

**ON COGNITIVE SCIENCE: ARTS, SCIENCE & PHILOSOPHY.  
TOWARDS THE NEW TECHNOLOGIES WITH OPEN-MINDEDNESS**

*~the contemporary civilization and the cognitive gap~*

As the century and the new millennium are in there 14<sup>th</sup> year: the scientists together with the ordinary people for the first time [since the new technologies are developing their owners(the ordinary people) faster and better than ever before]are becoming aware that not all scientific and communicative disciplines are so defined and separated. In a way they are for e.g. in the encyclopedia. Scientists are becoming aware that the syncretistic nature of the first primitive man can help them discover things where it was believed everything was already discovered; people however, with this notion could save (spare) where, before this attitude was accepted, it was believed everything was already quite economical. By using the eclectic and the interdisciplinary approach (that originated from the newly accepted or the rediscovered- syncretistic approach) scientists for e.g. discovered new synthetic fibers<sup>1</sup>; considering savings → ordinary people became more confident, already feeling as the scientists, and begin to economize by investing in better technologies. So the strictly defined disciplines and holding there border in an involute manner, isn't the best way to develop the same. Historically the contemporary disciplines originate from the educational systems around Europe in the Middle Age and their golden six subjects. The task of this defining was to enable the researchers and the students a sensible field of interest in order to develop their skills and their knowledge. This would have stopped them in confusing themselves, and wasting their energy as well- in the corridors of the scientific machinery (in case not defined in this six) which would have become a labyrinth. Scientists were supposed to increase their interests in the discipline, rather than to lose it; that

1

---

<sup>1</sup> The discovery of some fiber types was inspired by the structure of the gecko- (the lizard) feet.

would have liberated them from the dark chains of the than existing altogether knowledge, and would have helped them develop a professional disciplinary expertise (in physics, math, music etc.) unlike before (in animals, herbs, numbers...). But in fact the scientists were in many ways more constrained than liberated since this was in large amount a part of the monastic dogma. Although scientific method is telling us that the scientist must watch the world with a clear head and his eyes wide open, it seems that he was in many ways blinded by the wail of the contemporary civilization. This syndrome exists up till now. The technology doesn't help if we cannot see what is obvious. For e.g. the Renaissance man needed a telescope and a dozen of machines; but the antique man needed nothing of this, just his eyes and clear head. And he find out the earth is round and exists in a heliocentric system. In between there's a hall of 17 centuries. I am repeating this since many colleagues of mine noticed this in many fields of research: for e.g. chemists still deny the fact that the mother nature is the best chemist, since according to them it is not professional to mix the two disciplines: chemistry and biology. Yet in ancient Egypt they had incredibly advanced pharmacology, simply because they knew how to observe (they had: antibiotic from crocodile droppings, antipyretic from willows branches, contraception from lime; they didn't have cancers, maybe because they were mixing with other races<sup>2</sup>, or some say because they were eating gold...). According to some researches they were having electricity as well. Some clay/copper/vinegar batteries were discovered. Maybe they were simply watching the sky and the see. They noticed that everything that develops life is charged through blue filter. So maybe that's how they figured out that blue color transforms optical energy in electrical. Perhaps they charged afore mentioned batteries by laying them on the sun with blue flax on top. In this area the blue,

2

---

<sup>2</sup>According to some researches most of the types of the human genome have the cancer predisposition gen, which can be confused by mixing with other races or genomes. In this case this gen is confused, because it cannot recognize that new genetic chain which is in front of him. This "mixing" was mainly attitude of the aristocracy. The similar applies for many other things, for e.g. for blood sacrilege. For e.g. queen Cleopatra was a product of incestuous love, but she wasn't retarded, because her ancestors mixed with other genomes and races. On the contrary she was very clever. She spoke a dozen of foreign languages.

azure color was a cult. Maybe due to this they painted their clay ornaments, scarabs in blue. One museum in Switzerland claims that has restored their antique lamps. It is also possible that they didn't have lamps, but that they used peacocks feathers which they were covering with fluorescent dust, and then they were leaving them in the clay batteries. They were charging them with electrical energy enough to light those long, dark corridors. Until very recent the scientists didn't know how they were lighting these big corridors; some sad with mirrors. But they tried this and it seemed rather impossible. Simply these "beneath the earth castles" are too big. Considering the reading habits of the today's and ancient civilizations (here I mean rather readings of the outcomes of their scientific discoveries) it is significant that we should understand that it is not so important what we read but how we read it. The civilization code between different historically diverse civilizations varies. For e.g. in the antiquity the most important ethical code was cautiousness, in Christianity- the hope. Considering the situation this can have a different outcome in these two approaches. For e.g. if somebody in a designated place during a storm accepts an unknown visitor on his door → the visitor in antiquity will be rejected due to our cautiousness that makes us believe that he might be a burglar. Unlike in Christianity where though we know nothing of him we will hope that he is a nice person who really needs our help. In this case the second outcome seems more ethical and humanistic. Yet, in the case when somebody due to his parents genetic heritage is warned by the doctors that he should avoid eating greasy food because he might get a cancer. And if that person is a Christian believer and hopes that god will protect him he will continue to eat greasy; but if he does like in the antiquity and due to his believe in cautiousness stops to eat greasy, it is more likely he won't get a cancer. Another example: the Christian won't use condoms, the one that is more cautious will → so the second will be safer. So in the last two cases the antique man seems to be more ethical and progressive. But then and this can be relativized, since somebody may tell us: the real Christian won't have a sexual intercourse before marriage. Nevertheless the factual situation is that we have to choose between these two options. The denial of the existence of this civilizational

dichotomy will put us in a more risky situation. No matter how hard we try we cannot avoid the bare existence of the civilizational moment in our decision-making.

## EMOTION AND COGNITION

Somebody says real science, the one that is not improvisation or intuition, is always based on empirical proofs and material evidence. In real science imagination does not exist. But then can cognition itself be proven at all? According to the psychologists every imagination, phantasy or creation, is connected with some kind of emotion. Cognition is closely connected to our perception. There are two theories that explain emotion: The James Lange one tells us that “the bodily changes follow directly the perception of the exciting fact, and our feeling of the same changes as they occur IS the emotion” → in which “following a stimulus there is a bodily process; it is the perception of the bodily response that constitutes the emotion.” The Cannon one tells us that “having an emotion is independent of bodily awareness, since awareness and bodily responses are simultaneous events”. The organic difference between these two patterns is that the second one adds the hypothalamus, before and after the frontal cortex. That’s why Cannon has the “independent” emotion. So according to this, cognition and self-cognition are undoubtedly connected with the emotion. Only a living organism can make cognition, not a machine. The computer can make many estimations and operations, but cannot answer to a cognitive question. I wrote here living organism (not just people), since many scientists are telling us that almost all other species do have emotions. Without emotion there’s no cognition; without cognition → no science. It seems the scientists I was reading didn’t ask the following question: do other species have science? I believe no. Only people have science. We may argue that some animals do have art, but science is reserved just for people. Since only people can realize cognition. Actually the scientists did ask that question (in its answer they almost have a consensus that animals do have some sort of science), but they didn’t ask whether animals have the science with cognition. Animals do percept the world, and in order to survive do understand some scientific, natural phenomena.

Their perception is just organic, and not connected in an interceptive manner with their emotions.

All species do understand that the sexual intercourse does prolong their kind, yet there are existing human tribes that do not connect pregnancy with the copulation. They think that their women stay pregnant from the forest wind. Or let me give you another example: a dog-cub that is thrown in water can swim the same way like the human baby. Yet the dog does not forget to swim like people do. To support this let me add one more example: the linguistic researches with the baby twins that were growing separately proved that people are born with the inherited knowledge of the language. These three examples show that people unlike animals, as their cognition begins to develop, reject the knowledge they genetically inherited from their parents. With the cognition the human kind is trying to escape from its biological ancestry which could connect them with the other species. This notion opposes (but cannot whit drawl) the Darwin theory of the development of the species. According to this, man did become a man from a humanoid ape, but is not an ape anymore, so to speak. The religion seems is the pattern that supports this tendency. Though some species do have some form of religion, only the human one supports the cognition (which is trying to defer people from all other species by distancing them again from their genetic ancestry). We all do agree that human is the most developed from all species; but did all other species become less developed because they didn't have cognition? Is cognition simply the ability of man to oppose his instinct? No because all other species can oppose to some extend their instinct. So do people have an unknown voice which while their brain is not fully developed is telling them they should forget their instincts and that this is the reason of the evolutionary superiority of the human kind? The developing child (2 year old one) has a brain capability of a chimp. Did our ape ancestors hear that voice? I guessed for this voice, I don't remember I had such when I was at the age of 2. My knowledge of this is completely intuitive, I don't have any material evidence for this, except maybe some examples and experiments, of which some I mentioned in

this text. All our notion of cognition, like the religion itself is completely intuitive. Maybe that's why all the religions are on the same cognitive line like the human evolution. They are trying somehow to distant us from our genetic/ape ancestry, and make us believe that we (the human kind) are protected by a higher force. It is interesting to see how people did like to believe in the notion that in the reality this isn't possible. No animal (without human training) can learn such. Mahabharata is telling us of princes that became pregnant from a leave of lotus while she was taking a bath in the river, and the Bible is telling us of a woman that stayed pregnant from the Holy Spirit. It is interesting how these notions, though fully intuitive, in many cases were truth. For e.g. the latest researches prove that not only the reptile (with Para genesis), but also the mama-suckles can conceive without an intercourse. Namely latest researches show that the dinosaurs weren't reptiles. There were other possibilities too: with the regeneration of the egg, with double egg case or with the interaction of the egg with the tissue... So cognition (like emotion and religion) isn't an already defined area of the human intellectual or organic activity. Since speaking of intellectual activity → thought completely aware that all intellectual activity is always fully organic, the human kind always wants to diverse the intellectual from the organic activity. There's no difference between these two. Science is telling us that every intellectual activity, every emotion (accordingly and every cognition) does make certain organic change in our organism, mainly in creating a particular protein configuration/complex. The only science that still opposes this (one part of its scientific body) is psychology. The psychologists claim that intellectuality and emotions (accordingly- our cognitions too) are a part of a lasting electromagnetic process (interactive one, between certain organs), which expires as certain intellectual activity or emotion (cognition...) stops. So in a way, this approach too is organic (since some of our organs are involved), but there is no material evidence (in the form of the protein complexes), like there is in the previous one. But this approach does have its disadvantages because it does not explain how a therapist can "dig" an emotional memory, with a hypnotized patient on a couch. Emotional memory on the other hand does exist and is presented in

many scientific and artistic disciplines, such as the one in the Stanislavski method (for e.g. he suggests for an actor that wants to perform sadness to remember a coach accident, in which a coach killed a street walker, and he is lying dead on the street in a bloody stain → that's how the actor can dig his emotions). But are this his emotions from his past or he is inventing them because he (the actor) has emotions like all of us, anyway and already? In order to be more convincing on this discourse (the one whether our intellectual/emotional/cognitive activity does or does not leave an organic trace in the human organism) I will mention the Berger work on electroencephalography. He recorded the electrical activity of the cells of the human brain; which is no different than from the ones of all the human cells. He separated the waves by the intensity of their pulsation in three groups: alpha (8 to 12 cycles per second), beta (15 to 30) and delta (5). Delta are usually defining a kind of some clinical disorder, usually epilepsy; beta are found when alpha are absent, and are present when there is some visual stimulation (perception); but alpha is found when a relaxed person starts an intellectual problem (for e.g. arithmetic problem) or some emotion. This kind of frequency appears when the individual reaches the age of nine and after. These waves are abolished when the individual is sleeping. Then they are 3 per second. So why does alpha appear after the age of nine, if there's no organic change? In my opinion there certainly is some organic change in our organism at this age. Together with other changes that are happening in our organism, as we are reaching our adulthood.

## COGNITION AND THE INTERPRETATION OF TRUTH

As you can see the culture of active denial is spread throughout our contemporaneity, our history and our civilization. The human kind cognize throughout the time only the things that are good or that are believed are good for its evolution rather the ones that are truth or the ones that can be possible. In this process the interpretation of truth played significant role, in which truth and reality were not or were not always the same thing. In this pattern of our civilization the main tool was the religion, with its branches: the ethics, morality, decency,



easygoingness, infantilism etc. For e.g. in the old testimony it is said that “to god are not dear the ones that wear the clothes from the opposite gender”. But does that mean that in our days god loves only the transvestites or the cross dressers → since in time when the holly latters were written women were wearing pants and man skirts? Or let us once again see the example of Cinderella. After midnight everything that was transformed from the ferry turned back the same; only one of the glass shoes didn't. In the first example our civilization forced the stream of cognition in the perceptiveness of what is useful, not in what is truth or even what is Christian. Men were supposed to learn discipline, to become solders. By using clothes that do not exactly fit there anatomy they were learning how to become strong and scrutinized. The truth was that it was Christian for them to wear skirts, but reality was that the societies were in a need of more and more disciplined men that can wear every day there uncomfortable clothes. Women though could wear those clothes that made everyone laidback. The contemporary science too says that this should be reversed since pants are causing prostate cancer to man, and skirts genital cancer to women. But even today our cognition says it's worth the risk since our societies still need disciplined men, and relaxed and attractive women. The reality is that these clothes are bad for our health. But the truth is that we are completely aware while doing something bad for our health since we need disciplined man, pretty women and social acceptance. No matter how civilized we are nobody will tell us: Hey man, you may wear that skirt, that's good for your health! The similar is the cognitive issue with Cinderella. We won't think our grandma wanted to make us inane by telling us this story which opposes the basic senses of the child logics and perceptiveness yet increases its emotions and sense of morality and cavalry. The truth is we are not perceiving the story since it is impossible; the reality in this case is that the shoe is not important since we cognize that the emotions and the moral message in the story will make us good citizens by the existing moral standards. It is good to be with the Cinderella character, on her side in this plot. It doesn't matter that the plot is so badly constructed and impossible that probably if it appeared first time as a text for an exam in primary



school for a literary composition, the teacher would have written F for this pupil. It doesn't fulfill the basic plot standards, yet it cognizes/confides well.

It seems in our days the configuration of our cognition is becoming less complicated, but more useful. To illustrate this I will give you an example from a more recent past. In the last days of Yugoslavia the Yugoslav literature and drama subject in education still existed. Students could choose what drama texts or plays to suggest for the classes. One student suggested the text from Joakim Vujich "Negri". He thought it is an interesting text for conversation with his colleagues because contains progressive ideas and humor. The professor (who previously offered to the student a deal with money payment so that she will let him pass the exam, which the student refused) asked the student: "Why did you choose from all texts that particular one that deals with racial issues? Because you wanted to make us feel bad? You wanted to tell us what kind of people we are!" Later that month he was expelled from the university. The truth was that she was and is a criminal and her place is in jail, together with her colleagues from the university; but the reality is that in a society like the one that she exists in, people like her prosper. That society is like the ones Mrs. Tacher called them: societies of "the spoiled countries". The real reason why the student has chosen that text is because the book was printed in a hard edition and with big letters. I know because that student was me. Socially the issue of cognition is becoming more and more analyzed. I believe that the reason for this is the expansion of the...

## COGNITION AND THE NEW TECHNOLOGIES

...new information technologies and media, especially the digitally received private televisions and Internet. Information is not delivered in a so centralized and controlled manner like it used to be some ten years ago. This has in my humble opinion its good and bad sites. Almost everybody in nowadays can organize himself to say what he means. Everybody can hear his problems and social injustices. That's how maybe for the first time in our European history we find out about those people

for who the system never worked. Although they did nothing wrong they could never get what they in fact had: there social security, there health insurance, there right for privacy and there freedom of movement; there right to find out about their identity, and reach all other/their human rights. Everybody knew about this decades ago, but nobody ever talked about this, because everybody cognized that this will be bad for the ones that are speaking about this and that it will help no one. It will make the situation only worse, they thought. But when due to the new technologies (mainly Internet and cellular phones, with which the job market became richer and dynamic), this newly cognized entities became more and better organized in civilized groups. This gave them the opportunity to better organize, inform and educate themselves, with the newly and cheaply accessible electronic resources. Especially in the EU media became liberal like never before, so now everybody seems to be happy with the new situation → my neighbor, the TV star. Hence this unfortunately increased the notion that our neighborhoods and societies are more cynical than it was believed before. Many of us discovered that actually we didn't have any neighbors. We thought we did. Or many thought they had friends or family, but they discovered they had only there phone numbers or e-mail addresses. Many people said publicly about the big social and legal unjustness they were through. Millions of TV spectators and the visitors of the Internet sites did find out about this but nobody ever helped this poor people. The collective cognition in this was the following: since they reached the TV screens, probably somebody from the social system will help them. The spectators find out the *truth* about this people, but the *reality* is that they ended in this shows because the system abandoned them. Furthermore those newly formed social groups begun to form their own business and soon they started to do each other with the same cognitive technology. Now almost every public space (supermarket, bus station, cinema, square etc.) where the electronic system exists, is with "private dilatation and paid informers" (for this I am indebted with prof. Richard J. Evans). Nevertheless he used this excellent terminology for the situation in the Third Reich. Now everybody that has a cellular phone or an eye-pod can form a group and start this activity which is

actually illegal. They say that European governments receive a lot of money from this. I know a lot about economy and I can claim that this activity cannot develop any economy. It can turn it only in depth. That's why they (the governments, the politicians) begun to use the so called new language. By using the new cognition, it is possible this activity to be hidden and well spoken- at the same time. They call it liberal arts, doing the streets, public face lift etc. Why does the law say this is illegal? Because it is scientifically proven that "violating one's privacy and free movement can seriously damage his or hers health". This notion exists from the times of ancient Egypt where they noticed that when the aristocracy was spying each other (with the double walls or halls on the walls), that was causing them those scary diseases like epilepsy. Maybe now the huge problem occurred, since there's nowhere to tell about this. It used to be possible to speak about this kind of issues with the journalists from the media, but they have become an almost inexistent category. Since EU with its bodies (that were structured rather with economists than media people and journalists) insisted on total liberalization of the European media (in the last 20 years). That's how the before mentioned talk shows happened. But due to this media around Europe became completely voluntary and unprofessional. The journalists disappeared too. Nobody reads the papers anymore, everybody reeds on internet. At the beginning the media begun to make more money, but now they have to ask for sponsorship for every single program. I am sorry, but I have to say that the information that is sponsored is partly or completely corrupted. I am positive that EU did some useful reforms in the film business and its co-productions, but not in the media sector. I am afraid now are doing well only the televisions that kept the old broadcasting model, which is a mixed enterprise.

This already inspired many established media analysts to contribute with their theory and professionalism, but not with their understanding and mysticism! I must be open about this and I must say that I agree that these texts are very controversial and constrained by...something. So I understand why they received so

many paranoid reviews and accusations. Here I will give an example from the compilation "What Orwell Didn't Know", edited by Andras Szanto. The authors claim that the media mainly in USA became sensationalist and unprofessional, doing everything for some money; the media hid the controversial, violent contents because it was trying to keep the reach upper middleclass audiences (which are with children), by doing which they seriously underestimated the intellect of the spectators. They were adult enough to cope with the situation themselves. The newly situation was almost the same like in the Orwell essay where he speaks of the false Englishness which is hiding the big brother attitude, which of course is not a democratic one. But I read that article which is at the end of this edition and I have to say that in my opinion (I have read almost everything from Orwell), here he is speaking like a linguist. In some of his novels and stories he is speaking about the big brother syndrome. In his essay he is trying to condemn the newly established self-proclaimed British aristocracy that is placing some snobbish elements in its language, about which they (the aristocrats) know nothing about. I think the reactions to his work (the essay of Orwell) were also over the top, and yes, I think he was the victim of the big brother effect. His aristocratic family didn't wanted to let him became a writer, and was following him everywhere, so he had to take a pseudo name. Orwell was not his real name. He was running away from his relatives, all his life. They chased him with their paid informers everywhere he went (in the dormitories, publishing houses, papers, all the workplaces he attended...). In this his family was completely unaware how they destroyed his health, and at the end, depleted by hi struggle, he died, refusing to take his therapy. So I think the allure of the controversy due to the actually illegal activity of his family, still follows the works of Orwell. In my opinion he is a brilliant writer, not a controversial figure. I also think the authors of this addition overestimated the media. I saw the mentioned TV transmits from here, and they were always fully professional. I was living in Eastern Europe during the iron curtain and I can recognize the dictatorial, big brother media and journalism. I have to say that I cannot recommend this edition to the students, because in it they

suggest us that the presentation of the news shouldn't be sensationalist and entertaining. I disagree with this because there are researches that prove that the secret of the independent media is its success on the media market. And if you want to have a success on the media market you must present the news in the interesting and positive manner. Some media in Europe tried with formal presentation of the news and they fall apart. We must keep the interest of the spectator, and I have to say that the American journalists still keep the highest quality for this. I will add here the quote from Thomas Mann regarding reading: "We must always think of our reader. Reading should never be boring; reading should always have the lively, vigorous effect to the reader, regardless of what he is reading." So in order to keep the interest of the spectator, we must keep him emotionally attached so that he can realize his cognition of the reality and the truth. It is good that this and other compilations like "What Orwell..." are printed, because we can understand through the texts how even the greatest professionals can be one sided, when they juxtaposition themselves with the phenomenon they firstly encountered. However for the experienced readers I do recommend this kind of texts. Since and from them we can learn something useful considering the cognition phenomenon. Though with the non-organic approach in the before mentioned edition they indeed did present some interesting intuitive observations [in spite being many times without material evidence, Grace E. Cairns tells us that now, and back in history (even in the prehistory) the intuitive researches can be scientifically truth] regarding the effect of the cognition on the contemporary citizens, most of which were the intellectuals. The text of Mr. George Soros "Epilog" is a good example for this.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> In his text Mr. Soros is telling us that the human brain has its *cognitive function* which accepts the situation strictly like it really is and is making an effort to form an opinion according to it. *The manipulative function* of the brain accepts the human longings like they really are and is trying to create situations which will correspond with them. *The reflexivity* explains why our understanding is unfinished and why our actions have unwonted consequences.(p.203)

## ART IMITATES LIFE- THE ORIGINS OF THE COGNITION

The origins of the cognition are undoubtedly in the religion. Religion as defined by many and many times before originates from the human attempt to overcome his fear of dying. Since the primitive man didn't know the methods and the empirics of the contemporary science, he was trying to explain to himself the things that surround him and the things that were happening to him. Since he, the primitive man wasn't as afraid from other things as much he was afraid from dying, he developed another intellectual discipline, the philosophy. At the beginning he was much more afraid from dying. So the primitive man reserved almost all of his religious activity for the funeral rituals; and everything else connected to this cult, and the ghost of his dead ancestors. Philosophy was related more for the things or needs of his lifetime. Such as, when older members of the tribe used to teach and educate their youngsters about the wisdoms of surviving and the wisdoms of the universe. Thought they had no exact knowledge about the sky and the stars, watching some of the primitive arts they created can make us believe they were pretty dedicated astrologists. So philosophy originated from the human attempt to explain the world that surrounds him. And at the very beginning, although completely intuitive, philosophy was connected with science. Later religion and philosophy intercepted, and many times throughout human history they were fused as one discipline. Art originates from the need of the primitive man for better preserving of his knowledge for the next generations and his believe that art objects enforce the power of his magic rituals. The conscious cognition (the unconscious existed before- look at the afore mentioned example with the dog cub and the baby and their swimming abilities) appeared in the moment when he realized that in order to evolve, he must make a selection of the things he was doing: the ones that will progress him (or his tribe) and the ones that will regress him. But let us not forget here that the emotion (the love for his children) was the one that inspired him for this important decision. Many times he made bad selections: intentionally or non-intentionally. Intentionally → since not everything that is good for his tribe

was good for the primitive man, and in order to make it good only for himself (like the contemporary man mentioned in the previous part of this text) he used manipulation, or he lied. Unintentionally → like the people in the tribes (that I also mentioned in the text before) that were completely unaware that they stayed pregnant due to the sexual intercourse. Their cognition told them it is good to stay exposed on the forest wind- it was supposed to make them pregnant. With the exception of this last example, which refers to some really primitive tribes, all other sub disciplines of cognition exist nowadays too. Unlike: *religion*, *philosophy* and *art*, which changed a lot and developed many other disciplines, *the cognition* up till now stayed pretty basic. Almost the same things matter for us and others (or our contemporary tribe) as they did for the primitive man. It is because religion, philosophy and art were the players throughout the history and evolution, but the cognition was the reflector. In many cases cognition enlightened us; in many it placed us in the dark corridor. Intentionally or unintentionally...

For e.g. Moses from Michelangelo has horns because the cognition of its artist was telling him that he should listen what was sad in the Bible. Perhaps he was right, but the translation was wrong. Since on Latin there is only one word for horn and ray of light. The original text says that Moses had rays of light around his head, not horns...This wrong cognition actually doesn't have any meaning. If somebody does a lapsus linguae, and says whorns instead of horns that can speak of his sub consciousness, but in this case the horns are just a blank space.



Michelangelo: Moses with (w)horns?



His sarcophagus with the Ten Commandments I think is also wrongly represented, when with wings. I think they are the little doors like any other closet has. I have got this idea since and on my language there's only one word both for this little doors and wings. Speaking here of the importance of the decision making I noticed that the wrong cognition of the authors does not necessarily correspond with the bad respond of the audiences, because for e.g. the audiences are going to cinema for fun, not for cognition. But this kind of mistakes is different when it happens in the other areas of the decision-making. Here I will mention another example with the director Steven Spielberg, which is not with the filmmaking. When he was in a high school there was one big bully that everyday waited him after the school hours, beat him and threw him in the dirty pond nearby. Despite the fact that he was angry at him the cognition told him (told to Spielberg) that it would be good for him to make a friend out of this bully. So he offered him the main role in his student production, and the bully was so grateful that became his friend. Though Mr. Spielberg figured out that that would be good for him, this was an unintentionally wrong/regressive cognition. Nevertheless this is good for Mr. Spielberg, but not for the society (or for his contemporary tribe). Because by this he is sending a message to the others that it is good to buy friends and that this is not devaluating our social values. Does this mean that we should make our career with bullying not with zealousness or quality? Besides this is corruption and derogation; he paid with a favor to save himself from violence (like they used to pay to the mafia not to brake our grocery stores) and he didn't report the case to the police. Why didn't he? He noticed that and they have corruption; he thought that the bully was from the so called fifth colon (from the Wallachians, Tsintsars), "close with the police lines"? If so he should have reported this to the media? I agree that this can be another example of the civilization gap, but things like this should be solved with the matters that do exist in our civilization. Not with improvisations or intelligence. Besides I must underline that Mr. Spielberg was very lucky in this case. The modern psychology is telling us that somebody that assaulted us like this once will surely do that again; in there organic approach psychologists find out that the bullies usually have deformed fatter nerve

fibers that are increasing the violent electromagnetic impulse. That's how they addict themselves to their victims. He (the bully) should be a person with a limited range of movement around his victim. If on his place I would never have acted like this. Even if they didn't arrested the bully I would have remembered his violence till the rest of my days, always looking for a possibility of revenge. Because my cognition is different from the one of Mr. Spielberg. I am always thinking how beautiful this world would have been without bullies. Perhaps and I should consult a psychologist on this. People are telling me that I am too gloomy and that I never laugh. Dear, respected readers, you should know this is completely untrue. I do laugh. I am adding the evidence for this in the line beneath:

U huh u huh u huh u...Ha haha ha...Heeee...

“Accepting his/hers personality you might make what the psychologists are calling ‘the cognitive dissonance, which is the unsustainability between the ones perception and the reality’”. As evident from this quote from Mr. William Ury<sup>4</sup> this was an example how unsustainable and destabilizing ones cognition can be.

Like I said before → unlike the other disciplines: religion/philosophy (science)/art, cognition does not evolve. Cognition though does evolve the human kind and its civilization. Cognition itself is an involute discipline. The organic research is showing that as a discipline cognition is most similar with the linguistic, closed in its self. Like a fish that is eating its own tail. Using our nervous system, as I mentioned before in this text<sup>5</sup>, our organism creates “self-referring circulating organization”, which defines the “actionom of the neuron” which functions as a “homeostatic isomorphism”. This involute process which actually helps us improve our thinking (through cognition) is named “autopoiesis”. And it would not be possible

---

<sup>4</sup>For the example with Mr. Spielberg I am indebted mainly with William Ury and his excellent book “Getting Past No”. Unlike me Ury seems to be in favor of this kind of negotiations.(p.66)

<sup>5</sup>For the following I am mostly indebted with Prof. Humbert R. Maturana and Prof. Francisco J. Varela, from their amazing works presented in: “Autopoiesis and Cognition. The Realization of the Living”. The works are: “Biology of the cognition” (1970) and “Autopoiesis-the Realization of the Living”(1973). In them they are considering the cognition as an epistemologically inductive discipline (like the linguistics).

without the existence of the “eukaryotic cell”. This is again very close to the non-organic approach, as both of them are involute patterns. Usually these approaches are the ones that originate from philosophy, social or religious sciences. These approaches are based on the PSR (Pattern of Sufficient Reasoning).<sup>6</sup> “Unlike God man is a dependent entity. This creates three patterns: 1.Things that can be explained with something else 2.Things that can be explained with nothing 3.Things that can be explained with themselves. According to PSR even God cannot do everything, since not everything is possible.”<sup>7</sup> I would try to explain this further by adding here the quote from John Locke, which I also read in the William L. Rowe book: “everything that has been discovered by God is surely truth; there is no doubt about that. This is the exemplified object of the religion, but whether that object is the godly revelation or not, must be decided by our reason.”<sup>8</sup>

## CONTEMPORARY COGNITION:

### THE NEW TECHNOLOGIES AND OPENMINDEDNESS

18

Is cognition heading towards its modernity? The bare fact is that cognition is one of the first human disciplines about which no scientist ever talked about as a science up till the last 100 years. This makes cognition somewhat a phenomenon. Even a taboo → since nobody ever talked about it as a sole discipline that doesn't appear amongst the other species on this planet. Almost all scientists however do agree that some forms of art, science/philosophy and religion do exist amongst animals<sup>9</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup>For PSR see on p.66 “Philosophy of Religion: an introduction” by William L. Rowe(2007)

<sup>7</sup>I sublimated here the extraordinary example from Prof. Rowe again, which is on p.22. The example is: 1.Babe Rut is the president of USA.2.The president of USA is from Indiana. , accordingly 3.Babe Rut is from Indiana. Even God in this case couldn't, as Toma Accquin would have sad, make the patterns of this argument become truth, and its conclusion untruth. Since the gods will is happening only for the things that are possible. And it is absolutely impossible that Babe Rut is a president. Let me add here another example which is from the introduction of “Q`est-ce que la philosophie?”-Buda sad to people: If you want to be deliberated you shouldn't pursuit the happiness, you must wait for it to come to you. People did listen to Buda, but they never stopped chasing happiness. In this case Buda is the God, and people are the impossibility.

<sup>8</sup>About this see in the previously suggested book “Philosophy of Religion: an introduction” by William L. Rowe on p.93/94

<sup>9</sup>See about this in “Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors” by Carl Sagan and Ann Druyan

Only human were the ones to select by themselves the things they were supposed to do that were good or that they believe were good for their evolution. All other species do whatever they do in order to survive, to protect their cubs (or for e.g. if bacteria, to protect their colony), but other species did not have the notion for the future. They were living only for now. By having cognition the human kind could develop its civilization. The human effort throughout its evolution was to make its existence easier in order to have even more time for cognition → the animal with its senses is sensing the rain and the thunder (and by its instinct) and is hiding from it taking its cubs with it. But the primitive man willingly lost large part of his instincts since his cognition was telling him he shouldn't be satisfied in being just another animal. The primitive man was supposed to become something more. By cognition (the false one in this case) he find out that with making a ritual with his tribe he can control the weather. Other similar examples for this are the ones I mentioned previously in this text. Like the one (I mentioned 2 times already) about our inherited instinct for swimming. Unlike dogs, human during their growing up forget this capability. Because human want to grow up with cognition, not only with the surviving instinct. In its evolution unlike all living species, people tend to decrease their instincts and increase their cognition. All other species do seem just to increase their instincts. In this manner they develop their body and brain, until they reach that one moment in the evolution when they are being erased from this planet. Like the dinosaurs. Does this mean that we are not going to be erased too? I am double checking what I am writing since science is telling us that some sorts of dinosaurs had similar body/brain proportions compared to human. They were using their hands, walking only on their legs. Scientists are telling us that they were having developed sound apparatus in their throat, so it is possible that they were capable to speak. Maybe some of the cave drawings were by them? So maybe they were having art, and maybe they were having COGNITION? Who knows ... Anyway being the only living kind that has cognition isn't guarantee from extinction.

The primitive man surrounded by his cruel prehistoric surrounding wasn't afraid that if he loses his instinct he will be extinguished. Or he was afraid, but he didn't like the cruelty, he didn't like to be an animal at all, so he was willing to risk. In order to become something different, perhaps something more than rest of the animals. He was comparing himself with other animals. He didn't have the physique of the lion. He didn't have the violent power of many other animals, but he realized that if he can make cognition, he can beat them, and surpass them not just with the length of his life, but evolutionally too. But why shall man want to live longer than a lion when again, nobody lives forever? Besides, turtles live longer than people. In this sense cognition is closest to the religion. Because he wanted to believe. Again we see the involute nature of the cognition → because he believed it is important to believe. There was no evidence that if the primitive man believes it is important not to be cruel as the animal, higher force (god) was going to protect him or reward him. This is an interesting notion because it seems the Christian man is more similar to the primitive man than to the antique man. In the examples that I mentioned previously in this text, I sad that unlike the Christian, antique man doesn't believe in the hope. The antique man thinks hope is dangerous and delusional, and closer to superstition than religion. So the antique man has only rationality. Unlike him the primitive men and Christians believe that God will reward them if they are good, thought there was never any evidence for this. The primitive men and the Christians simply hoped that if they were ethical God would reward them.

Maybe due to this we are still not paying full attention to this issue. Cognition is still a little taboo for the human kind. Because with it the contemporary man will have to face something that due to his own senses (like in the prehistory) and his own science actually doesn't exist. That's god. Yet undoubtedly almost all the progress in our civilization happened due to this non- existence. I will quote Grace Kerns: Country that is based on religion progresses. With *it* the man realized that it is very important to evolve his civilization, rather than his instinct. The ones that

oppose this will say: this is wrong → civilization, the state, the system, the police, the army, the science are unnatural matters. They are artificial: people made them, not nature. They can protect us from nothing, nature is always stronger. But they are wrong. Protection is a very natural thing. Animals protect their cubs; during pregnancy the baby is protected in its mother stomach; our planet unlike any other has an atmospheric shield that protects the life. Cognition was telling the human kind that it is not wrong to develop the civilization, the technology, the society, the science, the ethical systems; unlike the animals and all other species that didn't have cognition and were developing only their bodies. And also there's this civilizational gap. Human kind must keep its environment. Only the machines cannot keep us alive. We need the nature in order to survive. Our life doesn't last forever. Cognition makes us aware that everything that we do and everything that originates from people is very fragile. When I named this text, I hesitated what disciplines to write in the title. Art, science and philosophy, I wrote. Yet they say: philosophy is the mother of all sciences or: isn't the religion and philosophy the same? Even our words are fragile. But only our believing survived from the times of prehistory.

21

## CONCLUSION

I spent the previous lines in order to explain that with the cognition is not wrong to develop the machines (the technology), as long as we take care how and why we develop them. How – in order not to destroy our environment for e.g. And why- for e.g. to take care that those machines are made in order to help us, not to destroy us (like those cars that are endlessly polluting our air, although the ecologically acceptable technologies are already invented!). It is important to be open-minded; the human kind learned that from its ability for cognition. Even during its prehistory. Sometimes the open-mindedness can make impossible things happen. Hence all those incredible cures/medicaments would have not been invented if everybody assumed that are possible only the things that seemed possible. The human believing is the impossible, yet the remarkable thing. Like for e.g. that girl

that was going to her office late at night. The office security had installed voice check. Yet it rarely opened. So her friends that were kidding her told her to say the password two times. She tried that, and thought it was impossible it happened. The door opened. That security installation was just a machine, it didn't have emotions. The machine is unable to feel sorry for the girl that is waiting in front of the door. But I am able, because I wanted to meet the girl. In order to make you cognize this, I invented this story...

#### REFERENCES:

1. "Beginning Psychology", Theophile Stanley Krawiec
2. "What Orwell Didn't Know", edited by Andras Szanto
3. "An Historical Introduction to Western Constitutional Law", R.C. van Caenegem
4. "Les Grandes questiones de la philosophie du droit", S.Goyard – Fabre R. Seve
5. "Autopoesis and Cognition. The Realization of the Living", Humbert R. Maturana and Francisco J. Varela
6. "In Defense of History", Richard J. Evans
7. "Philosophy of Religion: an introduction", William L. Rowe
8. "Getting Past No", William Ury
9. "Q'est-ce que la philosophie", Gilles Deleuze/Felix Guattari
10. "EU Media Law and Policy", David Goldberg, Tony Prosser, Stefan Verhulst
11. "Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors", Carl Sagan and Ann Druyan
12. "Philosphies of History", Grace E. Cairns

.....