

Between objectivism and perspectivism: reasons for a philosophy and science encounter

Konstantinos Mantzanaris*

Abstract

In this study we explore the encounters emerging from the restructured categorizations of subjectivity in the context of an open system that constantly confronts the structures that create it. On the one hand, science formulates valid propositions through the ratio that ensures and confirms the acquisition of knowledge, but on the other hand, the truth of its propositions is related to those mental processes which seek the truth of deeper values than those discovered on the surface of reality. The question that arises in this context is which criteria allow us to resolve these antinomies (objectivism/perspectivism) in order to develop the interdisciplinary terms between the humanitarian field of science and sciences in a spirit of unification. In this way, we approach the potential of scientific reformulation in terms of the above interpretive perspectives in order to project the overcoming of divisions under the principles of diversity and critical thinking both in the field of philosophy and science as well.

Keywords: objectivism, perspectivism, differentiation, epistemology.[†]

*Adjunct Academic Staff (Hellenic Open University, Thessaloniki, Greece); mantzanaris.konstantinos@ac.eap.gr.

[†] Received on June 20, 2024. Accepted on October 7, 2024. Published on October 20, 2024. DOI: 10.23756/sp.v12i2.1627. ISSN 2282-7757; eISSN 2282-7765. ©Konstantinos Mantzanaris. This paper is published under the CC-BY licence agreement.

1. Introduction

In this study we attempt to examine epistemological issues in the fields of interdisciplinary research in the light of a discourse between philosophy and science. We refer to the above discourse as a critical elevation of a condition that defines the truth of existence to the extent that it (the existence) transcends its ruptures due to the applications of artificial language. Under this premise it liberates itself from the representations of the truth and expands the perspective of experiential reality as a revolutionary rupture against the dominance of rational thought. In other words, if the cognitive desire concerns the controlling disposition of the subject in order to dominate over the nature or the society, then we enlarge upon the area of the divisions of science and the philosophical thinking in order for the above divisions to serve their asymmetries (Rotry, 1982).

On the other hand, when Snow states the different perspectives concerning the two cultures (1995), those of the sciences and those of literature and the arts to point out their misconnection, he highlights an epistemological gap that is further exacerbated even in the science itself in which a crisis is observed within it when, for example, "in the framework of the Copenhagen interpretation and with regards to the fundamental problem of elementary particles and their interactions, there was no consensus regarding the epistemology of the research programs aiming at solving it" (Evangelopoulos, 2023, p. 94).

In this way, the question we are dealing with concerns the criteria according to which it is possible to identify the lost universal concepts that scientific practice and positivist epistemology have deconstructed, being unable to integrate them into individual social events. In other words, we claim that the way in which the circuit of the unity of historico-critical forms (of a hyper-empirical dialectical epistemology) can remain open passing through the reading of those routes of subjectivity that moves in the direction of the questioning discourse and the criticism towards the legitimizations immersed in mine of their certainties.

How can one judge historical consciousness and human values by reflecting on the suffering caused by the two world wars under the blessing of scientific progress and ideologies of the time in force? With what perspective would one be able to read the truth as the ultimate truth and meaning for people's lives during the tragic periods of fascism and Stalinism? What accusation could one possibly cast at Husserl just before the Nazi atrocity spread, when he pointed out that positivism is naive because it interrupted the course of the European spirit from its historicity (Husserl, 2012)? Approaches to the above questions presuppose a cross-section of human actions in order to locate living according to the legitimations of divisions and dualistic arrangements of the world.

2. Towards a divisive consciousness

The modern world's lack of certainty stems from rational thought's divisive practices that dissect the discourse by stripping it of any existential reflection. Both Foucault's remarks on the standardization of subjectivity (Foucault, 2017) and Castoriadis's denunciations of identifying-holistic rationality (1999) place the ratio in a state of division, since the dualistic regulations of the world have promoted the "incongruously flows of energy in the flow of the world" (Deligiorgi, 2007, p. 47).

The human, being excluded within the indisputable walls of rational thought, experiences the "time of a clock that skips moments, and is content to show dates with no meaning beyond the sum of events..." (Deligiorgi, 2007, p. 256) ensuring in this way the establishment of the Cartesian cogito. This movement of the hands of the clock transforms historicity and duration of time into entrenched structures of self-referentiality in order not to shake the shaped structure from any person's projections and actions. Therefore, scientific practice is important, serving a world of similarities in order for the circuit of the structure to remain firmly closed.

An exclusive discourse is therefore produced which entrenches persons within a passivity in order to make them objects of a controlling rationality excluding any deviation from their study as historical subjects. Thus, the control of people through knowledge occupies more and more the field of the rationality of things, rising a rationality that obeys the positivist trajectories of science. In other words, the way reality is organized passes through its most rational belief according to its interweaving with goals and arrangements, creating divisive subjects who are categorized in dualistic forms of alienation from the truth of themselves.

However, beyond the above *desire* found in the dominance of positivist clarification over its assembly against the order of a positivist cognitive model, there is also identified the desire to know which goes beyond formal validity by delving into those processes which involve a continuous opening towards the truth. But where are these processes located?

Gaston Bachelard (1884-1962) in his epistemological approaches (2000) already points out a new scientific spirit at the basis of the anti-Cartesian revolution and in the field of electromagnetic physics of mathematics and also non-Euclidean geometries (Deligiorgi, 2007). In other words, what is being attempted is the search for the possible through the search for truth beyond the circuit of what has already been done. Thus, the issue is not the imposition of certainties but rather the unraveling of connections between scientific categories and the broader historical and social realities. But how is this transformation achieved?

3. Towards an open subjectivity

In order to highlight the above transformation it is necessary to survey what happens beyond the fields of rational symbols, representations and calculations. The conventional boundaries that define and separate science from philosophy, validating the refutation or certainty of their propositions, are re-engraved under the experimental expressions of a philosophical discourse that moves in the spectrum of open subjectivities. There, where "the venturous formulations" of Logginos "sweep all the rest away with their flow" (Logginos, 1990, p. 143).

What is derived from the above approach relating to an open subjectivity in order to transcend the finite borders of dominant self-referential discourses by projecting new formulations through an expanded reflection. Against the objectivist utterances of speech produced by the artificial language of science, open subjectivity maintains its relationship with reality by shaping those terms produced by its experiential and epistemological processes. The way in which the experiences of the subject are inserted between the subject and science but also philosophy expresses the infinity of views composing concepts and ideas. As Deligiorgi also notes:

"It is necessary that we open up to the unity of reality that includes us and makes us partakers of the interactions and differentiations overlooking its objectifying approaches and become its receivers again, this time consciously and with intention..." (2002, p. 392).

However, when we refer to open subjectivity we mean the testing of conceptualizations with experiential experience in order not to absolutize the fields of science and philosophy into dead-end antinomies. So what is perspectivism about but "the negation of objectivity, that is, of an 'intrinsic' value of knowledge, independent of the particular context and conditionings within which this knowledge is acquired"? (Agazzi, 2016, p. 350). In other words, it is not recorded a single perspective that is shown in order to exclude another, but a differentiation that specifies the manifestations of the above fields within relevant interactions. What is expressed is a journey into the world of subjectivity to the extent that the perspective elevation of judgment is achieved.

In other words, the issue is not to solve an antinomy but to verify the propositions that make up their entanglements. And this path goes through the extent to which we can emerge in our relationship with the world in order to form a new view towards the world of science. In other words, our relationship with the world reveals our traces in history through our experiences and actions. As Berghofer state "experiences present their objects in a certain way that at least partly depends on subjective factors such as previous experiences, background beliefs, etc" (2020, p. 9). And this relationship is unique and

unprecedented projecting its readings from science and philosophy in order to interpret the unity of the world.

It is not registered a dualistic rationality that legitimizes the authoritative aspirations of an absolutist proposition by recycling the terms of rational thought, but a dialectic that favors broader perspectives of interdisciplinary approaches. When an interdisciplinary relationship is established, a new form of thought emerges which constantly exceeds its limits. It also denies an absolute authoritative power. In other words, an epistemological perspectivism is produced that is interpreted as a network of relationships making our thinking more active since the doctrinal conditions of uncritical thinking are exceeded. As Massimi states "It is also, first and foremost, a forward-looking commitment to engage across scientific perspectives and retain knowledge claims that have served us well across multiple perspectives" (2021, p. 6139). When, for example, Heisenberg (1901-1976) adopts a kind of skepticism towards idealized reality in scientific validation, he turns his gaze to another reality that passes through the true face of being (1971).

Because in what way is the dismemberment of the dualisms produced by rational thought (the world from man, philosophy from science, Being from truth) overcome than with the free spirit of education, deviating from the traditional forms of domination that produce a closed system of unalterable principles? In other words, the way in which the philosophical wondering poses uncertainty regarding the rational judgments of science reduces the critical power of the mind to a form of clarification on new ways of saying. Therefore, from the dominant mathematical language that acts "as the most effective weapon for the domination of nature but also of human behavior" (Deligiorgi, 2008, p. 61) we move to where the gap between the historicity of existence and the consciousness is reduced.

Therefore, a dynamic is established, in the circuit of which the ego emerges as an existence that seeks those openings that lead it to the horizon seen under the plottings of its function with the real. One could argue that existence constantly claims the non-definite, joining one's voice with Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814) who notes that "he sees nothing definite, he expects more than he can conceive in this life, of what it will ever be able to conceive until the end of time" (1931, p. 176).

As the subject conquers the world through a reflective critique, it widens the perspective point of discourse of science by revealing the traces of open subjectivity in history. Thus, against a timeless historicity of postmodernism that reduces "the new moment" to a key dimension of its relativistic spirit, a science that is in line with philosophy is juxtaposed in order to survey the subterranean routes that constitute the being/ontological relations.

At the point where philosophy and science meet, we can shed light on political and moral issues guarded by rationality in the entire spectrum of our lives. We should look for those remnants of the path taken by rationalism. We will identify what was not leveled by the nihilism produced by History.

4. Conclusion

According to the above remarks, we would argue with regards to the formed structures of rationality that what is examined concerns the Law and the operation of the phenomena but not the becoming and the meaning that emerges from the reason. A deterministic logic dominates, which detects the surface of reality on the basis of an axiomatic logic, adding grist to the mill of a closed system that ultimately becomes an ideology deviating from the truth. Thus, an ahistorical consciousness is formed that persists in its solipsistic routs by recycling the present as an absolute condition that delimits its certainties in order to exist within the current discourse.

In these closed structures, then, scientism is guarded in order to observe the cognitive process that ensures valid scientific achievements and in this way becomes consistent in its idealized reference structure. In this way, however, the real is idealized, making the human experience a measurable calculation that ultimately cancels any attempt to reduce it to reflective imagination.

Because if we can finally go beyond the closed circuits of the discourse in force that reduces its validity to the meaning instituted by the value of its rules, we need to question the way in which science checks the validity of its power by necessitating its questioning of reflective discourse in order to deepens into the clarifying processes of knowing.

Under these conditions, science and philosophy are not subject to Cartesian dualistic readings of a distorted reality that resents finality in order to deserve the division of ratio, but to a real world where the experiences of the subject are true within the everyday biota giving meaning to its existence. In this way, Frankenstein restores the human sciences as a need of existence to experience the sensitivity of others while simultaneously discovering his own.

In this context, the discourse of philosophy constitutes a morality that criticizes both the historical conditions that have been formed to what extend and what constitutes our existence. Finally, the views of the circuits concern the open character of reality by deeping into the roots of the Laws in order to break the chains of the authority in force and looking at the flows of the river the cycles of History that do not identify with the beginning of their previous point.

References

- E. Agazzi. Scientific Realism Within Perspectivism and Perspectivism Within Scientific Realism. *Axiomathes*, 26(4):349–365, 2016. doi: 10.1007/s10516-016-9304-4
- G. Bachelard. *Le Nouvel Esprit Scientifique*. Paris: Les Presses universitaires de France. 1934.
- Berghofer, P. Scientific perspectivism in the phenomenological tradition. *Euro Jnl Phil Sci*, 10(30):1-27, 2020. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13194-020-00294-w>
- K. Castoriadis. *Le carrefour du labyrinthe*. Paris: Éd. du Seuil. 1999.
- A. Deligiorgi. Thinking and perspective. From the quattrocento to the electronic Novecento. Athens: Alexandria. 2002. (In Greece).
- A. Deligiorgi. The modernism of contemporary philosophy. The search for the lost unity. Athens: Alexandria. 2007. (In Greece).
- A. Deligiorgi. *Kairos*. Contemporary considerations for a better world. Athens: Alexandria 2008. (In Greece).
- G. Evangelopoulos. Theoretical and positive sciences. The two cultures and their intersections. Heraklion: University Publications of Crete. 2023. (In Greece).
- J. Fichte. *The vocation of man*. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1931.
- M. Foucault. *L' Archeologie du Savoir*. Paris: Gallimard. 1969.
- W. Heisenberg. *Physics and philosophy: the revolution in modern science*. New York: Prometheus Books. 1958.
- E. Husserl. *Die Krisis der Europäischen Wissenschaften und die Transzendente Phanomenologie. Eine Einleitung in die phänomenologische Philosophie*. Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag. 2012.
- Longinus. *On the Sublime*. London: Macmillan and Co. 1890. <https://shorturl.at/bfexP>
- M. Massimi. Realism, perspectivism, and disagreement in science. *Synthese*, 198 (Suppl 25): 6115–6141, 2021. doi.org/10.1007/s11229-019-02500-6
- R. Rorty. *Consequences of Pragmatism*. University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis. 1982.
- C. Snow. *The two cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 1959.