



The Matrix of Resonance

Mindaralew Zewdie

Addis Ababa University, College of Social Sciences

Abstract

All metaphysical works, in the history of philosophy, that dealt one way or another with energy painted for us a picture in which humanity is seen to stand as discreet, separate, helpless, hope bereft, beleaguered and belligerent instance of the living conscious energy in the face of the inordinate, inanimate, and untold vastness of the cosmic energy. Our relation to the impersonal vastness of cosmic energy by Schopenhauer's light is but suffering fatally from two incurable defects which he linked to Achilles with a vulnerable heel and or to the devil with the horse's hoof (Schopenhauer 1887). In chime with this line of argument, the Stoics stance has it to say that humanity's choice in the face of the cosmic energy is either accepting it with dignity or doing away with oneself, (Palmer 1998). Almost a couple millennia later the Stoic's resolve for suicide was taken up and given a fresh shot by Albert Camus who noted that in a situation wherein humans demand for meaning and significance can never be met, the only way out is suicide, (Camus 1942). Nietzsche kept Schopenhauer company in his understanding that this world is a prodigious empire of meaninglessness, suffering and striving driven along by an irrational force. However, Nietzsche went radical as he argues emphatically that we must live our lives to the fullest. And the key to do this is putting into effect the perpetual elimination of the weak by the strong, the idiot by the clever and the incompetent by the competent, (Magee 2000, Nietzsche 2002). In light of these problems, this study confers upon itself the objective of examining the metaphysical relationship between the cosmic and conscious energy and come up with a new view that would address the gap and overcome the shortcomings the perspectives thus far reviewed suffer from. Accordingly this study unearthed that we are not separate, helpless, hopeless, powerless, disconnected, beings that live and lead their lives in fear of the incalculable threat of extinction from the untold vastness of cosmic energy. Far from this, we are connected with the rest of the cosmic energy in the plenum dubbed matrix of resonance.

Keywords: matrix of resonance, metaphysical energy, metaphysical trove of energy, space-and-time-defying instantaneity, ubiquitous instantiate

It is true that various metaphysical works, in the history of philosophy, grappled directly or opaquely with energy. In their attempts to approach, handle and tackle the very issue they left behind a theoretical picture about energy in such a way that they conceptualised the problem in terms of the relation between the cosmic energy and the human version of energy which I termed for the purpose of this study as conscious energy. Put otherwise, in these works the cosmic energy in its untold vastness stands in total belligerence and diametric contradistinction to the conscious energy. So negative is the relation between the two flips of energy by their light that the only way to describe the very relation comes in the form of a row, a never ceasing belligerence. The very description drew a picture wherein humanity is but seen to stand aloof, discreet, hopeless and helpless, in the face of the stupendous, inanimate, and inordinate vastness of cosmic energy. According to Schopenhauer, our relation, the conscious energy's relation to the stygian magnitude of the cosmic energy is likened to the relation between a herd of frolicking lambs in the field and before the eyes of a relentless butcher who is but keeping a cool head while choosing one lamb after another for his cold and sharp knife. Seen from Schopenhauer's light, humans' relation to the cosmic energy, is likened to that of lambs pleasing themselves before a butcher who sees in them nothing save a fat material for his butchery.

“We are like lambs in a field, disporting ourselves under the eye of the butcher, who picks out the first one and then another for his prey. So it is that in our good days we are all unconscious of the evil fate that may presently have in store for us — sickness, poverty, mutilation, loss of sight or reason” [Schopenhauer 2014:3]

Put succinctly, the relation between the conscious and cosmic flips of energy is seen in ways and manners that are best captured by an Ethiopian adage which has it to say: *berae karaju yiwulal*, which, roughly translated, would mean in Amharic, an ox befriends its nemesis. It follows that, for Schopenhauer, the conscious energy is posited to live with its nemesis, viz., the cosmic energy. What could therefore be expected of a relation which is an instance of a conjoining between a whirlpool and a handful of flour? The answer is quite obvious. For Schopenhauer, in a relation where we the conscious energy are posited vis a vis the incomprehensibly massive magnitude of the cosmic energy, what we should do at best is go indifferent about it. Schopenhauer used the term 'resignation' to describe the solution we should come up with, in the relation between the conscious and cosmic flips of energy.

Nietzsche went hand in hand with Schopenhauer in the understanding that this is a world of total suffering, misery and atrocity of inestimable magnitude visited

upon the conscious flips of energy by the stygian vastness of the inordinate ordnance of destruction the cosmic energy poses and spreeds upon us. Nietzsche went his own different way, parting company with Schopenhauer, in the solution he suggested as a way out of the very situation under discussion. His is a solution which is a total anathema to resignation. Far from it, Nietzsche made a bold suggestion with strong commitment to make the best of this world. Making the best of this world, as a goal, sounds positive and appeals rather irresistible, at first glance though. Taking a closer examination, one would realise that Nietzsche's creed of 'living this life to the fullest' could only come at the detriment of one group of conscious energy by another group of conscious energy. Stated otherwise, the solution he offered is more problematic than the problem itself. In the name of a creed which holds that living life to the fullest, Nietzsche puts his racist incensed, and violence besmirched claim to consistently and perpetually eliminate the poor by the rich, the less fortunate by the more fortunate, the haves by the have - nots etc. To this end he intended to clear the ground by doing away with the existing values and belief systems, so that he can do whatever he feels like doing without being impeded in the least by the do-this and do-that-not precepts of the said value and belief systems. Once the ground is paved in this way, once the battleground is delineated unequivocally, once the battle lines are drawn clearly, the stage is more

than ready for the war to be waged not against the cosmic energy but against the helpless, the botched and wretched he referred to as the 'animal herd' by an *Übermensch*, a superhero from the ranks of the Hyperboreans. *"The weak and the botched shall perish: first principle of our charity. And one should help them with it. What is more harmful than any vice?--Practical sympathy for the botched and the weak..."* [Nietzsche 2002:13]

In fine, the relation between the cosmic and the conscious energies received a new but a self contradictory treatment in such a way that what is supposed to be a solution scouring philosophical effort turned out to be a self defeating thrust. So in effect, in view of coming up with a way out of the problem under discussion and as we glide from Schopenhauer to Nietzsche, we moved from resignation to self-contradiction. The self contradiction incurred where this issue is concerned struck a new notch as we go a couple millennia back and deal with the position of the Stoics. The stoics were noted, among other things, for their commitment to prepare and build the human mind which would be imperturbable in the face of adversity, a calamity the stygian cosmic energy might visit upon it.

The highly cherished commitment of the Stoics in offering all they could to make the mind teeming with fortitude gets its saturated expression in the life and turf of the once a slave and later freed Philosopher, the Stoic Epictetus. Of the exemplary exploits and epic deeds of Epictetus, William Ebenstein writes as follows:

"Epictetus was of poor life and became lame early in life. His master, a freedman at Nero's court, once twisted Epictetus' leg. Epictetus serenely smiled: 'You will break it.' His master continued and when the leg was broken, Epictetus merely said: 'I told you so.' This anecdote vividly reflects one of the qualities that popular imagination has come to regard as particularly characteristic of Stoicism: fortitude of the mind under all circumstances, the triumph of mind and will over matter and pain"
[Ebenstein 1965: 1380]

However, the Stoics who equipped themselves with the fortitude of the mind very much after the legacy lived by Epictetus, found themselves at the end of the day giving up on life and upon everything it represents. Put otherwise, as imperturbable as the Stoics were in the face of whatever the incalculable vastness of the cosmic energy might come against them, they lost all hope and succumbed to suicide. Judging by the resolve they have taken to live in quiet harmony and

dignity with the cosmic energy, no one would expect the Stoics to throw in the towel in the middle of the way. Sellars puts succinctly this self-defeating façade of the Stoics' position as he writes:

"In some circumstances, suicide may be the only rational action. Roman Stoics in particular became famed for their adherence to this doctrine, the most famous of all being Cato. Seneca's acceptance of his imposed suicide, forced upon him by Nero, has been cited as another example, echoing the choice made by Socrates. But a number of the early Stoics are also reported to have taken their own lives, including Zeno, and Cleanthes" [Sellars 2010:108]

So, with the Stoics the relation between the cosmic and the conscious flips of energy such that humans had no choice but to give in, in incurable despair and despondency, to an early death. A school that conferred upon itself the onus of being an ultimate champion in the bout between the cosmic and the conscious flips of energy, as if to take us all by surprise, gave it up and threw the towel in the middle of the game. It is a position which is far more disconcerting and hope draining than the ones taken by the likes of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche. In fact the stoics were not alone in this. A couple millennia later, their position was highly elaborated and enshrined by some existentialists of the twentieth century. In the face of a force so vast and a misery so widespread and ubiquitous as the cosmic energy, by Albert Camus's light, the French writer and existentia-

list, all the conscious energy has got to resort to is capitulation. He is of the stance that man's search for meaning and significance in this world would never ever be answered. Accordingly the only way out from a world that has no reply to human endeavor and quest for meaning and significance, a world he termed as absurd, is suicide, [Camus 1942].

A number of questions suggest themselves at this juncture: Why is it that the various metaphysical positions taken as regards the relationship between the cosmic and conscious flips of energy just tip between despair and pessimism, hopelessness and suicide? Why should humans in their relation with the cosmic energy be treated either as having nothing whatsoever to do with it except a lost battle of hope such that all they have to resort to is to turn away from it in total withdrawal which borders on hopelessness and helplessness? Why is the conscious energy's relation to the cosmic energy, considered to be something that drains human's hope to the point of seeing nothing as a solution to go for but suicide?

Philosophical answers to these and other related questions are what this research is meant to come up with. Pursuant to which, the first response one can come up in light of these questions is the one that has it to say: the hope draining, helpless and exceedingly despairing philosophical positions taken towards the relations between the cosmic and conscious flips of energy stem from the way the very problem was framed. To phrase it differently, the negative sounding conclusions reached akin to the issue of the relation between the cosmic and the conscious facades of energy emanate from the

faulty way the very issue was conceptualised. That is to say, trying to philosophise on the ways and manners in which the two flips of energy stand vis a vis one another as if they were mutually exclusive is wrong. If one starts by positing the conscious energy in total contradistinction to the cosmic energy, the conclusion one can possibly arrive at will definitely fall in the province of hopelessness, despair, helplessness and suicide. When the right way is to see the conscious energy as the very part and parcel of the cosmic energy, to posit one in a diametric opposition to the other will lead one to conclusions that are bleak and misery laden at best, and pessimistic and nihilistic otherwise. Taking the conscious energy aloof from the cosmic energy and pitting it against the latter will point from the very beginning to a showdown in which the former will be crushed, or will be hurtled into a state of misery, agony, fear, insecurity, in the least. In all the schools so far reviewed, the relation between the conscious façade of energy as represented by the activities of humans and the cosmic energy is presented as the war between two un-equals. The picture one can get from these wrong philosophical positions is one of a mismatch between the cosmic giant and the human dwarf. In as long as such way of pitting the conscious energy vis a vis the cosmic energy continues, there is no other conclusion to be arrived at than the one which exudes pessimism and its multiples, nihilism and its aftermaths. It is just like putting a cell underneath the foot of an elephant, to say the least. The result will obviously be total annihilation of the cell. Nonetheless, if one thinks of the cell being positioned somewhere inside the system of the elephant, upon its millions and

millions of connections with other cells it defines the very existence and function of the elephant. The same holds good for the relation between the conscious and the cosmic facades of energy.

Thus we need to have a new metaphysical perspective, the metaphysics of energy, where the conscious energy is seen and treated as part of the cosmic energy; or what is the same thing to say, as a manifestation of the cosmic energy. What David Bohm, a quantum physicist, writes further cements my argument:

"One is led to a new notion of unbroken wholeness which denies the classical idea of analyzability of the world into separately and independently existing parts... We have reversed the usual classical notion that the independent 'elementary parts' of the world are the fundamental reality, and that the various systems are merely particular contingent forms and arrangements of these parts. Rather we say that inseparable quantum interconnectedness of the whole universe is the fundamental reality, and that relatively independently behaving parts are merely particular and contingent forms within the whole" [Bohm & Hiley 1975: 96]

The schools that subscribe to such conclusion as helplessness, suicide and pessimism in their treatment of the relation between the cosmic and the conscious facades of energy had no choice but to succumb to the very conclusion, because they all share at least one metaphysical chink in their philosophical armors. And that chink is, they all, in their metaphysical

stances, assumed the conscious energy, as represented by the multifaceted activities of human beings, to be a bystander of whatever is going on in nature. Bystanders have nothing to do with what goes on but watch it passively, even if it goes against their very existence. And when that which goes on is too huge to surmise, too callous and impersonal to entreat with, all that is left for humans is to part company with their hope in life and confidence in themselves. Thus their inevitable way out, turns out to be suicide, as the Stoics and existentialists are known to allude to. At best the role of the bystanders is to discover the laws by which the world external to them operates. This has been, so it seems, the fate of humanity since the times of Newton and Rene Descartes.

Following the Cartesian split of reality into two mutually exclusive substances, the substance which thinks *res cogitans* and the substance which extends *res extensa* [Descartes 1969] humans are not only separated from and stand aloof to the material world, they as well stand separated from their own body and the rest of the world. A human being stands apart not only in reference to the rest of the world but also to itself. Humankind has thus become alien to himself, standing as an outsider to himself/herself where one's body is no longer considered as an essential part of oneself. So humanity stands in total aloof to itself, to say nothing of the rest of the world. *"I am not more than a thing which thinks, that is to say a mind or a soul or an understanding or a reason... I am, however, a real thing and really exist; but what thing? I have answered: a thing which thinks."* [Descartes 1969: 173]. With this philosophical basis the

chasm separating a human being in terms of two mutually diametric substances has led humans to consider themselves as strangers, standing in total disconnection to their bodies. What Palmer writes in this regard covers it succinctly:

“The self is defined as mind or soul and the body is not an essential part of the self. ... Descartes’ argument... leads to this strange conclusion (strange because most of us have always assumed that our bodies are rather essential aspects of ourselves and not baggage we take along with us when we go out) ... ” [Palmer 1996: 62]

Little wonder that, in the reviewed relevant literature on the relation between the conscious and the cosmic flips of energy, the two facades of energy are placed in utter disconcertion and hence in total contradistinction that the nature of their relation borders always on bilateral enmity or destruction, when humans are no longer seen to stand as an undivided organic being, organic whole, but rather as beings that are, even at an individual level, irreversibly disconnected, separate, independent, unrelated and mutually exclusive two halves. Thus, if humans are posited to stand in total stance of a stranger to oneself, it is just a corner away from standing in outright nemesis to the cosmic energy. As is clear from the foregoing, the division that makes a human being relate its body and mind in terms only of mutual exclusivity will as well be forced to find that the chasm won't stand there. It ramifies itself into every sphere of human activity. And that way, humans see and relate themselves, as is the case in most of the reviewed literature, either as beings that can only have a defective relation with

the cosmic energy at best and thus realizing that they have no say whatsoever in this world which stands outside them, so the best they can do is to turn away from it in total resignation or to give up on themselves, on life and on everything and commit suicide. Capra puts this situation in a manner that could further ossify my argument.

“Descartes’ famous sentence ‘Cogito ergo sum’ – ‘I think therefore I exist’- has led Westerners to equate their identity with their mind, instead of with their whole organism. As a consequence of the Cartesian division, most individuals are aware of themselves as isolated egos existing ‘inside’ their bodies. The mind has been separated from the body and given the futile task of controlling it, thus causing an apparent conflict between the conscious will and the involuntary instincts. Each individual has been split up further into a large number of separate compartments, according to his or her activities, talents, feelings, beliefs, etc., which are engaged in endless conflicts generating continuous metaphysical confusion and frustration” [Capra 2000: 23]

The impact of this metaphysical cleavage visited upon mankind is so profound that it leaves its indelible marks particularly on classical physics. Thanks to the Cartesian chasm created between mind and body on foundations of mutual exclusivity, Newton grabbed the situation with huge appetite and saw that everything in the physical world is but an assemblage of various compartments. Thus he conferred onto himself the onus of discovering the laws that govern

this huge assemblage of unrelated, separate, independent things or compartments. Thus came into play the mechanics of Isaac Newton which saw that Descartes’ huge Machine was very much in need of a mechanical explanation. And his mechanics came up with the laws that can explain it with precision. There followed a new era which put humanity at the watching post, outside that which is being watched, at an observer’s post separated from that which is being observed. In effect Newtonian physics, its explanatory and predictive successes notwithstanding, placed mankind in a helpless status where the only thing humanity can accomplish is watching itself totally separated from the rest of the world, separated from itself, and separated itself from what it is doing, viz., observing and measuring. Mankind being set aloof from the universe except as an isolated observer standing external to what she or he is supposed to observe, the feeling of being powerless, helpless, hopeless, meaningless, etc, is something that is not uncommon.

“The Cartesian division allowed scientists to treat matter as dead and completely separate from themselves and to see the material world as a multitude of different objects assembled into a huge machine. Such a mechanistic world view was held by Isaac Newton who constructed his mechanics on its basis and made it the foundation of classical physics” [Capra 2000: 22]

The combined impact of Cartesian philosophy and Newtonian mechanics upon the Western way of thinking was wider in its application and deeper in its grip that it resulted in depriving humanity of its

essential and necessary connection first with itself and then with the rest of the world. On a successive basis, humanity has been alienated from the central role it has been given by different modes of thought and world views other than science and philosophy. In the name of science and philosophy humanity has been marginalised on a non-stop basis from the central role it used to play and the centre stage it used to hold, in the eyes and world views of non-western systems of thought. The net effect of which is that humanity is suffering the natural and philosophical version of the economic alienation Marx saw being visited upon the proletariat in the capitalist system. By Marx’s light, workers become alienated from the objects they produce, from themselves, from their human nature and from their fellow workers, [Marx 1964].

Likewise, for humanity that posits itself generally against the cosmic energy under the guise of studying, measuring, philosophizing about the latter, its fate is one of alienating first itself from itself as body and mind and then itself from the cosmic energy that stands in outright contradistinction to it, and then alienating itself from its nature, at least part of its nature, namely depriving itself of all the host of choices humankind is capable of making and sticking only to despair and suicide. Last but by no stretch of imagination the least is alienating itself from its fellow humankind and setting itself out on a shameful, criminal, racist, nihilistic mission whose motto is ‘the perpetual elimination of the weak by the strong, the have-nots by the industrious, the poor by the rich, [Nietzsche 2002]. Almost in all notable philosophical and scientific endeavours, the successful way in which humankind

has been incessantly pushed away from having any meaningful role other than that of a mere bystander and a passive observer is clearly shown by Palmer as he writes in concert with the issue under discussion:

“For a thousand years, the concept of human dignity was closely bound to the idea that God had created the Garden of Eden in the very centre of the universe and that the rest of the cosmos was formed as a series of concentric circles radiating out of Eden, the belly-button of reality. This meant that the human drama was the key drama in the cosmos and that every other being in the universe was simply placed here as a witness to the human drama. This had the effect of imbuing every human act with meaning. Even if one’s life was filled with misery...at least that misery had significance; hence there was a certain dignity in even the most miserable human existence” [Palmer 1996: 51]

In resonance with this line of discussion one can see that the progress of philosophical and scientific theories over the last three hundred or so years has resulted in effectively taking away humans’ dignified position within the cosmos and replacing it with an abysmal sense of despair and despondency. *“Freud once said that human dignity has suffered three mortal blows. First Copernicus’s discovery that the human is not at the centre of the universe; second, Darwin’s discovery that the human is an animal; and third, Freud’s discovery that the animal is sick,”* [Palmer 1996: 52].

Modern philosophy and classical science portrayed humanity even-

tually but surely as an impotent observer who has nothing to do in the face of the untold vastness of the cosmic energy. A number of questions suggest themselves at this juncture: How far must we continue listening to modern philosophy and classical science when all they tell us is that we are nothing more than an alienated, sickened and impotent bystanders of the unfeeling, colossal and mechanistic universe? Are we not far better than that? Are we not, at a deeper level connected with cosmic energy? Are philosophy and science not disowning our active role in the universe and flinging to us a role of a disowned, disengaged, helpless bystander and a hopeless observer?

The answer to all these and other related questions has to do with a positive, resonating, well related, actively vibing perspective vis a vis the relation between the conscious and the cosmic flips of energy. Put otherwise, the whole metaphysical position so far taken in the row between the conscious and the cosmic flips of energy has to change in such a way that humanity shall assume its creative, active central and constructive role in the cosmic setting. Hence the need for the new metaphysics of energy wherein the conscious energy resonates with the cosmic energy in a creative, effective and constructive way. Seen from this angle, and viewed from this new perspective, the conscious energy bids goodbye and good riddance to the impotent role that has been grafted onto it by the combined hands of modern philosophy and classical physics. With the new metaphysics of energy I hereinafter dub as the matrix of resonance the role of humanity, or what I interchangeably refer to as the conscious energy, is one of

being active and its relation is also one of resonating, of equally being affected and affecting, of changing and being changed, of actively and engagingly responding and being responded to. It follows that the conscious energy is not out there only to respond helplessly to the callous machinations of the cosmic energy. On the contrary it is very much in there, in the very hub of inherently interlaced plenum of energy making and being equally made by the matrix of resonances.

The advent of quantum physics, above all else, comes up with ground shaking discoveries that support the position I take and the arguments I make as regards the matrix of resonance. The task of measuring the velocity of an event in space cannot be accomplished without affecting the position of the very event and vice versa [Hawking 2011]. The same holds good for activities of the conscious energy as regards the particles of the subatomic world. Since particles being part and parcel of the cosmic energy are defined as well as high energies or to use Einstein's parlance they (Particles) are energies themselves, and when the conscious energy is engaged in the task of measuring them, we can safely conclude that the conscious energy is changing an aspect of the cosmic energy and partakes actively in the making and breaking of the cosmic energy, instead of being a helpless bystander, and a hopeless observer of the cosmic drama. This being the case, even at the subatomic level, reality is to be seen as a matrix of interconnections wherein the conscious energy marks its prints indelibly with every endeavour humans make to measure, say the momentum of a particle. In effect in the matrix of resonance, the governing rule is not one of being

out there and receive with passivity whatever is hurtled at you, on the contrary the rule of the game is to be in there in the very thick of things and resonate with every act from every other element or component of the cosmic hub. *"The new physics tells us that an observer can't observe without altering what he sees. Observer and observed are interrelated in a real and fundamental sense"* [Zukav 2001:102].

In the matrix of resonance, therefore, the conscious energy is to be regarded as an active participant of whatever is coming off nearby or in relation to it where the cosmic energy is concerned. The gist of my argument is that, humanity as conscious energy is to be seen and understood not only as an active participant in a matrix of resonance with the cosmic energy, but also as a resonating factor that creates with its conscious activities reality itself, the matrix of resonance itself, in a manner of speaking. In perfect resonance with this line of argument Zukav writes:

"Philosophically, however, the implications of quantum mechanics are psychedelic. Not only do we influence our reality, but, to some degree, we actually create it. Because it is the nature of things that we can know either the momentum of a particle or its position, but not both, we must choose which of these two properties we want to determine. Metaphysically, this is very close to saying that we create certain properties because we choose to measure those properties"
[Zukav 2001: 30]

It is a case where a total reversal of the status quo is of essence as far as the relation between the conscious

and the cosmic flips of energy is concerned. Put otherwise, we have come a long way where the conscious energy is correctly viewed both in its position and role vis a vis the cosmic energy. Accordingly, the salient feature that defines the quintessential of the cosmic energy is no longer an impotent bystander, or a helpless and passive observer. In a diametrically opposite plane, the defining qualities of the cosmic energy in its relation with the cosmic energy are those of resonance wherein participation stands most dominant. A quantum physicist of note, Princeton University, John Wheeler, writes to this effect:

"May the universe in some strange sense be brought into being by the participation of those who participate? The vital act is the act of participation. "Participation" is the incontrovertible new concept given by quantum mechanics. It strikes down the term "observer" of classical theory, the man who stands safely behind the thick glass wall and watches what goes on without taking part. It can't be done in a quantum mechanics way"
[Wheeler J.A. et al 2000: 1273]

In a matrix of resonance the one attribute that reverberates through every page of reality is that of nonlocality. To state it in different terms, in a metaphysics of energy the conscious and the cosmic flips of energy are to be seen no longer as archrivals where the latter appears to be a total nemesis of the former, and the former is viewed as a lamb disporting itself before the eyes of a butcher [Schopenhauer 1887] who takes its cynical time to choose one after another for its prey. On the contrary, in a matrix of resonance as a plenum of all

resonances where every part and parcel of reality is a participant in it and no longer a mere recipient of whatever the cosmic façade of energy hurls at it, the other principle that holds good is a ubiquitous instantiate. That is to say, reality at its most fundamental is not only inherently related but also instantaneously connected in a manner that defies space and time. It is not something that the law of touch and move, act and react, shove and stumble, in a word something that Newtonian physics can explain. It is of such a nature that nothing of the knowledge, the whole host of experience, the concepts and the entire forest of language we have for so long dwelt in comfortably can explain. In chime with this line of argument, one of the founding fathers of quantum physics writes:


"The mathematically formulated laws of quantum theory show clearly that our ordinary intuitive concepts cannot be unambiguously applied to the smallest particles. All the words or concepts we use to describe ordinary physical objects, such as position, velocity, colour, size, and so on, become indefinite and problematic if we try to use them of elementary particles"
[Heisenberg 1974: 114]

It is rather something that can only be explained essentially by the principle of non-locality, among other salient qualities of it. Accordingly an event can be in many places without being amid them. Stated otherwise, an event can be here and there without being in between. In a trove of energy which is the same thing to say in a hub of energy where reality at its most fundamental resonates with itself, every element of reality is in ubi-

quitous relation and presence with other elements of reality. The elements or the events in reality are connected not in a unilineal way as defined and explained by classical physics and other related sciences and modern philosophy. Far from it, they are connected beyond space and time in a web of energy. David Bohm puts matters pertaining to non-locality succinctly in what follows:

"Parts are seen to be in immediate connection, in which their dynamical relationships depend, in an irreducible way, on the state of the whole system (and indeed on that of the broader systems in which they are contained, extending ultimately and in principle to the entire universe). Thus one is led to a new notion of unbroken wholeness which denies the classical idea of analyzability of the world into separately and independently existent parts"
[Bhom D. and Hailey B. 1975: 123]

To wind it up, the non-analyzability of the world into discrete and unconnected bricks from which it is assumed by classical physics and Democritus' metaphysics to be fashioned would insinuate at a number of groundbreaking metaphysical implications. The fact that an event can be here and there without being in between is the rule of the game in a matrix of resonance. But then this governing rule of the metaphysics of energy is possible providing the resonance is predicated on the undivided wholeness of reality. Unless reality is basically connected and essentially an undivided whole of intricate web of relations, immediate and ubiquitous resonances among its parts is unthinkable. This being the case, it follows that reality is



at its most basic irreducibly undivided system. And from undivided whole stems relations of instantiate resonances that define why reality is a matrix of resonance that defies space and time. In such a world one doesn't have to feel standing alone, desolate, hopeless and helpless facing one's alleged nemesis in the form of a vast untold empire of unfeeling destructive and misery-laden cosmic energy. David Bohm's point would certainly ossify my argument as he states, "We say that inseparable quantum interconnectedness of the whole universe is the fundamental reality and that relatively independently behaving parts are merely particular and contingent forms within this whole" [Bohm, D. and Hailey, B. 1975: 96]. This indeed holds good for the best part of quantum theory as it does for the Eastern world view in which neither the universe is considered as an assortment of independently existing separate physical objects nor humans are seen at best as an impotent bystanders observing it from outside. Capra a quantum physicist of our time, writes to this effect, "The most important characteristic of the Eastern world view is the awareness of the unity and mutual interrelation of all things and events; the experience of all phenomena in the world as manifestations of a basic oneness" [Capra 2000: 130].

On their firm stance that reality cannot be understood in the ways, manners, methods and dints prescribed by classical physics and modern philosophy, the Eastern mystics share the same metaphysical position with that of quantum physicists. Reality, which is described in quantum theory as an interconnected cosmic web, appears to be grasped directly and intuitively, goes by such different names as Brahman in Hinduism, *Dharmakaya* in Buddhism, *Tao* in Taoism, [Capra 2000, Chuang 1971, Zukav 2001]. And in the metaphysics of energy which stands centre stage in this research this same undivided whole of interconnectedness goes by the name **matrix of resonance**. Pursuant to this metaphysical position, every metaphysical endeavour shouldn't begin with bits and pieces which have been enshrined in Newtonian and Democritus' traditions and views as building blocks of reality. On the contrary, metaphysical probing should begin from the undivided web of ubiquitous instantiate and work outwards in such a way that it can explain the apparently different parts and parcels, objects, processes and phenomena as the multifaceted versions and contingent manifestations of the matrix of resonance.

Bibliography

- BOHM, D. & HILEY, B. (1975) *On the Intuitive Understanding of Nonlocality as Implied by Quantum Theory: Foundations of Physics* Vol. 5 pp 96 - 102.
- BOHM, D. (2004) *On Dialogue*. London: Routledge Classics.
- CAMUS, A. (1942) *The Myth of Sisyphus*. NY: New York Basic Books.
- CAPRA, F. (2000) *The Tao of Physics: An Exploration of the Parallels between Modern Physics and Eastern Mysticism*. Boston: Shambhala Publication Inc.
- CHUANG, T. (1974) *Inner Chapters*. New York: Vintage Books.
- DESCARTES, R. (1969) *Meditations on First Philosophy, in The Essential Descartes*, Margaret D. Wilson ed., Elizabeth S. Haldane and Ross G.R.T. trans. New York: New American Library.
- EBENSTEIN, W. (1965) *Great Political Thinkers*, third edition: Plato the Present. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- HAWKING, S. (1997) *A Brief History of Time*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- HAWKING, S. (2011) *The Dreams that Stuff is Made of: The most Astounding Papers on Quantum Physics and how They shook the Scientific World*. Philadelphia: Running Press.
- HEISENBERG, W. (1974) *Across the Frontiers*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- MARX, K. (1964) *Early Writings*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- NIETZSCHE, F. (2002) *The Antichrist*. New York, Routledge.
- PALMER, D. (1999) *Does the Center Hold?* Second edition. Mountainview: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- SCHOPENHAUER, A. (2014) *Studies in Pessimism: On the Suffering of the World*. Adelaide: The University of Adelaide Library.
- SELLARS, J. (2010) *Stoicism*. Durham: Acumen Publishing Limited.
- WHEELER J. A. et al (1983) *Gravitation*. San Francisco: Freeman press.
- ZUKAV, G. (2001) *The Dancing Wu Li Masters: An Overview of the New Physics*. NY: Perennial Classics, Harper Collins Publishers Inc.