

Education, Knowledge, Philosophy and Absolute (Constant) Theory of Everything

Ashesh Panthee

Abstract: *In absolute philosophy, to understand Absolute (constant) Theory of Everything, $I=0$ must be accepted and known by one's self. This applies for the absolute space time and space time is the only component in all possible existence so both are present in anything and even in nothing. Because of this fact absolute space is responsible for origin of matter and thus universe. In simpler form, every existence is an absolute or a constant while relative interpretation of existence is continuous i.e. two ends of a straight line meet at a point.*

Keywords: Absolute Theory, Academic Capitalism, Absolute self, Existence

"Science ends in logic, life begins beyond logic"

Complexity of academic writing arises due to set 'standards' be that giving of references or necessity of citing someone in supporting original idea to validate what is thought of, or following of certain 'format' that creates the rigidity in free thinking process. How would this already captive (because of standard or already perceived conventions) thought be fairly knowledgeable? This would have the tendency of being biased, guided by a 'motive' or 'aspiration', ending in achieving an 'identity' of certain dynamics. It seems like certifying own free thought by support of the foundations of other's perspectives. Own idea is always absolute to own space time irrespective of what others think of, or whether others validate this original thought, an uninfluenced idea.

To deny the existing conventions, an attempt to produce this absurd set of disorganized words is made and education is projected as materialistic thought, knowledge as common thought which may seem similar under similar space time bearing no risk of piracy. If the words and set of words are personalized it becomes academic capitalism. So in this series **no references are taken into consideration** and conventions are also not followed.

I thought of an idea to criticize the 'standard convention' of learning (the academic capitalism) or the formal term for learning (in formats) i.e. education via academy when I materialized my assumption of "Deny what you accept and accept what you deny" to reach the original source of anything and this will lead to ultimate knowing of **self**, the **absolute conscience**, because this will question one's own self and get result from its own self. In today's way of being certified, after some institutions validate your thought, you are questioning your **self** and validating the answers from others. It's you who question your **self** and validate your thoughts by your **self** as anyone can fool others but not self. How can your **self** and other's **self** have same bearing as both have their own reference of space time? But the process of institutional certification gives same relative (i.e. similar) reference frame of thought process.

Today science is struggling over knowing the governing principles of universe or matter in one of its efforts. I intentionally deny the existing assumptions despite their logical, experimental or equational (al intentionally added in context) validation and gave a thought to myself that no

relations in universe are equal, they are only proportional. This in simple term is things are similar but not same because of absolute space time frame of every existence. And this absolute existence makes the dynamics of 'same' different either of space or of time frame. It is that absolute space responsible for origin of matter and thus universe. How would assumptive equation and conditioned laboratorial experiments under **created similar environment** ascertain the actual and **same** extreme past and procedures?

In fact the space time dimension is absolutely constant and relatively dynamic. In different context I would also assert gravitational force has to be repulsive too, in order to gain balance of such large bodies because in attractive nature, the masses have to merge into a singular body as attracting poles of a magnet fuse together while repulsive magnets balance them at an ideal distance. Whatever be the idea but an absolute singularity exists in nature and universe; and that is the ultimate space, which is present in everything and even in nothing.

Assumption is the absurd brilliance of science while we, at the same time, deny this assumption because it perfectly relates things into equality on the basis of theories. In addition I must accept relativity was Einstein's error and it is a blunder. Is there any equation that would balance similarity of my life with that of other's? Externally there may be many but internally every equation of life would be denied by the absolute **self** of everyone. Based on this error of assumption or relativity the experimental science always fails at the extremes. At extreme low (relative 0) and extreme high (my one, 1 and present perception of infinity, ∞) science fails and assumes a constant to equate the relation. Philosophy, the simplest uninfluenced thought and absolute self knowledge would interpret the balanced equation differently and always at that instant, educated mind would call it an 'absurd' idea, because the thought or expression is not as per the established/existing conventions!

I would assume two ends of a straight line meet at a point. This is definitely not going to be accepted because there is no equational proof to it. Philosophically I would originate a thought, straight; it would travel from me and end in me. Life originates from me and ends in me, what is the path of my life? Is it circular, straight or some other form? The shapes are only relative perspectives and interpretations,

Volume 7 Issue 4, April 2018

www.ijsr.net

[Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

indeed perspectives are relative shapes but life and thoughts are always absolute to that of the originator, hence shapeless.

Mathematically I would assume a circle of infinite radius and its arc would tend to be relatively straight! Arc is a part of circle. Conversely straight line of infinitely small length has both the ends coinciding. Should this dynamics change with ease of calculation? Or should that remain constant? Is not it our guided perception which is changing?

In saying so, I must accept myself that I definitely have gaps in understanding the equational science and education or even the knowledge, but not philosophy because it generated in absolute me and my thought process. For the above assumption I would equate $1=0$, i.e. one is equal to zero, because both are existence and existence is not relative, relative are only perspectives, equations and education (and knowledge?). So conceptually existence are same not similar because existence is not relative. At this point, one is equal to zero and one is not equal to zero! Because one and zero both are distinct, absolutely both are same i.e. distinct in quality, relatively both are different i.e. quantity. So I must say the numerical (and assumptive) relativity which proves the equations are only assumptions and created for the quantification of qualities. In doing this, some incalculable space is lost and this mathematical failure is denoted by either zero or infinite in mathematics/science.

I am not concerned with certifying in what I have written, it is only exchange of thoughts which came to me, I or me could be anyone or anyone's absolute self! Certifications are relative achievements which captivate the way we think, the way we act. Uncertified animals are wild and certified are pets, and the sole difference between them is relative freedom and natural (absolute) freedom. But our effort today seems like converting (or interpreting) an ass to cow and vice versa and that would be a great achievement in genetics? Let cow be cow and an ass an ass in its own absolute distinction. Is everyone in search of relative identity, ultimately leading to identity crisis, because in market based economy crisis is valuation and validation?

Education is framing human mind so the educated manpower can be easily conditioned in the name of acquired intelligence, the smart enslavement of smart tech, or the artificial (compartmentalized) intelligence. I would again assert, the term development is a mere equivalent of **replacement**. Today we have not invented, we have amplified, represented or miniaturized the existing natural process only. So invention is the layman understanding of imitation of the existing natural process.

A word has its antonyms or synonyms but its absolute meaning is specific to its space time and non interpretable. Interpretations are relative similarity not the **same** connotation. In context, a stone at a given space time is only that stone, even the same stone displaced is not that stone, because the space time varies, if not both one definitely varies. So by absolute, it is the space time and by relative it is the cumulative of any absolute.

(Philosophy?) of meters of above curvatures (the relative representations and explanations using alphabets and

numerical) is only the 'Absolute Existence', which is the greatest value and it is relatively expressed as 1 and all other functions are less than it and one denotes the universe, both known(calculated) and unknown(whose calculation is still a finding). So our relative understanding of 2 is indeed one by two ($1/2$). Because every function involves interaction of some space time, original function is always greater than its sub function. In simpler term $1 > 1/2 + 1/2$ (one is greater than). If we are to equate this function $1 = 1/2 + 1/2 + \text{constant}$. Aptly this constant is = in itself, and today all the relations have some sort of constants in addition to = (even if it is not). But in other complex equations, constant in identity of originator is inserted and this is because of identity crisis. So = is negligible and this absolute constant doesn't bear the name of any originator.

To deny errors that science has assumed other constants are added, thus series of equations are nothing more than minimizing error by the additional use of errors. The error of equation is known only to the originator and why would anyone discredit self by exposing this error?

Considering the function of division for example, why are some functions indivisible and they either follow a pattern or repeat the pattern (e.g. $1/7$, $1/9$)? In fact the simplest division is half and complex division is infinity. Continuous numeric is only for the ease of assumption. Absolutely only one numeric exists which is absolute, be that 1 or 2 or 0 or any and each numeric has same value. In division relative half is automatically converted to absolute one. So the continuous numeric is half of half of half and so on.

Because interpretations are like a pattern and they would never end, I must try ending with knowledge as a common understanding and natural unaided observation while education is a relative interpretation having $1/7$ or $1/9$ type of possibility. But philosophy is the knowledge beyond that pattern or logic and is an absolute idea, be that certified or not. Philosophy is art that cannot be quantified for evaluation and at the same it is the loudest silence or silent expression, a distinct and absolute existence. It is a beginning in itself and an end too, it is like one is all and all is one. But science is a relative error, correct until it fails, but for philosophy, unless converted to science, it never fails, it only exists in its own life of absolute space time reference.

Despite my denials, I accept everything is right and I am not. Any by philosophy of absolute, at a given space time means again 'all is one and one is all' and this function is life, be that living or non living and in numeric it is none other than $1=0$. While assuming something beyond perceived existence it is $(0=1=\infty + \text{matter})$. And matter is the simplest form of conscience and a relative constant. To simplify in terms of relative understanding ($1 \neq 1/2 + 1/2$, indeed $1 > 1/2 + 1/2$ or $1 = 1/2 + 1/2$ where = is a constant).

In absolute terms of philosophy of absolute idea, in this writing, I was intended to represent my overall understanding as $1=0$, in four representation to our present understanding (one 1, two – and one 0, i.e. 4 in total)but it took me many because I have to sadly follow some conventions ultimately. This is absolute theory of

everything; to simplify, every existence is an absolute or a constant while relative interpretation of existence is continuous, unless both the ends of a straight lines meet at a point.