

NOT APRIORY KNOWLEDGE BUT KNOWLEDGE – FAITH. WORLD BY KANT AND WORLD BY HEGEL.

Dark matter and dark energy are lately receiving a lot of controversial judgments while overall leaving us with impossibility of the efforts to detect the events and essence of a new area of objective reality. At the first sight, this dilemma suggests segmentation of the Universe into the types of matter principally cognizable and the types that remain incognizable (probably for the time being?). So far all attempts are in vain, for a thing in itself is not yet a thing to us. In other words, Hegel establishes all kinds of the matter as a world of universal connection and cognoscibility in one case, and Kantian thing in it in another.

This is also supported by the fact that each of the worlds (visible Universe and dark matter and dark energy) is intrinsic to its single certainty, its single quality. These certainties with enormous variation of quality do not show sign of one another

Optimists would not rush to resolve the issue in Kant's favor, however these aspects should not be ignored by the science. Kant's important judgment is the difference between cognition of local reality available for trial, and universal definitions of a priory knowledge.

There is no matter, there is only faith placed in the existence of the matter, which emanates from alleged semblance or identity of the matter with its appearances. The idea of identification of «one» with «another» is wonderfully expressed in its absolute form in Hegel: «all rational is real, all real is rational». In our case: appearances of the matter are identical or similar to the matter itself or, in better words, by the appearance of the matter one can cognize the very matter. And this is the concept of cognoscibility of the world. Meanwhile, we are not rejecting the concept of world cognoscibility, but rather challenging the existing

forms of cognoscibility, when appearance of the matter allegedly reflects the matter per se. We see walls, structures, trees, people, city, stars, and the sky – anything, however these are not the matter but its appearance. Such an approach should not be treated as Berkeleianism or nonberkeleianism, we do not reject scientific materialism, and the question is to identify the problem emanated in association with the attempts to find a scientific faith in the process of cognition. Neither our approach to this Universe involves Kantianism – things in themselves for we acknowledge cognoscibility of the world as a comprehensive concept. We are not rejecting something beyond our consciousness and feelings. However, one has never ever seen the matter, seen is just its appearance. It is based on appearance properties of the matter, on their interaction and studies that we judge about the matter. We assert, for instance, existence of one world based on the oneness of appearance of the matter. But can it not be a non-continuity of the matter before its appearance in the external connection system. A good example is the existence of this Universe and dark matter and dark energy. Quality gradient among the worlds can be absolute and contacts among them impossible. When we state that «matter is nonexistent» we reject the faith or acknowledgement of a thing existing beyond our feelings and consciousness however not in the kind traditional philosophy is accustomed with. Matter can be disintegrated in the infinite worlds exposing the unity in the definite of a certain specific world. It is in the definite of a certain world, particular Universe that the oneness and holism are exposed, however they can be not available in the infinity as well. Attempting to capture infinity with the faith in infinity, one tries to «expand infinity» of his own world. Breaking out from local to infinite and only based on scientific belief one builds up the concept of matter.

Aristotle's extraordinary statesmanship and stroke of genius are astonishing, who at the dawn of antique philosophy emphasized the subjective truth that it can't lay claim to objectivity without. It was given in his time at the root of the problem. No pun intended, objective is initially subjective and not just by the form of it at that.

This article is not aiming to study the historical problem but it has to be noted that Aristotle in his works already showed highlights of terms and solutions for the scientific challenge. In *Metaphysics*, for example, Aristotle focuses on crucial aspects of faith: «but opinion is associated with faith (indeed, one who has an opinion, can't help but believe this opinion), meanwhile faith is not common in animals, but imagination is. Further, any opinion is accompanied by faith, while faith – by conviction and conviction by reasonable ground (logos)»[1, c. 431]. We believe, by Aristotle's essential to acknowledge that true opinion is faithlike knowledge in credibility of opinion. Wikipedia provides following connotation: «Faith is acknowledging something as truth without relying on facts or logic, just based on inner (subjective) confidence that requires no proof though sometimes finds them...»[2]. This definition is not formulated clearly: often times faith needs evidences and logic all the way through the boundaries of thesis: I believe since preposterous.

When a man has knowledge of something, he has faith, confidence in that whatever he knows is true. He can think about falsity of some knowledge however in this case he believes in the falsity of knowledge. Reason is based on faith, while faith – on reason.

To prove it is easy. As an example, let's take a piece of bread. A man, before taking a bite of it, sees and touches it, however not fully. A man is unable to have a full knowledge of something. To see fully what a piece of bread is composed of is not possible to him fundamentally. But the food intake process requires of him to trust his senses and reasons that tell him the bread is fine and eatable. A man should trust in what he eats relying on his senses and reason. Life cannot be executed without the faith. And it is at every step.

Science applies a concept of likelihood of events. It's a unity of definite and indefinite in the impact of events. This concept in a man's every day life is built upon the unity of knowledge and faith. As we have pointed out, a man is unable to have a full knowledge of a subject of his concentration; it provides a ground for the

faith in order to obtain a better subjective certainty for decision-making. A man takes a decision without a full knowledge and faith; incomplete knowledge forms a ground for confidence in success of his deeds or activities.

To further build up knowledge with faith for decision-making is subjective, for it relies on human faith, and it is objective as well as it is associated with objective likelihood. A fan of opportunities with different likelihoods.

Based on the developments in Aristotle's position it becomes clear that the very first knowledge—faith is faith in truth of one's opinion. Without accentuating this issue, it can be brought to apparently absurd thesis. It can appear that whatever a man does state, it is through faith in his opinion that he states the truth in the first instance. A man from this perspective can assert atheism or faith in God, duality or plurality of the reality, or any other thing but in each particular case he can believe in true nature of his statements. At this stage all the different controversial opinions are tantamount and equivalent. Even if any of these opinions relies on experience – practice. The practice itself is exposed to subjectivism for it is based on the faith in truth of practice as a criterion of truth. In other words, any opinion logically and practically rationalized, or the one built on other arguments and evidences cannot be absolutely objective and absolutely true. Between a man and objective or absolute truth there is subjectivity. In other words there comes a question whether our knowledge, any truth on the basis of its reality are relative?

This again brings to light our knowledge about matter that rather oddly is complimented by faith in its existence. Important in this aspect is truth: there is no matter, however we trust in the existence of matter. All we see is appearance of matter always and everywhere while matter itself was never seen without its appearance, it is nonexistent in its pure form, if only its infinite appearances across the Universe. Matter as a whole was never seen or sensed. We trust that all we can see everywhere is only an appearance of something, which we believe in as in the existing matter. However, the truth itself by the logic of our judgments carries a

moment of subjectivity. Hence absolute truth doesn't exist: we believe in absolute or objective truth, without this subjectivity any human judgment cannot be.

We not only can't see a matter without its appearance but also are doomed to believe in its existence. Based on simple and complicated logical operations, judgments, often coming from practice and experience, we conclude the existence of matter that is hidden from us «under» its appearances, never actually manifesting itself in its pure form. We can only trust that matter exists for we believe in its current existence. Of interest are J. Bruno's judgments though on a rather different aspect, we'll provide them for more textual clarification of our issue. In our view, Bruno's judgment is fair, when he notes that «no one can keep you from using the name of the matter your way as similarly many schools having own variety of values» [3, c. 1996]. J. Bruno for another aspect, relying on Aristotle's arguments, suggests: «Thus, as in art, in the infinite modification (if it was possible) of forms, they preserve within one and the same matter... same is in nature, in the process of infinite modification and adherence of forms one after another, there is always one and the same matter» [4, c. 1996]. In other words no matter what item we are going to take, «under» it there is one and the same matter. However to discover it as it is with sensory organs is impossible.

Analyzing Kant's ideas, Heisenberg underlines that experience never attaches any universality to our judgment. For instance, the sentence «Sun rises every morning» means that we do not know based on the past any exception from the rule and hence we believe it will rise again in the future. However, one can suggest an exception from the rule. If the judgment has a universal nature, i.e. if one can't think of any exception, it should be a priori» [5, c. 47]. We won't go into details about Kant's theory but we will underline an important idea that any concept that has a universal nature, within the aspect of our study is based on faith in this universality rather than on a priori. Universal nature of certain knowledge unlike Kant arises not on the basis of a priori knowledge but on the basis of faith in universal nature of concepts.

We shall turn to an aspect that was highlighted by Kant while introducing a prioriknowledge: infeasibility to understand experience-based universality. In fact it is not about them, it's about faith in what can't be embraced by mind based on experience. There is knowledge based on experience, practice and there is knowledge based on faith. They are interrelated.

The matter, as a universal concept, originates not only from experience but firstly from faith in its universality. Meanwhile, much tells us that matter is broken up into worlds or universes and no contact among them is possible due to absolute variation of their qualities and certainties[6,].

To that effect we have been introducing in scientific definition the involvement and noninvolvement categories[7]. Broken up worlds that matter is likely comprised of are not involved in each other's processes, they lack any interaction. In this sense lack of interaction among one another is similar to nonbeing. Nonbeing in one world is a being in another world, certainty of one world fails to find certainty of another.

Every step from local experience to universality there is a reason for new knowledge to arise based on faith as the way to refurbish an experimental knowledge.

On the other hand, we can apply world cognoscibility concept within the limits of this Universe however never with regard to the matter beyond it. Acknowledgingexistence of other worlds not involved in the process of this Universe is amount to the denial of their being, denial of the world cognoscibility concept beyond this Universe.Disruptiveness of matter leads to the state, when cognoscibility concept is real in one case while in other parts of the matter, using Immanuel Kant's definition, is void so that thing in itself will prevail.This Universe is thing in itself getting to be a thing to us but only in this Universe. The thesis will be refuted by successful attempts to find a certainty such as dark matter and dark energy, by discovery of their certainty by the certainty of this world.Each world

has its own certainty; interaction proves that certainties are available to be discovered.

Immanuel Kant's studies are given a new dynamic. Involvement and non-involvement categories are available everywhere in this world, in every item. In this Universe there are no things in themselves. In the processes of interaction, nearly always not quite fully covering the objects, there is something involved in them and something not involved. Consequently, part of the processes not involved in the interaction, appear as a non-being thing for another thing that has joined the interaction. A thing is not only an identity of a being and non-being by Hegel, but a disintegration of a process into those that are subject matter for another thing, and others are non-beings as those not involved in the interaction.

A question arises: is it not easier to decline the acknowledgment of the existence of other worlds if they appear as things in themselves identical to non-being?

Example with the dark matter and dark energy suggests that such worlds do exist and the concept is supported by natural scientists. If we take being and non-being in one thing for another thing within the interaction, it's just one aspect of a mobile controversy of the being and non-being in the things with dynamic edges. A thing having impact on another thing is causing a certain mobile matter non-matter relationship within it.

«There is no matter » – and it's not a metaphor for a more embossing expression of faith in a universal concept, which mind without faith cannot embrace.

There is no matter in its pure form, as something existing as a keystone. There is a contrary thesis: appearance of the matter is the matter. Then the matter doesn't serve as a keystone but is rather enshrined in infinite appearances. However throughout millennia Aristotle's thesis had been a leading concept of philosophic studies and the matter had to be viewed as universality that was and is expected to

be believed in. Experience without faith can't help mind to transition to understanding the universality.

At the same time it has to be noted that non-involvement of other worlds in the processes of this Universe, other parts of the interrupted matter in a form of many other worlds beyond contact with this world stands for the fact that the matter is real and not real as being. It constitutes identity of being and non-being in one and the same not just in Hegelian sense of word, it is also broken parts of being that are non-being for one another.

It occurs due to the fact that certainty of one world does not show the certainty of another. Among the worlds there can be an infinite variation of quality.

References

1. Aristotle. Metaphysics. Assays in 4 volumes. Volume 1.//Moscow: «Mysl» - C.431
2. ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/
3. J. Bruno, 1940 / World of Philosophy: Book for reading. In 2 V., Part 1. Original philosophic problems, definitions and concepts. – M.: Poliizdat, 1991. – C. 1996.
4. Ibid.
5. V. Heisenberg, Physics and Philosophy, M. Science 1989.
6. L. Hindilis, Multitude of Inhabited Worlds. Methodological aspects/Universe, astronomy, philosophy//Moscow State University Edition, 1988.
7. I. Asadullaev. Being – dissonance symphony/Dushanbe: Эп-граф, 2014. – C. 104-115,242-253. Internet, I. Asadullaev, Being – dissonance symphony:http://nbpublish.com/book_26315.html

8. Being and non-being of many universes. About new philosophic categories of involvement and non-involvement// VAK Journal “Politics and Society» №9, 2011. Socio-political Institute of Russian Academy of Science. Russian journal on social politics, pgs. 82-87.
9. Internet: Dark Energy, published admin in $\pi\tau.$, 2006-12-22 03:00; (interview with senior scientific assistant of Nuclear Research Institutes of Russian Academy of Sciences, Academician Valery Rubakov)
10. Avicenna. Essays, Volume 1//Dushanbe: Donish, 2005. – C. 183.
11. I. Asadullaev. Freedom generates hope//»Business and Politics» 15 August, 2006
12. Aristotle. Essays in 4 volumes. Moscow: «Mysl, V. 3, 1981. – C. 391.
13. B. Kusnetsov, Einstein. Life. Death. Immortality/ Moscow: “Nauka», 1972. – C. 133.
14. <http://www.centrasia.ru/newsA.php?st=1312833900>
15. Aristotle 1976 –Aristotle. Essays in 4 volumes. M., 1976.
16. AbuBaker Ar-Razy 1990 – AbuBaker Ar-Razy. Spiritual Medicine/Preamble. Dushanbe: Irfon, 1990.
17. Avicenna 2005 –Essays. Dushanbe: Donish, 2005.
18. Heisenberg 1990 –B. Heisenberg. Physics and Philosophy. Part and a whole: Translated from German. Moscow: Nauka. Chief editorship, Physics-Math. Literature, 1990.
19. Aristotle 1976 –Aristotle. Assays in 4 volumes. Moscow: Mysl, 1976
20. Bertram Russell. Wisdom of the West/M.: Publishing House «Respublika», 1998. – C. 226.
21. I. Prigozhyn, I. Stanger. Order from chaos: New dialog of human with nature: Translated from English/General edition of V. Arshinova, Y. Klimontovich and Y. Sachkov.- M.: Progress, 1986. —432 c.
22. Unity of material and ideal, and expansion of semblance (universal code of opposing proportional activity) / VAK Journal «Politics and Society» №3, 2011.

Institute for Socio-Political Researches of Russian Academy of Sciences. Russian journal on social politics.

23. E. Ilyenkov, *Dialectic Logics*. Politizdat, 1984. – C. 165.

24. Avicenna. *Collection of philosophical works*/Moscow: «Nauka», 1980. – C. 152.

25. M. Lomonosov. *Full collection of writings. Volume 3*/M. -L.: Publishing House of USSR Academy of Science, 1952. – C. 153.

26. Reflection, Darwin, Sufism. Universal law of reflecting proportion. /VAK Journal «Politics and Society» №12, 2012. Institute for Socio-political Studies of Russian Academy of Sciences. Russian journal on social politics. Pgs. 86-92.

27. K. Villy, V. Detye. *Biology*. – Moscow: Mir, 1975. – C. 220.

28. Aristotle. *Collection in 4 volumes. Volume 3*/ Moscow: «Mysl», - 1981. – C. 123.

29. Georg Wilhelm Fredrik Hegel. *Writings of various years in 2 volumes. Volume 2*// Moscow: «Mysl», 1971. – C. 104.

30. Internet: Dark energy, Published admin в пт., 2006-12-22 03:00; (Interview with lead scientific assistance of Nuclear Research Institute of RASc., Academician Valery Rubakov)

31. See. Universe, astronomy, philosophy // MSU, 1988.

32. L. Hindilis. *Multiple inhabited worlds. Methodological aspects* / Universe, Astronomy, Philosophy // MSU Publishing House, 1988. – C. 93.

33. V. I. Arshinov, Y.L. Klimontovich, Y.V. Sachkov. *Natural Science and Development: a dialog with the past, present and future (Post Scriptum)* // Ilya Prigozhin, Izabella Stengers. «Chaos from Order» / 1986. – C. 420, Internet.

34. V. Kusmin. *Concept of Consistency in K. Marx's theory and methodology* / M.: Politizdat, 1976. – C. 18-19.

35. N. Maiseyev. Vernadsky and modern times. – Questions of Philosophy. 1994. №4. c. 13.

36. V. F. Asmus. Metaphysics of Aristotle // Aristotle. Collection in 4 volumes. V.1 / M.: «Mysl», 1975. – C.34.

37. Mendeleev's Periodic System, General theory of interactions: www.b-i-o-n.ru/theory/atom/periodicheskaja-sistema-mendeleeva/.

38. D. I. Mendelejev. Collection of works, volume 2 / Publishing House of USSR Academy of Sciences, 1934. _ C. III.

39. Vladimir Zhdanov. Plasma in Space. Krugosvet (Around the Globe). Verified on 21 February 2009. Archived from original source on 22 August 2011. See: Wikipedia.

40. Mendelejev's Periodic System, General theory of interactions: www.b-i-o-n.ru/theory/atom/periodicheskaja-sistema-mendeleeva/.