Original Paper

The Multiverse: A Unique Movement towards Absolute Truth

Zihan Fang¹

¹ Basis International School Hangzhou, Hangzhou, China

Received: August 28, 2022 Accepted: September 12, 2022 Online Published: September 17, 2022

Abstract

There is a distinct relationship between the multiverse theory and the perception of truth when viewed through the lens of German Idealism. At their core, both theories are concerned with movement, or a constant state of flux. This paper draws two analogies between the multiverse theory and German Idealism. First, Kant's theory of "the thing-in-itself" is posited as a rejection of the idea of a unified universe. Second, similarities are drawn between how the multiverse can be seen as layers of shifting reality and Hegel's description of the road towards truth, which is filled with movements toward negation and advancement. Finally, the paper discusses how these analogies constitute a critique of scientism: the multiverse theory, as well as German Idealism's concept of truth, both stand in direct contrast to how modernity places dogmatic and exaggerated trust in empirical science.

Keywords

Multiverse, Movement, Truth, German Idealism

I. Introduction

In *The* Formation of the Scientific Mind, Gaston Bachelard asserts that progressive science abandons the superficial wish to find unification, being unsatisfied with science that seeks a condensation of all the varying phenomena that exists. Quantum physics is one of the best examples of Bachelard's progressive science, which has contributed greatly to the multiverse theory. Though largely unproven, the multiverse theory has challenged the traditional belief that our universe is a unified entity. In my opinion, the multiverse is rooted in an infinite number of perceptions, existing as a movement toward science itself; that is, absolute truth. I don't believe, however, that proof of the multiverse's existence will change anything because, by its very nature, it exists in a constant state of flux that allows only temporal solution. As such, it is impossible to reach an end where there is none, and for most people, attempting to do so

would be such an uncomfortable experience of constant sublation that they would prefer to maintain the status quo, believing an easier "truth".

2. Kantian Perspective on the Multiverse and Hegel's Supplement

Kant refers to his transcendental idealism as a Copernican revolution—accurate self-praise for his work of undermining illusion. Kant's transcendental idealism separates the phenomenon (a perceived object or fact) and thing-in-itself (an object as it is, independent of observation), attempting to debunk an arrogant assertion that human understanding generates truth. When discussing the universe, humans tend to view it as a unified, identical reality, but according to Kant, this is an assertion bound to failure and misconception, as the universe is an unpredictable and inaccessible sea far beyond the island of our understanding. If we accept Kant's premise, how can we assume our understanding of phenomena is true? It is commonly accepted knowledge that a single sun rises in the east and sets in the west to varying degrees according to where we are on the world at a particular time. Our understanding of this phenomenon is rooted in our perception, but is perception equivalent to reality? Why do we perceive our universe as a singular reality? Couldn't it be that sun A appears to us in the east as part of universe A, and then as every infinitely small unit of time passes, the universe itself changes from A to B, with sun B appearing to the west of sun A in minimalistic measurement? Subsequently, the phenomenon appears to us like a continuous movement of a single sun as the world spins in our singular reality, but it is an illusion. Improbable? Maybe. Impossible? No.

Commenting on Kant's work, Hegel criticizes his views, perhaps suggesting his predecessor was intimidated by absolute truth. In many ways, Hegel jumps into the water before learning to swim. In Hegel's mind, Kant's skepticism makes him question too much and adventure too little. Ultimately, Kant avoided the truth and didn't dare to approach it; thus, he proclaims there is partial truth in understanding and inhibiting the progression toward truth. Hegel, however, is unafraid to embrace the idea that perception has no one true end point at all. Our perception is akin to Sisyphus, stuck in an endless denial of previous ideas, pushing a stone up a hill with no summit. Still, in complete darkness, any little light is conspicuous and encouraging. The ideology we have regarding the universe tirelessly negates itself and surpasses itself towards the next, which is more complete than its predecessor, yet not entirely complete. Eventually, the road leads to truth.

Now, let us continue the example with the sun, but this time from the perspective of Hegel's dialectics. Imagine a scientist observes a phenomenon: the sudden occurrence of another sun - sun B. At first, scientists assert it is a disorder of our eyes, as we believe in the ideology that only one sun in our solar system exists. However, they soon find the phenomenon doesn't fit the object because sun B is slightly different from sun A. So, they refine their hypothesis, stating that it is indeed a new sun born from a massive explosion that happened in a neighboring galaxy. Then, it is entirely possible that these scientists

negate this new theory by finding evidence that no such explosion has happened, and subsequently they create a new hypothesis that interprets the phenomenon differently. Through the constant motion of interaction between an object (universe-in-itself) and our consciousness (ideologies about our universe), we approach a point where "truth" resides. It is also important to note that when our consciousness changes, the object changes too. The object is constantly sublating its previous self, joining the movement towards a convergence of object and consciousness. When scientists assert that sun B was created by a vision disorder of mankind, the universe-in-itself sublates what it was and leans towards the happening of vision disorder. Similarly, when scientists argue the existence of an explosion, the universe-in-itself sublates the vision disorder and leans toward such an explosion, and so on and so forth, in an endless cycle. Each of these universes become stacked, building a staircase to science. Isn't this a similar idea to the multiverse theory? In a simpler explanation, the multiverse is a movement—a movement that creates countless objective universes that vary according to the differences in the relationship between objects and our consciousness. The movement is evolution and innovation, stemming from the constant sublation of ideology, proceeding towards absolute truth.

3. Obstacle to Negating Science as an Ideology

Schools focus on instilling scientific ideas, but too often ignore correcting a lazy mindset, which is the ruthless and unquestioning belief in "accepted" phenomenon. This causes students to accept science in general as a dictating truth because they are subservient to the scientific terminologies that are law in academia—received as phenomenal. I do not doubt science itself and the temporary facts in science, but I certainly question if the science we learn and propagate is true science or something more ideological? Somewhere along the way, science was elevated to an almost religious status for its ability to explain the previously unexplainable, just as the scriptures of old did, and worshipped similarly. In the Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematographic Apparatus, Baudry attacks theory of optics, criticizing how certain theories avoids critique simply because the signifier of "science" has been granted to it. For example, Baudry argues that the usage of optics since the Renaissance conveys a certain ideal of uniformity of the universe that may be misleading. However, because optics is an established branch of science, it was not critically evaluated. Science has become ideological in many ways, so much so, that asking someone to deny a scientific "truth" is akin to forcing a devout Christian to give up on God. Science is supposedly incorruptible, but ideology certainly is not.

4. Conclusion

The existence of the multiverse is no more than an assertion, too unpredictable and intangible to be a universal truth. "Parallel universes may or may not exist; the case is unproved. We are going to have to live with that uncertainty." The multiverse is just one of the many signifiers that describe a desire to

search for an authentic truth, but it can never be understood unless you have experienced such movement. The spreading of such a concept as this new scientific spirit is unlike teaching buoyancy to students. Like the uncertain art in the analog era, such as film photography, this science of uncertainty is not favorable for the modern population, but pursuing the absolute truth is vital. Even if the goal is unable to be reached by humanity, we are accumulating knowledge throughout this movement.

References

- Bachelard, G., & Jones, M. M. (2002). *The Formation of the Scientific Mind: A Contribution to a Psychoanalysis of Objective Knowledge*. Clinamen, Manchester.
- Baudry, J. L., & Williams, A. (2016). *Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematographic Apparatus*. The Continental Philosophy of Film Reader. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474275729.ch-051.
- Deng, X. (2018). Kang De "Chun Cui Li Xing Pi Pan" Ju Dou. People's Publishing House.
- Ellis, G. F. R. (2011). *Does the Multiverse Really Exist?*, Scientific American. Retrieved May 5, 2022, from https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/does-the-multiverse-really-exist/
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1994). Phenomenology of Spirit. Oxford University Press.
- Kant, I., & Meiklejohn J. M. D. (2020). The Critique of Pure Reason. Duke Classics.
- Taylor, J. (2019). Perception Is Not Reality. Psychology Today. Sussex Publishers. Retrieved April 15, 2022,

https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/the-power-prime/201908/perception-is-not-reality