

## 'TRANSREALITY' PROJECT

(A Disclosure on Super-ecumenicity with a Strong Flavor of Scholasticism and Delirium)

by Sergey V. Deriugin and Andrey N. Naumov

Sergey V. Deriugin and Andrey N. Naumov are scholars at the Soviet Academy of Social Sciences, Institute for the Study of Atheism and Religion in Moscow. Sergey Deriugin was born in 1954 and graduated from Moscow State University and completed his graduate studies at the Institute of the International Labor Movement of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. He is the author of about 60 booklets and articles among which is also "Aspects of Dialogue Between the Faithful and the Atheist," OPREE, Vol. IX, No. 5 (September 1989). Andrey Naumov, born 1958 graduated from the Moscow State Institute of International Relations of the Foreign Ministry and is now completing his graduate studies at the Institute of the International Labor Movement of the Academy of Sciences USSR. He worked as a deputy chief of a department in the Foreign Ministry of the USSR and is the author of about ten articles.

Truth is stranger than fiction.(proverb)

Dear Reader,

Have you ever seen a troll, a ghost or a dragon? No? And none of your acquaintances have? And you suppose that on these grounds you may make a conclusion that nothing of the sort can exist? Let us disagree with you, though none of us or our friends has seen them either. We would like to explain our point to you.

As it is well known, such highly developed sciences as mathematics or physics are gradually moving beyond the horizon of everyday life. Using more and more abstract terms these, as well as a number of other branches of science, are successfully performing operations on the notions, are creating harmonious logical systems and are thus penetrating deeper into thickets of the inconceivable. Nobody can find his/her bearings on this specific ground or even enter these jungles without passing a course of special training. An average person's brains are filled chock full with reflection of her/his environment that is perceived by imperfect organs of sense. One's training is inseparably linked with a special kind of brainwashing, with the process of knocking off quite a portion of common sense out of one's head. All reflexes put in us by Mother Nature thanks to the process of survival of the fittest are aimed at living in an inhospitable environment. Such heritage that humankind got from our ancestors permitted us to become a predominant species. However, this legacy cannot provide any other kind of supremacy besides a biological one. Overstepping the limits of everyday, visible world, a person is to give a substantial part of his/her thinking instincts which are useless or even harmful to any attempts to describe something that cannot be directly observed and expressed in words.

The above-mentioned branches of science had gotten over the barrier of obviousness long ago and now are erecting logical constructions showing to earlier social sciences a general direction in which to go and some interesting methods of constructing.

It is considered that philosophy has its "main question": the problem of correlation between MATTER and IDEA (spirit, soul). They say that the question has its other side, that is a controversy about cognizability of the world. Two points were at issue long before Karl Marx was born, but hitherto no final solutions are found.

Since the debates do not seem to move towards the grand finale, it is high time to verify the correctness of even raising the two-fold "question." The subject under consideration expands and embraces the quarrel about the primacy of MATTER or IDEA, i.e. the groundwork of hostility between contemporary materialism and idealism, between Marxism and religion.

Both sprouting from one root, they branched off at some stage and declared each other to be a delusion and a personification of evil. Thus, religion and idealism as a whole were regarded as an instrument of the class enemy and an opium for a people. In its turn materialism and Marxism in particular were labelled as a sinful, godless doctrine, the devil's crafty design. At present, the gulf of enmity between the two creeds is very deep and there are no signs of intention to fill it. One can only mention a mutual consent to carry out a dialogue without any changes in basic dogmata. No doubt that this endeavor could be the first step towards bridging the gulf, but it will never provide a necessary level of relations. Such dialogue takes for granted the difference between the underlying principles of the parties. Main disagreements are not being removed, but simply suppressed, so that relations stay insincere and the whole undertaking looks like an armistice. And, as we know, such tolerance is always fraught with its antipode. But the story could also take a different direction. In this case, the continuation of the dialogue could be a kind of super-ecumenical process. The meaning of the fundamental notion of Marxism--MATTER--has been explained to us for a long time, and in principle, comprehension was achieved. Yet, our instructors have not found time for proper explanation of what they mean by "IDEA." It would be too vulgar to consider IDEA to be human thought; if this were the case, religion would be doomed to make room for flourishing Marxism, but the reverse is actually the case. IDEA cannot be reduced to thoughts of a supreme being looking, for example, like a respected, mighty elder. The essence of the notion is, using Marxist terminology, an indispensable, determined notion of objective reality, which is given to us in our sensations and is independent of our consciousness. This means that IDEA is a set of laws or the law-governed motion of MATTER.

Replacement of term IDEA by the notion "conformity with objective laws" is suggested in a vast majority of texts we have explored. And what is more, in quite a few cases "God" is explained by the same phrase.

One group of people declares that MATTER is boundless and indestructible, so there is no doubt that its primacy is a proven fact. Another groups rejects both such arguments as

well as the conclusion and asserts that the spirit is eternal and boundless, therefore primal. For the most part, when one recognizes that these are antagonistic positions discussion ends or develops into wrangling. We will go no further.

Every statement, whether right or wrong (similar to a joke and a tale), contains a kernel of truth. Therefore, both parties, in a sense, are right. If MATTER does not disappear or appears from nowhere, neither does the "objective laws of its motion." Therefore, neither of the two can claim primacy. IDEA, that governs MATTER is embodied in the latter term itself, being an integral part of the notion, because there can be no MATTER without motion according to objective laws of self-development, without its IDEA. Otherwise, such "MATTER" would be an incorrect usage of the definition. The same applies to IDEA: objective laws which are alienated from MATTER that precedes it and consequently are not its sequel would mean nothing. MATTER and IDEA are no more than inextricably mutually linked different sides of a single phenomenon. Looking at the above-mentioned argument from this angle conjures up another well-known dispute, what comes first, a chicken or an egg? These two arguments are very much similar in shape, pithiness and--what is most significant--observable results.

Thus, a primacy of matter (or an egg), as much as the contrary, is a mere assumption. This, in itself, is not a vice or a criminal case because all of science or religion, and generally speaking, every logical system rests on more or less non-contradictory complex of assumptions, which, in mathematics, bear the name of an axiom (an ancient Greek notion). It is characteristic that an axiom does not require proof because of its obviousness. (Remember also the same in Roman law: *perspicua vera non sunt probanda*). But what shall we do when two axioms contradict each other? Here the most interesting part of the story begins.

Any assumption or axiom is correct within the framework of particular conditions dictated by the subject under consideration. Hence, every axiom is not an absolute truth of what the adherents of either materialism or idealism try to convince us and each other, but a relative one. Lobachevsky, Riemann and other geniuses knew this very well. Approaches are correct where they are applicable. An additional conclusion can be drawn: if the subject of consideration is so broad that it includes all sets of conditions, which applies to these two "isms," neither of the two is acceptable. It is unimportant for our reasoning to know under what concrete condition is each of these systems to be used. To discover an indissoluble unity of the opposites is quite enough here. This unity means the existence of contradiction, which is being constantly settled and reproduced, due to which the entire formation is being developed.

The absolutizing of one side, building a one-sided system and attempting to manifest it as a general-purpose, main method of thinking is an apt description of old illness, dogmatism. Both currents are to be treated for it.

There are no true scientific, reasonable grounds at the bottom of the conflict between the two "isms." The main reason for their hostile relations are conflicting political interests of

people, a question of power. The so-called "main question" is solved in spite of chimerical hopes of the squabblers to win in this age-long battle.

Meanwhile, another questions has been raised: what is the phenomenon, constituted by MATTER and IDEA in the aggregate? What is being developed as a result of interaction of the two? Here we run into a notional problem, which in their own way a number of branches of science have solved long ago. Having overstepped the limits of ordinary life, being unable to reduce new complex notions to old, simple words, the sciences gave up such attempts and began putting agreed meaning in words. That is why, for example, color and charmed quirks in Russian and many similar word combinations in other languages appeared. Though it sounds outrageous, the obstacle to further progress was eliminated. We can use the same method is our reasoning.

Let the megaphenomenon, consisting of MATTER and IDEA, be called BEING. This notion embraces everything existing in the universe, everything we can and cannot feel, all MATTER together with all connected IDEAS.

Can we cognit this BEING?--another side of the settled question asks. In order to solve the dilemma of cognizability of the world a few specifications are needed. Who is the self, the subject of cognition? What methods will the self use? Must it be exclusively a human self? What period of time does the subject have for cognition? What is the world, the universe? What is, strictly speaking, a cognition? These limitations outline sets of conditions within which the answer can be "yes" or "no." A unity of the sets of conditions, under which a simple answer is possible, raises the problem to a logical level, where the answer is "yes and no" or "neither yes, nor no." Now we see that the second side of the "main question" also deals with assumptions, which have no absolute meaning and are admissable only within definite limits.

Each side of the "main question" has a very specific bounds of a simple answer, but on the whole, both situations are very much similar. Reaching a definite level of consideration it embraces all sets of conditions, where the answer is possible. At this level, MATTER and IDEA are and are not prime; the world is and is not cognizable simultaneously. These are maximally attainable abstractions within the framework of deeply egocentric (anthropocentric) mentality, which conform to the maximal attainable level of consideration. This level we have defined as BEING, which is an all-embracing (from the human point of view) notion. At this level, with respect to this mega-sets of conditions, the two questions may be asked only with a few specifications. In other words, they are not permissible in the usual shape of a categorical alternative.

Having gotten away from one absolute, didn't we run up against another one? Every absolute is a relative one, of course, except for dogmatists. Any absolute point which is reached is to be overcome by changing of mentality; that is why dogmatists are clustered around these points.

How high or final can be the theoretical level of abstraction generated by today's normal human consciousness? An untrained person is unable to digest a number of abstract

notions though different researchers (of the same species) are successfully operating with them. Consequently, the incomprehension of some notion for one's brain cannot be an argument for or against its usefulness. As to the negative reaction of an individual or even of a vast majority of the population, it indicates an initial untapped mental process. (It was stated above that the legacy of abstraction is a relative one and depends exclusively on the conditions of its application.) However, even knowledgeable priests have too much human consciousness to penetrate the horizon; they can only see what lies in front of them.

What can a person know about what he/she calls "everything," "world," "universe," "existence," and so on? Actually, only what she/he has already come to know about it. So in these and other limitless words he/she inserts very limited meaning.

What can a creature born and raised in a square world say about space and in what words? How would the creature's neighbors and households react to these fancies? Obviously, at some moment of "raving" a mad doctor may be sent for. Mankind has already overstepped this stage and has submitted an idea of multi-dimensional space though even those who deal with it do not fully comprehend it. Yet, as to unreality i.e., something that we cannot feel either directly or in a technologically-mediated way, it is believed that there is nothing to talk about. Having said "A" we declare that to say "B" and etc., is senseless. But is it so?

The dilemma of primacy (again!) of existence or non-existence was on the agenda at ancient times and to date the situation is very similar in regard to MATTER and IDEA. The problem is solvable if we take advantage of the twice-used method and in this case a very interesting picture comes to light.

Existence, which in this context coincides with our term BEING, though it has a different flavor, confronts non-existence. Let us call its analogue NON-BEING in order not to confuse the two structures of argumentation. Substance of this new notion gets into collision with a natural human wish to touch an object of investigation (it doesn't matter if it's a rattle, a cloud or anything else) because one of the object's names is "absence." It is impossible to imagine even one example of the term's content due to the fact that human consciousness belongs to BEING and cannot reflect anything else but BEING's phenomena. (An exception may be the moment of transition from BEING into NON-BEING of what no knowledgeable person can hand down to anybody who remains here.) The grasping reflex is to be restrained in this case as do mathematicians in the process of operating with indeterminate forms or magnitudes not having physical meaning (note again: relative to BEING). Scholasticism? Why not? It is possible that it, as a method of cognition which at one time has done much for development of scientific logic, simply outstripped its time.

Now, being armed with a method, usually cursed by contemporary social sciences, let's try to overstep the limits of BEING in order not to enter the NON-BEING--for this there is still time--but to take up a position of an outside observer. On the one hand, there is no reason to suppose that at this stage of reasoning humankind has reached absolute notions.

Difficult to understand BEING and almost unintelligible NON-BEING are absolute for HOMO who exists within strictly determined living conditions. This creature feels something is wrong with the visible part of the world and all that is beyond her/his reason she/he defines in one notion. The average person does not need to investigate the structure and laws of the beyond, as it does not contribute to his/her well-being. The picture is quite different for the hypothetical SAPIENS-outsider. Considered from this angle, the two terms are relative ones, and a new perception of the beyond takes place.

On the other hand, it is obvious that BEING and NON-BEING do not concur with each other. Differently, there would not be any appearance, disappearance or modification (as a simultaneous appearance and disappearance). In other words, there would not be any motion in BEING. This situation is impossible because motion is an inherent component of both sides of BEING. Inextricably linked to each other, BEING and NON-BEING are closely interwoven, overlapped and have common and specific areas. None of the two may be absolutized or reduced to another.

Characteristically, even ordinary consciousness that functions and passes on experience only within the framework of BEING is able to perceive the processes of interaction of the two phenomena. In a sense, this confirms the presence of the common area, just where the interaction takes place.

Now BEING and NON-BEING appear before us not only as intertwined formations but also as parts of a contradiction. In the process of its settling and reproduction, the unity of the two exists. Again, we find ourselves speaking about sides of broader abstraction which cannot be reduced as a whole neither to BEING nor to NON-BEING. This is logical enough, if human logic is applicable here at all.

Let us name this super-unity, for example, SUPER-BEING. This way we fill the gulf between eastern and western philosophies, which solve this problem of primacy in opposite modes. At this level of abstraction, as we have stated above, the intellectual experiment is made by a "superior mind" of a superhuman-outsider. Though such mind is situated inside us (perhaps, temporarily), it does its utmost to become free of the heavy burden of BEING trying to overstep the limits set by the bio-component of the human being and to grasp the much bigger volume than our surroundings.

The higher the level of abstraction, the more conditional specifications are required for solving primacy dilemmas. For example, what is reason? Is our type of reason the sole one? Which are the two sides of NON-BEING, and how do they interact with the BEING's aspects? And so forth and so forth. Notions and questions of BEING--three-dimensional--surfaces are to suffer more substantial transmutations to fit the situation.

We have obtained some kind of hierarchy in which a sign of logical law is discerned: every phenomenon, being a contradictory unity of two or more sides, is itself a component of a higher unity.

Since we have a toe-hold for our further argumentation, we may suppose that even SUPER-BEING is not an absolute level. Consequently, it must have another phenomenon to interact with as a counterbalance. Only in the process of interaction can SUPER-BEING exist itself and engender a new unity. Throwing away the usual meaning of the words we obtain SUPER-BEING and QUEERNESS as the two sides of THIS. Again, there are no grounds for supposing that we have reached the paramount abstraction, so THIS can interact with, say, ANOTHER and form SOMETHING. We should stop at this stage because we have reached such a distant point that the most interesting issues for further research have been left behind.

No doubt that an attentive reader, whom the authors count on, has noticed the proximity of the terms "existence" and "NON-BEING." Don't they contradict each other and our logical structure?

A contradiction is inherent in any word combination because every word reflects natural human surroundings, given to us in our sensations, in a very approximate and relative way. In this case, however, the conflict reaches an inadmissible degree and clarification is needed. "Existence" as well as a host of its synonyms (presence, being, reality and so on) and their derivatives was born long ago. The ancient notions were rough-hewn by science but are still fastened on obviousness, i.e. possibility of reflection by the consciousness of an average or normal bio-social creature. BEING, having usurped almost all words, leaves no terms for description of anything else but the specific BEING-area and an area of interacting with NON-BEING, or to express it more accurately, with the whole beyond. The imbalance of terms reflects a widespread point of view that there is nothing besides BEING and NON-BEING is its part. Thus the non-tangible specific sphere of NON-BEING is rejected. There are objective grounds for it: normal BEING-creature is unable to feel anything but BEING and can perceive only the interactive part of the beyond, which to some extent coincides with our home-surface. Remember the two-dimensional creature, which has huge problems with understanding or even the description of wherefrom something has fallen to the surface or where it has disappeared to, being unaware of the third dimension (or the fourth if time is included).

In order to restore the beyond's rights let us continue the redistribution of terms from BEING, and fill them with an additional meaning, that is necessary for operating outside our three-dimensional surface.

Therefore, BEING and NON-BEING (QUEERNESS, ANOTHER and so on) are equally existent. It sounds outrageous but not much more strange than "non-dimensional number," "irrational," or "imaginary quantity." Besides, we have come to an understanding that the inability of some people to comprehend an idea does not testify against its correctness or usefulness for cognition. Similarly, non-recognition of a phenomenon does not make it non-existent in old and new meanings. (Rather the opposite is the case: if one has not mentioned a car one has more opportunities to testify to its existence.) Natural-scientific researchers meet with something everyday, that was not "given to us in our sensations" yesterday, yet nobody believes that this "something" came into existence only today. There is no noble philosophical contradiction on hand

here, but rather the consequence of negligent use of words. On the one hand, MATTER exists independently of our consciousness, but on the other hand, it must be given to us in our sensations, namely conscious awareness. However, this awkward definition of MATTER corroborates an artificiality of separation of the two interdependent features.

"Existence" in its new meaning embraces everything that takes place (one more BEING's notion!) independently of our consciousness and sensations--neither direct nor indirect ones. This conflicts with the contemporary conception of science and of its experimental basis as formulated by Francis Bacon. It also conflicts with current materialism on the whole, but it cannot be regarded as a tragedy for anybody, except, of course, professors of vulgar Marxism, for whom the means of cognition became more valuable (in every sense) than the cognition itself. Materialism, as soon as it is on an experimental basis of science and not on absolute methods is useful only at definite stages of civilizational progress.

A contiguous problem arises together with building a model of the world's structure. It becomes necessary to determine relations between BEING, the beyond, and IDEA in the narrow sense of the word, and the human spirit, which dares to comprehend something unreal for the human being.

On the face of it, our consciousness cannot reflect anything with which it does not intersect on one surface. It reverts us to the problem of cognizability of the world, where the world embraces not only its visible, real parts, but also its unreal components. Can we, the BEING creatures, cognit or even describe something sealed off from us with an insurmountable wall? Should we deal with something that is practically isolated from us, and consequently where we cannot penetrate and where there is nothing of material interest to us?

Yet, is a corporal or sensuous penetration into an object a compulsory condition of its research? Evidently, it is not. Within BEING all processes form a very complex system. This systematic character of BEING allows us to research unachievable objects by perceiving disturbances taking place in our environment, no matter what we study, an electron or the Craboid nebula. As was already mentioned, BEING and NON-BEING have a common area, that is a sphere of integration of the two interacting systems. Any motion in this sphere causes some changes in visible processes and an outside impulse becomes perceivable, of course, if such an impulse is regarded as a theoretically conceivable one.

SUPER-BEING, which has a common area with QUEERNESS also cannot be explicated without taking into account the interaction. Both subsystems of THIS have their processes disturbed by the co-subsystem and as far as BEING is an integral part of SUPER-BEING (and further - of THIS and SOMETHING), there are a lot of different signs of the beyond in our surface. Since our home processes can be disturbed from outside, definite practical interests are connected with unrealities.

Overstepping the boundaries of BEING allows us to define a position of human reason (or spirit) in the structure of BEING. As our reason is able to move in outside spheres we can assume that it is located next to the intersection of the surfaces. We should note that the fact of our argumentation itself in a sense conflicts with the above statement. Consciousness of the authors and of the respected reader is a plain BEING phenomenon and cannot penetrate into the beyond. Haven't we done it already? As we used to say, yes and no. It is not our conscious that dares to leave BEING; it is our intelligence; it is a higher reason. Intelligence comes from the conscious, the lower reason and negates it. As we can see, reason is not a homogenous formation: it has a part that gravitates to the biological components of the human (HOMO-STRUCTURE) and a part connected with the second part of the name of our species (SAPIENS-STRUCTURE). HOMO-STRUCTURE destines one to operate with the visible, perceivable objects being incapable of abstract thinking. Not only is the human provided with such reason, but so are other representatives of the fauna. Different species and different organisms have different degrees of development of reason, but it is said that the human being is more clever than any other animal. This statement does not differentiate higher reason from the lower one but gives the total sum. Yet, we cannot declare that the HOMO-STRUCTURE is more complex than a dog's or a dolphin's lower reason.

Intelligence, the child of the conscious, strives for purification of anthropocentric dogmata, forming a new, very sharp contradiction, this time within our reason. Now we see that signs of interaction between our surface and the beyond can be found not only in our surroundings but even inside the human being who is a subsystem of BEING. Higher reason, the carrier of which--and perhaps not the fittest one--is the human being, gets free from the pressure of obviousness and practical usefulness with enormous poignancy. Sometimes intelligence becomes even hostile to lower reason and to its carriers (suicide, heroism and so on). We can observe the sensations we experience in the process of argumentation

when we balance on the verge of madness as an additional confirmation of the sharpness of the conflict between the two levels of reason. When one tries to research the beyond using one's two-fold reason, its lower part begins to riot--a very unpleasant thing.

Getting back to BEING we now comprehend it as a visible part of the iceberg. Now we can look at the human being from this new viewpoint. This specific, even unique phenomenon appears before us as a carrier of higher reason, a spiritual creature. Since the human being is situated next to the intersecting area, she/he is very susceptible to the beyond's impulses. Besides, as the conversation turned to our inside, we must note that we feel it directly and keenly. Hence, a human being, his/her spirit or soul appears to be the perfect starting point for cognition of the outside world through self-cognition. (Here religion is a bit nearer to truth than a vulgar branch of Marxism.) The partial inclusion in BEING causes a specific character of the human being as an object and subject of investigation and self-investigation.

Human intelligence and her/his subjectivity are to be distinguished. The latter one, being an element of spirituality is a result of collision of the human being with herself/himself.

Subjectivity expresses the wealth of the interior world where the human being lives most privately, leaning upon himself/herself, self-perfecting and developing her/his intelligence. Within this interior world a person designs his/her life, his/her behavior and from it he/she derives his/her fortitude and in it the human being starts realizing his/her internal potencies.

Spiritual life serves to other people as a demonstration of human existence and the value of her/his life, proves an existence of her/his personality. Personality, as a display of spirit, is situated over human psychophysical nature and has some independence from BEING.

Being situated next to the intersection of the world's surfaces, the human being is standing on the border between temporality and transtemporality. (Time sometimes is regarded as a product of realization of causation, so it can be said that every causal relationship generates its own time. Consequently, on other surfaces, where the processes and phenomena differ greatly from those of BEING, there must be quite different causation and other understandings of time. For BEING-creature it seems to be not a time, but its absence, an eternity.) Human soul is subordinated to specific laws that exist in the sphere of integration and the psychophysiological part is governing almost exclusively by the usual BEING-order. The soul does not submit to "IDEAS," such as the laws of conservation of energy and MATTER, of deterioration and entropy.

Realization of the transcendence of the world gives birth to transcendent thinking. This thinking is a limitless one and gradually envelops all the superinfinite. Once appeared in BEING such intelligence is doomed to exist.

It is erroneous to regard a structure of cognition as a simple sum of its parts; the structure is very complex. The bedrock of it is realization of the value of the beyond and attempts to penetrate into it. The cognitional sphere includes objectivity and subjectivity, the combination of which gives a number of diverse modulations. Knowledge and feelings of a person are different from intelligence; higher reason, expressed in the human being is superior to the human. In this view, we may assume that intelligence, the human being's soul, cannot be reduced to MATTER, to objective laws of its motion or to BEING, in spite of the terms used for description of these notions.

The authors can well imagine how this article can anger certain people, whose biological interests as well as those built upon biological interests, are affected by all this argumentation. This natural reaction expresses the conflict between the two levels of reason in personified way: conscious-reason pays back to higher reason in its own currency. An animal side of thinking has a very solid base for its stable reproduction until a definite stage of social progress is reached.

One may say there is nothing new in the article, and it is one big commonplace. Why not? Everything said or written after the ancient Greek philosophy fails to contain any absolutely new ideas. All contemporary philosophy is a process and result of development of old approaches or investigation of old problems from a new angle.

We have struggled forward far beyond the horizon, where only lunatics and geniuses can get without particular strain. Even these first steps were very difficult because psyches are good, perhaps too good, at defending themselves and their receptacles. Lower reason demands either to forget everything one has read, or not to take it seriously. We do not desire to go off our heads and we wish nobody ill, so let's regard all the argumentation as a prank, a game, to which we invite all lively or at least not very dull people.