

# The Causal Conditioning of Thought and a Theory of Everything

Heinz Volkenborn 

Dipl.-Ing. Architekt, Hamburg, Germany

Email: volkenborn-architekten@hamburg.de

**How to cite this paper:** Volkenborn, H. (2023). The Causal Conditioning of Thought and a Theory of Everything. *Open Journal of Philosophy*, 13, 775-777.

<https://doi.org/10.4236/ojpp.2023.134050>

**Received:** October 2, 2023

**Accepted:** November 20, 2023

**Published:** November 23, 2023

Copyright © 2023 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>



Open Access

## Abstract

In the present work it will be shown that a Theory of Everything presupposes a quantization of space and time in order to uncover the law of causality as a hidden parameter of human cognition, that nature destroying comes into effect. This involves not only a re-evaluation of the reduced Planck constant, but also and above all a new interpretation of Heisenberg's uncertainty principle as the basic description of natural behaviour. The proof is the decoding of 137.

## Keywords

Human Brain, Thought, Law of Causality, Uncertainty Principle, 137 (Number)

## 1. Introduction

Fifty years after Einstein's death, the scientific journal *Nature* asked the question: *How close are we to a theory of everything?* Gerard 't Hooft and ten other physicists were requested to answer ('t Hooft et al., 2005). So far so good or not, because more as fifteen years have passed since then without a conclusive answer being found and it is to be feared that fifteen more years will pass if the causal conditioning of *free will and God's assignment* contained in these question, does not question itself at some point ('t Hooft, 2017).

To understand this, we refer to our mind's cognitive capability and turn to thought which is equated with cognition. Because since René Descartes established: *I think therefore I am* and raised this phrase to the first principle of his philosophy, thought has been considered as the cognitive distinction of reason. Of course, Descartes did not invent thought. People thought, and called it so before. What is meant is rather the *thinking I* which he took as the pivot of reason. Here thought is removed from the body and attributing it to the mind of spirit.

Consequently, only thought can penetrate to objective truth, whereas visual and emotional comprehension must fall away as subjective forms of cognitions.

From this we may conclude thought is extensive cognition and therefore cognition of time in the unity and division of past present and future. Simultaneously, this uniting and dividing moment cannot be assigned to thought but can only comprehend the future.

For thought moves ahead in a generalising, appraising and judging manner, leaving the given Now to arrive from one target point via the next to a new target content. This is called discursive capability which has changed as its content, in order to predict events so and only so. But even if thought only seeks to secure the already existence, it can never stand still in the given Now. Rather, it constantly moves towards an apparition who appears to be within reach and determinable in thought, even though it is not yet really present. Only comprehension of the future can reach this apparition. However, cognition of time cannot be derived from this.

If Descartes says that only the *thinking I* can resist the *evil spirit* that pretends to truth, yet necessarily the answer deceiving us is: thought itself deceives us by saying time when it can only mean future. This places time into a situation of future distortion, where the law of causality comes into effect (Volkenborn & Volkenborn, 2019).

Having said that, let us turn to the human brain as the locus of thought. Of course, not only thought is located here. It shares this location with visual and emotional comprehension which Descartes described as suspicious cognition. Nevertheless visual and emotional comprehension constitutes spatial-temporal cognition together with thought. But we began by assuming that future thought has to be complemented by the first dimension. Subsequently, the past can be attributed to visual comprehension in the second dimension, to find the present in emotional comprehension, which unifies the first and the second dimensions, raising these to the third, space and time thus merge to form cognition.

Here we refer to the two cerebral hemispheres and the limbic system, hence to a spatially organised brain structure of future, past and present which proves to be multiply interlinked. So via the limbic system, the sensory organs are directly linked and, with the exception of the olfactory bulb, cross linked with both cerebral hemispheres which can communicate independently via the corpus callosum. There is no direct external link between the cerebral hemispheres. This suggests a functional architecture of cognition. The three forms of comprehension of spatial-temporal cognition are assigned to this architecture

Only in the unity and division of the three area of the human brain can cognition reveal itself. And this cognition is spatial-temporal cognition, without following the law of causality; as thought would have us believe (Volkenborn & Volkenborn, 2019).

## 2. Proof

The Proof is the decoding of the dimensionless number 137. Because if we ques-

tion the spatial-temporal cognition at this point such a decoding not only replaces  $\hbar$  with  $h$  and thus confirms Heisenberg's uncertainty principle as basic description of natural behaviour, but also and above all Einstein's velocity vector  $c$  and its connection with Newton's gravitational constant  $G$  as hidden parameter of causality within this behaviour (Volkenborn & Volkenborn, 2023). Wherein the spin quantum number  $s = 1/2$  as prerequisite of negative energy then is contained (Volkenborn, 2019).

### 3. Conclusion

Not a theory of everything, but to be or not to be, that is the question here. Wherein the question is contained: How much causality between  $\hbar$  and  $h$  tolerates a natural behaviour which comes into effect in an indeterminate way? There is not much time left for an answer. Climate change and the change of biodiversity leave us no other choice.

### Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

### References

- 't Hooft, G. (2017). *Free Will in the Theory of Everything*. arxiv:1709.02874v2 [quant-ph].
- 't Hooft, G., Susskind, L., Witten, E., Fukugita, M., Randall, L., Smolin, L., Stachel, J., Rovelli, C., Ellis, G., Weinberg, S., & Penrose, R. (2005). A Theory of Everything? *Nature*, 433, 257-259. <https://doi.org/10.1038/433257a>
- Volkenborn, H. (2019). *The Proof of the Riemann Hypothesis*. vixra:1908.0116.
- Volkenborn, U., & Volkenborn, H. (2019). *The Quantization of Time*. vixra:1907.0379.
- Volkenborn, U., & Volkenborn, H. (2023). The Quantization of Space. *Journal of High Energy Physics, Gravitation and Cosmology*, 9, 687-690. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jhepgc.2023.93055>