

## Anthropogonia: A New Cartesian Standing Point for Philosophy

### Introduction

The methodology of philosophy and science has been traditionally based on the definition of the *specifica distincta* of human being. In the theory Anthropogonia that I try to develop I take this tradition from nerophilosophical point of view. I have found usable the mathematical set theory for modelling “the total conceptual brain activity of human intelligence”. So, I take “the total conceptual brain activity of human intelligence” as a “set of intelligence”.

(1a)  $S_1$  (Set of intelligence)

Before the intelligence consciously and conceptually limits itself by drawing a line between in and out, it ( $S_1$ ) unconsciously identifies itself with the phenomenal world ( $S_w$ )

(1b):  $S_1 = \{S_w\}$

Kant has perfectly exhibited with his Copernican revolution that our understanding has an active transcendental role in any object that is taken. This is the main difference of human species among the other psychological animals, which gives to homo sapience another “*sapientia*” as *homo sapience sapience*. By the participation of concepts and consciousness, human brain started to take a double act: The act on the elements of the external world and this act itself in the brain in a sort cut. Namely, we think of something, and meanwhile we think of thinking something. Within this occasion of the evolution of human brain we have the possibility of producing concepts, having a consciousness and free will. Therefore the set of intelligence has no one element but two:

(1c)  $S_1 = \{S_w, S_1\}$

As you may notice, this is a self-referential Russell paradox. I called this “existential paradox”! This is an exact mathematical definition of human being. Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Kant, Hegel, Husserl, and almost all history of philosophy have been written around looking for this definition. Paradox is the end of true thinking, means there is no solution. Despite compromising mathematics, in the orthodox logic, there are two possible strategies can be taken to solve mathematical paradoxes. One of these is to ignore the set of existence, which is the set of world ( $S_w$ ) here, and the second is to divide the collection of the set of definition, which is the set of intelligence ( $S_1$ ) here, in two pieces.

The Western tradition has taken only the first option. One basic model of my mathematical definition, and the first logical strategy to solve it can be found in Plato’s cage metaphor, especially in “Meno's Paradox,” or “The Paradox of Inquiry”. His solution was to ignore the external world, and so, he has set up the theory of ideas. Aristotle has chosen the same path with Plato by asserting the unknowability of *prima ousia*, but also tried to overcome the dialectical position of ( $S_1$ ) so as to set up the scientific discourse of ( $S_w$ ). Kant followed Plato by creating deep crack between noumenon and phenomenon, considering the noumenon as unconceptualizable and unknowable, and followed Aristotle with his transcendental logic for

eliminating the dialectical illusion in the scientific sense of *proto philosophia*. Hegel has defined the problem of self-referential paradox in Kant, but has taken Plato's dialectical logic in the sense of Aristotelian science, and attempted to solve every paradoxes in the system.

This logical strategy is the psychological type of the Western metaphysical tradition. They always try to overcome any obstacles, and give an exact definition of it. They can't see things in their messy nature, and can't accept it as a factum. Everything is acculturalized. In the history of philosophy and science (and even art) all the creative logical strategies run around this paradox. All over the Western philosophy is eager, obsessive on solving, overcoming, ignoring this paradoxical position, and having a clean clear and distinct, smooth discourse.

## Solution

It is well known that, in such a logical project, Russell had tried to reduce mathematics to logic, and stuck in this kind of paradoxes, called with his name: Russell paradoxes. Gödel also has proved that any axiomatic formal system cannot be proved in itself, can't completely define itself. It is kept open and problematical. Gödel gives a clue for my solution. The existential paradox I named is the natural structure of human intelligence; it is not an end of thinking as it was in the Western tradition. It is a beginning of thinking. You may find countless examples of this in the Eastern tradition. Nagarjuna's logic in Mahayana Buddhism can be seen a typical example. I have also another sample lead me to my theory. His name is William Desmond, my teacher from Leuven, Belgium. He is a pioneer of post-Hegelian philosophy. His theory is called "*metaxology*", means "science of between" in Greek. It simply says that a thought dwells between in itself and its otherness. My theory is also a kind of metaxology, in the sense that gives a definition of the logical functions of (S<sub>1</sub>) between (S<sub>w</sub>) and (S<sub>1</sub>) itself.

My solution for the existential paradox is basically and practically to leave the mess, and let people to find their own ways. But this practical solution has a theoretical side too. What does it turn to if we theoretically attempt to solve it? This is the Eastern metaphysical tradition, to contemplate what is happening in between the messy, naked nature itself and the possible abstractions, cultural transformations or illusions of the world. So, I theoretically chose the second logical strategy, divide the set of definition in two, and contemplate how the existential paradox of human intelligence naturally produces illusions:

$$(2a) S_1 = \{S_w\}, S_1 = \{S_1\}$$

Now, for some practical reasons we need some informal interferences to keep the formula unified: 1)  $S_1 = \{S_1\}$  is a tautology and a null set ( $S_1 = S_1 = \emptyset$ ). Intelligence as a *subjectum* cannot take itself as an *objectum*; instead, it takes the others, as if the total ideal qualities of the others are its own identity. So, instead of identifying the set of intelligence with itself, it would be identified with (S<sub>1g</sub>) a set of idealized general intelligence ( $S_1 = S_{1g}$ ). 2) There is also another reason to interfere the mathematical formal structure of the formula: In practical life we experience only one unified world. All these divisions would be equivalent have the same

truth value, which means “iff “ ( $\Leftrightarrow$ ) in logic. So, our formula turns to (2b), and its logical conclusion would be (2c):

$$(2b) (S_1 \Leftrightarrow S_w) \Leftrightarrow (S_1 \Leftrightarrow S_1),$$

$$(2c) [(S_1 \Rightarrow S_w) \wedge (S_w \Rightarrow S_1)] \Leftrightarrow [(S_1 \Rightarrow S_{1g}) \wedge (S_{1g} \Rightarrow S_1)]$$

I                      II                      III                      IV

I.  $(S_1 \Rightarrow S_w): \forall x[(x \in S_1) \Rightarrow (x \in S_w)]$

II.  $(S_w \Rightarrow S_1): \forall x[(x \in S_w) \Rightarrow (x \in S_1)]$

III.  $(S_1 \Rightarrow S_{1g}): \forall x[(x \in S_1) \Rightarrow (x \in S_{1g})]$

IV.  $(S_{1g} \Rightarrow S_1): \forall x[(x \in S_{1g}) \Rightarrow (x \in S_1)]$

These are general, axiomatic, formal intentional states of intelligence, which dialectically mediates between in and out. But these are not Hegelian dialectical mediations, because there are nor immanent but transcendental. This formula belongs to the title “transcendental dialectic” in Kant’s philosophy. Meanwhile, each four parts of it contain some transcendental analytical a priori forms. Kant had produced a priori categories from judgements in a Scholastic tradition. But these a priori forms are produced themselves via an evolutionary historical process, like in Hegel.

This is the philosophical position of my theory “Anthropogonia”. It gives a new definition to the titles “transcendental aesthetic, analytic and dialectic” in an evolutionary process. Kant’s philosophy had needed such a contemporary bypass for a long time. Anthropogonia gets some little help from neurosciences and mathematical logic for its explanations. It is a new Cartesian standing point because it is based on a clear and distinct mathematical definition of human intelligence, namely the existential paradox. That is why it is a true paradox, a true false. In a Gödelian sense, it has a kind of formal system, and naturally it produces informal ideas, illusions. Human intelligence naturally produces illusions, and produces itself by acculturation in these illusions. Therefore, critical philosophy has a new meaning in Anthropogonia. I believe, in the book *Anthropogonia* I have hit the target of Cartesian meditations, succeeded and accomplished them. It is based on absolutely clear and distinct mathematical definition with zero cultural ingredients, and also can explain any possible, historical, cultural springs, formations in it.

### **An Application of the Solution on Philosophy Education**

There is another important dimension of this theory. It has not been discovered as I have exhibited here. For a while, I was out of my academic activities, and had asked myself “what is the meaning of all our academic studies on the natural and social sciences?” So, I have tried to explain philosophical sources of our questions for someone who knows nothing. I had started to discover that there were some reducible relations between philosophical questions. E.g. “legitimacy of state” can be reduced to the “ideal state” problem. Then, I have discovered that the logical, formal definitions of “state” and “God” were the same. Each field of

philosophy had one basic problematic question. And finally, there was a dialectical relations between these basic questions of the fields; e.g. between the possibility of external world and the truth value of knowledge, between the possibility of ethical autonomy or universalizability and the ideal state or God. Philosophy was inherent in human intelligence, and these questions were the productions of itself. Then I have discovered that these questions were the four types of some transcendental logical relations, which I had mentioned above, and also these are a result of a basic paradox of philosophical inquiry. By the end I have discovered that this was not an inquiry paradox, rather it was an existential paradox and the evolutionary nature of human intelligence. The vortex of the existential paradox was producing these kinds of aporias, paradoxes, tautologies and contradictions. Here are some meanings could be delivered from these logical relations:

### A) External problematic

**I. Outer- ( $S_1 \Rightarrow S_w$ ):  $\forall x[(x \in S_1) \Rightarrow (x \in S_w)]$ :** “Are the all members of the set of intelligence also some members of the set of the external world, and how?” (The problem of existing of external reality in ontology).

**II. Inner- ( $S_w \Rightarrow S_1$ ):  $\forall x[(x \in S_w) \Rightarrow (x \in S_1)]$ :** “Can the members of external world be truly represented in mental forms as some members of intelligence?” (The problem of truth and possibility of knowledge in epistemology).

### B) Internal problematic

**III. Outer- ( $S_1 \Rightarrow S_{1g}$ ):  $\forall x[(x \in S_1) \Rightarrow (x \in S_{1g})]$ :** “Is there a general set of ideal intelligence, which contains the whole possibilities of any type of members of the set of intelligences?” (The problem of existence of an ideal state or God in philosophy of ideology: Philosophy of religion and political philosophy).

**IV. Inner- ( $S_{1g} \Rightarrow S_1$ ):  $\forall x[(x \in S_{1g}) \Rightarrow (x \in S_1)]$ :** “Can the all members of a general (universal) set of intelligence be some members of each individual set of intelligences beyond the general (common) set of intelligence, in principle?” (Autonomy problem in moral philosophy).

I have also written another book on this approach, called *An Autroduction to Philosophy* and I still use it in my courses in “Introduction to Philosophy”. I have to admit that I have got a great success in teaching philosophy. One reason is this that I don’t impose knowledge on student. I only asks questions, follow the paths of these questions, and I make them to discover these basic questions and their relations that comes via the illusions of their culture. They directly find themselves in the middle of some philosophical inquiries, and feel that they are a philosopher. I see the approach in this book vital, at least for teaching philosophy. I know its reach scope will be very acquainted to my colleagues, philosophers, and would attract their attentions.