

Anthropological Aspects of Reproduction Between Nature and Culture Categories and the Paradigm of Complexity

Lucio Zichella

Abstract: The human reproduction became a crucial anthropological problem. The categories in epistemology, according the triadic dimension conceptualized by Kant, on a defined first level, can help to explain the dualism of nature and culture (expressing according to Kant a thesis and antithesis dimension), especially for the multivariable aspect of the problem, with complexity (as a synthesis). E. Morin proposed the complexity paradigm, introduced in the last century in basic sciences problem because of a large number of variables, in human science. The complexity as a paradigm needs to be fulfilled on a second level by categories, now with an analytical role. The problem, in my opinion, can be affordable by the use of the three principles of Morin theory: 1. dialogue between dualistic terms, 2. circularity between causes and effects, 3. hologramatic relation between the whole and the parts, for the auto-eco-organized open system of human reproduction represented by three Entities (depictable by three rings) interconnected [a) woman–mother b) fetus–person c) physical-psychosocial environment] at all levels of integration from a basic role and function to a symbolic dimension of the three entities.

Zusammenfassung: Die menschliche Fortpflanzung wurde zu einem zentralen anthropologischem Problem. Die erkenntnistheoretischen Kategorien Kants, wie er sie in einer triadischen Anordnung konzeptualisierte, können auf einer definierten ersten Ebene bei der Erklärung des Dualismus von Natur und Kultur hilfreich sein (nach Kant verhalten sie sich wie These und Antithese). Das gilt besonders für die die multivariablen Aspekte des Problems. Dabei könnte Komplexität eine Synthese sein. E. Morin entwarf das Paradigma der Komplexität, das im letzten Jahrhundert in die Grundlagenwissenschaften eingeführt wurde, um der Fülle der Variablen in der Wissenschaft gerecht zu werden. Die Komplexität als ein Paradigma muss auf einer zweiten Ebene von Kategorien realisiert werden, die hier eine analytische Funktion haben. Das Problem kann meiner Meinung nach durch die Verwendung der drei Prinzipien der Theorie von Morin lösbar sein: 1. Dialog zwischen dualistischen Begriffen; 2. Zirkularität zwischen Ursachen und Wirkungen; 3. Holographische Relation zwischen dem Teil und dem Ganzen. Dies bezieht sich auf das auto-ökologisch organisierte offene System der menschlichen Fortpflanzung, das aus drei miteinander verbundenen Einheiten besteht und durch drei Dinge veranschaulicht werden könnten, die auf allen Ebenen von einer basalen Funktion bis zur symbolischen Dimension dieser drei Einheiten miteinander verbunden sind: a) Frau–Kind, b) Fetus–Person, c) physikalisch-psychosoziale Umgebung.

Keywords: reproduction, anthropological dimension, nature, culture, categories, complexity, knowledge, synthetic approach, analytical approach

Reproduction as an essential function of life which nature in almost all living species, except in cataclysmatic conditions, never gives up, has become mainly a voluntary function in the human being.

In our society the reasons for this trend are cultural: a) the new role and the identity of woman, undisputed main protagonist in human reproduction, b) scientific and technological progress in the methods of control and planning of fertility.

The variables of the reproductive problems are numerous: biological, psychobiological, psychological, sexological, sociological, political, economical, but mainly, as I said, they are of cultural and individual identity. The study of the role of these variables in individual situations could be helped by specific categories and by the complexity paradigm.

The categories are primary predicates reintroduced by I. Kant (1724–1804) in his theory of knowledge (the criticism) at the end of the seventeenth century (twenty centuries after the conceptualization by Aristotle in the third century B.C.).

In the beginning the Kantian categories were four (quantity, quality, relation, modality), each of these were later developed in a triadic family in a total amount of twelve. Again, according to Kant, considering the usual dichotomy dimension of all a priori conceptualization (for example in human reproduction: nature and culture) in the knowledge, we need to add a third predicate (in a thesis, antithesis, synthesis dimension): to the thesis of the nature, the antithesis of culture asks for a third factor (in a Kantian transcendental logic aimed to improve the knowledge and the experience). In human reproduction today, Complexity is the third factor.

In fact the Complexity paradigm introduced in the last century in basic science by W. Weaver and then in human science by E. Morin is a tool, which is not yet well defined, but essentially conceptual to improve the knowledge and experience especially in conditions characterized by a large number of variables that are not affordable by statistics.

The complexity paradigm, as Morin says, is still a problem rather than a solution, pertaining to open auto-eco-organized vital systems. The human reproduction is an open auto-eco-organized system of three Entities: a) woman–mother b) fetus–person c) physic–psychosocial environment, in a dynamic equilibrium represented by three interconnected rings. The Kantian theory was charged of logicism and fixity from time to time over two centuries; as to fixity I need to underline that Kant himself conceptualized the possibility of a second level of categories named predicative in an open perspective developed later particularly by Husserl.

Complexity needs a second level of Categories that could be the three principles of Morin theory in my opinion:

1. Dialogical principle: conflicting data turned out mutually constitutive.
2. Cyclical return principle: indistinction between cause and effect.
3. Hologramatic principle: presence of the whole in the part; mutual co-belonging of the whole and the part.

This approach could open new perspectives in the difficult epistemology, in the otherwise rational concept of complexity, in auto-eco-organized vital function of human reproduction helping in the knowledge of some apparently paradoxical conditions and/or evolution of some clinical reproductive pattern: Mother nature in its wisdom with the intent to increase reproduction had decided to connect sex-

uality to it. The results are often not surprisingly opposite. Sexuality, an enigmatic disquieting dimension of life has a role in the maturation, identity, and relationship in terms of determinations and expectations of the human being as a person and is not limited to the reproductive function.

Categories from the Kantian synthetic intellectual role in the criticism to the empirical analytic role of Lewis in pragmatism. F. E. Beneke (1798–1854) said that Kant ended the period of analysis of Locke and Hume and started the period of synthesis. A burning problem. The theoretical problem of the analytic and synthetic mainly in the experience and the truth crossed, after Kant, two centuries till the destructive criticism of the difference between the two by Willard van Orman Quine in his book “The two dogma of empirism” 1951. However the practical difference, for which I refer to Lewis approach to the categories functions, remains a real condition in everyday life of the human being problems in the world. At the beginning I gave credit to the meaning of the triadic composition, proposed by Kant, between thesis antithesis and synthesis, which finds a solution in the relation between nature and culture through the complexity in human reproduction.

Now is the pragmatism of Lewis (1883–1964) that could give a meaning, to the analytical approach, in the second level of categories of human reproduction, with the Complexity, which otherwise will remain an empty paradigm. According to Lewis, a Kantian pragmatist in USA, the analytic approach to the a priori and to the categories (the main tools of Kantian criticism) are necessary to “question the experience” (living aside his point of view of the a priori role) for him the categories have to be the lead in taking action towards problems arising from experience. It is right to give a short summary of the conceptual evolution of categories through two centuries after Kant.

In the controversies on the Kantian theories, I have already discussed the charge of fixity; the logicism was the other main charge for the Kantian origin of the categories by the tables of judgements (one century later the Neokantist movement from Marburg tried to clarify the problem speaking of the possible connection between judgment and experience).

The psychologism was another charge while J. F. Herbart (1774–1841) a universally respected philosopher, accused Kant of not paying sufficient attention to the psychological problems. But the major criticism to the epistemology of Kant came at the end of the 18th century, when the entire philosophical world had to face the great improvement of the science.

Philosophy had thought for centuries to be the most important referee of science (Kant defined in his lessons of logic, published after his death, the Philosophy as “a science of relations of every knowledge.”). The positive impact of the philosophy with the science during Kant time deteriorate with the positivism of Comte and later also with the neopositivism (logic empirism) based on the Vienna circle at the beginning of the 19th century, this philosophical movement which retained to be the only philosophy of the science, had also an ideological crisis characterized historically by the transition of L. Wittgenstein (considered the main interlocutor of Vienna circle manifesto) to the analytic philosophy one ideology with a much more limited ambition in respect of the science.

Neokantism (from the schools of Marburg and Baden with the important contribution from Berlin by E. Cassirer) conceptualized a number of projects of

dynamization, formalization, transformation and re-foundation to cope with the emerging problems correlate to the progress of the science. Also the other philosophical movement encountered the same problems.

In the Neokantism prevails a) a dissociation from the ancillary role towards science recalling the old spirit of the discipline linked to the ontological domain, b) one dynamization project, based on the suggestion coming from the science of spirit of W. Dilthey (1883) a science devoted especially to the knowledge of the human being as a whole in his historical dimension, asking therefore the need of specific categories: in some way, at the end one new epistemology with anthropological dimension I like to remember, that we have to differentiate the anthropologism which affirms „the primary role“ of the human being and the anthropological science which derived at the beginning from the study of the remote cultures in the world from the anthropological philosophy.

Kant had foreseen the anthropologic philosophical approach with the questions he posed in his logic lessons: 1) what can I know? (metaphysic domain), 2) what should I do? (moral domain), 3) what can I hope? (religion domain), 4) what is the human being? (anthropological domain).

He confirmed the priority of the forth question. His pragmatic anthropological philosophy was for him only a double intuition, a) the evolution of philosophy toward anthropological philosophy b) the need of a pragmatist approach to it. As Ferrari underlines in his book (*a priori e categorie*) Kant in his critic of judgment regretted not to have paid enough attention to the problems of the human being in the world; a philosophical target considered today in many analysis the only legitimation to survive after the declaration of the death of the philosophy (Cellucci).

I like to underline the philosophical profile at least of some important contemporary authors regarding the always conceptual novelty of categories. From the intellectual deduction to the empirical deduction (as Aristotle had conceptualized XX centuries before at the beginning of the history of the categories), from a synthetic project to an analytic project in a pragmatist perspective.

E. Husserl, the founder of Phenomenology (with his incomparable capacity to integrate with the psychological approach of his teacher Brentano, the logicism of Bolzano and Frege and the *a priori* transcendentalism of Kant with which he had a love and hate approach), has to be quoted here, as I have already announced for his theories of categories deduced by one empirical domain of regional ontology in which human being has to search the pre predicative and pre categorical suggestions with which build up new categories. One concrete project, which overcomes the accusation of fixity, addressed to the Kant categories, opening therefore a real anthropological perspective deriving from the suggestion of human experience.

G. Ryle (1900–1970) distinguished member of analytic philosophy in Cambridge who has had a positive approach to the categories, of whom I'd like to quote only two sentences: “To be in the dark on philosophical problems is proportional at not to be in the light on the categories.” “One categorical therapy is what is needed for contemporary thought.”

M. Heidegger (1889–1970) “one authentic philosophy is the Life philosophy” “one of the major problem of modern philosophy is the problem of categories”. Existential analytic (the name of his theory) to make possible all the investiga-

tion (psychological biological, anthropological) of human being, not only to make clear the problem of being but in some manner the discovery of the one a priori to discuss the problem: what is human being?

In my opinion he is the only one who made really a correlation between ontology and anthropology: Being and to be in the world. Nowadays the theory of categories is also legitimated by the contributions of M. Korner during his stay in Oxford and of P. F. Strawson (1919–2006) from Oxford university. The category theory was not rejected by modern cognitivism which presents for example some interesting opinion like the algebraical approach (R. Jackendoff) to the end-point of the interaction between them that perhaps could be useful in the interpretation of some aspects of human reproduction, of the positive or negative role of principles of the Morin theory as second level of categories.

References

- Abbagnano N (1993) *Storia della Filosofia*. Vol 4. La Filosofia moderna di secoli XVII e XVIII. Ed. TEA. UTET. Torino
- Cellucci C (2008). *Perché ancora la Filosofia*. Ed. Laterza, Bari
- Ferrari M (2000) *Categorie e a priori*. Il mulino, Bologna
- Husserl E (2008) *La crisi delle scienze europee e la fenomenologia trascendentale*. Ed. Il Saggiatore, Milano
- Kant I (2004) *La logica*. Ed. Laterza, Bari
- Kant I (2006) *Antropologia pragmatica*. Ed. Laterza, Bari
- Morin E (1990) *Introduzione al pensiero complesso*. Ed. Sperling & Kuffer, Milano

Correspondence address: *Lucio Zichella*, Prof., Via Sant' Angela Merici 30, 00162 Rome, Italy