

## ZULF'S FOUR-SPHERE THEORY AND KANT'S TRANSCENDENTAL IDEALISM

ZULFIKAR MOINUDDIN AHMED

Let me make my philosophical position very clear. I posit that objective reality in its totality down to  $10^{-13}$  centimeters is fully described by Four-Sphere Theory. I claim that all 'things-in-themselves' are included in this description in principle and there are no 'things-in-themselves' possible in the universe that are not covered by Four-Sphere Theory. This includes an objective time and space described mathematically.

In my philosophy, human subjectivity is then taking place in Four-Sphere Universe.

This differs immediately from Kant's Transcendental Idealism because here 'things-in-themselves' are being described in technical detail. For example all matter is going to be formed from spinor fields on the four-sphere in absolute linear time.

Kant's Theory posited that all humans can perceive are appearances and therefore both space and time are intuitive and subjective and dependent on human subjectivity.

I claim that Kant's theory here is wrong. I do not believe that space and time are subjective intuitions at all.

Now I will tell you what exists that we cannot observe of things-in-themselves, and that is that the observable physical universe is an evolving hypersurface in a static eternal four-sphere of eternally fixed radius. Therefore all of physical world and observed material world is not complete description of Existence. There are unobserved phenomena in the complement of the physical universe in the Four-Sphere that are not accounted for by ordinary human experience at all.

So my view here is that subjectivity is a complex phenomena – which I am attempting to understand still – and it is an open question whether individuals have any ability to experience beyond the three dimensional hypersurface in *space* but there is no possibility of deformation of time (so Einstein's Special and General Relativity are wrong). Three dimensional space is emergent in my theory, but they are not subjective at all. They are 'things-in-themselves'. Then there are morals that I have shown are uniform across the human race in distribution modulo small variability, and largely explained by evolutionary adaptations in genetics.

So I do take great exception to Kant's Transcendental Idealism. It is fundamentally wrong. His moral theory is wrong as well because morals are not a derivative of reason either.

There are other sorts of Transcendental Idealism that might be consistent with Four-Sphere Theory but Kant's particular Transcendental Idealism is wrong.

### 1. PLACE OF REASON IN HUMAN NATURE

The idea that reason is a gift for human beings is fundamentally the propaganda of Socrates that gained widespread acceptance. I studied mathematics at Princeton and am trained in it. To me, it is clear that Reason is not an automatic feature of human nature. There is some basic facility with reasoning and K-12 education provides us with some reasoning skills. But ordinary human psyche does not reason well without habituation. It is most certainly not universal or even almost universal. It is like being a soccer star. With practice and interest everyone could reach some competence in soccer. But it will be extraordinarily rare to find talents of the Brazilian strikers among the population. Reason is more like soccer in human race. Proficiency in Reason is rare and shines with practice. Much of human life today does not require extraordinary skills in Reason. Socrates and others who want to base things on reason – such as Kant on morality – are simply not capturing human nature or human life but are producing a theory that is interesting but not actually describing human nature at all.