

# Philosophical Investigation of Intellectuals and their Environment

Lelisa Daniel/ Lelisa  
Department of Civics and Ethical Studies  
Dambi Dollo University  
Dambi Dollo, Ethiopia

**Abstract:-** ‘Philosophy’ is a controversial term which can be refuted and defended within intellectuals whether or not it is an issue of academic/scientific sphere. Most dominantly among the intellectual discourses of science is simply an attempt of examining the secret of nature and social beliefs. However, when we look from object to subject introspectively one can find the philosophical questions of philosophy itself, intellectual, and environment. Explicitly it raise questions such as: what is philosophy, who is ‘intellectual’, what is environment, what is the standard to be called intellectual, and how the ‘object’/‘environment’/‘body’ appears to such person. Providing an explanatory response to those questions involve careful analysis and/or enquiry of both philosophy and science itself.

To do so it starts from analyzing of antiphilosophical consideration of philosophy as an ‘activity’ rather than science. While following in such perspective it is our duty to show that it is possible to apply the claim of ‘activity’ upon philosophy itself. The result will be: philosophy of philosophy, philosophy of mind and philosophy of nature. This further involves dismantling of those concepts in which metaphysics, epistemology and axiology appear from branches of philosophy. Thus, holistic philosophy becomes burst itself to show the interconnection between philosophy and antiphilosophy.

Such holistic philosophy is derived from positive psychology in which both negativity and positivity are handled equally. In holism everything is seen through itself not a means to other end. Therefore, axiological test of ethics through anthropocentrism and nonanthropocentrism will appear in order to clarify our understanding of what is: man, nature, environment and wellbeing.

**Keywords:-** Philosophy, Intellectuals, Environment, Science, Truth, Value

## I. INTRODUCTION

It is a wonderful act to engage on the activity of knowing one’s own nature; and it is only those living beings (biological organisms) by nature that are capable to do so [1, 2].<sup>1</sup> Though there are (at least) two essential requirements in the process of knowing one’s own ‘environment’/‘nature’ (that is, the subject/knower and object/known), it is really a difficult task to identify what/who subject and object of knowledge are [3]<sup>2</sup>.

In order to deeply inquire these two issues (the subject and object of knowledge) I wish to start from examining the nature of “Environment”/“nature” itself firstly. And then latter on I would like to examine the subject of knowledge (whether it is human’s body or mind). This is useful since it is impossible for anyone to talks and knows anything else without the ‘existence’ of what he/she wants to talks/knows. The reason is that in a way to do ‘science’ we should start from the object of discourse rather than from oneself or the subject. On such manner the position of holistic existence will be implemented since intellectuals and environment becomes an object of investigation to the subject philosophy. Therefore, it is important or necessary to answer the questions what philosophy is, what is environment, who are intellectuals, and how such position appear in respect to its methodology.

The reason why holistic existence opted for such claim is that an enquiry of nature and its method is derived from the claim of holism in which philosophy by its essence becomes the study of the (‘whole’) general principles. On the other side it is still impossible to deny the complex existing subject in which the position of (individual) existentialism worried/cried for it [4]. When the two extreme positions holism and existentialism reconciled, the result will be

<sup>1</sup> It was Aristotle who announced ‘wonder’ as the beginning of philosophy, whereas Ludwig Wittgenstein was the first philosopher who called “philosophy as an ‘activity’ of language analysis” (see Ludwig Wittgenstein’s *Tractatus* 4.112 (Wittgenstein 1918, p.14, (quoted from the eBook which is prepared by Matthew Stapleton 2007, 10<sup>th</sup> edition)), and Rudolf Carnap’s “On the Character of Philosophical Problems” (Carnap 1934, p. 56)).

<sup>2</sup> As Miller puts it epistemological dualism is one among the three well known positions of John Locke (cited in E. Miller and J. Jensen 2009, p.109).

holistic-existence without any doubt, and such reconciliation is also called intellectualization. As a result, holistic existence concerns with the union of object (environment) and the subject (whether it is a person or mind).

It is human being in which such unity is fully expressed even though this assumption is open to the Cartesian ‘mind-body’ problem.<sup>3</sup> Because, human being is a complex nature while we consider the physiological and biological impacts of a person himself/herself upon his/her mind (intellect). This in turn useful to reduces the subject of knowledge into an intellect in order to identify intellectuals from any other non-intellectual individuals.

While reducing the primary subject of knowledge into intellect (i.e. the inner subject of individual), it is necessary to clarify what does it means to say such inner subject. Because as soon as we try to know environment (nature/body), then the existence of individual’s inner self must be reconsidered. However, every individual person has unique self (will) which can be investigated only from subjective perspective (first person perspective)<sup>4</sup> [5]. Therefore, one should not undermine the role of individual existentialism in this context.

Accordingly, in the process of intellectualization it is compulsory for us to raises the ontological, epistemological and ethical/axiological aspects since these are parallel to environment, intellect, and the norms/values of their actions with their respective manners. These three aspects makes philosophy as a trilogy in which philosophy itself, intellectuals and environment will be assessed. At the end, philosophy of philosophy (meta-philosophy), philosophy of mind, and philosophy of nature become the scopes that will be investigated.

This does not mean that the other branches of philosophy are excluded. But rather those other branches of philosophy (particularly, aesthetics and logic) are linked to them in implicit manner. For example, while talking about what is to be represented to the mind it is compulsory to touch the nature of art and how the mind constructed or connected to it [6]<sup>5</sup>. This enforced itself to discuss what kind

of methodological discourses (the logic behind) which will be employed on these issues.

## II. PROBLEMS OF THE INVESTIGATION

### A. War on Philosophy

Some people believe that philosophy is useless in academic and scientific perspectives. Such assumption is too strong while engaging on enquiry of nature (environment) and discourses in intellectual arenas. The standing premise of such assumption is that philosophy, by its character, is a kind of soft enquiry that thought peoples something opposite (an opposite enquiry), and such position is called negative philosophy [7].<sup>6</sup>

Others (from positive outlook) provide different criteria to exclude philosophy from academic spheres. Among them ‘positive philosophy’ of Auguste Comte, ‘verifiability and meaningfulness’ of logical positivism, and ‘falsification’ of Popper’s criterion of demarcation biased philosophy as ‘pseudoscientific activity’ [8, 9, 10].<sup>7</sup> This tradition is also called analytic philosophy which reduced philosophy into “an *activity* of language analysis” as Wittgenstein depicted it.

Though both positive outlook (intellectual/scientific thinkers) and negative outlook (ordinary individuals) were attacked philosophy, it is still standing to keep them from fall. Philosophy is tolerant to any position since it can be played between ideal positive world of the mind and the practical negative life of material world. It is due to such contradiction between idea and matter in which philosophy suffered a lot, and need further investigation of its own problem.

However, when we critically assess the core causes of such problem of philosophy, it rests on at least two points. These are: (a) the word ‘philosophy’ itself and (b) the nature of truth. Why philosophy is problem to itself, and how truth is challenge to philosophy? I believe that it lies on the meaning/connotation of philosophy, and the complexity of understanding the concept truth. This involves analyzing

<sup>3</sup> Miller clearly explained how Cartesian dualism is open to reconciling mind with body if both mind and matter were really two different substances (Miller and Jensen 2009, pp.95- 96).

<sup>4</sup> Bruce J. MacLennan’s article of “Philosophia Naturalis Rediviva: Natural Philosophy for the Twenty-First Century” which is (reprinted from: *Philosophies* 2018, 3, 28, doi:10.3390/philosophies3040028) explicitly explained how first-person-perspective studies are useful while engaging on human nature (B.J. MacLennan, 25 October 2018, in M.J. Schroeder 2019, pp. 8 – 9).

<sup>5</sup> Schopenhauer’s claim on “the world as representation” is clearly explained by Kathleen M. Higgins in Robert C. Solomon and Kathleen M. Higgins (eds.), *The Age of German Idealism. Routledge History of Philosophy*. Vol.VI. 1993, chapter 10, pp.335- 338.

<sup>6</sup> On the discussion of positive and negative Philosophy see Herbert Marcuse’s “Reason and Revolution.” Part II, “The Rise of Social Theory. The Foundations of Positivism and the Rise of Sociology.” Under the (1) “Positive and Negative Philosophy.” Found in *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Or available on: [www.marxists.org/reference/archive/marcuse/reason/ch02-2.htm](http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/marcuse/reason/ch02-2.htm).

<sup>7</sup> a) Auguste Comte’s *Positive Philosophy* is freely translated by Harriet Martineau, and with introduction by Frederic Harrison, Vol.1 of the three volumes. Botoche Book, Kitchener, 2000, pp. 7 – 55.

b) Gustav Bergmann, “Logical Positivism, Language, and the Reconstruction of Metaphysics.” Reprinted (in a truncated form) from *Rivista Critica di Storia della Filosofia*, VIII (1953), 453 – 81, by the permission of the author and the publisher, *La Nuova Italia Editrice*, Florence.

Bergmann’s position on positivism is also found on Carnap’s “On the Character of Philosophic Problems” (Carnap 1934, p. 63)

philosophy (the logic of philosophy) and truth (whether truth is objective environment and its ideas or the subjective desire/will of a person). Therefore, questions related to intellectuals and their environments must be addressed explicitly since they are backed by philosophical issues of ontology, epistemology, ethics/axiology and methodology (logic).

Addressing those questions is useful for providing the practical response to the allegations of those who undermine the role of philosophy in academic and intellectual arenas. This is further helpful to show the controversies that reside in this context, and let see the following points as among the disputes against philosophy.

- a) Some peoples argued that “philosophy makes human psychopathic/crazy or mad.” As a result of this they look philosophers as crazy individuals when they are going to meet with such peoples.
- b) Secondly, they considered philosophy as antireligious discipline, and hence it makes a person atheist and God’s enemy.
- c) Studying professional philosophy does not have good opportunity on making thicker bread since it simply deals with finding reality, truth, justice, and so on.

Contrary to these allegations I wish to say that those pseudo intellectuals’ assumption on the role of philosophy is mistaken to see the word ‘**philosophy**’ itself as a paradox. I believe that it is better for them if they remind the word ‘**intellectual**’ itself is only understood and examined through philosophy of mind. This in turn helps to provide the response against the above allegations based upon the following points. These are:

- a) If philosophy makes a person crazy, then can we call all previous philosophers as mentally retarded peoples? And can I call myself as a crazy person while I am writing (speaking) on this moment? Or can we call studying philosophy as the sole cause of all other crazy individuals without studying philosophy? To me it is completely wrong.
- b) For the second allegation there are also atheist individuals without studying philosophy. Contrary to such claim philosophy can also encourages a person to be strong theist through pragmatic approach (for example, metaphysical and epistemological idealisms).
- c) Against the third argument I said that finding thicker bread without in a just and altruistic manner is meaningless. Because, the duty of intellectuals are to solve the problem of their community rather than creating problems upon their community unlike those political realist unjust actors. While my neighbors suffered it is shame for me to feel better since I am sentient by nature.

#### *B. Supplementary Questions and Organization of the Investigation*

In addition to controversies on philosophy the following questions are those that must be answered within this investigation. Some of those questions are:

- Who are intellectuals, and how they are identified/differentiated from any other ordinary peoples?

What are the causes/standards behind to be called an intellectual?

- What is environment?
- What kind(s) of method(s) can be used on the philosophical discourses between intellectuals and their environment?
- What sorts of moral/axiological issues that challenges intellectuals from their society, and how they can overcome/solve ethical problems?
- What philosophy is, and how truth is understood while analyzing etymological defining of the word philosophy?

In order to provide reasonable and evidence-based response/answers for these questions I attempt to organize them into five steps.

The first step must be philosophy. This means that it starts from philosophy of philosophy and the character of truth. The reason is that it is better if we apply the claim that “philosophy is an activity” unto philosophy itself. Moreover, clarifying the connotation and denotation on the subject of investigation (i.e. philosophy) appears to me more convincing than the positions of anti-philosophy.

Secondly, it moves to philosophical interpretation of environment in which philosophy of nature will inevitably occur. This is linked to ontological aspects of the investigation since it is endowed and/or masked by the disjunction whether existence or knowing comes first. I choose to precede the former one due to its naturalistic aspect in which I attempt to see it by another language of “environment.”

Third, philosophy of mind will appear to set the standards that put limit between intellectuals and non-intellectuals. And then axiological discourses on philosophy of nature appear in the form of dispute between anthropocentric and non-anthropocentric views.

Fourth, I will discuss what kind of methodologies (literatures on the methods) will be used since it is derived from the way the subject and objects of the investigation will be assessed. Hence, the logic of philosophy will be uncovered on this stage. Because, it is a juncture on which intellectuals and their environment comes together or put apart from one another.

Lastly, I will come with finding and solutions for the crises that may happen from the coming together or put apart between intellectuals and environment. Encouraging positive psychology and deep ecology are the two dominant positions that weigh, and help as the bridles of horse to the force (of love) which resides within us.

### **III. PHILOSOPHY, ENVIRONMENT, AND INTELLECTUALS**

#### *A. What Philosophy is? Love and Wisdom*

Provision of defining the investigated problem is useful for setting the boundary in which the study will be carried out. Particularly, when someone put an ordinary English

word and added the word ‘philosophy’ to it, then it might be opposite to its former meaning or makes philosophy of ... Such problems might be linked to either ambiguity or vagueness, and therefore, need to be redefined. However, in case of the word ‘philosophy’ the situation is little-bit complex and difficult [11]<sup>8</sup>.

Although the word philosophy appears to be a general concept, it is not simple to provide a single/universal common definition of it because of two reasons. First, it has both the intensional and extensional **meanings**, and deals with both cognitively and emotively meaningful assertions [12]<sup>9</sup>. In its connotative aspect philosophy intends to symbolize the nature of reality with full and holistic circular continuous movement. In its denotative manner it encompasses existence and worldviews of both a wider and strict senses of philosophers (peoples). The second reason traced back to its historical origin and etymological definition of the word philosophy. As professional philosophy began in ancient Greek, then its etymology derived from the two Greek words ‘**philia**’ and ‘**Sophia**’ which means that “**love**” and “**wisdom**” with their respective manners. Therefore, it is possible to call “**the love of wisdom**” as the common and traditional defining of philosophy.<sup>10</sup>

But when we come to the analysis/explanation of what love is and what is wisdom, then we move beyond those words in themselves and still forced to dismantle them into their subject-object linkage. In such a way love is something within and its subject is completely ego. Uncovering the ego’s nature in love is purely subjective and hidden (i.e. emotive meaning). Accordingly, I love myself on the first though I do not know what I want to love and my lover. This shows that love is irrational desire that involves critical enquiry of: emotion/desires (psychological), its physiological natural inclinations (biological), and its impact (which is logical).

In contrary to love (something within) there is something outer which is called wisdom. Even though there is no single definien for wisdom, providing the practical appearance of abstract knowledge/Sophia/theoretical wisdom shows that the word wisdom denotes something object. But such object is inseparable from the subject. This indicates that wisdom is something the already designed and completed art and/or craft-like which is found both within and outside an ego. It follows that nature as a whole is art-like-wisdom in realities, and therefore, love is a force that connects things (those realities/wisdoms) together.

As wisdom involves wonder which is linked personal motives to aware his/her own love, then philosophy (seeking wisdom) can be redefined in terms of the union of those connotations of love and denotation of wisdom. Therefore, we can redefine philosophy as a rational, critical and general

<sup>8</sup> Alex Rosenberg 2005, p.1.

<sup>9</sup> For more details see Hurley and Watson 2018, Part I/Chapter 2, pp. 81-100.

<sup>10</sup> This etymological meaning of philosophy is quoted in Miller and Jensen 2009, p.5.

analysis of realities of *something within* (ego/love) and *something out-there* (wisdom). Such definition involves further the general investigations on the number/quantities of realities and how those realities related to each other.

On such manner there are two different truths/realities within philosophy. These are ‘love’ and ‘wisdom’. Love is an abstract noun that denotes the subject lover, the beloved object, and an act (verb) loving which resides within an inner individual/single person. Love is a ‘lively force’ which can able to move/guides an individual without his/her interest. Thus, identifying my inner subject (lover) and its object (beloved) involves further inquiry on finding ‘prestigious’/‘wellbeing’ in existence to show the rationality of love [13].<sup>11</sup>

Among those valuable prestigious (worthwhile) assumptions in existence are knowledge (wisdom), money, power, and sex are some of them. As we are dealing with analyzing the historic-etymological meaning of philosophy, then wisdom becomes the beloved/object of love in this context.

➤ *What is wisdom (Greek word ‘Sophia’)?*

The Greek word “Sophia” is linked to theoretical wisdom. But in its ordinary English usage “wisdom” is something concrete/practical aspect of knowledge. As wisdom is defined with something art-like-craft which can be designed, then it encompasses both pre-existing and existing realities which can be given to the intellect/mind by ‘giver’ [14].<sup>12</sup>

Wisdom as a pre-existing reality is ontological in character and purely involves metaphysical speculation. It is something ‘uncaused cause’ and substratum/substance of the other existing things. But wisdom as an existing reality becomes cosmological in character and purely perceptible in space-time related objects. This is being the case that the former wisdom is absolutely innate in intellect whereas the latter one is phenomenal given/perception.

From such analysis of wisdom we can possible to call that knowledge is an appearance of ‘truth’ to the intellect. Such truth is either an ‘Absolute Truth’ of pre-existing wisdom or the changing truth of visible/existing wisdom. Hence, a person is said to be called ‘intellectual’ when he/she is able to responds to the ‘lover’ subject within him/her with the beloved object of outside him/her to the wisdom.

<sup>11</sup> The traditional understanding of philosophy as ‘the love of wisdom’ is criticized and reversed to “the wisdom of love” by Cikovacki (C. Cicovacki, “Philosophy as the Wisdom of Love.” Published in *Ethics and Bioethics* (in Central Europe), 2017, 7(1 – 2), 75 – 84), De Gruyer publisher, 2017.

<sup>12</sup> For Friedrich Nietzsche the world as a whole is an art that shows “the will to power” (Friedrick Nietzsche (1967), *The Will to Power*. Book III: *Principles of A New Evaluation*, Section IV, “The Will to Power as Art,” in 796 (1885 – 1886), p.419).

Such condition becomes fulfillment of knowledge at individual level. Because, reconciling one's own will with one's own situation is the most difficult task of understanding. This means that one should understand life negatively, and responded to it positively. On this way we can possibly define intellectuals as those peoples who can able to respond positively to the inner truth of lover with those outer situations of their environment.

Therefore, philosophy can be understood through the existence of two realities from its etymological perspective. These are: (i) the reality of inner (the thing within) and (ii) the reality of wisdom (the thing outside). Due to such dual realities, philosophy, as such can be seen through the union of existentialism (individual existentialism) and holism (holistic existence). Such reconciliation is compulsory since individual existentialism will be useful to **uncover** the subjective truth of something within (i.e. love) whereas holistic existence used to **discover** reality of something outer (wisdom) [of both pre-existing and existing realities].

#### B. The Philosophical Interpretation of Environment and Intellectuals

The dictionary defining of "environment" is simply denotes the plural 'surroundings.' From this we infer that 'environment' is "the overall surroundings of individual whether it is natural, social, biological, or any other facts where a person can live in/on" since there are the subject (a 'thing' surrounded) by those object that surrounds. While we analyze the term 'environment' into its parts, then we found the plural noun "environs" and the suffix "-ment". Its root word 'environs' means the area surrounding a place. So, in philosophy the subject 'love' becomes the thing surrounded by the object 'wisdom'.

However, the force within [reality of love] or ego is still different from intellect (nous). Love is completely irrational and unconscious of itself as well as its environment/surrounding. Consequently, there are (at least) three different things within the philosophical discourse of intellectuals and their environment. These are: (a) environment [wisdom/holistic existence], (b) the ego [irrational force of love] and (c) intellect [the 'I' or a rational thinking thing/nous].

All of those realities can be fully appeared through a single existing human being. The reason is that human being is endowed with matter (which is similar to external environment), biological locomotion, emotion, and intellect. Accordingly, understanding the notion of environment through realities of something within with something the outer is used to reduce the primary subject of knowledge into an '**I'/intellect**.

It is at this point in which intellectuals are differentiated from non-intellectuals, and useful to examine types of 'environment' within the sphere of philosophy. On such a way 'environment' can be seen/understood as any non-I. Thus, environment encompasses the three forms of non-I, and it includes: (i) the two realities of things (love-wisdom), (ii) social environment, and (iii) the other I's.

As I have discussed (i) on how love and wisdom as pre-existing or existing realities occur, it is important to select what nature/body is in this stage. This involves an enquiry of philosophy of nature/natural philosophy/philosophy of body as its sole sub-point of investigation.

An investigation of nature involves critical assessment of physical, psychological and neurological aspects of human nature since man is endowed with body, intellect and emotion/heart. The three states of matter (i.e. solid, liquid and gases) can be fully seen through man. Thus, an inquiry of human nature must be inclusive in philosophical investigation which is an aspect of ethics. Such whatness of man's nature (what man is) raises an axiological question whether or not the body of man is distinct from other nature and can be evaluated more than them.

- *Philosophical Perspectives on Human Nature and its Implication for being to be called an Intellectual*
- *Essentialism (Greek Tradition of Subordination): Rationality as the Concern*

From the ancient Greek tradition of Plato and Aristotle human being is identified from any other nature or animal by having reason. For this group human being is a rational animal, and rationality is the key concern. Accordingly, the point of intellectual discussion of man is seen through his intellect rather than body and/or emotion [15].

Surprisingly, both of them agreed that using one's own reason is the gift of nature and being an intellectual is predetermined by nature. However, this does not mean that they attempted to explain the human soul (psyche) in similar ways. For example, Plato tried to put apart the body and soul in different places; and he claimed that the body is mortal, whereas, the soul is immortal (which exists in the world of Being/Idea)<sup>13</sup>.

From this claim, Platonic psychology tried to classify the human soul into three kinds; and this classification determines the person's character and the work he/she should perform in his utopia (just society)<sup>14</sup>. In the *Myth of the Metal* Plato claimed that the human soul is made up of either from "gold, silver, or iron and/or bronze." It follows that those people in which their soul made from gold become intellectuals or what he called "Philosopher King" since such peoples are guided by the virtue of wisdom and reason (intellect) rather than sensory experience. It follows that intellectuals are those people who defend intellectualism/rationalism from Platonic perspective.

Contrary to Plato's rationalism Aristotle claimed that intellectuals are those people who defend empiricism; and

<sup>13</sup> For more details on Plato's metaphysics and epistemology see Robert Heinaman, Chapter 10 (cited in C.C.W. Taylor 1997, p. 330). *From the Beginning to Plato. Routledge History of Philosophy*. Vol. I. Routledge: Taylor and Francis, 1997.

<sup>14</sup> Christopher Rowe, "Plato: Aesthetics and Psychology" (cited in C.C.W. Taylor 1997, Chapter 12, p.392).

believe in the unity of body and soul (i.e. hylomorphism)<sup>15</sup>. Aristotle sees intellectuals via virtuous on science and morality (particularly, in intellectual virtues/speculation ('*sophia*' in Greek term) and practical virtues). Speculative virtues of science are simply those which involve presupposition or thought-experiment (for example, metaphysics/theoretical wisdom of pre-existing realities). On the other, practical virtues of science/ 'phronesis' includes politics (which is the master of all sciences and requires the supreme episteme), ethics (which concerns with eudaimonia), and rhetoric (which is the art of speech). Thus, he proposed that intellectuals are those who are wise and have natural capacity of being master over the slaves, and those are naturalists and understand nature [16].

Such tradition (hierarchical understanding human's potentiality of intellect) was also extended to German philosophers (to Kant and Hegel). In Eze's critique of Western raciology those two eighteenth century German raciological theorists and idealists believe that by nature some human races are intellectual while others unfit for such group [17]. Both Immanuel Kant and W.F. Hegel were the two proponents of raciological thought who claim that White races as superior than yellow, blacks, and red races.<sup>16</sup> Accordingly, they claim that non-white races lack the "gift of nature" and do not complete the evolution of humanity with their respective manners.

To me such praise and blame game on evaluation and division of mankind into groups from external/accidental perspective is equivalent with blaming nature as a whole. Of course, we could not deny the existence of some talented individuals, and such condition becomes chance to them/everyone. However, it is not simple to define human being with a simple word due to its paradoxical nature. For example, while we move across in different cultures we might encounter the exclusion of some group of peoples by calling them as 'cannibals' and 'evil-eye'.

In cannibalism (particularly within our culture) human being is assumed to be turned into hyena/other wild animal, and such cannibals can able live within foxes without any threat. The shocking testimony about this group is that they

<sup>15</sup> a) Aristotle's hylomorphism is explicitly shown by David Gallop in "Aristotle: Aesthetics and Philosophy of Mind" (cited in David Furley (1999). *From Aristotle to Augustine. Routledge History of Philosophy*. Vol. II, Chapter 3, p. 92). Aristotle's philosophy of mind and intellect are also elaborated in this section (pp. 90- 103).

b) Furthermore, Aristotle's natural teleology (naturalistic subordination of nature) is explained by Roger Crisp in chapter 4, "Aristotle: Ethics and Politics" (cited in David Furley 1999, pp. 126 - 127).

<sup>16</sup> This raciological thought of Kant and Hegel was expounded by Emmanuel Chukwudi Eze as a critique against their hierarchical understanding of human nature in "The Color of Reason: The Idea of "Race" in Kant's Anthropology" (cf. E.C. Eze (ed.), *Postcolonial African Philosophy. A Critical Reader*. Published in 1997, Part II, pp. 103 – 131).

have strong unconscious desire to eat human flesh rather than others. When I met those individuals who considered themselves as victims to evil-eyes, they suffered a lot and fought with invisible reptiles and wild animals. I wonder while I have seen such condition, and impressed the nature of mankind which is imposed on him without his will. This is the reason why I eager to examine Sartre's claim on "man's throwing into the world" without his will though I disagreed on his claim of freedom. Therefore, "neither either nor or" is the dictum that applies upon the relationship between man and his environment rather than Kierkegaard's "either...or..." that shows absolute individual's freedom.

- *Materialism (British Tradition of Equality): Right as the Concern*

Both Hobbes and Locke were the two contractarian British theorists on the nature of man. The focus of their point is that whether or not humans have personal/natural right in the state of nature. For them humans are both physically and mentally equal by nature since man is by nature endowed with right.

However, this does not mean that they have same agreed position on the human nature. For Thomas Hobbes egoism<sup>17</sup> (man is egoist) is the essence of humanity which sees man through his body (matter) [18]. On the other hand, John Locke defended the rationality view of essentialism though he departed from them by accepting the notion of equality. For Locke natural man has natural right to defend himself since such right stands on reason [19].<sup>18</sup>

As materialism reduced all things into matter and it sees life negatively, then it is open to the objection whether human subjects are equally selfish or rational. It is impossible to underline that all peoples have the desire to be egoist because of the prevalence of heroes who commit their lives for the goodness of their peoples. Moreover, it is not all peoples who are rational since the irrational force of love controls them. Therefore, generalizing the essence of humanity is mistaken, and it can be only examined from the first-person-perspective and the 'environment' that surrounds him/her.

- *The 'Willism' (German Tradition of 'freedom-controversy'): Existence as the concern*

Arthur Schopenhauer, Freidrick Nietzsche, and Jean Paul Sartre (from French) proposed the new view of human nature by claiming the "will". Schopenhauer was the originator of such view with its hard-deterministic perspective. For him human being is really guided and controlled by his will and such will is the will to live. It is

<sup>17</sup> Hobbes' egoism is also called "psychological egoism" and he sees humanity through brutality towards resource, dignity and war (see Hobbes's *Leviathan* (1951), pp.76 - 79).

<sup>18</sup> John Locke's account of natural man is fully appeared on his *Book II: Second Treatise*, Chapter 1, p. 101 (cited from I. Shapiro (ed.) 2003. *Rethinking the Western Tradition. The Two Treatises of the Government and A Letter Concerning Toleration*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003).

such a will that controls a person (i.e. his/her reason) rather than the reverse. Accordingly, the human reason itself is guided by such a 'will to live'. Hence, there is no such a thing as freedom at all since 'the will always will'.<sup>19</sup>

By borrowing Schopenhauer's 'will' Friedrich Nietzsche changed such direction of will from simple ordinary living to a super-living of the will to power.<sup>20</sup> Nietzschean approach to human nature defended the will to overpower oneself in order to be called a superman. Because, the true essence of such man's will to power is degraded by Greek tradition of essentialism/rationality, John Locke's claim of equal democracy, and Judeo-Christian tradition of faith. Therefore, to recover humanity it needs moving beyond what is traditionally accepted as good or evil/bad, and involves trans-valuation of values in order to be called a superman.<sup>21</sup>

In contrary to Schopenhauer's deterministic and Nietzsche's unequal claims of human nature Jean-Paul Sartre (from French) shifted the direction of will from live and power to freedom. To do so Sartre explained the notion of "being in-itself from being for itself"<sup>22</sup> to distinct his position from Schopenhauer. For him authentic/genuine life is living in accordance with 'being for itself' in order to show the freedom of the will [20]. Of course, knowing the will is really a first person enquiry though peoples attempted to show its direction in a way they prefer. In this context whether it is towards survive, power or freedom all proponents of 'will' undermines the role of reason to guide/move humanity. Thus, man's heart/emotion is the focus/scope that needs series assessment of this group among the parts of humanity.

- *Psychological Sexism (Freudian Psychoanalytic Tradition): Sex as the Concern of Life*

Freudian 'libido' or 'sex urge' becomes deals on sex since it is a force of unconscious drive instinct that primarily moves a person to sex as the concern of life.<sup>23</sup> According to this perspective all actions of human being points to fulfillment of unconscious desire for sex. Life is guided by sex in one way or another. Sigmund Freud's psychoanalytic position stands on such view since personality is totally controlled by id (unconscious part of mind) [21].

<sup>19</sup> Cited from Robert C. Solomon and Kathleen M. Higgins in *The Age of German Idealism. Routledge History of Philosophy*. Vol.VI, 1993, pp.341- 345.

<sup>20</sup> F. Nietzsche 1967, p.369.

<sup>21</sup> Summarized from Nietzsche's *The Will to Power*, Book Two/chapter one and two (pp. 85 – 156), and Book Four/Chapter one (pp. 457 – 509).

<sup>22</sup> Taken from Professor Spade (1995), *Jean-Paul Sartre's Being and Nothingness*. Copyright at Paul Vincent Spade, 1996. (Class Lecture Notes, Part I, pp. 73, 80, and Part II, p. 166 -167).

<sup>23</sup> Serge Stoleru explained how Freudian theory of sexual drives are linked to neuroimaging functions (Stoleru 2014, pp. 1 and 5, in *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, March 2014/Volume 8/Article 157), or uploaded on *ResearchGate* by Serge Stoleru on 16 August 2015.

Even though the prime focus of psychology in sex is pleasure, its purpose has reproduction in nature. But consideration of sex through fulfillment of desires undermines its reproductive life sustenance. Additionally, any individual should give priority on keeping his/her health to gain peaceful pleasure. For example, in a condition where everyone is victim to HIV/AIDS or any sexually transmitted disease, then it is better for a rational person to forget any pleasure from sex. I mean that it is possible to apply Richard Routley's "Last Man Argument" and rational choice theory upon the last man who is free from being positive HIV/AIDS within the condition of the world in which all other peoples are victims to HIV/AIDS positive. It is reasonable for this person to abandon sexual intercourse within such condition.

When we critically examine the above positions on human nature, then they are narrower rather than holistic. Each of them overly interpreted humanity the way that is curious to them. However, an explanation on whatness of human kind further involves ontological, epistemological and ethical/axiological investigations in order to come up with balanced (all inclusive) approach to body, intellect and heart. Likely, as living beings, intellectuals do not have any other unique biological, physiological, neurological and physical standards. They have the same body in which other individuals are endowed with ontologically, and they live on the same planet earth with the others.

Accordingly, we can infer that the ontological perspective of intellectuals is same with the other humans. But, the only impact is that to what extent their environment is friendly or unfriendly related. Thus, the more we are friendly related to environment the less we actualize our potential intellect. In contrary, the more harshly we are related to environment the more we attempt to actualize our potential intellect.

But such ontological interpretation of man is open to whether or not the human body and heart (emotion) are unique from any non-human's body and emotion. This is an axiological test to traditional ethical perspectives on human and non-human valuations. Any of the historical explanations of environmental ethics, animal right, land ethics, sustainability, feminism, deep ecology, etc., are attempted to re-examine the place of our 'value' within the universe.

#### IV. AXIOLOGICAL EVALUATIONS OF 'SUCH' ETHICS (MORALITY OF MAN'S BODY)

The starting question in here is this: Is human 'body' greater than the 'body' of other natures such as earth, animal, water, air, and so forth? In Western traditional ethical perspective the proper object of investigation of morality is determined in terms of the goodness/badness of man's welfares and actions. On this way, an action or the thing is considered be good if it produces happiness/pleasure whereas bad if its product is unhappiness/pain to human's welfares. Such type of moral claim is called consequential/teleological ethics.

The other positions deny the consequence of an action on determining morality by searching the essence of goodness in itself. Kant's 'good will', Plato's 'knowledge or the Form of Good', Judeo-Christian 'peace' in divine command ethics of god's will and virtue ethics grounded morality on reason and ought. This group sees morality as universal and objective that applies on anyone at any moment. Therefore, they are called deontological ethics.

Even though both consequentialism and deontological traditions differentiated on the proper object of morality, both of them agreed that only human being is the center (proper subject) of moral standing being. Descartes, Christianity, etc. are criticized as anthropocentric while examined through axiology.<sup>24</sup> Hence, within anthropocene era nonhuman nature and women suffered a lot by men [22].<sup>25</sup>

Nonanthropocentric viewers criticized anthropocentric on animal right, women's right, land and environmental degradation, biological beings, water, the whole nature/ecosystem, climate change and so on.<sup>26</sup> This leads to the rise of new branch of ethics (during 1970's) which is called applied ethics. Primarily, applied ethics, is concerns with a rational and critical analysis of 'specific-controversial' moral issues. Some of the sub-branches of applied ethics are: environmental ethics, animal ethics, developmental ethics, land ethics, business ethics, bio-medical ethics, feminist ethics, water ethics, and deep ecology. The general idea behind those ethics are the revival of Holocene since "climate change will make us global refugee"<sup>27</sup> within anthropocene.

As we see from *Project Syndicate* (Aug2, 2018) Jeffrey D. Sachs commented on *World's Opinion Page* by saying "Holocene was the geological age that started more than 10,000 years ago" on which human being does not put them as the sole center of moral standing. It covers the time before 500 A.D. Whereas anthropocene is a chronological in which man lives after 500 years and put human being as the sole moral standing being [23].<sup>28</sup> However, with the growth of anthropocentric world view human being began to suffer from the impact he has done on environment. One of such impact was the occurrence of climate change due to ozone

<sup>24</sup> Stephen M. Wheeler, "Sustainability in Community Development." Cited in Rhonda Philips and Robert H. Pitman (eds.), *An Introduction to Community Development*. Part IV, Chapter 23, pp. 339 – 349, (London and New York, Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group, 2009).

<sup>25</sup> Victoria Davion, "Ecofeminism." In Dale Jamieson (ed.), *A Companion to Environmental Philosophy*. Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2001, pp. 233 – 246.

<sup>26</sup> Stephen M. Wheeler, "Sustainability in Community Development." Cf. Rhonda Philips and Robert H. Pitman (eds.), 2009, p. 340.

<sup>27</sup> Jeffrey Sachs wrote on how we need a new politics that is related with non-anthropocentrism while he claimed "environment matters."

<sup>28</sup> [www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/climate-change-disaster-in-the-making-by-jeffrey-d-sachs-2018-08](http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/climate-change-disaster-in-the-making-by-jeffrey-d-sachs-2018-08). (Such comment of Jeffrey D. Sachs was also reported on see *Khaleej Times*, 2018 Report.).

layer depletion, global warming, acid rain, el Niño, la Nina, deforestation, nuclear war, animal experimentation, e-waste (electronic waste), population bomb, abortion, euthanasia, organ donation, inequality, aid, urbanization (the quality of economic growth without development), the impact of market on class division among community (profit maximization in business), homosexuality, sexual harassment in patriarchy (marginalization of women and minorities), infanticide and so on.

The accumulation of such environmental and natural destructions will lead to the rise of new question on whether or not the 'body' of human (in particular, man's 'body') is the similar or superior to the 'other bodies' in nature. Such axiological critique in turn leads to the raise of re-examining of the term 'human' in a new holistic dimension rather than its narrower rationality (or any of a single proponent) of human nature. Therefore, now the issue is reconsideration of the scopes (connotation and denotation) of what man, body, environment and nature are.

In Western Eurocentric and Judeo-Christian tradition human being is endowed with intellect/mind, body/matter and emotion/heart/spirit. Such man's aspects, in one place, encourage white peoples to construct anthropocentrism. From anthropocentric point of view everything in the nature (including women) are made for the welfare of man, and humanity (everything) is defined in human centered patriarchal model. Consequently, the overall nature and women are the property of men, and man can use his environment and everything within there as he wishes to do so.

Suddenly when tragedy happen on nature by environmental pollution and critical assessment of the word 'right' can be seen through women and animal, then the authority of man upon himself and his surrounding became a hot debate. The starting point of such controversy is Cartesian understanding of 'body'. Descartes defined 'body' or matter as an "extended thing" [24], and accordingly, man's body is similar with that of women's, animals', and material atoms in the world. Only his intellect makes him superior on women and other natures/environment.

In Cartesian dualism there is no difference between human body and the other natures since it is matter. Furthermore, mind is seen in having thinking, and then it is unique metaphysical transcendence. But the question is can we consider mind as the same with nature or distinct from nature? For example, when an author dies, his views/ideas in his book continue to exist within that book and read/taught by those who are living. In dualism human being is the union of mind and matter in which his ideas exist within that mind. Accordingly, when a person dies both his mind and matter including his ideas will lead to extinction. Indirectly, dualism faced an objection of solipsism since such claim is defended by solipsism.

In contrast to solipsism we are reading the views of the past philosophers (particularly, Platonic and Berkeley's idealisms) though those philosophers were passed away. This has at least the following two implications.

- First, mind is inclusive (identical with) in nature whereas it is not environment. This means that 'nature' is broad in scope and it encompasses matter, mind, and society.
- Second, ideas can exist independently of the subject, and thus, essentially transcendent. As the ideas of author continue to exist, then in a condition where all humans disappeared from the universe those ideas continue to exist eternally.

These implications tell us that the human/man's body is similar with matter (and/or environment). What are left with man are mind (without idea), body and emotion since ideas are independent from his ownership. If this is the case (ideas of man is not owned by him), then women and other animals are also similar with him. Therefore, within the anthropocene both man and nature suffered as a result of social environment (patriarchal and hierarchical values of social environment).

But what is social environment? Is it only human which is social by nature?

Within this context social environment is the interaction between consciousnesses of I and the other I's. In such explanation the social aspect of environment is very broad one since it involves examining into the socialization process, culture, language, belief, and norms or values of human beings in group. This can be studied under the second-order-study which is known as social philosophy/philosophy of social science – which involves an explanation and analysis of what philosophy is (as it is elaborated above) and what is social. It follows that the concept 'social' denotes anything that occurs with two or more in one place, and it fits for not only humans but also conforms to non-humans. However, in case of human society the situation is worse since a particular man is endowed with multiple natures (such as mind, body, emotions and other metaphysical beliefs).

When the natural and social environments come together or apart (detach) from each other's, then a sort of crises may/can occur. The environmental and social crises (or the natural crises) that occurs within anthropocene is the result of authority of man over women and nature in which man is valued for itself whereas women and non-humans became the means to the end of man. In feminist theory such value is called patriarchal value in which the oppression of women leads to the destruction of nature [25]<sup>29</sup>.

<sup>29</sup> Such critique against patriarchal value was explicated by ecofeminist approach on environment (Laila Fariha Zein and Adib Rifqi Setiawan, "General Overview of Ecofeminism." Uploaded on *ResearchGate* by Laila Fariha Zein on 28 August 2019).

Therefore, there must be a new kind of value that treats nature and its course as an end for itself rather than a means to the welfare of mankind alone. Such new kind of value is called holistic value which was developed by Arne Naess by calling it "deep ecology"<sup>30</sup> [26, 27]. The major aim of holistic value is that bringing the revival of Holocene spirit in which man and nature must be treated equally and friendly. Such revival of holism explicitly appeared in contemporary intellectual discourse through the concept 'sustainability' as the center of scientific enquiry [28].<sup>31</sup>

Thus, non-anthropocentric value should be encouraged, and the traditional anthropocentric subject-object dichotomy of ethical investigation must be re-examined. As soon as such subject-object dualism of hierarchical value is reexamined, then the whole humanity is fully gain acceptance from cognition, body, and emotion. This means that the four prestigious beloved (i.e. knowledge, power, money and sex) and aspects of holistic life in man (balancing reason, body and emotion) will be implemented through positive psychology.<sup>32</sup>

## V. LITERARY METHODOLOGICAL DISCOURSE OF THE INVESTIGATION

When we compare philosophy with science the former acts as a meta-science (knowing about knowing) because it is done by logic which concerns with the principles of thought/ideas. As a second-order-study epistemology and methodology are also known as the sciences of sciences since the core business of science is an inquiry of nature and society.

This does not mean that philosophy does not concern with an enquiry of nature like that of methodology. The philosophical investigation of 'nature' can be fully seen through human since it is only human being who wants to know his/her self, non-human creatures and metaphysical beings for the sake of knowing. In doing so he/she completely follow the first-person-perspective, and therefore, methodological individualism will take place.

In addition to this, there are also other peoples like him/her who want to know themselves and the other creatures. On this case the formation of knowledge at social level will appear as soon as two or more individuals come together. Such understanding on the creation of knowledge inevitably paves the chance to win for the position of social constructionist perspective on science of Knorr-Cetina, and leads to accept social epistemology of David Bloor's

<sup>30</sup> David Rosenberg, "Deep Ecology." Uploaded on *ResearchGate* by Rosenberg on 24 May 2019.

<sup>31</sup> Freya Mathews, "Deep Ecology." In Dale Jamieson (ed.), *A Companion to Environmental Philosophy*. Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2001, pp. 218 – 231.

<sup>32</sup> For more details on positive psychology and holistic notion of wellbeing see Huy P. Phan, Bing H. Ngu, and Matthew O. White 2021, p.2.

“sociology of scientific knowledge” [29].<sup>33</sup> Thus, Collin’s methodological relativism is the logic that weights more in this context.<sup>34</sup>

As methodological individualism and relativism are narrower in separation, then methodological holism attempted to replace on defending the primacy of society over individual. The main premise of methodological holism is the claim that “the whole is greater than the part”, and society is more powerful than an individual. Unlike such claim of holism the primary concern in individualism is on the freedom of a particular person and the emotive-rationality of the subject should not be undermined by societal oppressive world-views [30].<sup>35</sup> Yet the methodological discourses of the two positions are still unsatisfactory in light of philosophical investigation.

In linguistic analysis of the word ‘philosophy’ the words “love” and “wisdom” can be further examined through Karl Mannheim’s “unmasking method”<sup>36</sup>. Explicitly (originally) Gabor Kutrovaz used the (unmasking) method in context of science war. While we add the notion that ‘philosophy as an activity’ upon ‘science’ by using unmasking, then we explicate the word ‘science’ itself is originally used in Latin which means that “to know”. In philosophy the issue of knowing is purely seen through epistemology. Following such perspective Kutrovaz borrowed Ian Hacking’s quotation on Mannheim’s definition of “unmasking” as:

“A turn of mind which does not seek to refute, negate, or call in doubt certain ideas, but rather to *disintegrate* them, and that in such a way that the whole world outlook of a social stratum becomes disintegrated at the same time. We must pay attention, at this point, to the phenomenological distinction between “denying the truth” of an idea, and “determining the function” it exercises” [31].<sup>37</sup>

From such definition of unmasking one can infer that it is possible to apply/employs unmasking method on philosophy of philosophy (meta-philosophy). In doing so, it will lead to explication of ‘love’ which directly linked to individualism due to its first-person-perspective. Moreover, in disintegrating the word “wisdom” (in any of its type) inevitably leads to the acceptance of methodological holism since wisdom/truth/knowledge will occur between two or more individuals. Therefore, there must be holistic philosophy which deals on hybridization of holism with

individualism as an individual born out of two peoples (man and woman).

As a result, holistic individualism is the method which can be drawn from holistic philosophy. Because, as an individual cannot exist without the parts of his/her bodies and society, then society in turn can never continue to exist without individual. This analysis is, in turn, necessary/compulsory to save philosophy from its announcement of ‘death’ by meta-philosophers (philosophers of philosophy) [32].<sup>38</sup> Consequently, philosophy can able to raise and/or stand itself from such death and destroys its cemetery whether on its negative or positive outlooks.

## VI. CONCLUSION

To sum up, the debate on the philosophical investigation of intellectuals and their environment can touch every aspect of scientific and philosophical inquiry [33].<sup>39</sup> Primarily as philosophy is already reduced to an ‘activity’ instead of science by antiphilosophy group, then it leads itself to metaphilosophy/philosophy of philosophy. This is inferred while applying the word ‘activity’ unto philosophy and looked in careful analysis. Due to this, the philosophical explanation (analysis) of philosophy, intellectuals and environment can be seen broadly in metaphysical, epistemological, and axiological tests of metaethical perspectives.

Against the positions of antiphilosophy on the intellectual and scientific significance of philosophy, in this context one can never undermine the importance of philosophy. As the word ‘philosophy’ is seen through love and wisdom, then no one free from those concepts. Even if we claim to deny those concepts of ‘love and wisdom’, we are engaging on negative philosophy. While affirming those concepts, then we are engaging on holistic philosophy since love is purely known subjectively whereas wisdom can be grasped objectively. Thus, the existence-essence dichotomous dispute will be eliminated through positive psychology since both the existing subject and the objective reality of truth are inseparable.

Following such footsteps philosophy can able to deal with human as a subject in general and of intellectuals in particular to contend with antiphilosophy. However, in strict sense of the term this debate is the subject matter of philosophy of mind since it concerns with the nature, content, and extent of human’s intellect. This further invites the fields

<sup>33</sup> David Bloor, *Sociology of Scientific Knowledge*. Cited in Niiniluoto, M. Sintonen and I. Wolenski (eds.), *Handbook of Epistemology*, 919-962. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2004.

<sup>34</sup> Such epistemic controversy in science war is quoted in Kutrovaz 2005, p.19.

<sup>35</sup> For more on “Methodological Individualism Vs. Methodological Holism” (see Chris Wright 2020, or <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344722560>).

<sup>36</sup> G. Kutrovaz 2005, p.51

<sup>37</sup> All quoted definition of ‘unmasking’ is directly cited from Gabor Kutrovaz 2005, p.51.

<sup>38</sup> Stephen Hawking was a person who announced the death of philosophy in *The Grand Design* (2010, p.5). Cited in Callum D. Scott, “The Death of Philosophy: a response to Stephen Hawking.” Published online: 25 Oct 2013, in *South African Journal of Philosophy*.” Volume 31, 2012-Issue 2. Published online by: Taylor and Francis, 2013.

<sup>39</sup> L. Wittgenstein (1953), *Philosophical Investigations*. In *Philosophical Investigations* I/27. Translated by G.E.M Anscombe, First published in 1953, and second edition in 1958, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958.

of psychology, neurology and physiology. As a result, intellectuals are at the same time endowed with nature and intellect when they can be seen holistically.

Though philosophical assessment of intellectuals can be seen as equivalent with nature, this is needed to eliminate the notion of being owner/agent of 'ideas'. This means that as soon as intellectuals die, their ideas continue to persist within their book. Therefore, even if we all were disappeared from planet, then ideas are outside the agency of ... and transcendent. It is at this juncture on which holistic philosophy of non-anthropocentrism or deep ecology become winner in axiological discourse on moral agency.

At the end, we can possibly claim that holistic existence is the curious position on the philosophical investigation of intellectuals and their environment because of its holistic observation of reality. This is in turn derived from examining into what the whole and the part are within social science in order to get holistic philosophy [34].<sup>40</sup> Such holistic philosophy treats both positive and negative philosophies since they follow confirmation of truth and denial of untruth with their respective manners [35].<sup>41</sup> As the focus (logical) positivism highly stands for science, and the business of science is an inquiry of nature and society, then epistemology and methodology (logic) are also the sciences of sciences. And therefore, all of them come together on the issue of knowing in order to answer the questions what is known, who knows, how to know, for whom and what purpose is known, and their response to them is either confirmation or denial of truth.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. L. Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. Published in Vienna, 1918. (Available in the Project Gutenberg EBook of *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, and the eBook is prepared by Matthew Stapleton 2007, 10<sup>th</sup> edition).
- [2]. R. Carnap, "On the Character of Philosophic Problems." Trans. by W.M. Malisoff, and Reprinted from *Philosophy of Science*, I (1934), 5 – 19, by the permission of author and publisher, The Williams and Wilkins Company, Baltimore.
- [3]. L. E. Miller and J. Jensen, *Questions that Matter. An Invitation to Philosophy*. Sixth edition, University of Colorado; New York: McGraw-Hill, 2009.
- [4]. [4] S. Kierkegaard, *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*. Section II, chapter 2, "Subjective Truth, Inwardness; Truth is Subjectivity." Edited and translated by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong, 1992, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992).
- [5]. B. J. MacLennan, "Philosophia Naturalis Rediviva: Natural Philosophy for the Twenty-First Century." (Reprinted from: *Philosophies* 2018, 3, 28, doi:10.3390/philosophies3040028), (B.J. MacLennan, 25 October 2018, in M.J. Schroeder 2019). In G. Dodig-Crynkovic and M. J. Schroeder (eds.), *Contemporary Natural Philosophy and Philosophies – Part 1*. MDPI, 2019.
- [6]. R. C. Solomon and K. M. Higgins (eds.), *The Age of German Idealism*. Cited in G.H.R. Parkinson and S.G. Shanker (General editors), *Routledge History of Philosophy*. Vol.VI, 1993. Routledge: Taylor and Francis e-Library, 1993.
- [7]. H. Marcuse, "Reason and Revolution." Part II, "The Rise of Social Theory. The Foundations of Positivism and the Rise of Sociology." Under the (1) "Positive and Negative Philosophy." Quoted in *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Or available on: [www.marxists.org/reference/archive/marcuse/reason/ch\\_02-2.htm](http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/marcuse/reason/ch_02-2.htm).
- [8]. A. Comte, *The Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte*. Freely translated and condensed by Harriet Martineau, and with introduction by Frederic Harrison, Vol.1 of the three volumes. Botoche Book, Kitchener, 2000.
- [9]. J. Bergmann, "Logical Positivism, Language, and the Reconstruction of Metaphysics." Reprinted (in a truncated form) from *Rivista Critica di Storia della Filosofia*, VIII (1953), 453 – 81, by the permission of the author and the publisher, La Nuova Italia Editrice, Florence
- [10]. K.R. Popper, "Science as Falsification." Originally published in *Conjectures and Refutations* (1963). Available in electronic *Library Genesis*.
- [11]. A. Rosenberg, *Philosophy of Science. A Contemporary Introduction*. Second edition, London, Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group, 2005.
- [12]. P.J. Hurley and L. Watson, *A Concise Introduction to Logic*. Thirteenth edition, (U.S.A: Cengage Learning, 2018, 2015, 2012).
- [13]. C. Cicovacki, "Philosophy as the Wisdom of Love." Published in *Ethics and Bioethics* (in Central Europe), 2017, 7(1 – 2), 75 – 84), and published by De Gruyter publisher.
- [14]. F. Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*. Translated by W. Kaufmann and R.J. Hollingdale in 1967, and edited by W. Kaufmann with Vintage New Edition. New York: Vintage Giant, 1968.
- [15]. C.C.W. Taylor (ed.), *From the Beginning to Plato. Routledge History of Philosophy*. G.H.R. Parkinson and S.G. Shanker (General editors), Vol. I. Routledge: Taylor and Francis e-Library, 2005.
- [16]. D. Furley (ed.), *From Aristotle to Augustine. Routledge History of Philosophy*. G.H.R. Parkinson and S.G. Shanker (eds. 1997), Vol. II, Routledge: Taylor and Francis e-Library, 2005.

<sup>40</sup> For more details see W.H. Dray's article "Holism and Individualism in History and Social Sciences." *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. [Encyclopedia.com](https://www.encyclopedia.com/humanities/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/holism-and-individualism-history-and-social-sciences). (June 16, 2021). <https://www.encyclopedia.com/humanities/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/holism-and-individualism-history-and-social-sciences>.

<sup>41</sup> Such treatment of positive and negative outlooks in equal way is the major point of positive psychology (Huy P. Phan, Bing H. Ngu, Matthew O. White 2021, "Introducing 'holistic psychology' for life qualities: A theoretical model for consideration." Published in *Heliyon* 7 (2021) e05843, and published by Elsevier, 21 December 2020.

- [17]. E.C. Eze, "The Color of Reason: The Idea of "Race" in Kant's Anthropology." Cf. E.C. Eze (ed.), *The Idea of Postcolonial African Philosophy. A Critical Reader*. Edited by E.C. Eze, Bucknell University: Blackwell Publishers, 1997.
- [18]. T. Hobbes, *Leviathan*. London, Printed for Andrew Crooke, at the Green Dragon in St. Paul church-yard, 1651.
- [19]. J. Locke, *The Two Treatises of the Government and A Letter Concerning Toleration. Book II: Second Treatise*. (Cited from Ian Shapiro (ed.), *Rethinking the Western Tradition*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003).
- [20]. J.P. Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*. Cited in Class Lecture Notes of Professor Spade (1995). *Jean-Paul Sartre's Being and Nothingness*. Copyright at Paul Vincent Spade, 1996.
- [21]. S. Stoleru, "Reading the Freudian theory of sexual drives from the functional neuroimaging perspective." *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, March 2014/Volume 8/Article 157), or uploaded on *ResearchGate* by Serge Stoleru on 16 August 2015.
- [22]. V. Davion, "Ecofeminism." Cf. D. Jamieson (ed.), *A Companion to Environmental Philosophy*. Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2001.
- [23]. Jeffrey D. Sachs, "We are All Climate Refugees Now." Taken from *The Project Syndicate. The World's Opinion Page*. Aug 2, 2018. ([www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/climate-change-disaster-in-the-making-by-jeffrey-d-sachs-2018-08](http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/climate-change-disaster-in-the-making-by-jeffrey-d-sachs-2018-08)).
- [24]. R. Descartes, *Meditation on the First Philosophy. Fifth Meditation*. Copyright by Jonathan Benneth, 2004 (First Launched in July 2004 and last amended in April 2007).
- [25]. L. F. Zein and A. R. Setiawan, "General Overview of Ecofeminism." Uploaded on *ResearchGate* by Laila Fariha Zein on 28 August 2019).
- [26]. D. Rosenberg, "Deep Ecology." Uploaded on *ResearchGate* by Rosenberg on 24 May 2019.
- [27]. F. Mathews, "Deep Ecology." Cited in D. Jamieson (ed.), *A Companion to Environmental Philosophy*. Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2001.
- [28]. S. M. Wheeler, "Sustainability in Community Development." Cf. R. Philips and R. H. Pitman (eds.), *An Introduction to Community Development*. (London and New York, Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group, 2009).
- [29]. D. Bloor, *Sociology of Scientific Knowledge*. Cf. Niiniluoto, M. Sintonen and I. Wolenski (eds.), *Handbook of Epistemology*, 919-962. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2004.
- [30]. C. Wright, "Methodological Individualism Vs. Methodological Holism." Uploaded on *ResearchGate* by Wright on 18 October 2020. (Available on: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344722560>).
- [31]. G. Kutrovaz, *An Epistemological Cross-Section of Science Studies: In the Context of the Science Wars*. Budapest University of Technology and Economics: Budapest, 2005.
- [32]. S. Hawking, *The Grand Design*. Cited in Callum D. Scott, "The Death of Philosophy: a response to Stephen Hawking." Published online: 25 Oct 2013, in *South African Journal of Philosophy*. Volume 31, 2012-Issue 2. Published online by Taylor and Francis, 2013.
- [33]. L. Wittgenstein (1953), *Philosophical Investigations*. Translated by G.E.M Anscombe, First published in 1953, and second edition in 1958, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958.
- [34]. W.H. Dray, "Holism and Individualism in History and Social Sciences." *Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Encyclopedia.com*. (June 16, 2021). Available on: <https://www.encyclopedia.com/humanities/encyclopedia-s-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/holism-and-individualism-history-and-social-sciences>.
- [35]. H. P. Phan, B. H. Ngu and M. O. White, "Introducing 'holistic psychology' for life qualities: A theoretical model for consideration." Published in *Heliyon* 7 (2021) e05843, and published by Elsevier, 21 December 2020.