

Argument Against Anthropocentric Attitude For Physical Existence Of Reality

Aadarsh Singh*

Abstract. The question of existence of reality beyond physical realm is an old question. This cannot be solved by science due to its nature and method of operation of science. Though some conclusions about it can be made logically and rationally. It has been showed that the claim made by materialists is equivalent to the one made by anthropocentric theists.

KEY WORDS

1. Metaphysics.
2. Anthropocentric.
3. Logic.
4. Epistemology.
5. Theism.

1. Introduction

Ever since the human brain is able to think it has questioned the nature around it in order to understand it better and also manipulated it for the good of its survival. The nature of questions being asked by men has gone ever since more and more abstract. One such branch of abstract enquiry is currently termed as philosophy. With the existence of senses, its natural that the environment around the individual is experienced in forms of qualia of senses. These qualia are rationalized and defined linguistically for the sake of logical abstract enquiries. Whatever abstract models that will be constructed to understand the nature around the individual, is limited from the beginning by this certain number of possible qualias that are experienced by individual and henceby their limited number of abstractions.

With the fixed number of fundamental qualias that an individual human can experience, the experience of environment is limited to the individual only in forms of those qualias. Hence it is typical to mistake these limited experience on the exposure to nature as the nature itself. There is no reason for as to why nature as a whole is all that we can experience through our senses.

2. Empirical Evidence and Reality

The world around us is experienced by our limited number of senses and hence any knowledge that we gather about the world, by building models is based on these data from the senses. Whatever the senses can interact with, we think of the world as that. So, our reality of world is limited to what our empirical faculties tell us. Though humanity has extended this empirical limitation to building abstract models, about the world around us, with the properties that are beyond the grasp of our empirical faculties, the ultimate test of models are empirical evidences. In the end, the best we can do is increase the sensitivity of our senses via instruments and experience the nature at different sensitivity scale.

*Aadarsh Singh is a research scholar of physics at IISc

2.1. *Problem of understanding nature with models*—Building abstract models about the environment around us has taken humanity to where it is now. The models built are abstract and can be put into variety of situations and see how it behaves. This property of model allows us to predict where the thrown rock will land i.e., what the empirical faculties will record for the nature around us. This abstraction of environment is very practical and useful but it has its problems. One such problem is that there can always be built more than one abstract model with each agreeing to the data given by the empirical faculties. But as logic says the nature that we empirically experience, is not more than one hence there has to be only one true abstract model hence the models have to disagree with each other for some properties under some conditions. But we can always build abstract models such that the difference in properties is out of limit of empirical faculties and hence denying the possibility of getting a valid empirical contradiction. Thus making the abstract model of nature ambiguous.

2.2. *Other challenges with abstraction of reality*—The knowledge and understanding of world is what the main stream of STEM field is concerned about. Whatever the knowledge that we gain is done by abstraction, symbolization and representation of nature and its constituents. There is also an old problem of relation between object and its representation as shown by Bradley and Russell. The word is not the thing is the problem that comes by abstraction of nature as pointed out by J.Krishnamurthi Ji. The abstract model is not the thing that it is an abstraction of. It is not even the empirical reality that we experience through qualia. So the abstract model, though useful, cannot be declared as the reality.

2.3. *Imposition of anthropocentric attitude on reality*—Nowadays it is widely accepted, consciously or unconsciously, that the nature is the way it is abstractly modeled. As explained earlier, there can be certain qualities or properties of nature which are beyond the grasp of our domain of qualia due to a limited number of senses hence cannot be modeled thus leading to a false picture of reality. Though there are several religion that claims world after death or before birth but the nature of those world is exactly the same as this world hence agreeing to this limitedly experienced world as the reality. The nature of God is also studied and explored within these anthropocentric concepts and ideas. This presupposition that whatever we can experience is all that there is to reality is as anthropocentric as the models which put human existence as the central issue for the existence of universe. This does not mean we should deny the information and qualias from abstract models and physical senses respectively rather it just says that there is no reason for the reality to be limited to what we define as physical or sensorial or empirical. Physical sciences has already shown there are dimensions that are beyond the reach of our senses such as fourth dimension but still it is something that can be thought about, due to nature of our senses, and modeled. No matter how far we develop, there will always be uncertainty even in the most certain of knowledge.

2.4. *Endnotes*—This is a discussion of Bradley and Russell on relation between things,¹ this is a reference to a book where Russell has stated Bradley's finding on relation,² this is a reference to a discussion site where J. Krishnamurthi ji explains "the word is not the thing",³

3. Conclusion

We have accepted the anthropocentric reality as the reality. Sometimes some of us say this is subjective and the objective reality is different but we believe in this anthropocentric reality

unconsciously. The reality from pure objective lens seems logically impossible to describe and apart from that whatever subjective reality is described or experienced, it is always limited and not complete. The anthropocentric attitude for physical existence of reality supports egoism and gives comfort and security to ego and hence is widely and easily accepted even by the most sceptical of us. Anything as something cannot experience something which not-something can and hence any abstraction made by it is blind to specific properties due to lack of qualia for that property or its consequence.

Notes and References

¹ Perovic, Katarina, "Bradley's Regress", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.),

² Russell, B., Oliver Wendell Holmes Collection (Library of Congress). (1914). Our knowledge of the external world as a field for scientific method in philosophy. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co.

³ Krishnamurthi, Discussion in "The word prevents actual perception." <https://jkrishnamurthi.org/content/chapter-24-word-prevents-actual-perception>