

Man is the Measure

The Foundations of General Schemas Theory

Kent D. Palmer, Ph.D.

P.O. Box 1632
Orange CA 92856 USA
714-633-9508
kent@palmer.name

Copyright 2004 K.D. Palmer.
All Rights Reserved. Not for distribution.
Started 04.05.19; Version 0.6; 04.05.27; gst02a06.doc

Keywords: General Schemas Theory, Systems Engineering, Systems Theory,

"Of all things the measure is man, of the things that are, that [for "how"] they are, and of things that are not, that [for "how"] they are not." Protagoras¹

Starting Point

Protagoras famously said that "Man is the measure of all things" which Socrates disputed according to Plato. It is with this statement of the Sophist Protagoras that we will find out starting point in our journey to understand General Schemas Theory. In ancient times this doctrine combined with an agnosticism about the gods, and the claim that Protagoras could make the weaker argument better, that led to his being branded a relativist. However, this gloss of his concept that we know so little of from his own words may in fact be an over simplification of the views of Protagoras who was also a man concerned with the meanings of words. Therefore, we might have expected him to choose his words very carefully when he said the words that he is most known for and which were most quoted so that finally

¹ (DK80b1) See
<http://www.utm.edu/research/iep/p/protagor.htm>

they became almost all we know of him. If we look into this question of how man is the measure, rather than the gods then we enter into a place at which the schemas were first becoming visible. We know that Plato in the Timaeus is the first use of the schemas in a systematic philosophy work in our tradition. Protagoras was much older than Plato and died when Plato was very young. However, Plato like Socrates dedicated himself to fighting the Sophists of which Protagoras was one of the most famous. His brand of sophism was relativism which Aristophanes uses to destroy the reputation of Socrates, as if the playwright could not tell the difference between Socrates the anti-sophist and Protagoras the sophist. This begs the question of making a non-nihilistic distinction between the relativist and the non-relativist, yet not yet the dogmatic absolutist. And this of course brings us back to the theme that Plato revisits over and over which is how to make non-nihilistic distinctions and why they are important. But here we want to merely focus on the concept of Protagoras in light of the over two thousand year history of philosophy in the Western tradition. It is clear that Plato did not believe that the gods were the measure of all things as the ancients had believed. His position was more sophisticated than that. But one can see that Protagoras standing in the face of that tradition is saying something very radical when he claims that Man is the Measure of all things, especially when that is combined with an agnosticism about the gods and the claim to be able to make the weaker argument (or bad) argument stronger (or better). Protagoras' relativism was turning the world of the Greeks upside down. This radicalism made possible the more sophisticated position of Plato, that not the gods but non-duals like Order, Right, Good and Fate were the measure of all things rather than man. In other words non-duals really only come to the fore as a possibility where the duals are sharply drawn in relation to each other. Protagoras served Plato's generation as did so many of the Sophists and Pre-Socratics to make clear the oppositions so that a non-dual position might be explored. Here we use the term Non-dual to mean neither

One nor Many but something else, i.e. in the sense that it is used by Loy in his book Nonduality. But at this point we will not go into this subject but merely note that Protagoras was a very useful precursor of Plato and Socrates. He was in some ways the anti-Socrates which the common man could not tell apart from Socrates himself. There are really three positions. There is the position of piety that says that the gods are the measure of all things, especially Zeus, then there is the position of Protagoras that Man is instead the measure of all things, signaling that we have moved out of the Mythopoietic era into the Metaphysical era, and then there is the position that recognizes that neither God nor Man are the measure, that in fact the Fates stand over both god and man in the scheme of things and that the non-duals are the measure of all things. It was part of the mythic doctrine that even Zeus could not change fate. If we wanted we could bring this into our era by looking at the work of Jung where he describes Mercurius, or Hermes, as the non-dual between Lucifer and Christ, whom the Gnostics thought of as brothers of the same Father. In other words in both the ancient and the modern analytical psychology setting there is a strict and definite dualism and there is sometimes defined a third option that is outside the dualism which is what Jung sees the Alchemists creating with their concept of Mercurius, the trickster that is neither good nor bad, but which is both good and bad too. If Socrates who supports the non-dual option cannot be told from Protagoras then there is a failure to make the non-nihilistic distinction properly. Socrates embodies the non-nihilistic distinction and when he is confused with Protagoras then we are trapped in the dualism between Absolutism and Relativism, or between Christ and Satan with respect to the symbolism of the Self. Harold Bloom says that Milton's Satan is the archetype of the Modern Western Poet. He is the only interesting character in Milton's work, just as Judas is the interesting one among the disciples of Christ. It is very difficult to make non-nihilistic distinctions but it is necessary to keep on trying, because it is the only alternative to being lost in the darkness of

nihilism.

So Protagoras is important in as much as he is a foil for Plato's definition of Socrates as the anti-sophist. But this obscures for us the importance of what he actually says. He says that Man is the measure of all things, not the Gods. If we forget for a moment what the measure of all things is and just concentrate on the fact that they must be measured, then we come to the key point I want to make as my starting place for trying to understand General Schemas Theory. Protagoras is saying that measurement is necessary between something and the things of the world. We need to ask ourselves what the nature of that measurement is. We need to ask ourselves what measurement is. We all know that measurement is taking some standard length and comparing it to actual lengths of things in the world. Measurement devices are created in such a way that they can register gradations of difference that are recognizable. The measurement device, say a ruler, has marks on it as to various lengths that are repeated so that we can count them and get a number that represents the length, or what ever the quantity is that we are measuring. Measuring devices allow us to go from qualitative differences to quantitative differences. And of course both quality and quantity are categories both for Aristotle and Kant. It is one of the major category differences that everyone seems to agree upon and measurement devices are designed to allow us to make this transformation; they allow us to apply numbers to the world beyond simple counting. In measuring we take out our standard yardstick or foot long ruler and we compare it to something that has length. We look back and forth between the measuring stick and the thing and gage the differences and compare to the marks in order to get a reading. Once we have that reading we forget the measurement process and use the results for calculation or reasoning about the world. What is not often thought about is that this use of the measurement device is a kind of projection of a grid onto a landscape, even if it is only a partial projection. Right there in the process of

measuring we are seeing a projection of some internally generated grid onto the landscape or things in it. What the ancients, Protagoras and Plato all agree on is that this projection process must occur. In other words it is not questioned that measurement should occur, the question is what is the proper standard, the gods, men or the non-duals that are at the core of the worldview. This is a lot like Baudrillard's point in The Mirror of Production that what capitalism and communism share is the assumption that humans must be productive, that productivity is the end all and be all of human existence. Radically different views of the world can share the same fundamental assumption. In the case we are looking at what is shared is the idea that things need to be measured by some standard, and that measurement process is a process of projection of an idealized grid of some sort onto the world of things. In many ways we have never gotten out from under this fundamental assumption. Baudrillard's example of capitalism and communism sharing production of humans as an assumption is merely another way of talking about the projection process as productivity. In fact, if we look at the Western Scientific and Technological and Philosophical tradition as a whole we can see that it is laboring under this fundamental assumption that measurement as projection must happen, later it becomes human production that is measured, i.e. man measures himself against standards. We might turn around the saying of Protagoras and say that Man is the measurer of all things, and the standards are what differ. Man is even the measurer of himself. He does not just project abstracted grids on things but also upon himself as yet another thing his own the world. So in this light we see that there is something deeper in Protagoras' statement that we might have expected at first. And what this deeper thing points to is the projection process itself as being integral to our experience of ourselves and other things. This book is about the projection process and its differentiation. What is interesting is that the projections are invisible to us because we live in our own projections like fish live in water or birds live in air, they are a medium to us that we

ourselves weave. So it is very difficult to see this self-projected medium. It is transparent to us. And when it is most transparent it is most effective. However, over the centuries we have found ways to sense the discontinuities in this invisible projection. These discontinuities between the various modes of projection give rise to the difference between the schemas. Schemas come out as the varied natures of the projection itself that makes possible measurement. If the grid is not projected onto the landscape then we cannot read off the numbers that represent the measurement. The projection of the grid is itself based on the projection of Space and Time that Kant called *a priori* and which we now think of relativistically as Spacetime after Einstein. So as we go deeper into how measurement is possible, then we get to the projection of differentiated spacetime eventually which is then nature of the schemas. It is not something which is obvious at first. It is one of the last things we recognize, i.e. that we ourselves are projecting differentiated spacetime. Yet it is the foundation of everything else we experience and thus it is a very significant insight. It is there encapsulated in the saying of Protagoras. Plato unpacks that into his theory of the forms, and his physical theory that sees form as triangles and platonic solids that give a place for his abstract forms to come into the things of the world using the combination of hot/cold and wet/dry into elements as the basis of this theory geometrical theory of schematized embodiment. Eventually it is Kant who realizes that there must be some a priori projection prior to experience. And this becomes more sophisticated with Heidegger's interpretation of Kant's Transcendental Imagination as the basis of his Fundamental Ontology. These steps eventually lead to our postmodern understanding of the kinds and aspects of Being based on the exploration of fundamental ontology by Continental philosophers such as Derrida, Merleau-Ponty, Deleuze and others. In our tradition the history of the schema is a hidden undercurrent. In this book we will attempt to bring out that undercurrent and make it more obvious that it is a broader deeper current than many others

that have been highlighted in the history of Philosophy. Understanding the nature of the schema is very difficult, and philosophers have been struggling with it for centuries. But it is crucial to understand that history if we are to lay the foundation of a discipline called General Schemas Theory. That is because right away the question is what a Schema might be. There are so many uses of the term today that it is difficult to pick out the key ideas from the various weeds that have grown in our garden. Fortunately Umberto Eco in Kant and the Platypus has done some weeding for us and has isolated the concept of the mathematical or geometrical schema from other uses of the term. So we will build upon his good work and concentrate on that use of the term and see it as being exactly what Protagoras, Plato, Kant and Heidegger are talking about, and which most philosophers have ignored throughout the development of the tradition. Certainly not enough attention has been paid to the concept of the schema to allow General Schemas Theory to be proposed prior to this, as far as I know. General Schemas Theory is a further generalization of General Systems Theory. But it is not until we get to the level of the Schema Theory that it is possible to see the links back to Kant, Plato, and Protagoras. The key thing is that the declaration that man is the measure of all things may only appear to be relativistic and nihilistic. That is because when he says that man is the measure he may be assuming that man contains the non-duals of the Western Tradition within him so that he is actually a precursor of Plato. The question comes up in myth of the relation of Zeus to the Fates. Myth says in a whisper that even Zeus operates under the necessity of the fates. So the question of the relation between the immortals, mortals and the non-duals is raised from the very beginning. Instead of Christ, Satan and Mercurius we could instead talk of Zeus, Hades and Poseidon as the representatives of the extreme artificial nihilistic duals and the non-dual. Poseidon is the only god from among the Greek gods of Indo-European origin. They represent Air, Earth, Water and Fire is given to Man by the Titan Prometheus. In other words Man is the strange creature who Zeus fails to

destroy who becomes equal to the gods in a sense by the intervention of a Titan, i.e. as an act of revenge of the older defeated chthonic generation of gods against the newer Olympians generation. Poseidon new eventually we would pass out of the Mythopoietic into the Metaphysical era and men would forget the gods. He knew man would be consumed by the fire of reason and forget the gods. Thus Empedocles uses his model of the four elements and makes his world oscillate between love and strife as a way of saying that man has replaced the gods because he comes to embody all the elements as he acts as a mirror to creation. It is one thing for men to be fragmented into parts and then to rediscover wholeness as we move from the extreme of love to the extreme of strife in our attempt to embody both the view of Parmenides and Heraclitus at the same time which was the goal of Empedocles system. But it is another thing to say that there needs to be a measure based on a projection based on the a priori of spacetime. Plato attempts to improve on Empedocles by giving the measure as the non-duals that are part of the structure of the world rather than thinking of them as within man. They are daemonic, that is half way between the gods and men. The elements become building blocks of the universe which is in a steady state rather than oscillating between condensation and expansion, love and strife, fragmentation and wholeness. But in that steady state there are differentiations of the receptacle of spacetime where the qualitative forms enter our world and are embodied. They enter into the quantas of Plato's triangles and his Platonic solids which are the two and three dimensional quantitative embodiments of Form. The ideal forms enter into these quantitative shells in spacetime and that is what allows quality and quantity to combine at the lowest structural level to create the things of our world out of the four elements. Eventually Kant separated the qualitative from the Quantitative and gave them a dialectical relation in his categories based on his reading of Aristotle's categories. Once form was defined as the primary schema then our tradition ran with that and forgot the

interfacing between the qualitative content and the quantitative shell. The exploration of the form schema took us from Greek times up to the end of the Nineteenth century to run its course. Only in the Twentieth century did we begin to take seriously other schemas like System and Pattern. And now in the Twenty-first century we need to begin to take all the schemas seriously and understand their relations to each other. We are on an exponential curve. For almost 2000 years there was only one schema of importance: form. Last century there were two other adjacent schemas: System and Pattern that were explored. Now we wish to explore all the schemas and have proposed a single discipline General Schemas Theory to attempt to elucidate them all. It will be interesting to see how long it takes to make that kind of discipline a reality. It will be even more interesting to see how it will mirror back to the disciplines their projection process and how that changes the disciplines. Right now it is unclear that it is a projection process that is occurring. Many scientists are realists and believe that they are seeing the actual schemas themselves out in the world. Yet it is phenomenology that allows us to see how we project onto the things of the world the organizations of the schemas. Slowly we get a glimpse of Man measuring all things, using different standards provided by the schemas. There is a subtle kind of measurement in which man measures himself by recognizing how he projects onto things the schemas. It is this more subtle sense of taking the measurement of man based on his measurement of himself in which we want to engage. General Schemas Theory understands the statement that was made when a man first stepped on the moon, i.e. "one small step for Man but a giant leap for Mankind," very differently. The mistake in this statement that was inadvertent was no accidental error or misspeaking. Man by going to the moon takes a measure of himself and that measurement process is a Leap, i.e. an emergent event, for Mankind. We measured ourselves by going to the moon. But in measuring ourselves we measured the process of measuring, because we projected the

possibility and then realized it. And that possibility was based on the projection of space between earth and the moon as crossable. Man takes small steps measuring himself by the very process of doing what comes naturally, walking. But when that movement becomes a move across an unbridgeable gulf then it is a Leap which makes a measure of all mankind as capable of space flight and exploration. We are caught in this paradox that measuring things is really a self-measurement. Measurement is based on projection, and projection is based on throwing out spacetime as Kant says prior to our experience as a basis for measurement. This gets even more complex when Fundamental Ontology enters the picture. But the fundamental idea that we must measure was stated long ago by Protagoras. What was left in the air was the standard of measure and where it come from. The idea that it comes not from the gods or men but from the non-duals at the core of the worldview is an interesting intellectual move on the part of Plato. We will need to explore the ramifications of that intellectual move toward a potential position before the one/many distinction comes into being.

"Of all things the measure is man, of the things that are, that [or "how"] they are, and of things that are not, that [or "how"] they are not."

Protagoras, statement is more complex than we normally state it. It has a second part that we take for granted. That is the statement that man is measuring the things that are and the things that are not, in other words he is making a measurement at the level of Fate determining the difference between existence and non-existence. Thus Protagoras is pointing us directly at the core of fundamental ontology by his statement. Man is deciding what is and what is not. But that decision calls into question existence and fate at the same time. Protagoras is pointing here to the interface between Being and Existence as he talks about the non-dual of fate.

We can only understand this once we realize that there are different kinds of Being, and that these kinds of Being are differentiated into meta-levels. There are four meta-levels of Being discovered by fundamental ontology: Pure, Process, Hyper and Wild. At the fifth meta-level there is a phase transition into Existence. The non-dual of Fate in the Western worldview is designated as being the arbiter between existence and non-existence. When Protagoras tells us that man is the measure of what Is and what Is Not then he is pointing to the nexus of the difference between pure projection, i.e. Being and the lack of projection which is Existence. When we say that something is not, we deny it as part of the fundamental projection of Being. But for man to be the measure of things in this way it assumes that he stands outside of Being, i.e. that there is Existence beyond Being. It is at the level of the duals of Existence and Non-Existence that fate appears as a non-dual in our tradition. That means that man is expressing his own fate in his measuring what is and is not. The fundamental nature of existence appears as the difference between projection and lack of projection, i.e. man measuring or not measuring. See the knot that Protagoras is pointing towards. The measurement done by man is something very fundamental because it goes beyond ontology into existentialism. Man is an existent one part of which is his measurement of whether things are or are not. By the very act of that measurement we learn of the possibility of existence, the lack of that measurement. By looking at the nub of this interface between Being and Existence we confront the fate of man.

All this comes to a head because there is Parmenides who denies that there is anything except Being. How can man measure out Being and Non-Being if there is no non-Being. Parmenides denies the way of appearance too which mixes Being and Non-Being. Parmenides appeals to a Goddess as the basis of his radical interpretation of metaphysics, but the real basis of his viewpoint is the paradoxes of Zeno which appeal to the force of reason making it seem impossible for time to exist.

Movement always leads to a contradiction of some sort, when viewed from the point of view of the present-at-hand or Pure Being. The goddess and the paradoxes say, that man cannot measure out his own fate by the decision as to what is and what is not. They both say that man cannot measure even himself because there is no non-Being, i.e. no existence. Parmenides would trap us in a Purely present-at-hand world and deny the ready-to-hand that Protagoras wants to highlight as the self/other measurement process. Heraclitus is the other extreme further away from Protagoras opposite Parmenides who makes everything into cosmic processes and forgetting man as the center of this process as we know it in ourselves.

Empedocles tries to marry the extremes of Parmenides and Heraclitus with a cosmic theory of the oscillation between perfection and destruction based on the functions of love and strife operating through world ages. But Protagoras has a more human position that is also between those of Parmenides and Heraclitus. It is a position that focuses on human finitude. Instead of appealing to the dynamic cosmology he places that dynamism in man as a measurement process that becomes a self measurement process. Self-measurement because man is seen as measuring out the projection of Being deciding what is and is not. Self measurement can only occur on the basis of existence as the opposite of projection. What causes projections to be made in steps? There must be discontinuities between the steps of the projection process and those discontinuities must be something other than Being, i.e. existence. Measurement needs those discontinuities created by the escapement to measure out the projection process. Existence and Being are two sides of the same matter. Man can measure out Being to things because he is rooted in existence, i.e. beyond what he is measuring out. By bringing together Being and Existence man *drees* his *weird*, acts out his fate.

We can take this back to Anaximander who was after Thales the progenitor of the metaphysical era. These were the first physical

scientists and philosophers of nature. Metaphysics and physics go together and can never be separated. In order to see the physis as physical we must construct a logos based on a metaphysical principle. Anaximander's metaphysical principle was the Apeiron, i.e. the unlimited. He ushered in the metaphysical era with the first map, the first cosmological model, the first prose book, and his definition of the first metaphysical principle. Ultimately this metaphysical principle that was ultimate became the Being of Parmenides. But when the tradition first started it was open as to what the metaphysical principle should be. With the selection of Being this openness was closed off in a particular direction that became crucial for the development of our tradition. When Being became the metaphysical principle then projection hid itself from itself, because Being is the projection of intelligibility. As Parmenides said, Thinking and Being are the same. What is unthinkable, i.e. existence, is outside of Being. That is why it is important that when we ascend the stairs of the meta-levels of Being that we encounter the unthinkable at the fifth meta-level. That encounter places Existence at the heart of Being as Heidegger says it is, a certain ecstasy that throws us outside ourselves. This throwing ourselves outside ourselves, what Heidegger calls *thrown-ness* of the human *dasein* (human being there) is the projection process. Protagoras sees it as measurement, by which man says what is and what is not. But in this projection process man measures out himself, i.e. what is essential in him which is his life that comes out of him as his projections of things, and more than that the spacetime in which things can be and which is necessary for any measurement to occur. For us to measure out Being, ours as time by the decision as to being and not being of things, we must have something to measure ourselves by and that is existence. As we measure ourselves out, in our lives, through our projections of spacetime, i.e. the measurement place, we encounter our existence, in the form of the finitude of our lives and the truth of our own death, and thus we discover our fate.

It is remarkable that so simple a statement, when put into the context of Pre-Socratic philosophy could have such a profound meaning. It is an early recognition of what Heidegger calls much later, *Dasein*, i.e. being-in-the-world. Just by making the way of being, the for-the-sake-of-which, of man measurement of things, and then saying that this measurement is done in terms of allotting Being or non-Being, Protagoras takes us to a place between Parmenides and Heraclitus which is not the reified synthesis of Empedocles. He does not agree with Parmenides that there is only Being and no appearance, nor non-Being. He does not agree with Heraclitus that everything is just cosmic flux of a universal river. He does not try to make a cosmic model that tries to marry these two extremes together as does Empedocles. Rather, he sees what Parmenides calls appearance, i.e. the middle path between Being and Non-being as measurement. Then he says that man is the measurer, and in that measurement he allots Being and Non-Being to things. But what is implicit in the term measurement is the fact that there is a comparison, and that means that there must be Existence which is the dual of Being that supplies the discontinuities which allow measurement to occur. If man can mediate between Being and Non-being then that means that man must be somehow above Being, i.e. what is measured out, and that means that as Heidegger says there must be some spark of existence in man, and as Heidegger says that spark of existence is the ecstasy of projection which underlies all measurement. If we do not project an ideal grid on the landscape we cannot measure anything. But to project that grid then we must first project the place of measurement, i.e. the spacetime environment where measurement takes place. And because that measurement is based on the existential projection of discontinuities we might expect that placement to be differentiated into kinds of places rather than merely being a homogeneous plenum. And that is the key point where the schemas are implied. For man to measure all things by projecting Being onto them there must be something other than Being

which allows man to rise above Being, which is existence, that supplies the discontinuities in the continuum that allows measurement itself. These discontinuities could merely be the marking off of spacetime which remains a plenum, or these discontinuities may be something deeper that actually are discontinuities between the organization of spacetime, such as the dimensions or their dual the schemas. If we read measurement to mean measurement of the things, and not the self then we only need the first type of discontinuities. But if we read measurement to be at the same time self-measurement then the second kind of discontinuity, the deeper discontinuity in the plenum of spacetime itself is necessary. That is because for man to measure himself he does not just need a ruler marked off by intervals to compare to something else. Instead he needs the projection process to be marked off into intervals or steps, and that these need to be distinguishable from each other, otherwise he would not be able to distinguish the passing of the projection process, i.e. its unfolding from man.

So the statement of Protagoras is very deep when seen in this light of reflexivity where measurement of the Being of other things, results in the projection which takes time, and this is the time it takes for *dasein* to be what it is, i.e. the projector of Being. But that involves necessarily the opposite of Being which is the ecstasy of Existence. And in measuring out the fate of things, man measures out his own fate. But in that process he projects not just Being but the spacetime within which things can take on their Being, and in that process he projects the schemas as different kinds of spacetime that allows him to know that the projection process itself is being measured out which is man's life as his being toward death. Unpacking this meaning from the words of Protagoras entails our reading back into his words something of the philosophy of Heidegger which allows us to see that measurement of Being is no mean process but is actually extremely profound.

This then is our starting point for our

exploration of General Schemas Theory. Implicit in the statement of Protagoras is the raising of the problem of projection, which we experience as relativity. We know from Einstein's work that relativity is the actual nature of Spacetime in a physical sense. Clocks are relative to each other depending on inertial frames of reference, but there is an absolute transformation between these inertial frames of reference called the Lorentz Transformation. Special Relativity theory tells us that the measurements devices, i.e. clocks, are all relative to each other. Thus Protagoras seems to have won the argument about relativity at least from the perspective of relativistic physics. But also in the realm of Quantum Mechanics measurement devices play a very special role and we have the idea of uncertainty where depending on what we measure outcomes are changed. This also sounds like a kind of relativity that becomes expressed in probabilities of outcomes and the paradox of the simultaneity of states in the unbroken probability wave. So here measurement in a sense really does determine what is and what is not at the outcome of an experiment. So Protagoras again seems to have won at least provisionally this argument as well in terms of relativity of outcomes to use of measurement instruments. The Athenians saw this relativism which we have come to accept at least in science as very threatening to their society and there is some talk that Protagoras was forced to flee Athens for his impiety. But in a strange way we can read his statement as a foretelling of the future of physics that sees man as measurer at the core of our understanding of the world, either as measurer by clocks of time or as measurer of the micro level where his instruments in some strange way determine the outcomes of experiments.

But then what can we make of the claim of Protagoras that he can make the weak argument the stronger. One way to view argument is through rhetoric, and there are different traditional modes of rhetoric. But one way to think of rhetoric is that all arguments are fictive and the various modes are merely

different ways to structure these fictive arguments. If we view argumentation in this way then the speaker in any argument is actually projecting his audience. The audience is projected as those who would accept such an argument. Now whether the actual audience agrees with the fictive audience is always something to be seen. But the speaker, or novelist, or writer of non-fiction, must project an argument toward a fictive audience who would be persuaded, and then the actual reaction of the audience either supports or belies that fictive projection. So when Protagoras tells us that he can make the weak argument the stronger, he is saying that he can project a fictive audience that accepts the weaker argument, and make that coincide with what the actual audience does. In other words he says he knows the secret as to how to project a fictive audience that becomes a real audience who accepts the weaker argument rather than the stronger. There was an assumption that the truth, reality, identity or presence, the aspects of Being, must coincide with the stronger argument. But Protagoras is telling us that the strength of the argument does not have to correspond to the aspects of reality, rather the projected fictive argument that is weak can seem stronger to the audience than the strong argument. To day we would merely say that the wrong argument was stronger than the right argument that was weaker. What Protagoras taught was how to gage the audience. The speaker is measuring out his words based on his gauging of the reactions of the audience. He is making what is not in keeping with the aspects of Being appear stronger. He is saying what is and is not to the audience and making them believe it so that they give the judgment that is desired by the speaker. In essence he was teaching the practice of Law, where even the lawyer who knows his client is guilty tries to get the jury to acquit the client. Only this competition in speeches guarantees a fair trial when what is in accord with the aspects of Being is in dispute. So there is an interface between the two statements by Protagoras. When the Man who is the measure of all things walks into the court then he must in his speech convince the

audience what is and is not. And because this is a projection then at times the better argument because it is true appears weaker so that the jury awards to the one with the strongest case in spite of the fact that the result does not reflect reality, truth, identity or presence. In other words Protagoras is telling us that all arguments are fictive and the trick is to gauge the audience, measure them, such that you fit your fictive argument to them, so that they make it a reality, or truth, in spite of the actual facts of the situation. In other words appearances may substitute for the aspects of Being which is something that Parmenides denies. But the key point is that this only occurs because all arguments are fictive projections. If it were not for the projection, the imagination of an audience that would accept a certain argument, and then measuring out ones words so that the audience actually does accept the argument, then there would be no use for rhetoric in the courtroom. Man measuring things in the end amounts to men measuring each other in the competitive arena of the court room and other arenas. Mutual measurement is a social construction process. In order to make it possible for the weaker case to overcome the stronger Protagoras appeals to words. Words have many meanings. By interpreting words differently and constructing an argument based on that interpretation which is coherent is how the weak argument is built up. In this way there are actually three levels in the way of thinking of Protagoras, which we will eventually identify with what is called Special Systems Theory. But here as we first encounter it we can say that there is the level of the words that are interpreted differently (Dissipative Ordering Level), then there is the measurement of things that becomes self-measurement (Autopoietic Symbiotic Level), and finally there is the projection of the fictive argument on the jury or audience and the mutual measurement by competition (Reflexive Social Level). These three levels go together in a way that will become more and more evident as we work our way through General Schemas Theory to the theory of the Special Schemas. But here we will merely say that it is remarkable that the three things we

know about Protagoras apparently forms a set of special systems. Fictive projections are made by interpreting words and constructing arguments. This is based on the speaker taking the measure of his audience, suiting the argument to the audience, and hoping that the real audience will accept the projection of the fictive audience and act based on that projection. If that happens then in the realm of mutual competition then the weaker argument can appear stronger. There can be distortions in the social field and the representations can be completely false but accepted and acted upon within a social group. As a group we can get lost in the mirror house of distorted mirrors that make things seem differently than they are. Thus the middle path of Parmenides gets constructed which is made up of appearances that depart from realities and truths of Being.

The fact that we only really know only three things about Protagoras and that these can be seen as forming a set of Special Systems is quite extraordinary. But this is a foreboding of things to come because throughout special systems theory there is an appeal to special systems theory and similar configurations to this will be seen over and over again.

What is important here is that in all the cases the concept of projection is being reinforced. We project meanings on words that allow for different interpretations that we use in arguments. We tailor the arguments to the audience taking the measure of the audience as it takes a measure of us as we speak. We hope to persuade the audience that our argument which may be in reality weaker is in fact stronger in this competition. We hope to distort or depart from the ordinary meanings of the aspects of Being in order to install a fictive view of the world that wins the court case and carries the day. The three levels support each other in the projection process. The ecstasy of existence that is the basis of measurement, the basis of interpretation, the basis of winning the argument is the overflowing of dasein. That ecstasy is differentiated differently at each level of the sequence of emergent levels. These discontinuities appear as the three things we

know about Protagoras. These three things we know about Protagoras turns out to be the truth about us, ourselves. Thus by taking the measure of Protagoras as a thinker, and thinking beyond the assumption of the tradition, we are in some way taking a measure of ourselves, because we ourselves are projecting on him, and what we know about him tells us something about our own projection process. The discontinuities between the statements we know about Protagoras, is the advent of existence that allows us to get the measure of our own projection process. In a way through him we get a transmission of a knowledge about the core of General Schemas Theory which is all about our a priori unconscious projection of spacetime as the background upon which measurement must occur. That background is not a homogenous plenum but is instead differentiated by the duality of dimensionality and the schemas. It must be, because measurement is for Protagoras a positing of Being and Non-Being for entities. That means we must rise above Being in order to make that allotment. Rising above Being means going into Existence. Thus we encounter existence in ourselves as the ecstasy of projection as Heidegger says. In the difference between existence and non-existence as opposed to Being and non-Being we discover our fate, as we measure out our lives in our unconscious projections. On the psychological level this projection process involves the production of things in patterns determined by the archetypes of the collective unconscious as described by Jung. There are many levels to this projection process. But we are here concerned only with the most basic one, the projection of spacetime as differentiated into schemas determined by dimensions. That is the a priori projection that determines in advance the a posteriori experience of things in discontinuously differentiated spacetime. Spacetime in physics is normally seen as a homogeneous plenum. What is different here is the idea that it is discontinuously broken up into the schemas on the basis of dimension. The schemas themselves are templates of understanding. Being means intelligibility, so the schemas are

forms of projected intelligibility organized prior to the encounter with the object at a particular ontic emergent level. It is so hard to differentiate and separate the ontic from the ontological emergent hierarchies of the things in the world from our projections of templates of intelligibility. But we do differentiate them in terms of our human scale. And this is where Protagoras becomes most valuable to us because he says basically that the human scale is preeminent, because it is our scale. Thus our finitude rules over the infinitude without taking away the primacy of the infinitude as the support for our finitude. Our finitude rules over the finitude by projecting human limited scales on things. These scales are associated with the schemas as templates of intelligibility. But the projections do not always agree exactly with the structure of the ontic emergent levels and thus we get science where our knowledge of the ontic emergent levels grows and we understand more based on the differentiation of them from the pre-understood schema that we unconsciously project. Protagoras tells us that the human scale is important, more important than the gods, more important than the non-duals at the core of the worldview that encompasses us as beings in the world. And we need to take Protagoras seriously on this point. The schemas are all about the projection of scale from a human point of view because they form an emergent hierarchy based on differences of scale. He says that our measuring all things by our own scales is primary. That primary scalar measurement is involuntary and unconscious and we only find out about it after the fact when phenomena do not fit into the molds that we project them into. But if we are to know ourselves, following Apollo's dictum then we must know what those involuntary and unconscious projected templates of understanding are like so we can keep them straight and separate from the phenomena that has its own structure that is in many cases different from the ontological hierarchy. By knowing our projections onto the things of the world that are not in concert with it we come to know ourselves. This is the basic premise of Jungian Psychology with respect to psychological phenomena. We are

continually projecting archetypes onto the world and living within them and it is only by becoming aware of that we can individuate ourselves and separate ourselves from our involuntary unconscious projections. But what we are concerned with here is a very fundamental form of archetype that is in fact our projection of spacetime itself as a differentiated dwelling for our finitude. But hints of this viewpoint can be seen in the sayings of Protagoras who was a pre-Socratic and a Sophist. In other words people were aware of projection being important from very early in the tradition in spite of the fact that for the most part it has been ignored by the tradition. In this book we will be following that dark thread of the Schemas through the tradition and attempting to come to a better understanding of what they are. But there is no better place to start than with Protagoras because although we know almost nothing about him, what we do know about him raises all the issues that are prominent in General Schemas Theory as a whole.

In "On the Gods," he wrote, "Concerning the gods, I have no means of knowing whether they exist or not or of what sort they may be."²

"About the gods, I am not able to know whether they exist or do not exist, nor what they are like in form; for the factors preventing knowledge are many: the obscurity of the subject, and the shortness of human life."³

Protagoras guides us in his view of the gods to understanding them as Kantian Noumena. For us the things in the ontic hierarchy are the noumena that we project schemas on in order to try to understand them, with the prior understanding that the projected templates are flawed representations that will be found to disagree with the noumena that they are projected upon. Building on that disagreement

² <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protagoras>

³

<http://campus.northpark.edu/history/Classes/Sources/Protagoras.html>

is called science which builds up a picture of the noumena in theory, despite our lack of actual access to it, and through the anomalies that appear when we project our schemas of understanding upon the noumena. The agnosticism of Protagoras concerning the Gods is the agnosticism we have toward the noumena that we see as the ontic emergent hierarchy we construct by the failure of reductionism in science. It is necessary to have this agnosticism in order to separate the ontic emergent hierarchy of the noumena cum phenomena from the ontological emergent hierarchy of the schemas. There is a certain obscurity that Kant points out that separates our knowledge of the phenomena from the noumena, what is really there out in nature. This obscurity is only made worse if we consider our projections to be the aspects of Being. Only by separating the two, ontic from ontological, can we hope to have any understanding of ourselves as knowers. In other words the separation of the noumena from the schemas is an act of self-consciousness on the part of the observer. We project involuntarily and unconsciously but we know we do it and we take that into account when we see how the phenomena react to the projection. The projection process because it is a measuring disturbs the object of observation. There are different patterns and each of them disturbs the noumenal object differently. Understanding the internal patterning of the templates of understanding helps us to take them out of account when looking at the phenomena.

In all this I am talking about the noumena, or in Jung's terminology the psychoid, i.e. the external appearance of the collective unconscious in physical things. But it is clear that the noumena do not actually exist as such, but are part of the projection. In other words saying the noumena exist is a reification of what is a process. No more than there is really a difference between subject and object, or conscious or unconscious, all these dualisms are merely ways of talking and theorizing. What is really going on is more subtle. But without a great deal of terminological

scaffolding such as that Heidegger built up in Being and Time it is difficult not to talk in these reified terms. But this reminder is necessary so that the reader does not get stuck in the dualities offered up by this argument as if they were reified things in the world. Phenomenologically there is no noumena (its bracketed). The noumena is a fiction, like many of the fictions produced by argumentation. It is a fiction that allows us to think about the difference between our projections and what is really there beyond the projections as Kant wanted to do. But there is nothing really there, the entire split between ontic and ontological takes place in consciousness. Another way to talk about it is in the Autopoietic style developed by Maturana and Varela in which we admit that there is only a closed boundary between consciousness and the outside world. Perturbations at the boundary of the autopoietic system are the equivalent to what I called anomalies above. Our schemas are the internal organization of our consciousness which encompasses everything and makes sense of all things within the boundaries of consciousness. But occasionally there is a perturbation to this reinforcing cycle, and that allows us to construct a world that is different from that recirculation of reinforcement based on the pattern of the perturbations. Autopoietic theory says the boundary is mostly closed, but there is some leakage into the autopoietic system and that leakage is enough to create a picture of the world that is distinct from the recirculating self-reinforcing patterns with consciousness and even the collective consciousness of physics. The schemas in this picture are the self-reinforcing recirculating patterns that act as templates of understanding for all phenomena based on the articulation of spacetime into non-homogenous patches based on dimensionality. We construct the view of the ontic realm based on small perturbations or anomalies that go against this over all patterning. What is interesting is that the schemas are mostly adaptive to our environment and that they only betray us occasionally. But, of course, where they betray us most are on scales that are beyond the reach

of our naked finitude. Physics has to fight this the most because it continually explores more and more remote scales. It is this close adaptation of the schemas to the environment within which our finitude is concerned for the most part which makes it less fit for projection onto other scales. So the success of our adaptation to the *meso* level scales is precisely what causes problems when we try to apply the same schemas to the *macro* and *micro* scales. This is what makes the reference of Protagoras to the shortness of life pertinent. Protagoras points directly to our finitude, and because of our finitude we need the schemas as a way to measure ourselves against infinite and infinitesimal scales. The measure of our lives is short, so obscure subjects that might take a long time to ferret out are out of reach of our understanding. What is out of reach of our human understanding has no schematic templates of understanding associated with it. Thus the schemas are seen by this view to be finite in number, because there is a limit past which they do not scale. Understanding those limits is to some degree a self-understanding. Protagoras knows his limits and so should we if we are to know ourselves well.

Protagoras and Logos

In the foregoing I attempted to outline my own idea of where in the Western Tradition the concept of Schema first gained prominence. I immediately tried to verify this intuition and found the book Protagoras and Logos⁴ by Edward Schiappa. This book confirms many of my suspicions about the importance of the work of Protagoras that has been downplayed because he had been categorized as a Sophist rather than as a Pre-Socratic philosopher. There is a general prejudice against the sophists started by Plato and carried on by Aristotle that has influenced the entire tradition. There are almost no studies of individual sophists, and I was just lucky that such a good ground breaking study of Protagoras has been done. That study shows that not only is what I said in my starting point

section more or less true but it shows that the actual situation is even more interesting than I suspected. In this section I will discuss Schiappa's book and the consequences of his views on Protagoras. From there we will go on to discuss how Plato treated Protagoras in his dialogues and then move on to look at the Timaeus which is where Plato first introduces the schema. That will entail some exposition of the development of the theory of forms in Plato which culminates in the theory that he presents in the Timaeus. The Timaeus is a key dialogue because it was very late in Plato's works and so represents the endpoint in his development of the theory of the forms (the fundamental schema in the Western tradition) but also it was the only dialogue of Plato known in the Middle Ages. So its influence on our tradition was profound, that is because if you only have the Timaeus you might think that Plato and Aristotle had very similar ideas and that is what makes our tradition during the Medieval period so slanted toward Aristotelianism. What Schiappa suggests towards the end of his book is that Aristotle's principle of excluded middle / non-contradiction may have been a reaction to Protagoras which incorporated some of his key ideas but then transformed them. This principle is the foundation of Western Metaphysics and needs to be considered if we are to understand the fundamental biases of our tradition. The fact that Protagoras set the stage for this development of Aristotle's metaphysics is quite unexpected. So the rehabilitation of Protagoras gives us a unique entry point into the Western Tradition from which our understanding of the importance of schemas might develop. It is so fascinating that the relativistic position of Protagoras makes possible the rendering visible of the necessity of the schema, and that we can see Protagoras' position as an alternative to the synthesis of Empedocles which does not make visible the schema but continues to hide it. Plato took his key idea of the elements that is used in the Timaeus from Empedocles' dynamic cosmology. But, perhaps, in a more subtle way it was Protagoras' theory that answered to Parmenides and Heraclitus that was a more

⁴ University of South Carolina Press, 2003

profound influence on him. Plato was trying to find a measure that was something other than either the gods or man. That drove him into the non-dual realm to posit the Good, and other non-duals as the measure of things. But it was the position of Protagoras that set up the possibility for Plato of finding that non-dual beyond and before the middle that Aristotle eventually outlawed. To think that Aristotle's outlawing of the excluded middle was also a development from Protagoras' work makes him even more profound as a precursor, because the establishment of the excluded middle set the fundamental bias of the worldview for two thousand years against the explicit formulation of non-duals. Schiappa shows that what little we know of the work of Protagoras can be used together to establish a fairly good idea of his positions on various matters for which he is remembered, mainly because of their repercussions in the works of others that can be traced back to Protagoras. So it is clear that we need to slow down and take Protagoras very seriously before we barge ahead into the works of Plato and Aristotle concerning the schema. In this case getting the entry point just right will determine to a great extent our trajectory through the tradition. Because the schema is something by definition a priori and invisible to us how we approach it will be very telling in the results of this study. The fact that this invisible part of our own projection mechanism becomes slightly visible with Protagoras because of his focus on man perhaps for the first time in our tradition means that this first blush of the idea deserves extra attention in order to see how the emergent event occurred. Protagoras was a sophist by trade but he was a philosopher by his bent and was not appreciated in the same way the other pre-Socratics have been appreciated by the later tradition even though he was respected by Plato himself in ways often overlooked.

Schiappa makes a broad argument that the Sophists were not all of the same ilk, even though they were grouped together and branded as a terrible influence not just by the Athenians but by Plato. They were the many-headed hydra that stood as the contrast to

Socrates, but from whom many could not distinguish Socrates. The main theme in Plato's dialogues was the question of how one distinguished between Socrates and the Sophists. The contrast between Socrates and the Pre-Socratics was clear. Socrates concerned himself with human issues while the Pre-Socratics concerned themselves with the kosmos and physis mostly rather than with humans. But really the only difference between Socrates and the Sophists was that the Sophists worked for money and were foreigners while Socrates worked under the spell of the oracle of Delphi for free and was a citizen. Socrates challenged the sophists and used them as his straw man to prove his own wisdom that was declared by the oracle at Delphi. Among the crucial confrontations between Socrates and the Sophists, one particular one is of utmost importance and that is the confrontation between Protagoras and Socrates. This is because Aristophanes could not distinguish between them. Socrates is called to commit suicide because of that inability to discriminate between them. This is because in Aristophanes' comedy *The Clouds* it is Protagoras that is being described but the character is called Socrates. It is not known why Aristophanes makes that mistake but it is crucial to the fate of Socrates. Protagoras merely has to flee Athens due to charges of impropriety but Socrates is killed for it, partially due to his own defense, but what made the defense necessary was the inability of Aristophanes to tell Protagoras and Socrates apart. The doctrines portrayed in the play are those of Protagoras and are not those of Socrates, but Socrates is cast as the archetypal sophist, and it is for that reason that Plato wrote his dialogues in the first place to clear up this confusion that killed his master. Later Plato places Aristophanes in his dialogue the symposium defending a theory of how humans were originally glued together and eventually lost their other halves, a story reminiscent of Empedocles' cycles of decline and regeneration of the kosmos between extremes of love and strife. But ironically it is a story in which humans are glued together and cannot be distinguished in their wholeness. Socrates and

Protagoras were so sewn together by Aristophanes, where the name was that of Socrates but the doctrines were those of Protagoras. This inability to distinguish according to the myth comes from an original wholeness. In this case we can imagine that that wholeness comes from the fact that both Protagoras and Socrates both focused on Man. They thought different things about man, but they had a shared humanism, and it was this that made them indistinguishable for Aristophanes. Aristophanes inability to make a non-nihilistic distinction in this case led inexorably to the death of Socrates. Plato sets out to right this wrong, and show us how to make non-nihilistic distinctions between the wise and the sophist. And that is a nutshell why we have the works of Plato. So Protagoras is a strong player in the drama of the death of Socrates, but because he is not directly responsible it is easy to miss the importance of Protagoras as a player in the drama.

Schiappa goes on to explain that the attribution of the invention of Rhetoric to Protagoras and the other Sophists, and the grouping them all together as if they were a school of thought is an error. One of the major premises of Schiappa's book is that we need to realize that Rhetoric was invented by Plato as a way of characterizing the Sophists and their difference from Socrates, and that the various Sophists held very different opinions and as such can not reliably be treated as a group but only fairly treated as individuals. Thus Schiappa sets out to lift the veil of prejudice from the face of Protagoras for us. Schiappa goes on to say that the sophists played a key role in the transition from the oral /mythopoeitic era to the literate / metaphysical era. The sophists were committed to written prose texts and were experimentalists in different styles of written texts. In this way they were followers of the trend started by Anaximander who first wrote in prose and started off the metaphysical era with his various inventions. Yet the sophists were still influenced by the oral predominance of their times as transitional characters. It is this transitional position in the tradition that Schiappa wants to emphasize.

The stages of pre-Socratic development went from considering origins, to considering what stuff the world was made of, to considering the properties of substances and how it was made. Schiappa considers Protagoras to be right on the boundary between the second and third stages. Parmenides and Heraclitus are considered denizens of the second stage while Plato and Aristotle are considered inhabitants of the third stage. Protagoras made it possible to transition between the last two stages by his exploration of his own philosophical concerns. So it makes sense that Protagoras was responding to Parmenides and Heraclitus in his statements, which Schiappa confirms in his analysis of the fragments. His response is very different from that of Empedocles who is still thinking in terms of the cosmos in his attempt to reconcile the two radically different ways of looking at things that effectively correspond to Pure Being (present-at-hand) and Process Being (ready-to-hand). Parmenides produces a monism of Being and outlaws other routes, i.e. the route of appearance and the route of non-Being. Zeno finds paradoxes that makes Parmenides way seem to be the only way of reason despite its non-intuitiveness. Heraclitus on the other hand produces a cosmic description of a world in flux and the competition of opposites which are dialectical in their relations to each other. His way was suppressed ultimately and does not resurface again until Hegel. But his way is compared favorably with what we see in Taoism in China for instance. Parmenides wins this battle of the Titans of ontology among the Pre-Socratics. Being becomes the metaphysical principle and both appearance and non-being as routes for approaching things are suppressed in our tradition. But this was not an easy job, because Protagoras offers a synthesis of the two progenitors of the Western tradition that is very compelling that Plato takes seriously as does Aristotle. That synthesis appears in a close reading of the aphorisms of Protagoras by Schiappa and the triangulation backwards and forwards between the second and third stages of the development of philosophy outlined above. The statements along with their context in the tradition lead us to a very

clear picture of the position of Protagoras. Surprisingly it is very close to what I outlined in my starting point section of this paper. But we can refine our analysis following Schiappa and consider some fine points that he brings up that are very important for our story, that was not clear before I read his book. The basic idea is that Protagoras makes a crucial move focusing on man.

Two Logoi Fragment

He first says that for every thing (pragmata) there are two logoi which reminds us of Heraclitus and the focus on cosmological and human opposites. But the focus has been shifted from physis, or even physis in man, to logos. Protagoras crosses the divide from physis to logos. In a way by doing so he enters the promised land given to him by Parmenides who set up Being, the central verb of Greek, as the Metaphysical principle. If Being is the metaphysical principle then language and reasoning using language is the predominant realm rather than physis. But Protagoras says that the same opposites that Heraclitus saw cosmically also operate in the realm of language. So the fact that there are two logoi about every pragmata or thing is a key point that will be echoed by Kant when he sets up the Antinomies. In other words, the Antinomies are the two arguments that can exist about every subject. For Kant this proves that reason alone is useless. Reason must be tempered by Experience to yield Understanding. So the move of Protagoras into the realm of Logos and bringing in the complementary opposite of Heraclitus that are in fact one, ultimately introduces dialectics into the realm of logos. When Protagoras enters the realm of Logos he does so with a vengeance since he becomes the first to do grammatical studies of Language and take it as an object of study in itself. Parmenides by establishing the broadest verb, the verb To Be, as the basis of everything, opens up language as the dominant realm over Physis, but he brings in the cosmology of Heraclitus into language, and then he turns language itself into an object of study, especially focusing on the

parts of speech like verbs and the meanings of words. What is interesting is that the fragment represents a claim about the relation between language and reality. Language as the domain where Being holds sway is split off from reality (pragma). Thus Protagoras uses the term pragmata which are things seen from the point of view of deeds not thoughts or statements in language. Notice here that there is a hint of the idea of measurement in the sense that measurement is a hands on way of dealing with things though instruments. Everything that we can get our hands on has two logoi concerning it. Now these two logoi can mean statements but can also be reasoned arguments. And the fragment can mean either that the two arguments just show up or it could mean that both are true depending on whether you take the locative or the veridical meaning to be the most important. Either the fragment can be translated "Two accounts (logoi) are present about every "thing" (pragmata), opposed to each other." Or one can translate the fragment, "Two contrary reports (logoi) are true concerning every experience." These two different translations imply very different ways of looking at the logoi about the pragmata. And I want to contend that the difference is very important, and in fact leads to a very important split in the tradition. The idea of two reports that are true, at the same time, leads to the concept of the supra-rational where opposite things are true at the same time without interfering, which is a signpost of the non-dual. It is precisely this that Aristotle attacks Protagoras for in his Metaphysics and says is impossible. But the other reading that two accounts merely show up, i.e. are present but not necessarily true, reminds us more of Heraclitus and the idea that everything is in opposites and the opposites themselves are dialectical and thus encompassed by oneness at a higher level synthesis. Because the things talked about are pragmata then reality is seen to be in the things. The only aspect that seems at first sight missing is identity, and that appears in the oneness of the opposites as sameness at the higher level, and in the difference of the logoi about the same pragmata. So all the aspects of Being appear

here. If we have two logoi about a single pragmata that show up, they could be engaged in showing and hiding, as one appears and then hides while the other appears. But it could be that they both appear at once in which case there is a question of what happens when the two logoi get mixed up so that paradox results. So one of the interpretations leads to paradox and the other leads to supra-rationality and these two are fundamental opposites. In our tradition both are banned by Aristotle's excluded middle. In other words Aristotle wants to ban both paradox and supra-rationality which is the possibility of non-duality. He wants to ban both the idea that different accounts might mix, but also he wants to ban the idea that the different things might be true of the same thing at the same time. Schiappa mentions that this idea of the reference frame, the "at the same time" or "in the same way" was invented by Protagoras. Protagoras says that A is B for C must be said of anything mentioned. The reference frame must be supplied for something to have Being. This is the basis of his relativism which is a full relativism because he invents the reference frame to make the relativism work in the same way that special relativity works using reference frames. It is possible that this idea of the reference frame is what solves the ambiguity between the two translations that Schiappa offers. In other words being present of the logoi is for someone from a particular perspective or in a particular reference frame. He might be saying that there are always at least two reference frames and thus from each reference frame there will be different logoi about the same pragmata. Because of the separation of reference frames the logoi cannot contradict as long as you identify the reference frame. Contradictions only occur if you fail to identify the reference frame. On this view the two possible interpretations actually blend into one more complex and interesting assertion of relativism of reference frames, similar to special relativity. Given the fact that reference frames must be given for something to have Being, then there are at least two reference frames and from each reference frame one might construct an argument or description, or

narration, etc. – a logoi – and they will necessarily be opposite each other because the dialectical oneness is intrinsic to the logos as it is the physus according to Heraclitus. Given the different points of view they can both be true at the same time in the same respect despite being effectively opposite. Thus they can represent non-duality. Or they might be paradoxical if we mixed the statements into one statement. Both supra-rationality and paradoxicality are possible. What is key is the separation of concerns by the reference frames. Reference frames are the basis for admission of something into Being. This is new. Parmenides did not have this idea, for him Being came first, and appearance and non-Being were aberrations. For Protagoras Being is an achieved state based on the recognition of reference frames. Appearance is clearly a partial view that is seen from only one reference frame, rather than from two or more. Non-Being just like in Special Relativity theory is where the light cones don't overlap. Non-Being is the pragmata that cannot be seen by at least two reference frames at the same time. Pragmata are the things as seen from the point of view of deeds. If for some reason there is some pragmata, some deed laden thing, that is not encompassed by at least two frames of reference then it has no Being. What is relative is all that has Being. Parmenides Being is absolutist monism. Being comes first and is an inherent quality of everything that has been designated as having Being. But for Protagoras Being is something achieved, something brought into the realm of relativism. It is what ever is absolutist and monadic that has no Being, thus he turns Parmenides upside down. What Parmenides calls Being is Non-Being for Protagoras and vice versa. That is a startling result. Parmenides cannot explain appearance and non-being but can only warn us away from them. Protagoras can explain what they are because what ever enters into the realm of frames of reference has Being, what ever does not has no Being, and what ever is seen from a single frame to one frame of reference is an appearance. So Parmenides creates a framework of the three routes to banish two of them which is a negative exclusive action.

Protagoras builds a framework that includes all the possibilities of the various Parmedian routes and shows their interlocking relations to each other that defines relativism. Defining relativism is in a way a counter definition of absolutism. As in Special Relativity, the relative can be transformed from one frame of reference to another. Thus in a way it is an Absolutism because absolutely everything is transformable to all frames of reference. Similarly here in Protagoras there is an implicit Absolutism that appears in the claim of a oneness of the opposites through synthesis into the higher oneness. There must be two logoi, the space of Being demands that and that is an absolute demand that produces thesis and anti-thesis that can become a synthesis in the sense that Heraclitus saw in all opposites, and which Protagoras sees also operating in language. He saw it in the gender of words in language which he studied and that was probably one of his evidences that language demands that thing be represented as opposites which the language turns into a higher synthesis of meaning in sentences and arguments, i.e. in the unfolding of the logoi in relation to each other. It is Protagoras that is credited with first using the technique of dialectic that Socrates found so useful and which we ordinarily associate with his name. Protagoras would bring the opposite speeches together in his discourse through question and answer which is another Socratic technique that he is said to have invented. The more we hear about Protagoras we wonder whether Socrates was in fact an imitator of his great Philosopher/Sophist. So although Schiappa does not mention it I think that it is frames of reference that Protagoras invented that allow the two different readings of his fragment to stand together and reinforce each other. By that they show us how he in some way developed the space in which all subsequent arguments arose and were played out, such as the arguments of Socrates, because those arguments appeared in the arena that he developed as relativistic, where Being is what is seen from different points of view. In this system all the aspect of Being come together in a very powerful way. Identity appears at the lower level in the pragmata as that which the

two logoi are about. But identity also appears at the level of synthesis that demands the complementarity of arguments. One identity is the lack of difference and is veridical. The other identity is a sameness or belonging together of thesis and anti-thesis in synthesis. Reality appears as the pragmata, things shaped by deeds, but also reality appears in the response of the audience in the court to the arguments of the defense and prosecution. Sometimes the audience misbehaves and does not accept the fictive argument that has been projected on it. This is a form of reality testing for arguments that went on in the courts and decided the fates of men. Truth appears as the fact that both arguments may be true at the same time from different points of view and verified as such. But truth also appears as the showing and hiding, aleithia in which the different arguments appear and disappear dancing around each other as discourse during the dialectical interchange unfolds. Presence appears as the showing up of the two logoi about the same thing, but presence also is the showing up of the pragmata as the subject of deeds related to action. Protagoras has devised a framework in which each of the aspects appears in both its Pure Being and Process Being related forms. That framework defines what has Being, and that is what ever can be seen from more than two frames of reference or viewpoints. What cannot be seen relativistically has no Being. This is exactly like Special Relativity theory in which what is outside of lightcones has no Being, is no where and no when. It is also like Quantum Mechanics where what cannot be observed, i.e. the superimposed states of the probability wave, which is a model of supra-rationality, has no Being but exists only as a potential beyond the veil of the Copenhagen interpretation of the microworld. What has no Being is the monism that Parmenides invokes, and this is in fact what Modern Science has confirmed. On the one hand there is a supra-rational monism of the simultaneous states of the probability wave that has not collapsed yet through observation. On the other hand is the monism of the beyond the pale of all the lightcones that no one can know. What we can

know is only what can be seen by overlapping light cones. It seems paradoxical that there is a state that is nowhere notime that is orthogonal to past, present and future. That is a state much like the kind of Stasis that Parmenides envisages because it is not touched by the flow of time. Parmenides framework is the dual of that of Protagoras, it is the framework of the nowhere notime and he is calling that Being. It is the Being of ultimate paradox because the concept of Being has been pushed to the extreme of being an absolute. That Being has become non-Being for Protagoras, and vice versa, what Parmenides calls non-Being and appearance has become Being. Non-Being is the realm of contradictions, the realm of change. Change always involves contradiction from a philosophical point of view as Zeno shows us. Protagoras framework can handle change and appearance because he has frames of reference and these frames can be dynamic, so that change merely is captured from different points of view at the same time, appearing different from moment to moment, while appearance is how it looks from the individual points of view at any one time. It is as if Heraclitus has come inside of Logos when you picture what Protagoras has in mind. Change can run though the framework that Protagoras has constructed because Being itself is relative. It is absolute at the level of synthesis, but relative at the level of the logoi and their dialectical interplay. It is this combination of Pure Being and Process Being that becomes the Monolith of Being that Heidegger talks about in Being and Time, but here it is implicit in the inversion of Parmenides accomplished by Protagoras. It is built up by having aspects operating at both meta-levels of Being within the same framework. But in effect it combines the Process Being of Heraclitus' flux with the Pure Being of Parmenides absolute Being purified by rejection of appearance and non-being or change, i.e. becoming. The combination allows the two kinds of Being to support one another and create the monolithic framework that encompasses both present-at-hand and ready-to-hand together as Heidegger tries to do in Being and Time. It is quite a remarkable

philosophical feat which produces the clearing in which Plato and Aristotle can make their fundamental contributions which reify this framework by transforming or rejecting specific portions of it. In many ways we can see that the framework of relativity set up by Protagoras, as an inversion of the framework of Parmenides and its combination with Heraclitus, has set the stage for the development of a lot of philosophy in our tradition as well as science. For instance, Hegel is implicit in this because of the relation of the two logoi to the synthesis that holds them together yet apart. Heidegger is implicit in it because of the combination of two kinds of Being in the same framework. Descartes is implicit because it is as if he focused on a single point of view or perspective and saw everything that everyone else saw as *res extensia* and everything he saw as the cogito. Kant and Husserl are implicit in it because transcendental idealism builds on Descartes position. Kant sees the Transcendental Object and the Transcendental Subject kept coherent by God, in other words Kant is thinking about how does everything remain coherent from all the viewpoints. God must make them coherent, either as evil demon of Descartes or as the God of Berkeley. But Kant things that behind each perspective there is something producing a priori synthesis and that what is seen are noumenal objects. Relativism proper does not consider what is on either side of Being. Being is what is relative. Kant wants to flip back and consider the Being of what to Protagoras has non-Being, i.e. the noumena of things seen and the transcendental subject that does the intentional seeing. He wants to know what it is that goes around behind the scenes and keeps what appears relativistic coherent and that seems to be God for him. But to the relativist entering back into the absolutist monism of Parmenides is something that should not be indulged in. For Protagoras all we want are pragmatic explanations that allows us to hear the arguments in the court of law and get them decided in our favor. Idealism escapes from this practical concern and enters into the inverse Parmenidian framework yet again. In other words Kant wants both the Protagorian

and Parmenidian frameworks operating at the same time. Husserl accepts this transcendental idealism as a framework but then wants to go back inside the phenomenal or relativistic aspect and bracket the noumena and the transcendental subject and just pay close attention to the phenomena. When he does that he discovers the difference between essences and ideas, and that essences are not simple ideas and that leads to Heidegger's identification of present-at-hand and ready-to-hand as two modes of Being. What is strange is that we can see all of Western Philosophy playing out in this space opened up by Protagoras and his simple inversion of Parmenides' framework and in his incorporation of Heraclitus into the realm of logos. This is what makes Protagoras important.

Measure Fragment

When we add to this framework of relativity, which is the inversion of the Parmenidian route model in a way that achieves unity rather than separation, the concept of measure in relation to man then the whole model undergoes another transformation. Man has not been the focus before. It is Protagoras that changes the focus to man and makes man the center of philosophical attention, which Socrates carries on in a way that will transform philosophy and indeed the entire worldview making it humanitarian. It is this humanitarianism that we would return to in the Renaissance. Previously the gods were the center of attention, and humans were peripheral. It was not predetermined that the humans would become the center in the metaphysical era. For most of the pre-Socratics it was nature that was the focus. It was a major reversal that placed man at the center of a relativistic framework once Protagoras turned away from the absolutism of Parmenides, for whom Being was everything, and the centrality of physis for the other Presocratics like Heraclitus. But Protagoras turned to man and emphasized logos for one reason. That is because once Being became the metaphysical principle, then language was seen to hold sway

over everything that is, and it was man that produced the logos driven by language competency. So who was this being (*dasein*) that produced the unending flood of speech and thought and what was the nature of language. Protagoras studied language and he helped men to speak better in situations where speech had a consequence, i.e. the loss of life, liberty or wealth, in the courts of Athens where the jury was one's fellow citizens. What Protagoras noticed was that what ever was decided in the courts became reality for the people of Athens and especially for those who were on trial, or were pleading their case before the courts in some civil matter. Thus Protagoras concluded not just that things were relative in that arena, where everyone had an opinion from their point of view, but even more important, the reality that was created in those courts was projected by the people who were involved in the process. What ever they decided together became reality, i.e. came into Being, or went out of Being according to their collective will. This fact of the projection of Being, i.e. the relativistic reality, identity, presence, and truth, took flight from man, what Heidegger would call *Das Mann*, translated as either the *They* or *One*, what Deleuze and Guattari would call the *Socius*. Protagoras tried to capture this projection of the Group of Being for the group in his fragment about Man being the Measure of all things. Things in this case is indicated by the word *chremata*, which means 'goods' or 'property', or more abstractly 'matter' or 'affair'⁵. So there is a difference from *pragmata*, which were the things from the point of view of deeds. Here we are considering those things of value to men which were at issue in the courts. The word *anthropos* is man in the widest possible sense. *Metron* means measure in the sense of assessing quantity but it can also refer to 'appropriate proportion or ordering'. It can refer to the balance and order in nature. One fragment of Heraclitus refers to the *metron* as what regulates the opposites. For Sextus Empiricus *metron* becomes the same as a criterion⁶. If we interpret *metron* broadly, yet

⁵ p. 118

⁶ p. 119

stick closely to the concept of measure in the sense of a physical act of measurement, then we see that Man (Anthropos) is the Measure (Metron) of all Things (chremata) is a short statement with very profound consequences and meaning. The framework of relativity with its frames of reference has no center. Protagoras is placing in it a center, it is mankind which does the work of measuring each thing in its courts and decrees the Being of that thing, measuring it against other things of value in the process. And of course the most important things that are measured in the courts are men themselves. They are measuring each other in the process of measuring things. In measurement we bring out a standard, a criterion and compare things with that standard to get a quantitative assessment which we then use as a substitute for the things themselves. In the measurement process we create values for things, and thus establish our own values. Nietzsche wants us to revalue our values, i.e. take values to the meta-level. But here Protagoras is establishing the first level of valuation, as a process of projection by the group, the They, the socius. Taking out a criterion and actually performing a measure is a process that takes time. Each court case is such a measurement. What Socrates will come to question is the criterion that is used. Socrates will transform the criterion by demanding that it be a non-dual, i.e. not a unity nor a multiplicity. Socrates however, needs the whole framework established by Protagoras in order to focus on the criterion. Protagoras wants to establish the framework as a whole with man at the center. This is the very Man that Foucault believes is vanishing in our epistemic period as he says in The Order of Things. But Man in the sense of the Metron has been with us since Protagoras placed him at the center of his relativistic framework. And he is an essential feature, because if you are going to have relativism, i.e. eschew all absolutes, then you need something that will establish what is not absolute. In this sense man becomes the perfect vehicle because unlike the gods he cannot know the absolutes. Anything man produces must be relative by definition, if for no other reason because his

life is time limited. So man is the obvious choice to be the center, but man has never been the center before. Man is the being who projects Being through the process of measurement, of things in terms of their usefulness and value to him, and of himself within the group and among his citizens in the polis. Heidegger says it well when he says that Man is the being who must take a stand on his own Being, i.e. he is both ontic and ontological at the same time. Everything else is merely ontic. This projection process prior to the split between subject and object is what Heidegger calls daseining, i.e. man's process of taking a stand on his own being. This involves the ecstasy of the projection of Being which Heidegger sees as the nature of existence. Dasein has existentials rather than categories. Things appear in categories but Dasein has instead capabilities related to the projection process which are understanding, discoveredness, and talk which all come together and overlap as care. As was said above, if man measures all things by saying what is and what is not, then he must have some aspect that rises above Being itself, there must be some aspect of man that tastes existence as the ecstasy of projection itself, from the outside rather than from the inside. I call that Ultra Being which appears at the fifth meta-level of Being. Making man the measure of all things as to whether they are or are not means that there is a difference between Being and Non-Being that is established. This difference is a matter of existence. Only existence provides the discontinuity that would allow Being and Becoming to be distinguished. It is the intrusion of Existence that makes non-Being possible. Once we have turned the tables and established man as the center of our relativistic framework, i.e. as the producer of relativism itself through a measurement process, because all things have their value only in relation to all other things considered, then we have a very powerful framework from which it is difficult to escape. I don't think Protagoras has been given his due in this case, because he can be seen as the creator of our worldview in a fundamental way following the lead of Anaximander and Parmenides.

Anaximander established the metaphysical era and said that there must be a metaphysical principle that balances the finitude of writing, of the mapped world, of the models he built of the Kosmos. Parmenides established that this metaphysical principle would be Being, i.e. would be in Logos not in Physis as previous Pre-Socratics had imagined. But Protagoras took the absolute of the metaphysical principle and made that instead of Being, rather non-Being, in other words he placed us in Being rather than it being alien and static to us because appearance and non-Being as change must be rejected. Protagoras said that the framework of relativism must have frames of reference. Because there are frames of reference there can be logoi from different viewpoints, and these logoi follow the same rules that Heraclitus saw in nature and in all things, because they appeared as opposites and were united in that opposition and complementarity as if under a higher synthesis or oneness. Protagoras saw that the logoi were created in speech and was one of the first to study that speech to try to understand language. Protagoras then looked to the one who created the speech and saw that this animal was producing a projection on the basis of which a measurement process was made possible. Man actively engaged in measuring and valuing things, and in the process measured and valued himself, both as a group and separately each one among men. What is hidden here that we want to bring out is the fact that all measurement processes are based on comparison, and in order to make a comparison you need something to compare to, and what is compared to, i.e. the standard is the thing that is projected which the chremata are measured against. Measurement is an action, but is dependent on a prior action of projection of the standard of measurement. This is where projection enters into the picture as an important element. It is not an obvious element of the scenario envisaged by Protagoras, but it is fundamental to our understanding of measurement as an activity. And this is the point of departure for schemas entering the picture within our tradition. It is amazing that this is where it enters the

tradition and in such an invisible way, almost surreptitiously. We have a framework that establishes relativity, we have a center of the production of Being as what is relative, we have a process of measurement which is an activity by which social invention and construction takes place, and also we have the projection on the basis of which this activity is possible. It is this projection that we can see as the hallmarks of schematization. That element is hidden within the framework, and only appears when the framework is given a center that is actively engaged, but once that element appears it never recedes from the tradition, but is always there in the background as a potential basis for philosophical speculation. It appears most strongly in Plato and Kant and really is best understood for the first time as crucial by Heidegger. Heidegger brings it to the foreground when he identifies projection as the core of dasein which is within man as the projection of Being from out of a being. Protagoras sets the stage for the entire development of Western philosophy by bringing measurement together with his relativistic framework. Even all the absolutists were sucked into this vortex whether they liked it or not. Western Philosophy is the story of a struggle against this vortex by the various types of dogmatists. Relativity became the major enemy of Plato, Aristotle, Kant, and many other of the major philosophers in our tradition. Without relativism as an enemy the absolutists would not have had to be so creative in trying to destroy that viewpoint. In this framework relativism did not have to argue its case because it was argued for that position by its opponents. It was the slippery slope that everyone felt themselves sliding down, and they were desperate to avoid in their fallenness, their thrownness.

Schiappa translates this fragment as “*Of everything and anything the measure [truly-is] human(ity): of that which is, that is the case; of that which is not, that it is not the case.*”⁷ Protagoras goes against Parmenides and embraces non-Being. He says that it is man

⁷ p. 121

that decides what is and what is not, not some nameless goddess at a gate in the sky. And he establishes by that discrimination the importance of appearances from particular points of view based on frames of reference. So he embraces all of Parmenides scheme of discriminations between modifications of Being and brings them together into a coherent framework with man at the center, projecting the criteria or standard and then using it actively to measure things including himself. The fact that Metron can mean order is interesting because order is a non-dual between physis and logos that we use to create science. Protagoras has shifted us out of the Physis into the Logos where Being holds sway. If we are to project that Being onto the physis then that is a further projection from the ontological to the ontic. It is in that move, the projection from Logos onto Physis that the schemas appear. We do not get that in Protagoras because he has escaped for the moment completely into the realm of Logos leaving the Physis behind. But the fact that metron is related to order (nomos), i.e. later the laws will become a basis of judgment in the courts means that slowly the non-dual is appearing as significant. And we can see how the fundamental opposites of our worldview are coming together in this framework. The framework is established on the basis of a move from the infinite static Being of Parmenides to the production of finite beings in a measurement process of a dynamic and relativistic Being. This is the move with respect to Parmenides. But the move with respect to Heraclitus is to take the opposites out of physis and see them in logos instead. This move establishes the difference between physis and logos as important, and by making the metron the center of the framework it is pointing to the important role of order. If the previous philosophers had not established two opposite logoi then Protagoras could not make these moves with respect to both of them simultaneously in order to construct his framework. Protagoras is practicing what he preaches because he has taken the logoi of Parmenides and Heraclitus and produced a synthesis of them by making orthogonal moves

with respect both of their positions. In this way he produces a framework with a center that has held sway in the history of Philosophy for a long time and today remains vital⁸.

Stronger Weaker Fragment

Now we consider the next piece of the framework that Protagoras constructed. This is his claim to be able to make the weaker argument stronger. We have two logoi and we naturally consider them dualistically and measure them as to which is the stronger and which is the weaker. It is this fragment that lets us know that we have entered into a reflexive environment, a funhouse full of mirrors that appears as the field of the *socius*, where something large can appear small and vice versa. Protagoras claims that he can navigate in that fun house and allow the speaker he trains to arrange the mirrors so that his audience sees the smaller argument as larger and vice versa at will. With this fragment then it becomes clear that Protagoras recognizes the nature of the reflexive social field, and we immediately see that the form of Protagoras' framework has the signature of the special systems. In this case the dissipative ordering special system appears at the interpretations of the pragmata or chremata and upon the words that are used to represent them. In other words, as Protagoras studied there were various meanings to words and based on that different logoi could be constructed that described the pragmata or chremata which could make them appear differently to different people given their particular perspectives. The autopoietic special system appears in the conjunction of viewpoints and of arguments based on those viewpoints where one might say A is B from X, or A is not-B from Y. This conjunction of viewpoints and logoi is inevitable just because of the natural diversity of opinion that appears in the relativistic field when it is not distorted by absolutes. When it is distorted by absolutes then dualism reigns. One dual as an absolute tries to destroy the other dual. In any case,

⁸ See Margolis, Joseph; *The Truth About Relativism*; (Blackwell, Cambridge USA 1991)

whether absolutes are present or not, the ground state is relativism, myriad differing opinions. Logoi need to be constructed to not just represent those differences but in order to sway the opinions of those who are deciding in the court. The logoi ultimately become those speeches of the Prosecution and the Defense. The interpretations of words, the valuing of things are all dissipative ordering structures that spread throughout the field of discourse. But they are dependent on the juxtaposition of the logoi and the constellations of viewpoints. And the field is distorted as if it were a fun house of mirrors reflecting things that appear in the social field differentially depending on their position within the field and the curvatures of the mirrors. So if one can find the right place within the field of reflexive mirrorings then something that seems weaker can be made to appear stronger instead and vice versa. It is this fragment that shows that Protagoras knew he was dealing with a reflexive field and because we can recognize this we can see that the rest of the field can be seen as an example of the special systems in conjunction. Interpretations of words and viewpoints on situations are unstable and move across the field changing our understanding of things. But these changes of ordering of the elements in the field, what Deleuze and Guattari call desiring machines, are produced by the competition of arguments, descriptions, narrations and other rhetorical modes. The conjunction of viewpoints and of logoi is a constant within the realm of the meta-system of the court, which is a sort of marketplace of arguments. But since the field is like a funhouse of distorted mirrors based on the assumptions, opinions, absolutes that are disturbing the perfect relativity of the field, then it is possible to move within the field to places where weaker arguments appear stronger and vice versa to various point of view that would have thought otherwise without the arguments that are offered that make use of the distortions in the field. The Athenians, and we see it best in Aristophanes play The Clouds, thought that this admission was tantamount to nihilism. In other words this manipulative side of Protagoras was seen as

nihilistic to the extreme. And that is true, it was nihilistic. Protagoras brought out the nihilistic possibility in the situation where the orator could sway the populace to change how things stood in the community because democracy had unleashed the polis from tyranny so that decisions became publicly visible for the first time. The tendency in the market place of ideas is toward ideology, i.e. a unification of belief, that is a move back toward absolutism by the tyranny of the many over the one, rather than the one over the many. In this marketplace of ideas nihilism as described by Stanley Rosen in *Nihilism* is the natural state because we find that artificial extreme opposite positions are represented by the Logoi that are seen to be fighting. But ultimately the two Logoi are the same, i.e. those arguing are from the same class and are protecting their property, but also they are together protecting their mutual rank and position, and by giving the best speeches they are remaining in control through the use of rhetoric, i.e. the manipulation of the logos. Thus we get a loss of meaning, either anomie or alienation, in those who realize that the two sides in each argument are for the most part indistinguishable from each other if we look close enough, despite the fact that they seem to be supporting artificially extreme positions in relation to each other. For instance, as Baudrillard notes in *The Mirror of Production* that both Communism and Capitalism not to mention Fascism believe that human productivity is the be all and end all of human life. It is a mutual unquestioned assumption. Once you realize that then one wonders what the difference is. We ask what is the difference between the Americans who torture Iraqis and Sadam Hussain. Achilles asked what is the difference between Paris stealing Helen and Agamemnon taking Briseis from him. Nihilism springs out of the field of relativism and absolutism. Because of this Protagoras lets us recognize the real problem at the basis of Western metaphysics that Nietzsche finally saw which was the inherent nihilism of the Western tradition. Heidegger took up that theme as well. It was not until one asked Nietzsche's question of the value of values that

nihilism became clearly the fundamental problem, that is why his beggar goes around with his lamp lit in the middle of the day saying God is dead. In the darkness of nihilism we cannot see our hands in front of our face for the intellectual darkness that appears out of Protagoras framework. That is why Plato attacks the Sophists so vehemently, they are the ones who made clear the nihilism that is inherent in the Western Tradition from the beginning and reveled in it. They were the first to make their living off of the nihilism and thus they embodied it. They were like Oedipus and Socrates was to them like Tiresias. In other words the Sophists did not realize what was wrong with them, they like Oedipus were going around looking for the problem and Socrates was the one who attempted to let them know that it was they who were the problem, the ones who had unleashed the plague of nihilism in Athens that would lead to the loss of the Peloponnesian War. How to solve this outpouring of nihilism was the key problem that Socrates and Plato were working on in their careers. And the solution was to concentrate on the criterion and offer a different one than Man himself, rather the criterion became the non-duals. What separates the non-duals from the duals are the schemas. But with that statement we get far ahead of our story. Nihilism was what poured from the Pandora's box of the framework created by Protagoras. It was the black gold that like oil today seemed in unending supply. It was what sucked the lifeblood from Athenian Society. Plato and Aristophanes agreed on that. The fact that Arsitophanes and others could not tell Socrates from a Sophist meant that they could not make the non-nihilistic distinction between Oedipus and Tiresias. The Athenians ultimately killed the messenger Socrates while Protagoras was sent into exile, wandering like Oedipus. This nihilism of Protagoras was capped off by his agnosticism expressed in his concerning the gods fragment.

Concerning the Gods Fragment

To top it all off Protagoras was agnostic with respect to the Gods. He did not say that God is

dead like Nietzsche near the end of the monotheistic Christian Tradition. Rather he was talking about the other set of viewpoints that had dominated Greek polytheism and the mythopoeitic age. Protagoras was squarely in the Metaphysical era in his agnosticism towards the Gods. Other pre-Socratics had expressed doubt before him.

He said according to Schiappa, "*Concerning the gods I am unable to know, whether they exist or whether they do not exist or what they are like in form.*"⁹

The gods are the other set of viewpoints we might consider as the measure other than man. And in the mythopoeitic era they would have been the choice of everyone. But something interesting about this fragment besides its expression of agnosticism that intensifies the perception of the nihilism of Protagoras for the public of that time, is the fact that this statement is seen to be the first use of an existential predicate in Greek. It is thought that this is the first time that the verb to be was used in an existential sense. This sense is of course foreign to the term Being and so this is a controversy. But what strikes me is that Protagoras must know that from man to measure Being and non-Being out he must somehow rise above it and the only place to go beyond Being is toward existence, so it is interesting here that Being is used in a proto-existential sense with respect to the gods, because implicitly there is an existential sense in the measuring out of Being as well that we have noted previously. In some sense both the gods and man are related to an existential sense of Being that plays out differently in both. In terms of the gods it plays out as an agnosticism of their existence or non-Existence which is like the Being and non-Being measured out by man which he must rise above somehow. In terms of man his relativistic knowing is a measuring. Since gods are absolutes it does not fit into what can be known by man with a relativistic knowing about a Being that is measured out by man. Gods are beyond this

⁹ p. 141

measuring out by definition. They are the immeasurable especially with respect to their lives as immortals. But now comes the really interesting part. He says that he does not know what *form* they might take. Here we see the introduction of the form schema for the first time. *Idean* means form, nature or appearance. This will become the central concept in Plato's metaphysics. Schiappa says that this juxtaposition of the existential use of Being and the essence of the gods in terms of form (*Idean*) is the first place where the essence/existence dichotomy appears. This is an example of the projection of form as a schema onto the unknown. It does not return anything of knowledge, not even the knowledge of existence or non-existence. But it is an interesting example of a pure projection of a schema onto the absolute rather than onto the things. It is assumed that pragmata or chremata are in forms and it can be determined if they have being or not by man. But an absolute is beyond the reach of the projection of form or the determination of being of things, and because man cannot reach the gods the term Being has the sense of existence here. What this tells us is that the reaching beyond Being toward a comprehension of Existence is part of the framework, and also the projection of schemas as a fundamental kind of criterion is also part of the framework of the thought of Protagoras. They are parts of the framework that break down when applied to absolutes. We would not see these aspects if it were not for their misapplication beyond the framework of relativism to absolutes. The second sentence merely gives the limitations on knowledge which are the obscurity of the subject and the limitations on life. The gods are precisely those who are not limited in life, and who are invisible men, and thus naturally obscure to men. Men need to concern themselves with their own finitude and for those things that can be known within the relativistic framework. This fragment we need to read back into the framework as a statement about the finitude of men who measure out their lives by measuring things including themselves. In this process they make themselves clear who they are, they are taking a stand on their own Being as beings

as Heidegger would say by opening out a clearing in Being. Protagoras' framework is a version of this clearing or opening. From it certain subjects are excluded like the absolutes of all kinds like the gods. It reinforces the finitude of man by bringing attention to the shortness of his life unlike the gods who have no shortness of life. But also we can see in the movement from obscurity to clarity how logos and physis enters into the picture at the next level up from finitude/infinity. Both the physis and logos make things clear by their unfolding, they take on form after form in that unfolding process and by that we come to know their essence. Forms of animals as they develop, or the forms of arguments composed of the forms of sentences in turn composed of the forms of words. The world is seen as a nesting of forms in both physis and logos. This is where the schema form enters the picture as important. The framework projects the criterion against which the measures are taken. But first it projects the space or clearing or opening in which the things can take form, and that space or clearing or opening is not homogeneous, it is not a *res extensia* (Plato's receptacle) but instead a human spatiality. As such there is implicitly the projection of schemas like form that are the partitioning of the projection of spacetime. We do not see that at first clearly because we are obsessed with form only and its nesting and we do not see other schemas as important. But what is interesting is that the form schema is there, from the beginning encoded in Protagoras' way of looking at things and it only becomes clear when it is projected on the absolute of the gods who are obscure and can never be made clear by taking on the form schema like everything else does within the clearing of the framework that establishes relativism developed in such a crafty way by Protagoras.

The Framework of Relativism

It is fascinating that the few things we know about Protagoras fit together so neatly to give us a picture of his relativism. It is because we can fit him into the tradition and by his differences and inversions of Parmenides and

Heraclitus as well as Plato and Aristotle we can triangulate his transitional position within the tradition. It is also fascinating that it was with the advent of relativism that the schemas first came into view. Phenomenology according to Heidegger, is the focus on something that does not show itself, but on the basis of which other things (phenomena) appear, but which when focused on can be made to appear in some way, perhaps only by distortions in the relations between the things that do appear. What we are engaged in here is a kind of phenomenology of the schema. In this case we are seeing that Protagoras establishes relativism as a framework and then states that man's measurement of the Being or non-Being of beings is the center of this framework, and also he shows the use of this framework in his teaching practice. Socrates and Plato are concerned with the nihilism unleashed by this framework and attempt to come up with a solution to that which leads them to the realm of non-duality. But the framework itself is very interesting because it is clear that it set the stage for the rest of the history of Western Philosophy in some fundamental ways. That framework is an opening up of the landscape explored by the Western Philosophical tradition. Relativism never went away as the strawman that every philosophy must attack and destroy. Because it became the common enemy of all philosophers it's influence lasted until today. The work of Protagoras was the basis on which Sextus Empiricus established skepticism. Skepticism was a major influence on Hegel and his development of his dialectical philosophy. That philosophy led to Marxism through the inversion of spirit into the materialism. Many of the battles of the last century were fought in the ideological space between capitalism, fascism and communism that was set up by Marxism. So Protagorean relativism is still important to us today and has shaped our world in fundamental ways. But our focus is on how the framework of relativism brings with it the assumption of a projection process that underlies measurement. The space within which the measurement activity must be projected and the standards against which the

measurement is made must be projected prior to the act of measurement. Schematization refers to the breakup of spacetime into different layers of organization based on dimensionality. Protagoras assumes metron is basic to man, it is his form of production within the polis. Protagoras draws attention to the form (*idean*) schema which becomes central in the philosophy of Plato. Plato in the Timaeus shows how the form as an abstract *idean* interacts with the receptacle to produce the dimensionalized embodiments of form. Both the projection of differentiated and organized spacetime schemas, and the projection of standards or criterion for measurement come prior to the production of measurements themselves. Measurement is comparison and the things and the standards and the space within which the measurement can occur must all be there before the comparison happens. The production of space as a projection, the production of the criterion or standards as a projection is something hidden normally but which is necessary for the appearance of relativized beings within the clearing of the court. We can make these elements visible because they are part of the framework, they are assumed to be there as fundamental pieces of the overall scaffolding of the world constructed in the court of the polis. Our goal is to focus on these elements that are normally invisible, and bring them to visibility as foundations for the encountering of pragmata and chremata. This is because they play such an important role in the tradition that is normally not noticed. Kant brought to light the a priori nature of space and time as presuppositions of experience. Heidegger brought to the fore the nature of worldhood another schema of great significance. Protagoras and Plato and others within the tradition focused on the schema of form as another example of something that is not readily visible but which is important precursor to our experience of things in the world. Our work is to attempt to do the same thing for all the schemas, and to show the intimate relation between the schemas as levels of organization and templates of understanding for phenomena and the background projection

of spacetime. Spacetime is not homogeneous but is rather through dimensionality broken up into regions, the schemas are the representation of these regions of intelligibility that are part of the overall projection of Being.

The framework of relativity consists of an inversion of Parmenides, taking Being as non-Being and vice versa and an incorporation of Heraclitus from the physus into the logos. It assumes that there is a polis and that this polis is democratic and that within the polis there are law courts where citizens defend themselves with arguments and where other citizens judge those arguments and vote to produce a result that under a tyranny would be totally hidden. The process of reaching a decision has to be public and has to take into account all the arguments of both sides of the issue at state for this relativistic scaffolding to exist. But once you have this historic situation where democracy and transparent public decision making occurs as happened in Athens, then the clearing necessary for the erection of the relativistic framework exists. So the social conditions are crucial and just happened to appear at the time when the sophists rose up as a cadre of teachers of argumentation, or the use of logos. They were mostly foreigners and they taught the most wealthy how to preserve their wealth though argument in the courts against the claim of their fellow citizens on that wealth. The framework of relativism sees arguments as being in competition and through that competition it sees the logoi as being complementary. It thus sees the arguments to be like the opposites of Heraclitus, as bound together dialectically. But also it sees that these arguments are relative to each other, and not absolute in themselves. Protagoras invents the concept of the frame of reference to explain how different people from different positions could see opposite states of affairs and thus could argue completely contrary or contradictory positions. Protagoras says that what is occurring in this situation is a measurement process. We all understand measurement as the comparison of something with a standard or basis of criterion. In order to measure we need to project the spacetime in

which the measurement will take place, then one must project the criterion or standard, then one must make the measurement and state the result. Projection of the spacetime and the criterion are the parts of measurement that are assumed by the act of measurement and are a priori to it. Measurement itself results in the decision as to whether things are or are not within the city. If they are then they are in a relative way, and Being itself is seen as relative, not as an absolute as it was for Parmenides. The problem with relativity is that it unleashes the difficulty of nihilism, as the standards themselves clash. There is a war of the standards and in the end we find that it is very difficult to tell one standard from the other. Meaning gets sucked out of our world when we cannot anchor our standards to absolutes. One response to this situation is Skepticism of Sextus Empiricus. Another response is the appeal to non-duals as the basis of the standards which is how Plato and Socrates respond. But regardless of the response we know that relativism unleashes the plague of nihilism and that was recognized eventually as the key problem in the Western tradition by Nietzsche when he discovered the question about the value of values. The key point for us here is that Schematization is part and parcel of this relativistic framework, which becomes universal as the enemy of all dogmatists in the tradition. Once established the relativistic framework does not go away but is there in the background as the thing to be attacked by all philosophers especially in its form as the straw dog of skepticism. It is ignored that Skepticism was a genuine response to this relativism. It said that we will keep the dialogue going at all costs, even if I have to argue other positions, i.e. be the devils advocate in order to keep the discussion going. Final results that are absolute foundations may not appear but we will continue the dialect in the search for truth and find peace in that. This position is a lot like Buddhism. It brings the relativism inside as the possibility of arguing for sides of the argument that one does not agree with in order to keep the dialogue going. Plato and Socrates have a completely different approach that is also like Buddhism which has

to do with the formulation of criteria that are non-dual. The responses that are like Buddhism are those that take the threat of nihilism seriously. Absolutist positions that hope to quickly refute relativism or skepticism and move on fall deeper into the nihilism without realizing it, because they do not take the threat completely seriously. Plato and Socrates take it seriously and propose an extreme solution of jumping into the non-dual realm. Aristotle is of the opinion that it is possible to legislate it out of existence by creating the law of excluded middle and non-contradiction. What ever the responses within the tradition, the framework of relativism that is produced remains fundamental as something that later philosophers react to. It in fact becomes the scaffolding of the tradition itself and all the later philosophical positions can be seen as structural moves within that framework. So the fact that Schematization is inherent in the framework of relativism is significant. Here we wish to draw out that thread of the role of schematization within the framework of our tradition and explore its implications. Protagoras has provided for us our starting point in the genealogy of the concept of Schema in the Western Tradition. We need to follow that thread in order to understand fully what the Schema might be to us as a condition for phenomena to appear which is itself hidden. We need to try to bring out that hidden phenomena of schematization and show its structure in order to understand science and technology, and especially the design of technology that is accomplished in Systems Engineering and supported by Systems Theory. We are looking to produce a foundation for the understanding of Schemas in general within our tradition and give meaning to the various schemas though their comparison and contrast. Form was the primary schema, mentioned by Protagoras and taken up by Plato as the keystone of his philosophy. We will be exploring the different organizations of the various possible schemas as templates of understanding, but that exploration from a historical point of view must start with the form schema because it is the primary schema developed by our tradition

and which the development of all the other schemas follow.

The Courtroom and the Clock

We have said above that the framework of relativity is based on the social institution of the Athenian court. The Athenian court system was very different from our own. There are many of these differences that might be worth exploring in another context to understand fully the relation of sophism to the court system of Athens. Here however we merely want to draw attention to those aspects of the court that are related to the Projection of Schemas. The question is how did Protagoras get the idea of Man as the Measure of things. And I think that the answer clearly is from observing the practice of the Athenian Court system. In that practice there were a large number of jurors, hundreds or thousands. There was no appeal of their decision. They voted by casting dies into bottles. They listened to the two arguments for and against and then they decided guilt or innocence. There was a separate vote concerning the punishment. But here is the key point, which is that in the court was a water clock that was operated by some selected juror which measured out the time of the speeches of the litigants. This clock would be stopped and started depending on whether testimony was being read or other procedural actions were occurring. Witnesses did not appear in the court, but rather their testimony would be read when requested and this did not take away from the time for speaking of the litigant. Now I think that we can point to this clock that measured the time of the logos of the litigants as the key to the origin of the measure concept. In effect the water clock was measuring out the time of the logos. One of the jurors was doing this measuring out of the logos using the clock. Then at the end of the speeches for or against the defendant, then the jury as a whole would vote using the dies they cast for or against the defendant. Thus the opinions for or against came down to a quantitative measurement of votes cast. So the jury, and in the case of Athens it was a large jury, would measure the

two logoi that were presented to them in the time allotted to the speakers. So there is a double measurement here, the measurement of the logoi based on the measure of water by the water clock, and the measurement of the content of the logoi and their presentation by the collected jury at the end of the two speeches. What ever decision was made was final. So in this case we can see man, as the jury, measuring out the logoi as if it were a physical substance. How the two speeches for and against the defendant were compared to each other, and how the final vote of the jury measured the content of the speeches in favor of one and against the other. The jury was always odd in number so that there could be no tie. This is clearly the practice of the Athenian community on which the framework of relativism was built. It directly involved measurement both of the two logoi in time, and also the content of the logoi through the voting that led to a verdict. Here we have both the temporal form of the logoi and its content being measured. Further the form of the pleading of the defendant and the accusations of the prosecutor of the suit were very free form in the case of the Athenians. It was basically a no holds barred verbal fight, in which any tactic was admissible. There were no rules regarding the tactics that might be used and so every sort of underhanded trick that could be done was tried in order to win these cases. The very freedom of the speeches of the litigants is contrast to the measuring of those speeches by the votes cast by the jury which was a very rigid procedure that had to do with placing the dies of different kinds in different jars such that the others could not see how the individual jurors voted. The dies were counted at the end of the voting and the count was announced that led to the verdict of the whole group of jurors against or for the defendant who was singled out and his fate determined. Measurement produced a quantitative count of for or against votes. Each juror decided for himself and voted in secret and the vote signified the group will. Here if we use Heidegger's terms the jury represents Das Mann (The One, The They) and the litigants represent dasein as singled out facing

his fate determined by Das Mann. Man in this case as a general social phenomena which sets and conforms to norms, the Anthropos, is measuring all things, including other men. What is hidden here is the criterion for judging ones fellow men. Each juror privately and in secret decides what the criterion is in any particular case. You can see that this need to judge ones fellow men, actually produces the soul searching that might create subjectivity in the individual juror. It is the secretiveness of the ballot that produces the subjectivity as a degenerative mode of Das Mann. The litigants are trying to project fictive arguments that will convince the jury. They find out the value of those arguments when the vote is counted. So litigants are more perfectly dasein in as much as they are trying to conform to norms that they think will sway the jury. What is hidden with respect to them is the truth of their statements. But that truth does not matter if their performance is good enough to sway the jury. If all that matters is winning the case, then exactly what you want is some way to make the weaker argument appear stronger. But what is interesting is that the rhetoric of the speakers is based on a projection of the kind of audience that would accept the augment, and then that argument is presented to appeal to that audience, and then with the vote one finds whether the correct projection of a fictive audience has been made by the litigant. Here men are judging men, they are measuring out the time of the logoi, in the space of the court, and then they are judging the content of the two logoi and giving a quantitative verdict that decides the fate of their fellow men, turning quality into quantity. So we see here how space and time are projected. The space being the special court building where the proceedings take palce. The time represented by the clock that gives equal time to the two speakers. In the speech making there is a projection of the audience that can be convinced, and then the delivery to that audience of a speech aimed at the projected audience, and then that speech is measured at the end by the vote of the jury. By bringing in the litigants to a stage and by giving them their time to speak there is a counter projection onto

the speaker by the jury. The speaker is being projected as a citizen of Athens. Only certain speakers could appear, male citizens, and all others were bared from bringing cases to the court. Thus the court was operating as a meta-system and filtering out who was a system allowed in that meta-system and who was not. The court was an openscape in which systems might appear. In our terms an openscape, or environment, is a meta-system and infra-system together. These terms will be explained in due course. They are mentioned here for future reference. The point is that the court is this opening or clearing in which certain sorts of acts of justice could be performed by citizens. There was a tremendous amount of filtering that the citizens did on who could appear in the court and be litigants or the jury. So the projection actually went both ways. The litigants projected on the audience the template of convince-ability which speeches tried to fulfill and then were tested against. The jurors projected on the litigants the fundamental attribute of citizenship that allowed them to stand before them in the court. For instance, females could not bring a case or be a defendant. They were represented by males and cases were brought against them by males and the male jury decided their fate. Any male citizen could bring a suit against any other male citizen. Everyone else were considered property in one way or another. This tremendous filtering projection of the jury against onto the litigants, as a counter projection, to that of the litigants who projected a persuadable audience must be understood as prior to the specific case at hand. So mutual projections were occurring on the basis of which the court proceedings went forward. But prior to that the actual space of the court and its clock, i.e. the spacetime seen in existential terms as the availability of the places and the times of the courtroom scene, were projected by the entire polis so that what was happening in the court made sense to the entire population of the city. These two levels of projection are those we mentioned before, projection of spacetime of the court by the polis, and then mutual projection of jury onto litigants and vice versa. Measure has to have

these kinds of previous projections in order to function. The specific measuring out in a particular case must occur on the background of these prior projections. So projections are clear in this case as a background activity prior to the specific activity within the courtroom on any particular day. What is not clear is where the particular type of projection we call schematization comes into play. However, we will consider this what Heidegger calls a case of *formal indication*. That is to say we will pick out a general set of characteristics, in this case prior projections that set up the courtroom scene and the possibility of social measurement, and then we will be exploring further the types of projection that are possible. One type of these projections that are going on are those concerned with schematization. It is an extremely hidden possibility of projection. But it is an important one. It is happening in the court room, in fact it is happening at all times for everyone as part of the ecstasy of Dasein. But it is not readily apparent in this particular situation. It takes some sort of philosophical analysis concerning the meaning of "form" before it becomes clear as it does in Plato, what is meant by schematization in its proper sense, which is a very fundamental type of projection that grounds all the other projections we have been discussing. It is a projection that appears between the projection of spacetime of the courtroom and the mutual projection of litigants and jury on the other. Many schemas of familiarity are being accessed and realized in the courtroom situation. We want to focus very precisely on one particular type of projection called schematization that is close to the projection of spacetime and in fact differentiates that projection, so that other schemas may be applied to what appears in spacetime. That level of refinement in our understanding of projection will come later as we progress. But right now all that is important is that we understand that projection was occurring in the courtroom establishing it as a place of litigation, and that Protogoras was not just making up his framework of relativity but in fact it was grounded in the practice of Athenian justice as it occurred on a daily basis

as part of the everydayness of the Athenians themselves. The framework of Protagoras tried to make sense of this realm of activity in relation to the major ideas of his day, in terms of what Parmenides and Heraclitus had said about the nature of the world. Looking at the court system using the ideas of Parmenides and Heraclitus as guides Parmenides formulated his relativistic framework as a theoretical explanation of what was happening. The framework sticks close to the phenomenology of what was happening in the court itself. Measurement comes out of the existential situation in the court. It is not some arbitrary interpretation that Protagoras randomly seized upon. Rather it was something obviously occurring in the court and was related in obvious ways to other practices of measurement like surveying. Protagoras is said by Aristotle to have been against pure mathematics, but was more interested in practical mathematics. And we can see that this is because practical mathematics such as used in the building trade was closer to the phenomena he was studying in his teaching practice. We use this Heideggerian technique of *formal indication* to generally point toward the phenomena we want to explicate further. Protagoras has given us the basis for our *formal indication* within the Western tradition. It is left to us to develop further the understanding of projection in order to ferret out the hidden phenomena of schematization from the other types of projection that are occurring. What is made clear by this *formal indication* is only that projection itself is occurring. What schematization might be is still unclear.