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For centuries, we have sought to understand the essence and formative functions of reality and way existence is manifested. Thus, I shall assert my own adapted form of theory, predicated on ideas based in the Hegelian Dialectic[[1]](#footnote-1), characterized by notions of probabilistic modality and Idealism[[2]](#footnote-2).(Hegel, 1998) Such a conjunction of concepts may seem at first glance quite daunting, however, I believe that the actuality of this conjunction leads to a notion of reality that is not only intuitive, but also meaningfully interrelated with our current conceptions of reality and material science. This fortunate comingling of factors will soon be shown to result into a comprehensive predication for reality such that we are able to draw a line connecting the dots on the actualization of matter and the development of reality from the ignition of the universe we reside in, to our current state of Being[[3]](#footnote-3) in the world today.

The goal of my theoretical commingling of notions to a proper holistic theory is to resolve our metaphysics into a new sort of Philosophic paradigm by which we may view and evaluate reality in a way that is able to provide paths to meaningful theories for discovering more of reality so we may continue to expand our descriptions and understandings of reality. I believe that effectively cojoining and adapting these theories to one another creates a meaningfully distinct whole, such that it becomes something entirely distinct from its former component parts. This adaptive developmental process is, I believe, fundamental to the very world I will seek to describe, and as such there is sense to this development, and credence lent to evolutionary theories of development that I believe this theory may be capable of resolving, such a question being whether the chicken or the egg came first, and why waves and particles exemplify spooky behavior.

Let us begin by describing the basic function and Hegelian form of the Dialectic. This notion of Dialectic development from Hegel is difficult to articulate, in its simplest, it seeks to address the notion of what is through the manner in which things exist, rather than simply by its essence or its notion/concept. An example given is that of a plant, it begins as a seed, which given right conditions, develops into a sprout, then a seedling, then develops buds which then blossom into a flower. We are intuitively aware of this developmental process yet take for granted that the thing which we designate as a flower, is in fact contingent upon those features which it is no longer defined by, and no longer retains. It is no longer a seed, nor a bud, but it meaningfully has within itself a retention of those predicate features, such as the stem, roots, and form upon which the flowering was predicated on to become its whole. The flower is defined by its predication on what it no longer is, as much as it is defined as what it has come to be, and what it cannot then become. A flower is described distinct from other wholes but can only come from a predication of other, smaller wholes that in the process of their development to flower fundamentally become something else to do so, losing their apparent state of being while maintaining the essence of their existence in their continued impetus towards become their end whole, i.e. seed, to flower. The notion of the flower entails the inclusion of the developmental process it undergoes, beginning from a seed, and this inherent impetus and function from seed to flower is the essence of the flower. This combination and formative iteration of being is what Hegel is seeking to distinguish as the dialectic, that this “type” of process is the fundamental process and function by which reality is ever unfolding and becoming. For now, this is the type of process by which I wish to be prevalent in our minds as we develop this new adaptation of concepts. (Hegel, 1998)

Next, we will define what I sought to express through the idea of Probabilistic Modality. Firstly, let us understand Probabilistic as the notion that to every expression of an action, such as flipping a coin, there exists a distinct chance of the coin landing on a heads or tails, generally conceived to be 50/50. It may land on either, with an even amount of possibility. In looking to studies of behavioral psychology, we find the same typicality, behavior is probabilistically based and contingent on a multifaceted variety of factors and circumstances, yet even in controlled environments subject to a minor probability, more variable than most mathematical probabilities and deviations due to the variance in human emotion and expression. Secondly, we will define Modality as the structural system of classification in the determination of what propositions or events are possible or impossible based upon the content, contexts, and contingencies at play at a given place and point in reality. I.e. what can possibly happen right here, right now, under these local circumstances given this specific collection of knowledge and material at this point in time and space.

Finally, we come to the point where we describe what is meant by idealism, and no, I do not mean of the optimistic variety in which we seek an understanding of the future in a characteristically positive or optimistic light. I am referring to the Idealism that conceives of reality as developmental production and manifestation or proverbial unfolding of our minds. Idealism typically is categorized into Ontological Idealism which conceives of fundamental reality as a Spirit, Mind, or Will, that is immaterial, and into formal or epistemological Idealism which conceives that though there exists some substance independent of the mind, the only form of reality we can conceive of is the impression of it as interpretated by specifically our own mind , and so all claims to knowledge must necessarily be a form of “self-knowledge”. (Graham, 2019)

Now, the work must be done meaningfully and coherently conjoining these independent notions and substantiating them such that they are filled to wholeness and capable of expressing the Truth[[4]](#footnote-4) of their content. I believe it is such, that reality arises by virtue of a form of ex-nihilo, or existence from Nothing. This Nothing, would be described as a form of Immaterial Un-being[[5]](#footnote-5), in which it could conceivably exist in and of itself. To further the description of reality arising, I can do so only semantically. I would posit that the foremost function of reality is by this Dialectic process, and that the inherence of Immaterial Un-Being, finding itself as a totality of absence, and in its complete nature developed the expression of itself through the semantics of “I”, a distinction of itself from other, and that in this distinction of itself as other entailed by the developmental process of the Dialectic, the notion of Everything[[6]](#footnote-6). This notion of Everything as the negation[[7]](#footnote-7) of Nothing would then require a developmental process of substantiation to the notion, thus causative of all Being. In the then developmental process of Everything and at the start of Being, the constraints and contingencies requisite to types or sequences of existence would find formation and actualization through the Dialectic process and find substance to its iteration through the mechanisms of material composition determined by Probabilistic Modality, and its notional representation through Idealistic manifestations of existence as a means of notional progression. So doing, finding a material and immaterial manifestation of Being entwined such that the function of the Dialectic process is complemented by a substantiative material process that co-exists in a co-iterative manner. Thus, we have a type of Mind to Matter relation that works to facilitate the actualization of formation of both concept and material in reality in a manner that is ever seeking to facilitate the existence of Everything to resolve the content of the notion entailed by Nothing and thus our reality becomes a formation of this process by a system of existence and formation that is bound by these metaphysical constraints and systems of distinction. Summarily, we live in a reality compromised of compositional systems of interrelation and development in their most fundamental specificity, particles, that then come to subsequently compose themselves in cohesive permutations and forms that slowly compose into our universe and world as we know it, allowing for that fundamental Will or Spirit this “I” of our self-experience, to apprehend our reality through both a material and immaterial experience of both a Mind and Body in cohesion. I believe then, that we individual manifest a particular individual mind, that is derived and exists as a layer of the Mind, such that I am arguing in the same way that there is a source or essence that composes atoms, that there are categorical underlying mental states and wholes that act as predication states for the particular individual minds, such as we find in material states of composition and formation, these each and all manifesting fundamental causal capacities manifest in our experiences.

The idea I’ve outlined may seem implausible, silly, even ridiculous! I assure you, however, that the ground upon which I have begun to tread is far more stable than one may think. In fact, in the current world of physics, much of the community studying and working in Quantum theory have conceded that due to implications found in Quantum decoherence, and if we assume that universal wave function is substantially real, that at the perception of a wave “collapsing” into an actuality, it does not actually collapse, but simply becomes realized to the local observer, while the other conceivable outcomes of the wave become physically realized in some other “world” or universe. This would describe a reality in which while we may only know one sequence of possible iterations of events, that tangential to our own universe there would be other iterations of events and sequences distinct from our own. This theory is in fact a relatively mainstream interpretation of quantum mechanics and aligns notionally in its content and theory with the concept of reality I have formerly outlined, simply approaching the concept of reality I theorized from the evolution of our scientific and material understandings of the universe. (Guido, 2021)(Lev,2021)

Another concept I would provide as an example of this process is that of biological evolution. There exists an impetus to existing organisms towards the facilitation of their development and continuation that is not explicable solely through material means. As many have sought to prove by acknowledging that you cannot (at least consistently) imply an ought from an is. Yet reality has an ought to regarding its own development, an impetus preceding but informed by the nature of its “is” or being. So, we see cellular organisms develop in relation to their environments such that their adaptation and development meets this criterion for continued being and furthered existence. The chicken, for example, evolved from a long chain of entities, ranging back millennia to the prehistoric reptiles we know as dinosaurs. Thus, informing us to a solution on the relation of the chicken and egg to one another, while the egg holding the chicken precipitated the being that came to constitute that which we know as a chicken, this creature arose only to fulfill the notion of an entity evolved to become the chicken such that the impetus to evolutionary adaptation necessitated of its long line of not-chicken predecessors. Again, working to demonstrate not only the manifestation of the probability given the contingencies of the environment, but the developmental process of the dialectic through the retention of the essence of the entity in its traits and adaptations for survival, while phasing out the former notion of what it had been as it becomes something else yet same.

Finally, as an example, I’d like to point to the human mind and the conventions composed by human minds. Humans developed to a culmination of being that required of them a means of conceiving of the very notions they must abide by to sustain and further their own development. Without becoming something capable of doing so, humans likely would not have survived the predators and environments we subsided in. Along with our biological faculties, we had to develop our cognitive capabilities, the way we sought to engage in reality. So, we utilized our affinity for pattern recognition to manifest in our actions the same type of interactions we perceived within the world. Thus, we came to understand basic causality and concepts of composition and relations. We then furthered this understanding through experimentation, and then evaluation and then abstraction. The complexity that moved our minds slowly but surely developing, correcting, adapting, and evolving in the form of our society, language, science and cultures. Such as is pointed out in the form of paradigms as illustrated by Thomas Kuhn, in which the former paradigm’s anomaly or problem becomes the focal point for the shift to a new paradigm and thus retains some content of its original iteration while developing into a newly iterated whole of a new notional whole composed equally of what it denotes in its own right, as much as it is the culmination of all that came before, once again, illustrative of this Dialectic process, fueled by the impetus of this will towards being made manifest by the probabilistic modality of human action and conceptualization.

It may be said that while the picture painted by my Probabilistic Dialectic Idealism is conceptually appealing and does justice to intuitive feelings regarding a whole of reality determined by its continuous development and separate causal Mind and Body states, it does so in a way that gives too much credence to certain positions or typicality’s. Naturalism would generally argue and posit that while much of what I theorize could be refitted to a workable lens, that my insistence upon certain notions of Idealism and the separate manifestation of Mind is needless and arbitrary. I would argue its necessity by virtue of the way the elements physical reality manifest is distinct from the type of way thoughts, emotions, abstractions, and experiences tend to manifest. I would also argue that it is by virtue of this distinction that my Philosophy is more capable in describing features of reality of which we are currently aware of, but have no material means of categorizing, such as the mind, and the seeming universal impetus towards iteration that seems bound in the universe. However, it may say that complexity of what I pose leaves much to be defined and corroborated to justify the position while all one who subscribes to a Naturalist or more Empirical philosophy must do is simply wait for the science to find an explanatory means of describing seemingly non-physical entities and notions. (Encyclopedia, 2023)

Similarly, Monist theories of reality have ready solutions to the iterations of reality I seek to explain, through means of divine orchestration or by a Kantian Categorization of reality, such that, all things that are must be and are consequently justified in their existence by virtue of their existence in relation to other existent forms of being that cohesively come to composition in a sort of super determinism that is in its nature divine and incomprehensible in its composition, but acknowledgeable in its notion. I would argue that while finding this solution to reality may satisfy those wishing to place more faith in the preordained determination of reality through a divine mechanism, its accounting for the intuition of free will, probability, and development of reality leaves much to be desired that my conception of reality better satisfies.

Similarly, Spinoza’s form of Modality and metaphysical conception strictly necessitates a unitary and infinite preexistent universe, one that is always determined in its being and is experienced by virtue of individual minds and along predestined culminations of already existent moments, whereas my philosophy conceives of an ever developing, adapting and coalescing reality in which the individual particular wills of minds work conjunctively with the larger wholes developing composition to collapse into sequential states of experience based on contingencies and probabilistic notions that work in tandem to determine the way reality unfolds. While one may argue for a Spinozian concept of philosophy, to predetermine the universe upon a singular iteration of substance rather than by the continual coalescence of development to unfolding of being as truth, I believe, is too reductive in its inherence and doesn’t adequately address fulfillment of notions such as endlessness or the infinite as it specifically finitizes reality in its scope as perceiving of the whole as already complete. (Spinoza, 2021)

These notions addressed; I find also that humans tend toward theological conceptions of reality that more intuitively track alongside the philosophy I have laid out. Daoism for example conceives of a like system of reality formation predicated on the notion of a ceaseless eternal motion and development known as the Dao and focuses on the polarity and contrast of perceived opposites such that the tension between these polarities create sub-concepts that continuously manifest and iterate through different forms of reality. Similarly, Daoism distinguishes the mental and physical as distinct yet entwined, exemplified in the notion that “to understand the universe, one must seek only to understand oneself”. Such notions of reality are resemblant if not informative to the more total description I seek to facilitate through my metaphysic regarding the causal relationship and development of reality through this interrelation of the mental and physical by the dialectic and functional mechanisms I outline.

Similarly, and yet somewhat counterintuitively, my philosophy more closely identifies with the fundamental conceptions of God as expressed in more Western interpretations of Christianity, as Eternal, or Endless. Where other philosophers even of the caliber of Kant and Spinoza, seem to describe a God maligned by finitude and comprehension, the predication and continuous impetus of endless dialectic and probabilistic modal formation ever striving to substantiate the notion of Everything can by virtue of the nature of Everything never find finitude, but may still exemplify all the attributes of necessary contradiction and eternal totality found in the western conception of God.

With all these considerations in hand, I believe I give justice to my assertions and substantiate my notions well. The broad yet descriptively specific nature in which my metaphysical assertions culminate, I believe, appeals to a natural intuition that most all people are predisposed to. It seems that the hardest bullets I must bite are those that necessitate a certain meaningless-ness to reality, and sacrifice certain existential comforts found in other systems. I also reduce the comprehensibility to the universe as I concede in its active formation rather than conceiving of a universe with settled development functions, but I insist upon the furtherance of our knowledge in an attempt to come as close as possible to the active development of the material of the universe as possible so we may predict and create more helpful, inventive and renewable technologies and inventions as possible to better the fullness of our experience in this endless manifestation and unfolding of Being.

Thus, we find a reality in ceaseless fluctuation and development, ever unfolding into sequences of experience determined by their impetus in the scope of their context as determined by their conceived probability and its development as predicated on the Dialectic process it developed within, into actualizing into a distinct formation of reality at that point in space and time to the observation of a particular Mind or minds. While complex in foundation and even more so in its collective consideration, its applied manifestation is nothing more than the world and ourselves as we are within it, which I believe is the most important piece of consideration to keep in mind in working toward a better metaphysical conception of reality, does it address the experiences that have been seemingly expressed up to this moment, and does the theory sufficiently map onto our current conceptions of reality while also containing features that previous paradigms of belief that predate it. I have sought to do so, and so hope this work may sufficiently articulate and express the concepts I am working to express, such that one may walk away from this work with a new lens by which to consider the world.
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1. The concept of developmental process determined by a function of Thesis, Antithesis to synthesis. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The notion of the composing itself in relation to a mind’s conceptualization [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The iteration of existence at point in reality finding expression [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. An expression of reality that is actual in and of itself and defined only by itself. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The concept of the semantic definition of Nothing [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The concept of a composition of all possible things that could ever come to being in reality. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The concept of the antithesis to a given notion requiring substantiation of the notion through its own development [↑](#footnote-ref-7)