolated egos existing “inside” their bodies. The mind has been separated from the body and given the futile task of controlling it, thus causing an apparent conflict between the conscious will and the involuntary instincts. Each individual has been split up further into a large number of separate compartments, according to his or her activities, talents,

feelings, beliefs, etc., which are engaged in endless conflicts generating continuous metaphysical confusion and frustration (Capra 2000: 23).

The right way to explain reality is not one of trying to analyze it into fundamental elements as was the case with Thales and his followers, Empedocles, Leucippus and Democritus all the way to Descartes and his successors. In ways that can cement my argument one of the noted quantum physicist and philosopher of our time, in the name and person of David Bohm writes as follows:

One is led to a new notion of unbroken wholeness which denies the classical idea of analyzability of the world into separately and independently existing parts...We have reversed the usual classical notion that the independent "elementary parts" of the world are the fundamental reality, and that the various systems are merely particular contingent forms and arrangements of these parts. Rather we say that inseparable quantum interconnectedness of the whole universe is the fundamental reality, and that relatively independently behaving parts are merely particular and contingent forms within the whole (in Bohm & Hiley 1975: 96).

Taking a probing look at the issue being discussed one can easily see why infinilineality is the best way out of the entanglements unilineality, bilineality, polilineality et cetera get us into. Elements of a given whole, compartments of a given system, parcels of a given cluster are to be seen in all-lineal connection which defies space and time, number and limitation, unilineality and its multiples. Reality is all connected instantaneously and inalienably in manners that run in the face of all philosophical and scientific endeavors to trace things to a few and limited fundamentals. David Bohm comes strong clear and persistent where the nature of the relation between parts and the whole is concerned.

Parts are seen to be in immediate connection, in which their dynamical relationships depend, in an irreducible way on the state of the whole system (and indeed on that of the broader systems in which they are contained, extending ultimately and in principle to the entire universe), (Bohm and Hailey, 1975 quoted in Zukav 2001: 340)

According to quantum mechanics, the system remains an indivisible whole in spite of the separation of the particles in space. Measurements performed on the particles simultaneously are predicted to show correlations that imply that each particle carries, in some sense that can be well defined mathematically, an imprint of the activities of the other. This cooperation takes place in spite of the strictures of Einstein's own

special theory of relativity, which forbids any instantaneous physical communication between the particles (Heisenberg 2005: 5)

The aforementioned philosophers and their metaphysical positions and conclusions failed to see that in a world that is deeply interconnected in the sense that it is unfathomable to alienate one from others, from the very web of interconnectedness, unless in abstraction, reducing the entire gamut of reality to one or two or multiple substances is an outright shortcoming and a clear mistake in metaphysics. The right way to see and explain things is to put them in the plenum of relations, hereinafter termed as *Infinilineality*. *Infinilineality* is defined by three qualities, among others major diagnostic features: Its capacity to bear with traditional, religious and scientific views, its openness to welcome, correct and overcome even unilineality, bilineality and polilineality and other related views, and its inherent affiliation with the philosophy of matrix of resonances. *Infinilineality* can as well be defined as a view that is unlimited by number, undeterred by time and unaffected by space.

At its most elemental, matter couldn't be chopped up into self-contained little units, but was completely indivisible. You could only understand the universe as a dynamic web of interaction. Things once in contact remained always in contact through all space and all time. Indeed time and space themselves appeared to be arbitrary constructs, no longer applicable at this level of the world. Time and space as we know them did not exist. All that appeared, as far as the eye could see, was one long landscape of the here and now (McTaggart 2001: 11).

As regards *infinilineality's* being inherently open to traditions, I would like to allude to what the founding fathers of quantum physics have done after discovering that matter at its most fundamental level lands on the subatomic particles. And these subatomic particles are connected everywhere instantaneously (Heisenberg 2006). And this instantaneous connection across all of space and all of time made the giants in the field land on a new berth of understanding and revelation that reminds them of the teachings of religion, the practices of traditions and the belief systems of different people. What the founding fathers of quantum physics came to learn following the discovery of the inalienable interconnectivity of the world and the omnipresence of electrons everywhere every time that what they have discovered might have been already discovered or prophesied about in other value and belief systems of different people across the globe. The gist of the issue I am grappling with is that with *Infinilineality*, gone are the days in which everything is

thought to be reduced into one or more material elements by which the entire world is supposed to be explained and into which this same world could be analyzed. On a diametrically opposite plane of thought, when what you can find at the subatomic level is not a sheer building block from which the entire world is reckoned to be built brick by brick, rather a packet of energy connected instantaneously with every other element, every other packet of energy wherein the lines of connectivity with each other are unlimited, indeterminate and the manner in which the connection comes off escapes time (Heisenberg 2005). Following these developments the founding fathers of quantum physics could no longer feel convenient to stay within their own provinces of theory and experiment. The discoveries they made about the universe at its most elemental forced them to leave their wonted berths of thought and practice and thereby make jolts into other fields and value as well as belief systems such as philosophy, mysticism and traditional practices of people in different corners of the globe. In ways that might ascertain my argument, Lynne McTaggart writes as follows,

The pioneers of quantum physics - Erwin Schrodinger, Werner Heisenberg, Niels Bohr and Wolfgang Pauli – had some inkling of the metaphysical territory they had trespassed into. If electrons were connected everywhere at once, this implied something profound about the nature of the world at large. They turned to classic philosophical texts in their attempts to grasp the deeper truth about the strange subatomic world they were observing. Pauli examined psychoanalysis and archetypes and the Qabbalah; Bohr, the Tao and Chinese philosophy; and Heisenberg, the Platonic theory of ancient Greece (McTaggart 2001: 12).

It is with this spirit in sight and relishing on the openness quantum physicists have lived to such an extent that they dared to see what philosophy, mysticism, and practices of people in non-Western world, practices that were scorned off more often than not by science at large and relegated to the repository of what they called views and practices of backward people, and non-scientific views and value systems, infinilineality is able to overcome the drawbacks of earlier metaphysical positions and mark a new and higher notch of explaining reality. With infinilineality we are in a position to overcome the chasm that was permitted to stand between our mind and our body. Nor is this all. With infinilineality we are at one not only with ourselves, and not only with our mind and body, but as well we are at one with the rest of the world. We are essentially connected to the rest of the world instantaneously and

inalienably. So with infinilineality the precept that works is that the lines that connect us with ourselves and with the rest of the world are infinite both in number and nature. Thus our relation to ourselves and the rest of the world is connectivity that rests necessarily on infinilineality.

## **Summary and Conclusion**

This research was able to define afresh the rightful place of metaphysics in particular and philosophy in general amid the claims of modern philosophy and classical physics that denied humanity the deservedly earned role of being at the center of the universe. Following a prudent meting out of the claims made where the objectives of this research are concerned, the said claims in this work were able to land an opportunity to show where ancient and modern philosophers got it right only to get it wrong (Bohm 2004).

The most important upshot of this research is that, science is just a necessary and yet hasty journey away from philosophy only to come back home belatedly to the quintessential of philosophy. In what appeared to be a far off hindsight, at least partly, philosophy cruised its way aboard the ferry of reason and, religion scuttled its voyage on board the ship of commitment, prayers, devotion and intuition only to have its ship docked somehow at the harbor of one and the same universal force.

This research showed how humanity when and if being back in connection with nature benefits immeasurably. By mending the lines of connectivity which had been, at best summarily denied and at worst incredibly severed by the physics of Newton, by the biology of Darwin and Spencer and by the psychology of Sigmund Freud, by the philosophy of Rene Descartes, to name just a few.

Unlike the world view of Newton or Darwin, theirs [quantum physicists] was a vision that was life-enhancing. These were ideas that could empower us, with their implications of order and control. We were not simply accidents of nature. There was purpose and unity to our world and our place within it, and we had an important say in it. What we did and thought mattered – indeed, was critical in creating our world. Human beings were no longer separate from each other. It was no longer us and them. We were no longer at the periphery of our universe – on the outside looking in. We could take our rightful place, back in the center of our world, (McTaggart 2001: IV).

This research showed, among other things, that the world out there is no longer indifferent to our conscious activities. The world out there

responds to the commands we issue providing we know how to get back the key to such commands. In agreeable chime with this McTaggart states what follows. “Human consciousness – was utterly central to this process of subatomic flux actually becoming some set thing, but we weren’t in any of the mathematics of Heisenberg or Schrödinger. They [quantum physicists] realized that we were somehow key, but they didn’t know how to include us” (McTaggart 2001: X).

In sum, the following conclusive assertions can be made where reality is concerned. Reality is not unilineal. It is not bilinear, either. Nor is it even multilineal. It definitely is infinilineal. In making these assertions I am not metaphysically referring to the ultimate stuff of which reality is made either. Instead I am unequivocally speaking about the quintessential feature which can define reality at its most fundamental. And that diagnostic feature of reality is infinilineality. And the metaphysical position that theorizes about this ultimate feature of reality is hereinafter dubbed infinilinealism.

Moreover, this research was able to show, among other things, that philosophers have been grappling with the idea of the one and the many in their metaphysical endeavors to come up with a primordial substance from which everything is supposed to come into being and into which everything is presumed to wither away at the end of their journey. And that philosophical scour for the ultimate substance, the fundamental reality or the final building brick appeared to be something or the other of a material substance for the Pre-Socratic philosophers (Mckeon 1941). Nonetheless, their honest philosophical endeavors to come by the elusive primordial substance, their metaphysical runs uphill and philosophical jolts down dale whittled down to unilineality. Unilineality is a philosophical position which ended up in tracing all things back to one or another material substance. Thus the chosen material substance be it water, the indeterminate substance - a kind of mixture of other material substances (Miller 1984), air, fire or a combination of them would only make us repeat the same mistake we erred in different forms. The same mistake pops up when the choice we landed on helps us to make a huge leap from everything is water into everything is atom. It is just a variety on a theme. The problem is best captured in a time-honored Ethiopian adage which has it to say: *ke’zunjero qonjo mn yimerarrttu* (a distinction without difference). That explains the need for a new metaphysical position. And that is exactly where infinilineality steps into the scene.

This research thus showed why the gamut of metaphysical positions that runs from the Unilinealism and polilinealism of the pre-Socratics all

the way to Bilinealism of modern philosophy in the hands of Rene Descartes (Descartes 1969), to mention just a few, failed short of the mark. However this research was not limited to pointing at the drawbacks of the earlier metaphysical positions, it as well was behooved with the onus of coming up with a new perspective, which it did, a perspective that can get to the ultimate feature of reality at its most quintessential. And that feature turned out to be infinilineality.

## References

- Bohm, D. (2004) *On Dialogue*. London: Rutledge Classics
- Capra, F. (2000) *The Tao of Physics: An Exploration of the Parallels between Modern Physics and Eastern Mysticism*. Boston: Shambhala Publication Inc.
- Descartes, R. (199) *Meditations on First Philosophy*, in *The Essential Descartes*, Margaret, D. Wilson ed., Elizabeth, S. Haldane and Ross, G.R.T. trans. New York: New American Library.
- Heisenberg, W. (1958) *Physics and Philosophy*, New York: Harper Torch books.
- Heisenberg, W. (1974) *Across the Frontiers*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers
- Heisenberg, W. (2005) *Physics and Philosophy: The Revolution in Modern Science*, Great Britain: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Heisenberg, W. (2006) *Physics and Beyond: Encounters and Conversations*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Mckeon, R .ed. (1941) *Aristotle, Metaphysics*, in *Basic Works of Aristotle*, New York: Random House.
- Magee, B. (2000) *The Story of Philosophy*. New York: Dorling Kindersley Book.
- McTaggart, L. (2001) *The Field: The Quest for the Secret Force of the Universe*, New York: Harper Collins publishers Inc.
- Miller, EDL. (1984) *Questions that Matter: An Invitation to Philosophy*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Palmer, D. (1999) *Does the Center Hold? Second edition*, Mountainview: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Puthoff, H. (1990b) *The Energetic Vacuum: Implications for Energy Research*. NY: *Speculations in Science and Technology*.
- Puthoff, H. (2010) *Advanced Space Propulsion Based on Vacuum, (Spacetime Metric) Engineering*; JBIS, 63: pp. 37- 49.
- Zukav, G. (2001) *The Dancing Wu Li Masters: An Overview of the New Physics*. NY: Perennial Classics, Harper Collin Publishers Inc.