

The Theory of Everything

A Research Paper submitted to the Department of Engineering and Society

Presented to the Faculty of the School of Engineering and Applied Science
University of Virginia • Charlottesville, Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Science, School of Engineering

Joseph E. Cohen

Spring 2025

On my honor as a University Student, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this assignment as defined by the Honor Guidelines for Thesis-Related Assignments

Advisor

S. Travis Elliott, Department of Engineering and Society

I. Introduction

Navigating life without understanding its underlying rules is akin to playing a game without instructions—actions feel arbitrary, outcomes uncertain. Historically, human existence has mirrored this uncertainty, initially driven by a fundamental survival instinct. Early humans primarily addressed immediate physical concerns such as securing food, shelter, and safety. Over time, as immediate threats diminished, our strategies evolved to include intellectual and existential pursuits. Nevertheless, the underlying objective has remained consistent: to make sense of the complex reality we inhabit.

To achieve clarity, we individually develop beliefs and definitions based on personal experiences and cultural influences. Collectively, these beliefs coalesce into broader societal frameworks, including science (encompassing physics, biology, chemistry), philosophy (with its diverse schools), and religion (in its various forms). Each framework attempts to categorize reality, aiming to offer comfort through structure and predictability.

However, categorization, despite its usefulness, is inherently incomplete. Defining what something *is* simultaneously excludes what it is *not*, limiting our understanding. Philosopher Thomas Kuhn highlighted this limitation through his analysis of scientific paradigms, demonstrating that frameworks inevitably encounter anomalies they cannot fully explain (Kuhn, 1962). Extending Kuhn's insight, we recognize that all conceptual frameworks—scientific, philosophical, religious, or personal—face similar anomalies, leading to recurring cycles of crisis and renewal. As long as our understanding remains fragmented into separate categories, we perpetuate this cycle of incompleteness.

This paper introduces a different approach: a “Theory of Everything” that uses a single underlying principle to describe all phenomena in our reality. Rather than proposing another

conceptual framework defined by labels or boundaries, this theory identifies reality as fundamentally balanced, existing independently of human categorization and without inherently favoring any particular perspective. This paper demonstrates that subjective experiences and empirical phenomena, often perceived as separate, can be logically bridged by recognizing they both reflect the same underlying principle of balance. By showing how this principle unifies these seemingly incompatible domains, we aim to establish a coherent foundation that could potentially be generalized into a universally applicable theory of everything.

Examining this neutral foundation within both empirical and subjective contexts, this paper clarifies how experiences traditionally viewed as distinct are unified through consistent underlying logic. Ultimately, exploring this perspective provides greater insight into the dynamics governing all aspects of reality, bridging gaps between traditionally separate domains without imposing additional categorical constraints.

II. Historical Context: From Survival to Categorization

Human beings have always been driven by a fundamental survival instinct, though its expression has evolved significantly throughout history. Initially, survival meant addressing immediate physical dangers like finding food, building shelter, and protecting against predators. Over millennia, as human societies grew more complex and immediate threats diminished, our strategies expanded beyond mere physical safety into intellectual and emotional domains (Maslow, 1943). We began seeking stability not just through physical security, but through understanding and interpreting the world around us.

As individuals, we naturally accumulate beliefs and definitions about our experiences, ranging from judgments like “this should take me only an hour,” or “this is impossible,” to

deeper personal definitions such as “I am capable,” or “I am not good enough.” Often subconscious, these beliefs emerge from our unique life experiences, social contexts, and cultural environments. For example, someone repeatedly praised for their talents might internalize confidence, whereas someone facing continuous criticism may subconsciously believe themselves inadequate (Bandura, 1977).

Collectively, these individual beliefs and definitions merge into broader societal frameworks. Over time, widely shared beliefs crystallize into organized categories and institutions, giving rise to structured fields like science, philosophy, and religion. Science, encompassing physics, biology, and chemistry, emerges from our collective attempt to intellectually grasp the tangible aspects of reality. Philosophy, with its many schools of thought, develops from our collective desire to make sense of abstract questions regarding purpose, morality, and existence. Religion, in its diverse forms and traditions, evolves as a collective response to spiritual uncertainty, addressing existential questions and offering comfort through shared narratives and practices.

These societal structures serve a crucial function: they help us systematically organize our reality, providing reassuring stability, structure, and predictability. In an uncertain and complex world, categorization offers comfort by presenting explanations that feel complete. Yet, by defining reality through categories, we inherently limit our perspective, creating boundaries that leave parts of reality inevitably unexplored or misunderstood. This fundamental limitation naturally leads to challenges and conflicts within our frameworks, setting the stage for deeper investigation into why categorization, while comforting, ultimately constrains our understanding.

III. Limitations of Categorization

Categorizing reality has undoubtedly advanced our collective understanding, providing clear frameworks and structures through which we navigate complexity. Yet, by their very nature, categories are fundamentally limited. When we define what a category includes, we simultaneously determine what it excludes. Reality itself does not fragment into separate domains like science, philosophy, or religion; there is only one universe that we collectively experience and attempt to understand.

Philosopher Thomas Kuhn illustrates the inherent limitation of categorization through his influential concept of scientific paradigms. According to Kuhn, science does not simply progress by gradually adding new knowledge over time, but rather through cycles he termed “paradigm shifts” (Kuhn, 1962). Initially, an established paradigm successfully explains observed phenomena within its clearly defined boundaries. Over time, however, anomalies—phenomena the paradigm cannot adequately explain—begin to accumulate. Eventually, these anomalies become impossible to ignore, triggering what he calls a crisis that forces a fundamental shift in perspective and the emergence of a new paradigm with different assumptions.

Although Kuhn's analysis primarily targeted scientific progress, this pattern of paradigms, anomalies, and crises applies universally to every human-constructed conceptual framework, whether scientific, philosophical, religious, or personal. By constructing categories, we inevitably leave certain phenomena unexplained. Consequently, each category inevitably encounters situations that expose its limitations, prompting cycles of crisis and renewal.

Physics provides an intuitive example of categorization's inherent limitations. Today, Quantum Mechanics (QM) and General Relativity (GR) represent two of humanity's most successful scientific theories. Quantum Mechanics accurately describes the microscopic world of

particles and fundamental interactions, portraying reality as discrete, probabilistic, and fundamentally uncertain. Conversely, General Relativity explains gravity and cosmic-scale phenomena remarkably well, portraying reality as continuous, deterministic, and smoothly curved by mass and energy. Individually, each theory excels within its respective domain, yet attempts to unify these theories into a single coherent framework, a unified set of rules capable of explaining all observable phenomena in our universe, remain unsuccessful (Rovelli, 2004). *Why?* Because each theory implicitly categorizes reality within specific boundaries, rendering them fundamentally incompatible beyond their defined scope.

Thus, categorization, though historically essential and reassuring, ultimately restricts our understanding. As Kuhn's framework illustrates, anomalies inevitably surface due to the inherently incomplete nature of any categorical framework. To genuinely understand reality comprehensively, we must seek an approach that transcends traditional categorical boundaries, one that includes rather than excludes, encompassing all aspects of existence.

IV. Uncovering the Theory of Everything

Albert Einstein famously said, "*We cannot solve our problems with the same thinking we used when we created them*" (Wikiquote, n.d.). Historically, humans have sought to understand reality by assigning meanings and labels, forming broader fields like science, philosophy, and religion. Although helpful, these frameworks inevitably encounter contradictions or exceptions when taken literally. To truly understand reality, we must move beyond categorization altogether.

Consider what remains if you remove all labels, interpretations, and judgments from your perception of reality. Strip away categories like "good" or "bad," scientific terms such as "gravity," and philosophical or religious meanings. What remains is reality itself, exactly as it

exists, free from human interpretation. This foundational existence is what we call objective reality. It's impartial, balanced, and without built-in preferences. Reality cannot logically favor one perspective over another, because if it did, we'd have to ask: *why that perspective, and not another? Who or what could decide this if objective reality encompasses everything?*

Additionally, if reality already held built-in meanings, it would impose them on everyone, removing our freedom to form personal interpretations. Thus, reality must logically remain impartial and open, like a balanced scale with no inherent tilt. This openness naturally allows infinite possibilities, enabling each of us to experience subjective realities filled with personal meaning.

To intuitively grasp this, think of reality as a blank canvas. A scientist picks up a Sharpie, measuring and marking the canvas with exact dimensions, confidently declaring, "This represents reality." Soon after, a philosopher arrives with watercolors, painting thoughtful scenes and profound imagery, arguing, "No, consider this instead." Finally, a religious leader approaches, illustrating rich narratives and stories across the canvas. *Which depiction is correct?* The question itself becomes meaningless, each image is simply an interpretation, none inherently more "true" than the others. When we debate whether science, philosophy, or religion best captures reality, we're focusing on the paintings rather than questioning the canvas itself. Each discipline paints reality differently, yet all exist upon the same foundation. So, instead of fixating on individual interpretations, we should ask a more fundamental question: *Upon what are all these perspectives painted?* The answer emerges clearly—a blank canvas. This blank canvas is the foundational simplicity underlying all perspectives. It has no preference for what is painted upon it, yet it provides the freedom to create whatever we choose.

Subjective interpretation is not only allowed but essential. Without subjective meaning, reality remains undefined and purposeless. Just as a canvas gains significance from the artwork upon it, objective reality finds meaning through subjective experiences and interpretations.

But among infinite subjective realities, *why do you specifically experience your current one rather than a reality with entirely different possibilities, perhaps different laws of physics, or something resembling childhood fairytales?* The reason is that your experiences directly reflect your internal beliefs about what is possible. The natural laws and conditions you encounter are shaped by deeply held assumptions about reality. If these internal assumptions shifted, your external experience would shift accordingly. This dynamic must exist to maintain an overall balance; your subjective experience (an internal bias) is precisely counterbalanced by corresponding external conditions, forming a continuous duality.

Yet, *how exactly does subjective experiences coexist with an objective foundation without contradiction?* Consider reality as a perfect mirror. A mirror itself is impartial and holds no preference for what it reflects, it simply reflects whatever stands before it. Your internal beliefs, assumptions, and meanings represent the projections onto reality, and your external experiences are reflections of those projections. Because the mirror itself is unbiased, internal and external realities remain balanced. They represent complementary aspects of a continuous interaction: your subjective experience (an internal bias) is neutrally counterbalanced by matching external conditions. In other words, external experiences logically depend upon and reflect internal beliefs.

You might still wonder why reality exists at all rather than nothing. Absolute nothingness can't exist, because “nothing” itself requires existence as a contrast. Without existence,

non-existence loses meaning. Thus, reality itself is inevitable; existence provides the simplest coherent starting point.

In short, reality remains impartial, shaped into infinite interpretations by internal beliefs. Clearly recognizing this reflective relationship provides the basis for a universal framework, one that can consistently describe all experiences. The following section explicitly demonstrates how this neutral framework naturally emerges through empirical, objectively measurable phenomena, thereby laying a clear foundation for understanding subjective experiences.

V. Bridging Objective and Subjective Reality through Balance

A genuine Theory of Everything must provide consistent principles capable of clearly explaining all scenarios, whether scientific, philosophical, emotional, or practical. To demonstrate that this proposed theory meets such criteria, we'll explore its universal applicability from two primary perspectives. The first is the empirical realm, involving objectively measurable phenomena, and the non-empirical realm, involving subjective human experiences. Although reality itself isn't limited by such categories, examining both areas explicitly highlights the theory's universal relevance.

A. The Logic of Empirical Phenomena

To clearly establish this neutral framework, we begin by exploring how it naturally emerges within empirical, objectively measurable phenomena. Empirical science traditionally describes reality independent of subjective perception; yet beneath all scientific theories, regardless of their internal differences, exists a universal law: the conservation of energy. This law states explicitly that energy cannot be created or destroyed, only redistributed or

transformed, preserving balance (Halliday, Resnick, & Walker, 2013). Crucially, this balance mirrors the neutrality principle established in the previous section.

Earlier, we noted that categorizing reality, while useful, inevitably limits understanding by imposing boundaries on something inherently unrestricted. Empirical science often divides reality into specific categories, such as forces or particles, simplifying complexity but simultaneously restricting deeper understanding. To uncover a theory of everything, we must instead start directly from conservation of energy, allowing reality to reflect neutrality through unlimited possibilities.

Building upon the foundational neutrality, a simple analogy will clarify precisely how empirical phenomena naturally emerge. Consider neutrality as analogous to a perfectly still pond, uniform and without distinctions. Without disturbances, this pond remains featureless, offering no basis for perceiving change or difference. To meaningfully measure or perceive any phenomena, a reference point must first be established—this introduces the necessary distinctions into neutrality.

Introducing a reference point is analogous to selecting exactly how you touch the pond's surface, defining the precise ripples produced. Your reference point represents your chosen observational perspective, the internal definitions of the system you intend to observe. If your reference point is, for example, observing Earth from your position upon it, the characteristics you define, such as Earth's mass, its location relative to the Sun, and other related attributes, are equivalent to specifying how you touch the pond. Immediately, ripples radiate outward, creating external patterns directly reflecting your internal definitions.

To empirically ground this analogy, frequency provides a natural way to encode these informational distinctions clearly. When you touch the pond, the generated ripples inherently

carry information about your disturbance, such as strength, location, and intensity. In empirical science, energy and information similarly relate through frequency, since frequency encodes distinctions efficiently and precisely: higher frequencies represent more detailed and specific informational distinctions (Greene, 2004). Thus, frequency naturally emerges as an ideal method for describing empirical information within a neutral reality.

Once multiple frequencies, representing defined characteristics, interact within the neutral field, wave dynamics naturally arise. Overlapping frequencies amplify or diminish each other through interference. Constructive interference, where frequencies reinforce, creates stable regions of concentrated energy empirically perceived as matter. Conversely, destructive interference creates regions of low concentration, perceived as empty space. Matter and space thus emerge naturally as complementary aspects of interference patterns generated directly by your chosen definitions.

Similarly, observed forces reflect this same balance. Introducing informational definitions creates energy gradients in the neutral field. Forces arise simply as the system's intrinsic tendency toward equilibrium, with objects moving to restore balance. Attraction occurs where interference patterns form stable pathways between regions, guiding objects together; repulsion arises where interference produces barriers requiring additional energy to overcome. Thus, forces reflect balance itself rather than distinct categories like gravity or electromagnetism.

This neutrality-based informational framework naturally reconciles quantum mechanics and general relativity, two theories historically viewed as incompatible, by clarifying how wave interactions manifest differently at various observational scales. At microscopic scales, individual wave interactions dominate, revealing discrete, probabilistic behaviors characteristic of quantum mechanics. In contrast, at cosmic scales, vast numbers of wave interactions blend

and average out, producing smooth, continuous behaviors accurately described by general relativity. Additionally, these wave interactions naturally exhibit harmonic patterns, repeating, self-similar structures observable across multiple scales, explaining why empirical reality consistently shows fractal-like complexity from atoms to galaxies (Mandelbrot, 1982). Thus, quantum mechanics and general relativity represent complementary observational perspectives of the same underlying neutral reality, differing only in scale rather than fundamental logic.

Explicitly recognizing this unified perspective does not diminish empirical science's achievements but instead contextualizes them within a broader theoretical understanding. Science's empirical effectiveness arises precisely because it fundamentally adheres to balance and energy conservation. Ultimately, by clearly demonstrating how neutrality gives rise to objective phenomena through internal informational definitions reflected externally as observable patterns, we establish a logical foundation that naturally extends neutrality's logic to subjective experiences. As we will explore explicitly in the next section, subjective experiences similarly emerge from internal beliefs and definitions, further illustrating that reality, whether viewed subjectively or empirically, is governed by the same set of rules.

B. The Logic of Subjective Experience

Having demonstrated how neutrality underlies empirical phenomena, we now extend this principle seamlessly into subjective experiences. Although subjective experiences are often perceived as arbitrary compared to empirical events, they follow precisely the same logical structure: internal definitions become externally reflected patterns. Revisiting our analogy of a neutral, still pond, we can illustrate clearly how subjective experiences logically parallel empirical phenomena.

Just as empirical phenomena emerge depending on precisely how you interact with the pond, reflecting your chosen definitions, subjective experiences arise directly from internal beliefs and expectations. Everyday beliefs such as “I’m bad at math,” “this assignment will take forever,” “it’s cold outside,” or foundational assumptions like “I’m a human on Earth,” reflect internal definitions shaping your reality. Such beliefs simultaneously form the empirical backdrop and give context to subjective experiences, establishing what you perceive as possible or impossible. More deeply rooted assumptions about identity, worth, or reality function similarly to larger physical structures, anchoring your subjective reality and strongly influencing future experiences. Conversely, minor beliefs, such as fleeting thoughts or temporary feelings, shape your immediate experiences in subtler ways.

Neutral reality mirrors these internal definitions precisely, resulting in experiences that appear as self-fulfilling prophecies. Thus, subjective and empirical realities are not separate; both reflect identical dynamics viewed through different interpretive lenses. Deep-seated beliefs define stable, seemingly deterministic patterns of experience, while lighter, transient beliefs allow for more probabilistic or flexible outcomes, mirroring the difference between classical physics at astronomical scales and quantum mechanics at microscopic scales.

But what specifically drives subjective experience? Just as empirical forces arise from energy gradients that guide physical systems toward equilibrium, subjective experiences feature analogous forces—emotions. Emotions are not separate phenomena. They simply represent subjective labels for the very same energetic gradients empirically described as forces (Damasio, 1999). Positive emotions, akin to attractive forces, signify alignment between internal expectations and external experiences, effortlessly guiding you toward desired outcomes.

Negative emotions, akin to repulsive forces, highlight misalignment and prompt internal adjustments toward equilibrium.

It's essential to emphasize that neither positive nor negative emotions are inherently “good” or “bad.” Emotions, viewed neutrally, are valuable indicators of internal-external alignment. Approaching emotions neutrally transforms them from rigid categories into useful feedback, allowing conscious adjustments of internal definitions to facilitate preferred experiences.

It's important to emphasize that beliefs are not inherently problematic. They are essential, providing the framework that makes coherent experience possible. Confusion and apparent contradictions emerge primarily when subjective experiences become rigidly categorized or emotionally attached to specific external outcomes. For instance, consider someone consciously seeking a fulfilling romantic relationship yet consistently facing disappointment. On the surface, their explicit desire for companionship conflicts sharply with persistent experiences of rejection. However, from the neutral perspective, external reality predominantly reflects foundational internal beliefs rather than surface-level desires (Bandura, 1977). In this example, the conscious desire for companionship is a minor belief easily overshadowed by a deeper, more influential belief, such as feeling fundamentally incomplete without external validation. Reality, therefore, neutrally reflects this deeper belief, perpetuating experiences of inadequacy despite conscious wishes to the contrary.

This dynamic clearly illustrates why emotional attachment, rigidly defining fulfillment as dependent on specific external outcomes, often perpetuates undesired experiences, even without an immediately obvious reason. Such attachment subtly reinforces deeper beliefs of dependency or incompleteness, prompting reality to neutrally reflect these underlying assumptions. To expect

external circumstances to shift without first addressing internal beliefs is akin to expecting your reflection in a mirror to smile before you do. Reality, like a mirror, can only reflect changes that originate internally. Conversely, approaching experiences with neutral preference, maintaining a desire for certain outcomes without emotional dependency, reflects internal completeness and balance. This internal coherence allows preferred outcomes to emerge naturally and without resistance, mirroring empirical systems that effortlessly return to equilibrium when unobstructed.

Clearly understanding this reflective logic resolves apparent paradoxes and contradictions within subjective experiences. Experiences that feel effortless—moments when you are “going with the flow”—indicate alignment between internal definitions and external reality, resulting in minimal friction. Conversely, experiences characterized by difficulty or frustration reveal internal contradictions, clearly highlighting areas where your internal definitions may require adjustment.

This principle naturally scales to collective societal patterns. Large-scale challenges like economic disparity, political conflict, or health crises, though usually seen as purely external, similarly reflect shared internal beliefs society collectively holds. Repeatedly addressing only external symptoms leaves deeper assumptions unexamined, causing these issues to persist. Recognizing societal conditions as reflections of collective beliefs suggests that addressing foundational assumptions could effectively shift persistent societal issues at their source.

Ultimately, by explicitly grounding subjective experiences within the same neutrality framework underlying empirical phenomena, we clarify that subjective and empirical realities are fundamentally unified. Both domains reflect identical neutrality-based dynamics, differing only by interpretive labels: subjective terms like emotions and beliefs, or empirical terms like

physical forces, planets, and atoms. Recognizing this common foundation unifies subjective and objective experiences into a coherent, universally applicable theory of everything.

VI. Conclusion

Historically, human beings have sought clarity and stability by categorizing reality into distinct frameworks such as science, philosophy, and religion. While helpful, these frameworks inherently limit understanding, as demonstrated by recurring anomalies that emerge from their imposed boundaries. This thesis has introduced and explored a fundamentally different perspective, a genuine Theory of Everything, founded on the principle of balance, a neutrality that underlies both subjective experiences and empirical phenomena.

By examining neutrality explicitly within empirical contexts, we demonstrated that measurable phenomena, from quantum mechanics to general relativity, naturally emerge from internal informational definitions expressed externally. Extending this logic to subjective experiences revealed that beliefs, emotions, and personal interactions may reflect precisely the same neutrality-driven dynamics, differing only in interpretive labels rather than fundamental structure. Subjective contradictions and paradoxes thus become logically explainable and resolvable through this balanced framework.

This unified perspective not only clarifies traditionally separate domains but also provides a coherent foundation from which future inquiry can proceed. While rigorous mathematical validation is beyond the scope of this thesis, developing such frameworks represents an important next step toward empirically evaluating this theory. However, meaningful exploration of these ideas doesn't strictly require mathematical proof. Regardless of whether this theory is ultimately correct, its deeper value might be in prompting us to question

assumptions about how reality works, encouraging us not to accept things as fixed simply because that's how they've always appeared.

Ultimately, by explicitly recognizing and exploring the fundamental neutrality and balance underlying all experiences, we bridge longstanding divides between subjective and objective understandings of reality. This approach does not discard traditional frameworks but contextualizes and unifies them, enabling a more comprehensive, coherent exploration of the universe and our place within it.

References

- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- Damasio, A. (1999). *The feeling of what happens: Body and emotion in the making of consciousness*. Harcourt.
- Greene, B. (2004). *The fabric of the cosmos: Space, time, and the texture of reality*. Knopf.
- Halliday, D., Resnick, R., & Walker, J. (2013). *Fundamentals of physics* (10th ed.). Wiley.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.
- Mandelbrot, B. B. (1982). *The fractal geometry of nature*. W. H. Freeman.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). *A theory of human motivation*. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346>
- Rovelli, C. (2004). *Quantum Gravity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wikiquote contributors. (n.d.). *Albert Einstein*. Wikiquote. Retrieved May 8, 2025, from https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Albert_Einstein