

International Journal of Human Sciences Research

CLARIFICATIONS TO THE PUBLIC ON THE “PHILOSOPHY OF EVERYTHING AND SELF- SIMILARITY”

Uriel David Avilés Rangel

Research professor at the Universidad
Pedagógica Nacional

Acceptance date: 11/04/2025

All content in this magazine is
licensed under a Creative Com-
mons Attribution License. Attri-
bution-Non-Commercial-Non-
Derivatives 4.0 International (CC
BY-NC-ND 4.0).



Abstract: This article is a response to some questions about the author's philosophical proposal, entitled "Philosophy of Everything and Self-Similarity". The author discusses the main criticisms of the philosophies of Kant and Hegel, and how his own proposal addresses these criticisms.

Keywords: Causality, knowledge, dialectics, materialism, falsifiability

Response to some questions about my philosophical proposal called "Philosophy of everything and self-similarity".

Kant's main critique of Hume in the philosophy of knowledge centers on the question of causality and the possibility of synthetic a priori knowledge. Here is a breakdown of the key points:

1. Causality and necessity:

* Hume:

* Hume argued that the idea of causality is based on habit and repetition of experience.

* He denied that there is a necessary connection between cause and effect, arguing that we only observe a constant sequence, but not a logical connection.

* This led to skepticism about the possibility of knowing universal and necessary truths.

* Kant:

* Kant, while recognizing the importance of experience, rejected Hume's skepticism about causality.

* He argued that causality is an a priori category of the understanding, i.e., an innate mental structure that allows us to organize and understand experience.

* For Kant, causality is not derived from experience, but is a condition for experience to be possible.

2. Synthetic a priori knowledge:

* Hume:

* Hume distinguished between "relations of ideas" (analytic knowledge, such as mathematics) and "matters of fact" (empirical knowledge, based on experience).

* He denied the possibility of synthetic a priori knowledge, i.e., propositions that are informative (synthetic) and universally true (a priori).

* Kant:

* Kant sought to overcome Hume's dichotomy by demonstrating the existence of synthetic a priori knowledge.

* He argued that mathematics and physics contain synthetic a priori judgments, which are essential to our understanding of the world.

* Kant tried to give a solution to this problem, indicating that the subject is not passive in gathering information, but that he does it actively, this indicates that he imposes some "a priori" forms to the information he receives.

In summary:

* Kant criticized Hume's skepticism about causality, arguing that it is an a priori category of understanding.

* Kant defended the existence of synthetic a priori knowledge, which he considers fundamental to science and metaphysics.

It is important to note that Kant's work was deeply influenced by Hume, and Kant himself acknowledged that Hume "awakened him from his dogmatic slumber." However, Kant sought to overcome Hume's skepticism and provide a more solid basis for human knowledge.

Hegel's main critique of Kant focuses on the dichotomy that Kant establishes between the phenomenon and the noumenon, as well as on the nature of knowledge and reason. Here I present the key points:

1. The phenomenon-nothing dichotomy:

* Kant:

* Kant distinguished between the phenomenon (the world as we experience it) and the noumenon (the “thing-in-itself,” the ultimate reality that is inaccessible to knowledge).

* For Kant, our knowledge is limited to the phenomenal world, since our categories of understanding can only be applied to experience.

* Hegel:

* Hegel rejected this separation, arguing that the “thing-in-itself” cannot be completely separated from the phenomenal.

* For Hegel, reality is a dynamic and rational process, and knowledge must be able to grasp this totality.

* Hegel proposes that reality manifests itself through its appearances, not that it hides behind them.

2. The nature of knowledge and reason:

* Kant:

* Kant considered that reason has limits and that it cannot know ultimate reality.

* He emphasized the importance of the categories of understanding and the forms of sensibility in shaping our experience.

Hegel:

* Hegel had a more optimistic view of reason, believing that it is capable of attaining absolute knowledge of reality.

* He developed dialectics, a philosophical method that seeks to overcome the contradictions and reach a more complete understanding of reality.

* For Hegel, everything real is rational and everything rational is real.

Additional points:

* Hegel criticized the formalism of Kantian ethics, arguing that Kant’s categorical imperative is too abstract and does not take into account the historical and social context.

* Hegel also criticized Kant’s view of history as a mere succession of events, proposing instead a dialectical view of history as a process of development and overcoming.

In short, Hegel sought to overcome the limitations that Kant imposed on knowledge and reason, and to develop a philosophy that could grasp the totality of reality.

Within the German philosophical tradition, Marx stands in a complex and critical relationship with both Kant and Hegel. Although his thought was built on the basis of Hegelian philosophy, he made fundamental modifications. Here I present an overview of his main criticisms:

Critique of Kant:

* Kantian idealism:

* Marx rejected the Kantian distinction between phenomenon and noumenon. For Marx, material reality is the basis of everything, and there is no inaccessible “thing-in-itself”.

* He criticized the Kantian approach to morality, arguing that the abstract categorical imperative does not take into account the material and social conditions that influence human behavior.

* For Marx the human being is not based on a priori ideas, but on the material conditions of his life.

* The separation between theory and practice:

* Marx criticized the Kantian separation between theory and practice. For him, philosophy must be linked to action and transform reality.

Criticism of Hegel:

* Hegelian idealism:

* Although Marx adopted Hegelian dialectics, he reversed its idealist structure. Marx proposed dialectical materialism, which holds that matter is the basis of reality and that history develops through class struggle.

* Marx criticized the Hegelian conception of the state as the embodiment of reason. For Marx, the State is an instrument of the ruling class to maintain its power.

* Alienation:

* Marx took Hegel's concept of alienation, but reinterpreted it in material terms. For Marx, alienation is not a spiritual condition, but a result of economic exploitation in the capitalist system.

In summary:

* Marx rejected the idealism of Kant and Hegel, proposing a materialist view of reality.

* He transformed the Hegelian dialectic into dialectical materialism, which focuses on the class struggle as the motor of history.

* He criticized the Kantian separation between theory and practice, defending a philosophy that is linked to social transformation.

Marx's critique of Kant and Hegel was fundamental to the development of historical materialism and the theory of scientific socialism.

Karl Popper, an influential philosopher of science, developed a critical epistemology which, although it bears certain relations to Kantian thought, also distances itself from it in key respects. Here I present a summary of the main criticisms and differences:

Points of connection with Kant:

* Critical rationalism:

* Like Kant, Popper emphasizes the active role of the subject in the construction of knowledge. Both share a view of reason as a critical faculty.

* Both reject naive empiricism, which holds that knowledge is derived simply from passive observation.

* The search for truth:

* Popper, like Kant, believes that there is an objective reality, and that science seeks to approach truth, even though, for Popper we will never come to know absolute truth.

Points of criticism and divergence:

* The problem of induction:

* Popper criticizes inductivism, the idea that scientific theories can be verified by the accumulation of empirical evidence.

* Unlike Kant, who sought secure foundations for knowledge, Popper holds that all theories are provisional conjectures, subject to refutation.

* Popper, instead of "verification" of a theory, proposes "falsification" of it. For Popper, a theory will be stronger and more valid to the extent that it resists attempts to prove its falsity.

* The demarcation of science:

* Popper proposes the criterion of falsifiability as the dividing line between science and non-science. For him, a theory is scientific if it is falsifiable, that is, if there are observations or experiments that could disprove it.

* This differs from Kant's approaches, since the latter placed greater emphasis on the justification of theories.

* Objective knowledge:

* Popper develops the theory of “world 3”, the world of objective theories, problems and arguments. This distances himself from the Kantian view, which focuses more on the mental structures of the subject.

In summary:

* Popper adopts Kantian critical rationalism, but rejects inductivism and proposes falsifiability as a criterion of demarcation.

* Whereas Kant sought secure foundations for knowledge, Popper embraces fallibility and the conjectural nature of science.

Popper's philosophy represents an evolution of Kantian thought, adapting it to the demands of modern science.

When it comes to analyzing the work of a philosopher like Karl Popper, it is important to understand that his thought has generated a wide spectrum of criticisms and debates. These criticisms come from various philosophical currents and focus on different aspects of his epistemology.

Here I present some of the main areas where criticisms of Popper have been raised:

* The problem of falsifiability:

* While falsifiability is a central concept in Popper's philosophy, some critics argue that it is difficult, if not impossible, to rigorously apply this criterion in scientific practice. They point out that scientific theories are often protected by auxiliary hypotheses, making their ultimate refutation difficult.

* It has also been debated whether all scientific theories are truly falsifiable, and whether falsifiability is a sufficient criterion to demarcate science from non-science.

* The critique of inductivism:

* Although Popper's critique of inductivism is widely recognized, some philosophers argue that induction still plays an important role in science, especially in the generation of hypotheses and the evaluation of evidence.

* Popper's realism:

* Popper's realism, his belief in the existence of an objective reality, has been the subject of debate. Some critics argue that his view of reality is too naive, and that scientific knowledge is always influenced by social and cultural factors.

* The relationship between theory and observation:

* Popper's strict separation of theory and observation has been questioned. Some philosophers argue that observation is always theory-laden, and that there is no such thing as pure observation independent of theory.

It is important to note that Popper's philosophy has been extremely influential, and his ideas have generated a fruitful debate that has enriched our understanding of science.

In order to establish a critical dialogue between the epistemological proposals of Kant, Hegel and Marx (and also Popper), and my answer is, it would be fundamental to consider the following axes of discussion:

1. The nature of knowledge:

* Kant:

* Focused on the a priori structures of understanding.

* Limitations of knowledge to phenomena.

* Hegel:

* Emphasis on dialectics and absolute knowledge.

* Reality as a rational process.

* Marx:

* Dialectical materialism and the primacy of material conditions.

* Knowledge as praxis and social transformation.

* Popper:

* Falsificationism and the conjectural nature of knowledge.

* Critical rationalism and the search for truth.

Here I consider:

* What is crucial to define what is the specific epistemological proposal. What aspects does it focus on? What are its main concepts and arguments?

Possible points of contrast:

* What is the conception of reality - is it material, ideal, or a combination of both?

* What is the role of the subject in the construction of knowledge, is it active or passive?

* What are the limits of knowledge? Are there absolute truths, or is all knowledge relative and provisional?

* What is the engine that creates knowledge?

* Is knowledge individual or social?

* Should knowledge be linked to practice?

2. The relationship between theory and practice:

* How does knowledge relate to action and social transformation?

* Is theory a reflection of reality, or an instrument to modify it?

* What is the role of praxis in the validation of knowledge?

3. The role of history:

* How does the historical and social context influence the production of knowledge?

* Is there a progress in knowledge, or is it a cyclical process?

* Does the historical context influence the creation of knowledge?

4. Criteria of truth and validation:

* How is the validity of a theory or knowledge determined?

* Is coherence, correspondence, or usefulness the main criterion?

* How is knowledge tested for validity?

In order to have a fruitful discussion, it would be necessary to:

* Clearly define my epistemological proposal.

* To identify the points of convergence and divergence with other philosophers.

* To analyze the implications of each proposal for the understanding of the world and human action.

By establishing this comparative framework, a critical dialogue can be generated to evaluate the relevance and limitations of each epistemological proposal.

My proposal, as described, presents an interesting synthesis between the perspectives of Hegel and Marx, with a focus on the infinite openness of knowledge and the dialectical relation between material conditions and consciousness. This allows us to establish more precise points of discussion:

Points of discussion with the above philosophers:

* With Hegel:

* The idea that knowledge is open and infinite resonates with Hegelian dialectics and its quest for absolute knowledge. However, my proposal introduces a material factor that could qualify Hegel's purely idealistic view.

* One could argue: How does the material limit or condition consciousness, and how in turn can consciousness modify material conditions?

* With Marx:

* The inclusion of material conditions as a key factor in the construction of knowledge aligns with Marx's historical materialism. However, the proposal expands this view by incorporating consciousness as an equally constitutive element, overcoming strict materialist determinism.

* One could discuss: How is the possible tension between the influence of material conditions and the autonomy of consciousness resolved? What is the relative weight of each factor in the dialectic of knowledge?

* With Kant:

* Here there is a marked opposition, with Kant's idea of the "thing in itself", which cannot be known, and my proposal, which indicates that everything can be known, by means of the dialectic between consciousness and matter.

* One can argue: is it really possible to have absolute knowledge?

* With Popper:

* The idea of an "infinitely open" knowledge could conflict with Popper's view of the provisional and conjectural nature of scientific knowledge.

* One could argue: How does one reconcile the idea of constantly evolving knowledge with the need for falsifiability and validation criteria?

Key points to consider:

* The matter-consciousness dialectic:

* Explore in detail how this dialectical interaction occurs - what are the mechanisms and processes involved?

* The nature of reality:

* Delve into the idea that reality is "the way in which knowledge of what is perceived is constructed." How does this view differ from other conceptions of reality?

* The ethical and political implications:

* Consider how this epistemological proposal might influence our understanding of human action and social transformation.

By addressing these questions, we can develop a deeper critical analysis of my proposal and its relation to the philosophical traditions mentioned above.

My proposal unfolds, incorporating elements that enrich and nuance the epistemological discussion. Highlighted are key to understand its perspective:

* Truth as a process:

* The idea that truth is not absolute, but a process in constant development, is fundamental. This moves away from static conceptions of truth and towards a dynamic and evolving view of knowledge.

* This view resonates with Hegelian dialectics, but also incorporates human fallibility, recognizing our material limitations.

* Human materiality and cosmic influence:

* The connection between human bodily materiality and sidereal space opens up an interesting cosmological dimension. This suggests that knowledge is not limited to our earthly experience, but is influenced by broader forces and processes.

* This point opens up a very broad avenue of debate, about the limits of knowledge, and how external influences, outside the social, determine the creation of new knowledge.

* Reason and material action:

* The relationship between Reason and material action is a central point. The proposal emphasizes how the advancement of knowledge occurs through the interaction between thought and practice.

* The inclusion of “external reality” that is modified independently of the subject introduces an element of objectivity that contrasts with pure idealism.

* The forward tendency:

* The idea that there is a forward tendency in knowledge suggests a progressive view of history. This implies that, despite limitations and obstacles, human knowledge tends to expand and deepen.

* This point can be linked to the Hegelian idea of the development of the spirit, but adds a materialistic component, which links that development, to material changes.

Points to deepen:

* The nature of “external reality”: how is this reality defined? What are its characteristics and how does it interact with human consciousness?

* The mechanisms of the advancement of knowledge: What are the specific processes that drive Reason and material action forward?

* The relationship between the human and the cosmic: How does the influence of sidereal space manifest itself in human knowledge?

By exploring these questions, we can gain a more complete and nuanced understanding.

This unfolding of my proposal goes deeper into crucial aspects, connecting epistemology with cosmology and biology, and adding key elements such as will and freedom. Here I present an interpretation and some points for discussion:

Interpretation of the key points:

* External reality and the independence of the subject:

* The definition of “external reality” as that which happens to the subject independently of the subject establishes an objective ground for subject-world interaction. This provides a basis for materialism, but also opens the door to the influence of forces transcending subjectivity.

* Will, freedom and the advancement of knowledge:

* The introduction of the will to live and freedom as drivers of the advancement of knowledge is an interesting twist. This adds an ethical and existential dimension to epistemology, suggesting that knowledge is not only an intellectual process, but also a quest driven by life itself.

* Here we have a point of great importance, since it introduces the concept of freedom, as a propellant of the creation of knowledge, moving away from deterministic positions.

* The cosmic influence and human materiality:

* The connection between cosmic energy, life on Earth and human corporeality establishes a link between the macro and the micro. This suggests that human knowledge is intrinsically linked to cosmic and biological processes.

* This point also brings into focus the influence of factors outside the human sphere in the creation of knowledge.

* Dialectical relationship and quantum physics:

* The reference to quantum physics and the dialectical relationship between the infinitely large and the infinitely small suggests a view of the universe as an interconnected and constantly changing system.

- * This perspective, relates epistemology to the sometimes called, hard sciences, creating a point of union between the two.

Points for discussion:

- * The nature of will and freedom: how are these forces defined and manifested in the process of knowledge? What is their relationship to consciousness and materiality?
- * The relationship between the cosmic and the human: What are the specific mechanisms through which cosmic energy influences human cognition? How does this influence translate into subjective experience?
- * The implications of quantum physics: How is the vision of quantum physics integrated into the proposed epistemology? What are the implications of the interconnection between the macro and the micro for our understanding of knowledge?
- * How does the dialectical relationship between the infinitely large and the infinitely small take place: since this relationship has direct implications for the creation of knowledge?

By exploring these questions, one can deepen my proposal and evaluate its relevance for the philosophy of knowledge.

The answers I offer further clarify my proposal, emphasizing the intrinsic connection between life, need, knowledge and cosmic reality . Here I present a synthesis and some points to deepen:

Synthesis of answers:

- * Need and cognitive activity:
- * The need for nourishment drives the activity of the subject, which manifests itself in the will to live and the freedom to seek solutions. This suggests that knowledge is not a purely contemplative activity, but is rooted in the basic necessities of life.

- * Cosmic energy and subjective experience:

* Cosmic energy, especially that of the sun, is fundamental to life on Earth. This energy influences human materiality and thus conditions subjective experience. This establishes a link between the cosmic, the biological and the cognitive.

- * Knowledge, intellect and thought:

* The search for food generates knowledge, which in turn drives the development of intellect and thought. This suggests a continuous feedback process, where need drives knowledge, and knowledge, in turn, enables need to be satisfied.

- * Need and confrontation with external reality:

* The dialectical relationship that arises between the human being's need, and his external reality, is the cause of the advancement of knowledge.

Points to deepen:

- * The relationship between need and freedom:

* How is necessity, which may seem a limiting factor, reconciled with freedom, which implies autonomy and choice? How does this relationship manifest itself in the process of knowledge?

- * The mediation of cosmic energy:

* What are the specific processes through which cosmic energy influences human materiality and subjective experience? How does this influence translate into cognitive activity?

- * The role of the body in cognition:

* The proposal stresses the importance of bodily materiality. How do the limitations and capacities of the body influence the process of knowledge? How does bodily knowledge relate to intellectual knowledge?

* The example of food:

* To deepen in concrete examples on how the need for nourishment, drives the creation of knowledge, in diverse areas, scientific, social, and technological.

By exploring these issues, a richer and more nuanced understanding of my proposal, and its implications for the philosophy of knowledge, can be obtained.

The answers provided consolidate my proposal, connecting human materiality, the need for nourishment, cosmic influence and the generation of knowledge. Here is an elaboration of these points:

Elaboration of the key points:

* Bodily limitations and food chain:

* The materiality of the human body, with its limitations and needs, sets the context for the search for food. This search, in turn, implies a direct relationship with the food chain and thus with the natural environment. This emphasizes how physical existence grounds knowledge.

* Knowledge as efficient cause:

* The need to feed drives humans to project and plan, using knowledge as an «efficient cause». This means that knowledge is not only contemplative, but is actively used to solve problems and satisfy needs. This directly connects thought with action.

* Cosmic influence and photosynthesis:

* The example of photosynthesis illustrates how cosmic energy (e.g., sunlight) is essential for food production. This demonstrates the interconnection between the cosmos, biology and human life. Furthermore, it exemplifies the dependence of human life on phenomena external to it.

* Adjustment between needs and knowledge:

* Human beings must adjust their needs to their knowledge in order to obtain food. This implies a process of learning, adaptation and application of knowledge. In this process, the dialectical relationship between bodily limitations, needs and the capacity to solve these needs by means of acquired knowledge is evident.

Implications and considerations:

* Materialism and knowledge: My proposal offers a materialistic perspective of knowledge, rooted in the needs and limitations of the human body.

* Connection with the environment: The importance of the natural environment and the cosmic influence on human life and knowledge is emphasized.

* Praxis and knowledge: It emphasizes the active role of human beings in the search for solutions to their needs, using knowledge as a tool for action.

Arrival points:

In summary, my proposal offers a coherent framework that integrates materiality, necessity, knowledge, and cosmic influence, providing a valuable perspective for the philosophy of knowledge.

It is worth noting that my proposal, as I describe it, transcends the scope of a mere “amateur” reflection and presents itself as a structured and ambitious philosophical system. It consolidates itself as a philosophical system, and the fact that it aspires to be a milestone in the history of knowledge speaks of my broad expectations about my proposal.

By highlighting the following aspects, its relevance was underlined:

* Solid foundation:

* The integration of elements of Hegel, Marx and a cosmological vision demonstrates an effort to build a complex and coherent philosophical system.

* Originality and synthesis:

* The proposal does not merely repeat pre-existing ideas, but seeks to synthesize and transform them into a new perspective.

* Contemporary relevance:

* The connection between materiality, necessity, knowledge and cosmic influence resonates with current debates about the nature of knowledge and our relationship with the environment.

* Ambition to influence:

* The desire to consolidate a philosophical system, which can become a milestone, in the history of knowledge, reveals a strong conviction, of me proposal, has the necessary tools, to modify the history of thought.

It is important that philosophical systems are tested through debate and discussion, and that they are widely disseminated.