

Full Length Research Paper

Theistic panpsychic naturalized epistemology: the scientific philosophy of Africanity and Einsteinism

Maduabuchi Dukor

Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria. E-mail: essencelibrary@hotmail.com.

Accepted 14 July, 2009

The objective of this paper is to postulate Theistic panpsychism as a version of naturalized epistemology. It is a cognitive science of essences, substances and modes of physical world (phenomenon) and the *a priori* world (noumena). The traditional epistemology is that with experiences in the form of impressions or sense data, we justify our claims to know objects such as tables, or molecules etc. Theistic Panpsychic naturalized epistemology is concerned with external physical and metaphysical worlds of objective and subjective realities. Consistent with modernity and post-modernity, it is neither against the canon of reason nor intuition, nor experience but asserts that there are truths of non-empirical modalities. As an objective idealist, realist and panpsychist, the African Bantu sees God in every being and object manifesting as gods, spirits and forces. These forces, he understands and grapples with designators and predicates in explaining nature and medical and scientific puzzles. Similarly, considering the theory of relativity from epistemological standpoint, this paper establishes that Albert Einstein grappled with theistic panpsychism, and then to *special theory of relativity* and finally *general theory of relativity*. He explained the randomness and uncertainty of nature with notion of God and forces thereby confirming his theistic panpsychic disposition before his great scientific discovery's namely $E=mc^2$. The realm of theistic panpsychic naturalized epistemology is nature, absolutes, thinking, cognition and deductive reasoning. It is a transcending totality encompassing the *a priori* and *a posteriori* and provides answers to moral, epistemological and metaphysical questions. It is the epistemologist of Africanity (African or Bantu cognitive world view) and Einsteinism (Einstein's world view that influenced his theory of relativity).

Key words: Africanity, Einsteinism, Theistic panpsychism, Naturalized epistemology, Animism, Please re-attach the following as the correct References

NATURALIZED EPISTEMOLOGY

The question of truth and falsehood characterizes all methods of inquiry into objective reality which naturalized epistemology in its biological, sociological and genetic (or psychological) versions seeks to explain. Exponents of this epistemology want to tell concerned scientists, philosophers and epistemologists that there are veritable, independent and indubitable ways of reaching out to objective reality that is external world. The problem of our knowledge of the external world is traditionally how a self with private mental state can come to have knowledge. W.V.O. Quine restated this naturalistically:

"I am a physical object sitting in a physical world. Some of the forces of this physical impinge on my sources. Light rays strike my retinas; molecules bombard my ear drums and finger tips. I strike back, emanating concentric air waves. These waves take the form of torrent of this

course about tables, people molecules, light rays, retinas, air waves, prime members, infinite clauses, joy and sorrow, good and evil" (Quine, 1999)

First, the traditional epistemology states is that with experiences in the form of immediately given impression or sense-data, we justify our claims to know objects such as tables, chairs or molecules. This provides the foundation of certainty for the sciences. Second Quine's naturalized epistemology rephrases the problem as one of how we learn to talk about or refer to objects: what are the conditions that lead to reference? How is scientific discourse possible? There is a third way that is interested on the external world of physical objects and the meta-physical world of objective and subjective realities. Is scientific and epistemological discourse possible without cognition of forces, substances and essences that are

functions of our intuition, space and time? This way of cognition which is part and parcel of intellect and culture is Theistic Panpsychism (Dukor, 1990). Theistic panpsychism is a philosophical system that explains the cognitive modalities and epistemology of the African and scientists like Albert Einstein. It is also a naturalized epistemology. Within the context of modern and post-modern thought, bi-polarism and pluralism, theistic panpsychism can be defended as not only a fundamental cognitive method amenable to from empirical scientific method but also an epistemic correlate to the psychological version biological and sociological versions of naturalized epistemology. There are two universal philosophical premises that call for this conclusion. Beyond the modalities of seeing and hearing naturalized epistemology has added the biological, the sociological, the genetic and now the Theistic Panpsychic modality, all of which are subject to the alethic modalities of necessity, contingency and possibility. In an experimental or cognitive way they all have the elements of deductive and inductive models of premises and conclusions. Theistic panpsychic naturalized epistemology is a form of naturalized cognitive understanding of the infinite possible worlds. It is an inquiry that starts off naturally from the cosmological and ontological nature deciphering the forces, substances and essences as objective contents of intuition and experience. It is a beautiful bride of modernism and postmodernism.

THEISTIC PANPSYCHISM AND POSMODERNITY

The realm of Theistic Panpsychism is the realm of nature and absolutes. It's legitimate and substantive agent is the mind. The mind is the vortex of thinking, cognition and deductive reasoning. Since time and space is absolute and the inquiry into this is made possible by the logic of the doctrine of infinite possible intuition, then theistic panpsychic inquiry is facilitated by modal logical possibility into the infinite nature's space and time. It is naturalised transcendental epistemology because space and time and theistic panpsychic designators dwell in the same absolute continuum and totality. The designators of this panpsychic modality are mainly God, gods, spirits and forces. They constitute nature's satellite dishes and rays. These are ontological existents which are justified by experience. A Theistic Panpsychic inquirer sees God in every being and object manifesting as gods, spirits and forces. Something akin to Spinoza's naturalism is emitted here. "Man participates in Nature as a body-mind. Man innately impelled as are all things by a striving to preserve his being" (Spinoza, 1949). The African Panpsychist is an epistemological dualist as well as a realist and idealist. Like Descartes, Locke and Lovejoy, there is objective world outside the mind. It exists independent of our mind but not independent of the mind of God. Similarly the African would agreed with the realists like

Russell, "an object of knowledge is not as construction of mind, but is independent of the act of knowing. Sense data, physical objects, mathematical objects, other minds, all may exist whether or not we know them" (Russel, 1980) yet, all physical objects and mathematical objects are constructs of the mind of God. Theistic Panpsychic inquirer is a mind in-dweller who roams in the realm of absolutes or Platonic ideal state exploring in space and time, God's created objects. What is hereby construed as naturalized epistemology is a recognition of the phenomenal world as natural world from where by theoretical deductive the Panpsychic inquirer discovers the nuomena or reality. This nuomena is world in-itself (thing-in-itself) acknowledgeable by theoretical deductive reason. Nature has abundance evidence to presuppose the existence of God, gods, forces, freedom and immorality as objective realities in the nuomenal world.

As an ontologist, Theistic Panpsychic inquirer studies space and time as forms of sensibility and intuition. Mathematical and ethical knowledge are forms of intuition and modalities of theistic panpsychism. Kant would argue that "Arithmetic is possible because time is the other form of mind imposed on all experienced events. We know *a priori* those conditions (forms of space and time) which the mind imposes on all things before they can be its objects in experience" (Immanuel, 1945) Theistic Panpsychism reinforces and incorporates the validity of *a priori* knowledge, the autonomy of reason, the individuality of truth and methodology of modernity. Though Theistic panpsychism is entrenched in modernity, it has the support of post-modernity because it can be a contentious method of arriving at the truth due to its pre-scientific nature. Jean Francois Lyotard says that 're-writing modernity is what post-modernity is' (Jean, 1997). Modernity has as its hallmark, abstraction, futurity, individualism, liberalism and secularization.

"The central and fundamental thrust of the modern... is the bold and unhesitating affirmation of the autonomy of the human individual and society, as not dependent on, or answerable to, any other reality. It is this affirmation that repudiates all external authority outside of human reason, whether of religion or tradition" (Paulos and Jean, 1997).

The first major criticism of the European Enlightenment (modernity) came from the Frankfurt Schools of Social Research at Frankfurt in Germany. In their *Dialectic and Enlightenment* – Max Horkheimer and Theodore Adorno criticized the Enlightenment as "totalitarian and as having attempted to capture Nature and kept it in the strait jacked of abstract reason... (Max et al., 1997) This is however, not the concern of Theistic Panpsychic inquiry as a system of knowledge on an indubitable basis of certainty. Its concern is the postmodern epistemology as a broad and culture based spirit of arguing.

Postmodernity in a Nietzschean sense and Dionysian –

Becchanalism style repudiates all rules and conventions against the inspired rule bound rationality of the Enlightenment. Philosophical enterprise is aimed at discovering the truth. The issue as it applies to Panpsychic modality, therefore, is a truth question.. Michael Foucault, a postmodernist, revolted against Kant and Rene Descartes and the modernist philosophy, hence a systematic “rejection of the most basic premises of modern European philosophy... It was, in a phrase, the wholesale rejection of the transcendental pretence” (Solomon, 1988) Foucault furnishes three distinct dimensions to the field of knowledge, philosophical, mathematical and empirical sciences. The movement from unity (in Kant) to fragmentation (in Foucault) is a hallmark of postmodernism and a justification of whatever truth is in other philosophies. Michael Foucault also observes that “Kant’s position on representation is inadequate. Secondly Kant’s transcendental consciousness required transformation in terms of life, labour and language” (Singh and Michael, 1992) Yet Theistic panpsychism is not a total rejection of Kantian epistemology, but agrees with it in many fundamental areas and also agrees with Foucault on the three dimensions of knowledge namely; the philosophical, mathematical and empirical sciences. As an exponent of ‘textual activity’ Derrida, the modern father of deconstruction, is against the log centric prejudices and traditional notions of thinking. Like the structuralists and post-structuralists, Derrida is against the traditional metaphysical categories of subjectivity” (Panneerselvim, 1991) His position and argument would therefore dismantle the edifices of stereotyped canons of philosophizing in favour of multifaceted and multifarious notions of truth including that which the Theistic Panpsychism can provide. He would argue that:

“The Western metaphysics relies upon a series of oppositions – between mind and body, the intelligible and sensible, culture and nature, male and female, signifier and signified, writing and speech, parole and langue, diachrony and synchrony in which one pole is elevated above the other,.. Here, the opposites are not maintained in dynamic tension, but are placed in a hierarchical order which gives the first priority. At the point at which the concept of difference intervenes all these metaphysical oppositions become non-pertinent” (Parker et al., 1996).

For Derrida, philosophy is a textual activity. Similarly, in Theistic Panpsychism there are concepts of existentialism, phenomenology, hermeneutics and deconstruction. We could exhume in Theistic Panpsychism concepts similar to Brentano’s immanent existence, mental-in-existence, intentional-in-existence, immanent objectivity and so on. Of course, these are concepts emendable to Theistic panpsychic ontology and cosmology. Indeed there are also Hursserl’s *noesis* and *neoma* just as there are streaks and flags of

bio-psychological career of the self, ontological continuity and bio-psychical process in Theistic Panpsychism.

THEISTIC PANPSYCHIC EPISTEMOLOGY

Synthetic a priori modality is the epistemological basis of the Theistic Panpsychism because it is an ontology which grapples with universal and necessary truths. This inquiry does not compound a difference between Bantu Ontology and *synthetic a priori* ontology. For the Bantu the universe consist of ‘forces’, which are not distinct from atomic ‘beings’ The universe of forces for the Bantu and the Theistic Panpsychic inquirer, “is a hierarchy that starts from God, the all powerful force, and descends through the ancestors, living humans, animals, plants and down to the least forceful inorganic world’ (Copi, 1979). Therefore is a distinction between philosophical knowledge and scientific inquiry.

“Philosophical knowledge is knowledge of the general nature of forces and the general principles governing their interaction. Scientific knowledge, in contrast, is knowledge of the unique nature and behaviour of individual forces. It is knowledge acquired through scrutinizing the visible signs of the nature and behaviour of the various invisible forces.” (Ernest, 1953).

Whereas, philosophical knowledge is taken by the Theistic Panpsychic inquirer to be universal, indubitable and unanimous, scientific knowledge is contingent. It must however, be pointed out that every conceivable object, entity, concept, notion, being etc are in the ontological commitment of the ontologists and Theistic Panpsychists. Hence both the philosophical and scientific knowledge are part of the ontology of the Panpsychism. knowledge is either synthetic or *a priori* or both. Philosophical knowledge like general nature and principles of forces are like $7 + 5 = 7 + 5$ and extended bodies, hence are analytic and *synthetic a priori*. Similarly, scientific knowledge is not perceived as wholly synthetic but has a component of and confirmable by, the *a priori* knowledge in the panpsychic realms. The difference between Theistic Panpsychism and the scientific methodology is that for the former, all forms of knowledge are either wholly or piecemeal *synthetic a priori* or analytic, while a scientist works with only synthetic evidence and its hypothetical assumptions. In both science and Theistic Panpsychism, the laws of thought are the governing principle because after said and done validity will be tested at empirical level. Panpsychism like science discriminates questions on the basis of the law of identity that is A is A; the law of non-contradiction that is nothing can be both A and not A and the law of excluded middle, that is everything is either A or not A. The laws of thought is both an empirical and logical law and because it is a logical law it is the law of perfection that governs the imperfect and synthetic

laws of physics as well as the perfect and analytic objects of Theistic Panpsychism. On the basis of these fundamental laws of nature, the panpsychic inquirer grapples with questions bordering on contradiction, contrary, sub-contrary, sub-alternate, converse, obverse, contrapositive with natural insight and intuition. He does not have problem configuring logical and mathematical formulas like De Morgans theorem – $(p.q) \equiv (-pv-q)$ or Commutation $(pvq) \equiv (qvp)$ (Albert, 1953) or even Albert Einstein formula $E=MC^2$ because after all scientific laws discovered and yet to be discovered are based on the laws of thought (laws of nature and logic) which constitute a naturalized epistemology.

The Bantu or the African ontologists are capable of grasping these formulas just merely because they are ontological connection of forces and beings, and because they are ontologists and ontological beings, they are merely interacting causally with objects as subjects. Transcendental existents are functions of space and time, all of which are comprehended intuitively by the ontologists. Theistic panpsychist is a being in transcendence having *a priori* knowledge of substances that make up physical objects. For the ontologist the *a priori* knowledge transcends *aposteriori* knowledge, although they often complement each other. Yet as an epistemology, problems are presented to it by the science. In Kant, understanding must approach nature in order to be taught by it, but as an appointed judge and not as a pupil who agrees to everything the master likes. However, in Theistic panpsychic naturalistic ontology, the understanding transcends and judges or legislates experience. In the same vein it denied physical objectivity to the concepts of space and time (Ssunil, 1991). The description and denial of space as that 'which fills up space' are ontological disagreements. And that the general theory of relativity finally settled with 'space as opposed to "what fills space" which is dependent on the co-ordinates has no separate existence, is an ontological commitment to Theistic panpsychism (Quine, 1992).

Naturalistic epistemology traditionally adopts a totally descriptive method on the question of the orientation of epistemology. It considers our knowledge or the word to be part of the world such that our discourse about knowledge need not be and should not be qualitatively different from that of natural entities which are the objects of our knowledge, in so far as the terms and the idioms of the latter are descriptive. Naturalistic epistemology has three versions: Biological, Sociological and Psychological versions. The biological version considers knowledge to be basically a biological phenomenon, such that its description of phenomenon, must take recourse to the terms whose efficiency has been proved in our study of biological phenomena. Here the biological definition of naturalized epistemology points to the fact that nature has its role to play in the evolution of matter, and this nature, to a panpsychist is propelled by intelligible forces which Einsteinism and Africanity would uphold as the vital

element in evolution. In other words Darwin's theory may be a material evolution only, while Einsteinism and Africanity would be a panpsychic and material evolution combined. Similarly, the psychological and genetic, like the biological naturalized epistemologies are reducible to theistic panpsychic epistemology which is affirmed in early Einsteinism as well as in African Bantu world view. Therefore, this is the sense in which natural selection could be validly embedded in theistic panpsychic naturalized epistemology. Since it is admitted today that the theory of evolution by natural selection has been proved to be extremely successful, there is a growing tendency to provide a theory of knowledge in terms of the theory of biological evolution. Jean Piaget, in working out his genetic epistemology (a psychological version of naturalist epistemology) attempts to bring child's psychology to bear on the development of human knowledge. According to him, the ways by which the child constructs the concepts of space, time, physical objects, number, motion, causation and so on, provides keys to our understanding of the phenomenon of human knowledge. Genetic epistemologists are quite often sensitive to the possibility of our biological nature in knowledge especially morphology and organic evolution throwing light on the nature of the knowledge. Piaget throws light on this as follows:

"There is no doubt that child psychology constitutes a kind of mental embryology not only a description of individual's stages of development but chiefly as the study of the very mechanisms of this development to consider epistemology of comparative anatomy of thought operations..." (Alex, 1999).

Piaget views language as a specialized adaptability and the naturalistic conception of the origin of morale taking its principle from the study of evolution of animal societies. Hence, the fundamental theories of evolution have yielded what is amendable to naturalistic epistemology. But essentially the language aspect of it is deeply embedded in the psychological and the social versions both of which have their root in the biological.

Appreciating that philosophy is a science and that knowledge is possible, V. O. W. Quine deviated from the traditional rationalists and empiricists' epistemology and argues that we are no longer under the obligation to go beyond science in order to validate the object of science. We use language analysis to show that to have knowledge is possible and that knowledge can be justified. For V.O.W. Quine, therefore, 'Naturalized Epistemology' means reducing epistemology to the study of language learning and language acquisition. It recognizes that the skeptics' challenges springs from science itself and that in coping with it we are free to use scientific knowledge. For Quine, the whole problem of knowledge is a scientific problem. One of the main epistemological problems is the problem of relating our

knowledge to the external world. In naturalized epistemology, the problem of relating words to the world is a casual one. The most important thing for Quine is that:

“We go to work with our words, whose relation to the outside world does not belong to the study of meaning or to Semantic theory but to causal theory. So the only way that we can understand the relationship of words to world is by studying how they are acquired, and this is a scientific study” (Alex, 1999).

It is argued that observation sentences that have to do with the words and world serve as “both the starting point in human language, learning as well as the empirical grounds for science.” (Alex, 1999). He says that one relies on two components which are parts of a naturalist’s ontology that is the physical happening at the nerve endings, the neutral input or stimulus, and the linguistic entity, the observation sentences. According to Quine, observation sentences are those that can be learned purely by ostentation and as such are causally most proximate to the stimulus. Unlike traditional epistemology, Quine’s epistemology is naturalistic because we “stand apart from one place as part of nature and make philosophical judgments. This is part of the theme that philosophy is continuous with science, science being the part of nature most suitable for knowing itself” (Alex, 1999). Beyond Quine’s account of traditional epistemology, Theistic Panpsychic epistemology transcends observation sentences and physical happening in encompassing totality because the nerve endings or the neural stimulus are cognitively endowed to understand not only physical objects but also forces, substances and essences of the subjective - objective mysterious matters in space and time. In theistic panpsychic epistemology man is part of nature in totality and as a being in encompassing transcendence, he makes philosophical and scientific judgments.

Theistic Panpsychic epistemology is one unique and fundamental naturalized epistemology that has escaped the attention of the history of philosophy and science simply because it is older than science. Like the biological, the sociological and the psychological versions of naturalized epistemology, the Theistic Panpsychic naturalised epistemology operate as the law of nature, but different from others in that it is metaphysical (after physics) and transcends the observable phenomenon of the biological, the sociological and the psychological to the *a priori* ontological space nature. The Theistic Panpsychic inquirer conceptualizes the categories of beings and forces as modes, essence and substances. These essences and substances are grappled with, configured and manipulated in the creative process by man for man, although the highest and supreme substance is the Chief creator, the Supreme Being. He does not conceive the substances as separate forces or beings. In $E = MC^2$ they

do not regard E as separate from M or C; they regard them as forces or created beings that “preserve a bond one with another, an intimate onto-logical relationship, comparable with the causal tie which binds creature and creator,” (Alex, 1999) even though mechanistic science would regard them as separate substances that substances that exist either by themselves or in themselves. The inquirer solves daily philosophical, pathological, social and scientific problems by grappling with the interaction of substances (forces and modes), understanding them and finding the truth and arriving at answers to the problems. To him the rules of Association – $[p \vee (qvr) \equiv (pvq) vr]$, material equivalence $(p \equiv q) \equiv (\{p > q\}. \{q > p\})$ are ways of cognizing the interaction and relation of forces (substances). These formulas are not strange to the Theistic Panpsychic epistemologist; it may be only the symbols that make the difference. The symbols or atomic propositions in these formulas are mere representations of forces, substances and essences as language game in epistemological inquiry.

The languages of the Theistic Panpsychic epistemologist are formulas embedded in his locutions like lives. Forces, vital forces and strength, all of which represent various forms of energy, quanta, photons, electrons, neutrons and so on. For the Bantu, “there is interaction of being with being, that is to say, of force with force. Transcending the mechanical, chemical and psychological interactions, they see a relationship of forces.” (Alex, 1999). This is ontological commitment which can be perceived or expressed in symbols. The Akan, the Igbo and the Yoruba see it like that. In the created force (a contingent being) there is “a causal action emanating from the very nature of that created force and influencing other forces: one force will reinforce or weaken another.” (Elwes, 1989) There is what is called the general laws of vital causality in the interaction of forces. This is because, “Interaction of forces and the exercise of vital influence occurs... according to determined laws.” (Quine, 1999; Baruch, 1957) These laws are as follows (a) man as the centre of the created universe reinforce or diminish the being of another man. (b) The vital human force can directly influence inferior force-beings (animals, vegetable or animal) in their being itself. (c) A rational being (spirit, man or living) can act indirectly upon another rational being by communicating his vital influence to an inferior (animal, vegetable, or mineral) through the intermediary of which it influences the rational being (James, 1976). These interactions revolve around man as the centre of the created universe. Man interacts symbolically with objective and subjective realities in time and space and adduces meaning out of them. He is not penchant for general laws but his understanding and explanation of the mysteries of the cosmos and the universe is personal and interactive because of his place in the Theistic Panpsychic hierarchy of forces.

These forces, substances and essences are cognitive theoretical entities. A Theistic Panpsychic epistemologist

depolarizes them and forges a unity among them for explanation and understanding. He periscopes all forces in accordance with the fundamental laws of thought and nature, that is laws of identity, contradiction and excluded middle and then analysis them with designators and predicates without quantifications of modern logic and science. Known designators, forces and substances are displayed inductively as;

a₁ a₂ a₃ a₄ a₅ a₆ a₇ a₈ a₉ a₁₀ etc
 b₁ b₂ b₃ b₄ b₅ b₆ b₇ b₈ b₉ b₁₀ etc
 C₁ C₂ C₃ C₄ C₅ C₆ C₇ C₈ C₉ C₁₀ etc

Unknown designators are unknown forces and substances which are immaterial. Therefore undespached forces and substances, for a Theistic Panpsychic epistemologist are both unknown designators and theoretical predicate entities. This is the nature of theistic panpsychic epistemology that forms the basis of Bantu and Igbo epistemology and predates modern science and quantum mechanic.

THEISTIC EPISTEMOLOGY OF MODERN SCIENCE

The epistemologies of Spinoza, Descartes, Leibniz, etc, are the cumulative and, progressive theistic panpsychic epistemologies that historically and analytically gave birth to modern science. Spinoza's doctrine of attributes, infinite and finite modes, serve to express both the all encompassing and systematic nature of the one ultimate reality and to distinguish and determine the states of finite being within this reality. In its immanentism as well as in its rational mysticism, the doctrine of Spinoza is not improperly regarded as a Platonism re-directed by the influence of Descartes and invigorated by the enterprise of modern science. The analogy between philosophy and Geometry which Spinoza inherited from Descartes makes God a heavenly body in space but not in time; man is thinking the eternal order leaves history but without rising to the levels of transcendental subjectivity or in the activity of the absolute spirit. Since it is not man but God that thinks, rational thought transforms man into a geometrical mode. For Spinoza, Wisdom of the true teaching about the eternal order is the idea of God or God thinking himself. Hence, God's thinking is transcendental, immanent and panpsychic. According to James B. Wilbur in his words,

"Spinoza's God escapes from corporeality only by the geometrical order of the parts of his body, what Spinoza calls an eternal thinking of external order" (Concise Roulledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2000). He says,

"Spinoza is an atheist in so far as he does not conceive of God as spirit. At the same time, it would be more accurate to call him an "acosmest" because what he

derives is the reality of the created world. Spinoza's God is not alive and his creation is an illusion (Descartes, 1968).

But the interpretation of this that is amenable to modern science is its theistic panpsychic nature, which is a form of pantheism. Yet in this Pantheism, there is an active God like in African philosophy. Because his naturalized God has no desires or purposes, human ethics cannot properly be derived from divine command; rather, Spinozistic ethics seeks to demonstrate from an adequate understanding of the divine nature and its expression in human nature.

Descartes' uses methodic doubt for finding out whether there was any indubitable truth. He found this truth in the affirmation *Cogito, ergo sum*, "I think, therefore I am". This truth was so solid and so certain that all the most extravagant suppositions of the skeptics were incapable of upsetting it, "hence, he says, "I judged that I could receive it without scruple as the first principle of the philosophy that I sought." (Descartes, 1968). In "*Cogito, ergo sum*" (Christian, 2004). Descartes found a doubt-proof truth that cannot suffer the corroding influence both of the natural doubt and also of the hyperbolical doubt. Descartes' view is that if he is deceived, he must exist in order to be deceived and that if he is dreaming, he must exist in order to dream. This idea is not new. It had been recognized by St. Augustine many years before Descartes. Augustine's *Si fallor, sum*, "if I am deceived, I exist" is similar to Descartes' *Cogito, ergo sum* and that is why it is commonly believed that Descartes was influenced by Augustine. The certainty of Descartes' existence holds only when he is thinking and conscious.

"I then considered attentively what I was; and I saw that while I could feign that I had no body, that there was no world, and no place existed for me to be in, I could not feign that I was not; on the contrary, from the mere fact that I thought of doubting about other truths, it evidently and certainly followed that I existed" (Christian, 2004).

In his principle of philosophy, Descartes' states that, "I think, therefore I exist is the first and most certain of all which occur to one who philosophize in an orderly way" It is an indubitable truth, solid and firm enough and on which Descartes proposes to found his philosophy which subsequently influenced modern science.

Descartes explained that some activities of the human body are mechanical like those of the animals. For him, acts like respiration, circulation of the blood and digestion are automatic. He concludes that the movement of the body could not originate in the human mind but that the mind could only affect or alter the direction of the motion in certain elements and parts of the body. To explain how the mind could do this, he said that the soul or mind does not move the body directly, but, having "its principal seat in the brain," (Leibniz, 1973) in the pineal gland, comes in

touch with the “vital spirits” and through these the mind acts with the body. Descartes certainly gave a mechanical explanation to human body while at the same time allowing the possibility of the influence of the mind through the activity of the will upon human behaviour (Stumpf, 1994). He holds that human beings unlike animals are capable of different kinds of activities. They can engage in pure thought and their minds can be influenced by physical sensations and perception. For him, human bodies can be directed by their minds and their bodies are moved by purely mechanical forces. Descartes’ panpsychism is however not in nature or material objects but animated beings and humans; it is reducible to a creative process.

Leibniz was dissatisfied with the way Descartes and Spinoza had described the nature of substance. To say, as Descartes did, that there are two independent substances, thought and extension, was to produce the impossible dilemma of trying to explain how body and mind, two different substances could interact. Spinoza had tried to solve the dilemma by saying that there is only one substance with two knowable attributes, thought and extension. Still, Spinoza monism was a pantheism in which God was everything and was part of everything else. To Leibniz, this conception of substance was inadequate because it blurred the distinction among God, humanity and nature, each of which Leibniz wanted to keep separate. Leibniz challenged the fundamental assumption upon which Descartes and Spinoza had built their conceptions of substance, namely that extension implies actual size and shape. Descartes assumed that extension refers to material substance that is extension in space, and is not divisible into something more primary. Spinoza too, considered extension as an irreducible material attribute of God or Nature (Christian, 2004). Leibniz disagreed with both Descartes and Spinoza. Observing that the bodies or things we see with our senses are divisible into smaller parts, why can we not assume, asked Leibniz, that all things are compounds or aggregates? “There must be” (Christian, 2004), he said “simple substances, since there are compound substances, for the compound is only a collection or aggregation of simple substance” (David and Gwynne, 1979). The windowless substances, he called monads.

Leibniz held that space is a set of relations amongst material objects. But Newton, following in particular the Cambridge Platonist Henry More, believed that space had an existence independent of matter, being in this sense absolute. Similar views were held with regard to the concept of time (Saurabh, 2001). But to uphold absolute space is to say that no distance changes, distance being essentially relative to some standard. Within the Special Theory of Relativity, we are not dealing with a theory of the nature of space, but of motions of particles relative to each other. According to Leibniz, space is that which material objects are situated and through which they move. It is a background for objects of which it is

independent. Any measure of the distance between objects within it may be regarded as a measure of the distances between its corresponding parts (Simpton, 1989). “To have an idea of place, and consequently of space, it is sufficient to consider relations (of things among themselves) and the rules of their changes, without needing to fancy any absolute reality out of things whose situations we consider. Space denotes, in terms of possibility, an order of things which exist at the same time considered as existing together. It is an order of coexistences and being neither a substance nor an accident, space must be a mere ideal thing. Now a common interpretation of the relational concept of space makes space something “determined solely by the fundamental particules” (Simpton, 1989). For Leibniz therefore, the ideal form determined by fundamental particles suggest an animistic and panpsychic understanding. Also, Leibniz appears to have worked out his concept of time by analogy from his doctrine of space. Time, for Leibniz, was not something distinct from temporal things. ‘Instants’, he said, ‘considered without the things are nothing at all’, and they consist only in the successive order of things. Although many philosophers may have inclined towards Leibniz’s views, and although Newton’s arguments were to be undermined by, for example, Berkeley and Mach, it was not until the Einstein-Poincare theory of relativity became widely accepted that the so-called relational view of space and time came into its own. The restricted and general theories of relativity are now so widely accepted, in their foundation if not in details, that it has become a maxim of the scientific strategies to acknowledge ‘relational’ space and time, and to profess horror of anything ‘absolute’ (Lewis, 1970). Albert Einstein saw in the Special Theory of Relativity a vindication of the Leibnizian arguments (Eucke, 1980). To understand Leibniz’s theories of space, time and motion, it is of two entirely unrelated points of departure. First, like all continuous phenomena which cannot be composed, space, time, and motion must be illusory. Second, motion, as Leibniz learned from Huygens, could be determined only relative from a designated observer. Putting these insights together, Leibniz came to the conclusion that space and time must be relative, and that in some way, compensate for their illusory nature (Paul, 1991). Leibniz also held that passivity is always relative, and space and time are passive (Wilson, 1989). This idea of relativity of time and space in Leibniz was kept in the dark until Albert Einstein came up with his relativity theory. Relativity theory demonstrates that time and space which in classical physics were thought of as objective properties or postulates, were dependent on the motion of an observer. Time or our sense of time in this theory is some calibrated duration or clock in our mind, which gave readings that vary proportionally according to one’s speed. The motion of an observer determines the ‘chuck’ of space that such an observer can perceive (Stumpf, 1994). We live in a relativistic universe. The

Newtonian universe, which existed till the beginning of the twentieth century was one in which conventional physics adequately described matter-in-motion. But relativistic universe is one in which matter is in motion at very great speed. Since Albert Einstein published his papers on special relativity in 1905, our understanding of our universe and our place in it has undergone continual revision.

Einstein's equation predicts that as objects move at very high speed (near the speed of light), time slows down, mass increases, and length decreases (Stumpf, 1994).

According to Einstein's theory, no material object can travel faster than the speed of light (which is about 186,000 miles per second). Relativistic phenomena begin to occur around ten percent of the speed of light. At these velocities, as already noted, three significant things begin to happen to all objects in motion including human beings. Time slows down; the mass and length of objects decreases. Let us take for instance the phenomenon known as "time dilation". The measurement of time – and perhaps to the actual flow of time – is strictly relative – that is, to the standpoint of the observer. Two travelers moving in different reference systems at high speeds relative to each other would measure time differently, and both would be right.

The "twin paradox" apparently illustrates actual realities. Imagine twin brothers twenty years old, one of whom becomes an astronaut. He takes a journey through space to a planet orbiting the star, Rigil Kent, which is about four light-years distance. His spaceship travels at 148,000 mps (miles per second). At that speed (which is $\frac{4}{5}$ the speed of light), according to all the clocks in his spaceship—calendars, wristwatches, atomic clocks, heartbeats—his experience of time would slow to $\frac{3}{5}$ its normal rate as observed and measured by his twin brother on earth. He would therefore make the journey to Rigil Kent in three years and return in three years, the entire roundtrip taking six years. But while he was on the six-year journey, his twin brother on earth would age ten years. From his earthbound viewpoint, he would measure his space-traveling brother's journey taking five years out and five years back—ten years according to his calendars and clocks (Albert, 1999). And both measurements are correct. There is no suggestion that one measurement is the real one and the other is distorted or illusory. Both are true. Time, therefore, is relative. The relativity of time-measurement was a cornerstone of Einstein's system. In 1905, it was only a theory, but now there is evidence to support it. It is important to note here that Einstein's conceptualization of relativity in 1905 was fundamentally theistic panpsychic before its matured stage known as special theory of relativity. The problem that Leibniz had during his own time was that his idea of relativity received no acceptability. This was mainly because of the disagreement he had with Newtonians over priority of the discovery of the calculus and the consequent neglect

which he received in the scientific world. But now, following the relativity theory of Einstein, one can hold it as a fact that Leibniz was after all right. Both Leibniz and Einstein, I think, are theistic panpsychic animists in various ways, yet scientific, according to the scientific paradigm.

ALBERT EINSTEIN AND THEISTIC PANPSYCHISM

Albert Einstein was first and fundamentally a Theistic Panpsychic epistemologist before becoming a scientist penchant for formulating equations about special and general theory of relativity. At age five, like a master and adept in Theistic panpsychic inquiry, he puzzled "over a toy compass and the mysteries of nature (The Columbia is lost" Time Feb. 1, 2003)". All his papers in 1905 bordered on Theistic Panpsychic cognition. The first paper is on that light behaves like a wave and a stream of particles called quanta and photons. There is a duality reminiscent of nature's night and day, spirit and body, etc. The dual consciousness is only but the Contour of Theistic Panpsychic cognition of matter or what I described as a version of naturalized epistemology reminiscent of, or in consonance with Bantu conception of being and forces. His second paper, thereafter confirmed the existence of molecules and atoms as the constituent substances of space – time relationship in matter. The second paper was based on thought experiment which is largely panpsychic. "If you could travel at the speed of light, what would a light wave look like? If you were in a train that neared the speed of light would you perceive time and space?" His special theory of relativity which is the answer to the question states;

"No matter how fast one is moving toward or away from a source of light, the speed of that light beam will appear the same, a constant 186,000 miles per second. But space and time will appear relative. As a train accelerates to near the speed of light, time on the train will slow down from the perspective of a stationary observer, and the train will get shorter and heavier." (Albert, 1905).

This is not obvious to an expert in physics, but it is to a theistic panpsychic inquirer like Albert Einstein and the Bantu. The feeling of Astronauts in outer space is an answer to the two questions of whether the astronauts perceive space and time as either non-existence or is relatively insignificant. Said Kalpana Chawla, one of the victims of Columbia space Shuttle on 1st February 2003, on her experience in space mission in 1994, "you just hang, you can't feel your hands... It is not like on earth, where you can feel the ground and your elbows feel the chair. The only thing I feel is my thoughts." (Albert, 1999). From this statement one could observe the relativity of space and time as well as the theistic panpsychic nature of thought elements that the astronaut could perceive.

Both observations affirm Einstein's theory and its panpsychic background. His grappling with the panpsychic nature of energy and matter led to that they were "merely, different faces of the same thing." (Albert, 1905) with their relationship described by the most famous equation in all of physics: "energy equals mass multiplied by the speed of light squared, $E = MC^2$." (Albert, 1953). It is believed that this equation helped to resolve certain mysteries, but the Panpsychic cognitivity is foundational to all great scientific discoveries.

Similarly the general relativity theory published in 1916 was based on a thought experiment akin to panpsychic epistemological inquiry. "Imagine being in an enclosed lab accelerating through space. The effects you would feel would be no different from the experience of gravity. Gravity is a warping of space-time." (Albert, 1953). While the special relativity theory grapple with the panpsychic dimension of subatomic forces, the general theory opened up an understanding of the largest panpsychic forces from "the formative Big Bang of the universe to its mysterious black holes" (Albert, 1953). These forces and unidentified substances often jolted Einstein into theistic Panpsychic conclusions. The randomness and uncertainty in nature made him uncomfortable as to conclude that "God does not play dice" (Albert, 1953). Though the concept of God would have played the role of a unified field (Theistic Panpsychic modality) to remove what appeared to be randomness and uncertain in nature, he rather continued relentlessly to search for an explanatory equation. Another Theistic panpsychic statement associated with his epistemological curiosity and inquiry is "that we are but a speck in an unfathomably large universe. The more we gain insight into its mysterious forces, cosmic and atomic, the more reason we have to be humble. And the more we harness the huge power of these forces, the more such humility becomes imperatives" (Albert, 1953). He is said to have constantly invoked God who he perceived as "God who reveals himself in the harmony of all that exist" (Albert, 1953). This is nothing short of Theistic Panpsychism or call it Spinoza's Pantheism. His belief and faith in divine harmony or theistic panpsychism led to his rejection of randomness and uncertainty in the universe. "The Lord God is subtle, but malicious he is not, searching for God's design... was the source all true art and science." (Albert, 1953). As a philosopher with faith in the beauty of God's handwork, he is first a theistic panpsychic epistemologist and then a scientist.

Science breaks down complex indistinguishable substances and forces into piece-meals and symbols while Theistic Panpsychic epistemologists grasp these forces as a unified whole whose parts are united by a network of interactions. Every great scientist like Einstein first grapples with the theistic panpsychic modalities of the universe, objects and man before setting to explain them in terms of symbols. In analytic judgements, there are some (unlike mathematics) that have intuitive contents. In

Kant as much as in Einstein and theistic panpsychism, space-time warping is products of intuition and reflect reality. Albert Einstein as a theistic panpsychic inquirer doubts the certainty of mathematics. This doubt perhaps stems from perchance to go beyond abstract figures to understand the real nature of things which is ontologically constituted by substances forces and essences. He asks;

How can it be that mathematics being afterall a product of human thought which is independent of experience is so admirably appropriate to the objects of reality? Is human reason, then, without experience, merely by taking thought, able to fathom the properties of real things? (Albert, 1953).

Immanuel Kant (1781) has one answer to these two questions and that is that all knowledge begins in experience and end in abstract reason. A theistic panpsychic inquirer from Bantu or Akan would argue that knowledge is a product of reason (intuition) and experience or both. Albert Einstein would argue that subjects, like mathematics do not have intuitive content or reality and certainty. According to him,

"As far as the laws of mathematics refer to reality, they are not certain, and as far as they are certain, they do not refer to reality... The progress achieved by axiomatic consist in its having neatly separated the logical-formal from its objective or intuitive content; according to axiomatics the logical-formal alone forms the subject matter of mathematics, which is not concerned with the intuitive or other content associated with the logical formal" (Albert, 1953).

For Einstein, the logical formal like $E = MC^2$, unlike mathematical formulas like DeMorgans - $(p.q) \equiv (-pv-q)$, has objective or intuitive content. Like Einstein, theistic panpsychic naturalised epistemologists pay little or not attention to mathematical formulas without intuitive potentiality. Einstein evolution from theistic panpsychic naturalised epistemology is clear. He moved from panpsychic background, discarded the certainty of mathematics and then to science. According to him;

Science is the attempt to make the chaotic diversity of our experience corresponds to a logically uniform system of thought. In this system, single experiences must be correlated with the theoretic structure in such a way that the resulting coordination is unique and convincing" (Albert, 1953).

Again he says that;

Science searches for relations which are thought to exist independently of the searching individual... such concepts are not necessarily supposed to correspond to any objects in the outside world. However, all scientific

statements and laws have one characteristic in common: they are 'true' or 'false'.

He warned against expressing emotions in building up its coherent system. In a theistic panpsychic tone, he says, "for the scientist, there is only one 'being', but no wishing no valuing, no good, no evil – in short, no goal..." Einsteinism evolved from understanding nature to equation.

Theistic panpsychic inquirers in Igbo and Yoruba of Nigeria, Akan of Ghana and the Bantu of East, central and Southern Africa adhere to theistic panpsychism as primary sources of, scientific and medical therapies and, the contingent equations of science as the secondary sources. The naturalized epistemology is subject to different modes of applications ranging from the medical, the gravitational and radioactive phenomena to hearing and cognitive development. It is fundamental and basic epistemology because it is the primary sources of herbal, musical, gravitational and radioactive elements or forces and words or languages for naturalized cognitive science in the field of medical science, in explanation of lightening and thunder and in the learning and knowledge acquisition techniques. In all these, the inquirer uses modal elements like God, gods, forces instead of electron, neutron, photons, etc. He uses designators like $a_1, a_2, a_3, b_1, b_2, b_3, c_1, c_2, c_3$, and or predicates like R_1, R_2, R_3, \dots and speaks in terms of conjunction (\cdot), disjunction (\vee), implication (\supset) and material equivalence (\equiv) without much emphasis on equations. All this, is of course, subject to the laws of identity, contradiction and excluded middle.

There is a tendency to describe this form of inquiry as anti-science, even when I have no pretension to treat it as science. It is not astrology, theosophy, spiritualism, clairvoyance and occultism either. It is the primacy of mother-nature as the primary giver of all explanations about universe, objects (animate and inanimate) and man. Theistic panpsychic naturalized epistemology is not a thought projection but thought application and understanding of the natural order of things. A theistic panpsychic inquirer is simply an empirical existent described by Karl Jaspers as *Dasein*, who lives in space and time and who in encompassing totality and freedom grasp the essential connections among eternal truths in mathematics and physics, space and time. He is a conscious partaker of possibilities. As a spirit *Geist*, he strives to embrace all of his experience, life, and culture within certain ideal totalities.⁶³ Hence, a theistic panpsychic epistemologist, like Albert Einstein as mode and substance and bundle of possibilities operate as *Dasein*, consciousness and *Geist* (spirit) in an encompassing transcendence, totality and freedom amidst other possibilities and necessities which the Igbo and the Bantu call forces. Theistic panpsychism is a transcending totality encompassing the *a priori* and *a posteriori*. It provides answers to moral, epistemological and metaphysical questions that arise from time to time.

REFERENCES

- Albert E (1905) *Relativity: the special and the general Theory* (Trans) R.W. Lawson (New York, Bonanza Books) P.155.
- Albert E (1953). "Geometry and Experience" in F. Feigl and M. Brodbeck (eds) *Reading in the Philosophy of Science* (New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts. Inc., 1953) p. 189.
- Albert E (1999). in *Time Person of the Century*, Dec. 31, 154: 27-22.
- Alex (1999). Orenstein. Op. Cit P. 271.
- Christian LJ (2004). *Philosophy and Introduction to the Art of Wondering* p. 375.
- Concise Roudledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy; Routledge Great Britain, 2000, 857.
- Descartes R (1968). *Principles of First Philosophy*. Trans by Anscombe, E., Geach, P. T. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd.
- Dukor M (1990). "God and Godlings in African Ontology" In *Indian Philosophical Quarterly* Vol. XVII. No. 1, January. Pp. 75-89 Theistic Panpsychism as a Metaphysical and Epistemological Concept is developed between pp. 80-86.
- Elwes RHM (1989). (Benedict De Spinoza) *Ethics, Including the Improvement of Understanding*, Prometheus books, U.S.A. 1989, p. 40.
- Ernest C (1953). *Substance and function and Einstein's Theory of Relativity* (Dover Publication Inc. P. 456.
- Eucke R (1980). *The fundamental Concept of Modern philosophic Thought* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1980) p. 234.
- Immanuel K (1945). in Hafstadter A. *Ibid.*, Also see Wedden. T. D. *Introduction to the Critique of Pure Reason*, (Oxford, Clarendon, Press, Emphasis is on Transcendental Deduction of Categories.
- James BW (1976). *Spinoza's Metaphysics* Van Corcum, Assen, Netherlands, p. 125.
- Jean RL (1997). Quoted by Paulose Mar GrEgorias "On Postmodernism" in *Journal of Indian Council of Philosophical Research* Vol. XIV, No. 3 May – August, p. 84.
- Leibniz GW (1973). *Philosophical Writing*, p. 179.
- Lewis J (1970). *History of Philosophy* (London: Hodder and Stroughton Ltd. 1970) p. 104.
- Panneerselvim S (1991). "Derrida and the Philosophy of Deconstruction" Discussion, *Indian Philosophy Quarterly*, July 1992 – January, 19: 3-256.
- Parker E, Buijo KM, Kalum BA (1996). *Placed Tempels, Bantu Philosophy (Introduction) in African Philosophy: A Classical Approach* (Ed (New Jersey, Prentice Hall 1996) p. 19.
- Paul E eds(1991), *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, p. 422.
- Quine VOW (1992). Quoted by Rinita, Majumda. "Dream Objects Reference and Naturalized Epistemology" in *Indian Philosophical Quarterly* April, 19(2): 78-79.
- Quine VOW (1999). Quoted by Alex, Orenstein. "Epistemology naturalized – nature know thyself" in *Philosophy and Basic*, Reading (ed) Nigel Warburton London, Routledge, P. 30.
- Russel B (1980). in Hafstadter, A. *Ibid.*, Also see Russel Bertrand, *The Problem of philosophy* (London, Oxford University Press. pp. 4 – 25.
- Saurabh S (2001). *Metaphysics of Unobservable in Metaphysics*, *Journal of Indian Council of Philosophy Research*, Vol. XVII, No.3, July/Sept 2001.
- Simpton JA (1989). (ed) *The Oxford English Dictionary*, Vol. vii. (Oxford University press, 1989) p. 880.
- Singh RP, Michael F (1992). "A Critique of Immanuel Kant" *Indian Philosophical Quarterly*, July. 14: 3-255.
- Solomon RC (1988). *Continental Philosophy Since 1950* (New York, Oxford University Press, p. 194.
- Spinoza E (1949). in Hafstadter, A. *Principles of Philosophy: A Simplified Summary and Instant Reference* P. 1. Also, see "Of the Nature and Origin of the Mind" in *Spinoza, Ethics* (New York, Hafner Press, pp. 79 – 126.
- Stumpf SE (1994). *Philosophy History and Problems* (U.S.A. McGraw-Hill, Inc. p. 256.S.