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Abstract: In this study, we analyze some controversial issues in Broad-spectrum philosophy and traditional philosophy. There were many vexed issues in the history of philosophy, such as, discussion on cognoscism and agnosticism, the division of one into two and more, the truth is unique or more. In our research, we get the result that it has undoubtedly great significance in deeply promoting the philosophical issues by clarifying these arguments under the view of Broad-spectrum philosophy.
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INTRODUCTION

Broad-spectrum philosophy is a kind of theory which pursuits the precise and accurate of philosophical questions, it can clarify many of the specious when analyzing the traditional philosophy problems by using of its theories and methods. Here we choose some vexed issues to introduce.


In this study, we analyze some controversial issues in Broad-spectrum philosophy and traditional philosophy. There were many vexed issues in the history of philosophy, such as, discussion on cognoscism and agnosticism, the division of one into two and more, the truth is unique or more. In our research, we get the result that it has undoubtedly great significance in deeply promoting the philosophical issues by clarifying these arguments under the view of Broad-spectrum philosophy.

ONE-DIMENSIONAL TIME AND “COGNOSCISM”

According to dialectical materialism, time is one dimensional, that is to say time only pass in one direction accordance with past → present → future.

Since the birth of dissipative structure theory and so on the self-organization theory, it has further revealed that the essence of time one-dimensional was the motion of matter changes which were not reversible, that is, the system evolution of the "no memory".

For example, in an intermediate bulkhead sealed box, the higher density of gas or liquid is in the left and the right is empty. When the partition was opened, the gas or liquid would spread to the right after a period of time, then the gas or liquid would uniformly distributed in entire box, this state cannot automatically restore to the original separate state. Then, we could not infer the previous distribution from present state, which is called" no memory system". Figure 1 shows the diffusion system.

Since the evolution system has no memory, then how could we trace the state of previous system and it rightly means the world is agnostic? This was contradicted with the cognoscism in dialectical materialism.

How to answer this question?

In the broad-spectrum theory of class change, reversible and irreversible is relative to some standard classification, that it puts the collection (series) of the status of the movement and change of the thing according to certain criteria (usually the equivalence relation) into a number of "class" (mathematics called equivalence classes). The same kind of status seems as a class of non-discriminatory (the state in different class...
has difference), thus when the thing changes in the same "class" ,then we can judge the its previous and future state, Thus can be said that things are knowable.

That is to say, reversible and irreversible, cognoscism and agnosticism is relative to a certain classification criteria, when the classification criteria designated, their distinctions have the absolute nature, when the classification criteria changed, their distinctions are relative.

Generally speaking, when the classification becomes more and more detailed, the reversibility can be turned into irreversibility; while the classification becomes more and more coarse, the reversible can be converted into irreversible. The first case reflects the real evolution of the objective world of material systems; the latter case shows that we can judge the past and future for some extent.

For example, under natural condition, a person's aging is reversible and the physiological changes all the time, which is one of the most detailed classifications. But when the person is mature, the basic structure, appearance, height and other features are stable and unchanging, which is a coarse classification. For the latter, we can judge his past and also predict his future by inferring from his basic characteristics now. It is applied this principle that we could get the victim's body status through checking dead body's basic characteristics in criminal investigation.

So, we can find that cognoscism and agnosticism has closely relationship with the classification criteria and detailed or not in the broad-spectrum theory of class change, there is no absolutely cognoscism and agnosticism.

The discussion on the division of one into two and more: As early as the mid-1980s in the last century, with the rise of the system theory in domestic, people began to mention the problem of “one into more”, up to the early of 1990s, some people began to “systematically” discus the problem of “one into more” in the so-called "system of dialectical science". In recent years, the view of “one into three” has been brought out.

We must know that the dialectic is the philosophy which is adhered to "one divides into two". So, what is the relationship among with the view of “one into more” and “one into three”? Let's talk about “one divides into more” at first, the scholars who hold this view believe that the world is composed by the systems; the system generally consists of many elements with multiple relationships. So, the view of “one into two” makes the complex and diverse world seem simple.

It is right when we think the system was consisted of many elements with multiple relationships and at this time the “more” which means the elements and relationships consists of system are more.

But the “two” (one divides into two) in dialectic both talks about neither the entities (elements) nor any relationship, it talks about the relationship which is both coincidental oppositorum and the two sides complement each other. Take a concrete example. Water molecules (H2O) consists of two hydrogen atoms and one oxygen atom, hydrogen atoms and oxygen atoms are bonded through chemical key (Fig. 2).

From the system's point of view, the water molecule consists of three elements and two relations (two chemical bonds), which is a system analysis. But the contradiction analysis method would not stop in this level, it should ask what power is it to maintain the water molecule (but not decomposed into atomic) as well as decompose. The answer is attraction and repellence.

When the attraction and repellence between hydrogen and oxygen atoms keeps balance, the water molecules remained stable. When water is heated or connected through direct current up to 1000°, the power of repulsion would exceed attraction, then the chemical key would be destroyed and the water molecule was decomposed into hydrogen and oxygen:

\[
\text{H}_2\text{O} \xrightarrow{1000^\circ} \text{H}_2 \uparrow + \text{O}_2 \uparrow
\]

Here, the “two” (one divides into two) does not talk about entities (chemical element) but the two contrary effects between attraction and repellence. Usually, in the inorganic system, no matter how many elements, how many kinds of complex relationships, it is the attraction and repellence taking effects in the final analysis to maintain the system stable or collapse.

Thus, we cannot be confused between “one divides into more” in the phenomenon level and “one divides into two” in essence level, they are at different levels. The theorem of class change governed by yinyang in broad-spectrum philosophy has solved this problem.

Now we discuss the relationship between “one divides into three” and “one divides into two”. Some scholars wrote that the examples such as Tao gave birth to the One; the One gave birth successively to two things, three things, up to ten thousand. (<The Tao Teh King> wrote by Lao-Tzu); people consists of men,
women and neuter; particles have particle, anti-particles and neutral particles; the genetic code table is an amino acid which is encoding by three basic group (single nucleotide); temperature has sub-zero, zero and minus; real number consists of "positive, negative and zero number"; logical deduction has the way of positive and negative, together method have too numerous. So the “one divides into two” in dialectics is wrong, while the “one divides into three” is right.

We can find that the scholars presented the examples of “three” either the entities (for example, men, women, neuter, three basic groups and so on) or the things’ existing state (zero, above freezing, subzero, positive, negative and zero and so on), which do not involve the evolution of the system and also do not involve the power for a system to maintain or collapse itself. So this is not the research object of the law of the unity of opposites.

Similarly, in, the dialectical concept is the objective reflection of contradictions and the purpose of study is to know how to transform from a concept into another concept, so the essence dialectical logic is to study the concept of rheology and its mechanism. And this differs in level with the “one divides into three”.

The discussion on the truth is unique or more: For one thing, is the truth only one or more than one? The answer in traditional philosophy is only one (this is the "truth monism"). When we change the angle of observation, adjust the level of observation, we can obtain things of different shapes, different levels of state and different properties of things. After reforming and opening, there was also a part of philosophy workers brought out the opposite point of view, they believed that the truth can have multiple; this was caused by different observed angles, levels and ways.

Broad-spectrum philosophy analyzes and solves this problem according to the theorem of multivalent objectivity. The theorem of multivalent objectivity thinks that when people select a certain observocontrol mode, observocontrol angle, level and ways, for one thing, the results are consistent (within falling into the same equivalence class) which are observocontrol by n individuals or n times ( n in theory can be infinite), we can get the objective recognize, that is truth. When we change the observocontrol mode, we get another objective recognize. If the observocontrol mode has n, we could get n truth. The n truth are not equivalent, they are quite different and generally difficult to "integrated" into one. Figure 3 shows the objectivity and n-ply truth.

According to the analysis above, when the observocontrol mode determined, the truth of the same thing is only one; but according to the theorem of multivalent objectivity, the observocontrol mode can be changed, at this time the truth can have more than one. In other words, for the same objectivity, when n individuals or n times using the same kind of observation, observation point, or experimental means, the result should be consistent, that truth is only one, which is the absolute nature of truth and meaning. But when observocontrol mode changing, due to each observocontrol mode corresponds to a kind of objectivity (truth), so a variety of observocontrol modes correspond to more than one truth, that truth is a collection, this is the relativity of truth.

For example, there are a variety of different geometry (such as Euclidean geometry, affine geometry, projective geometry, topology and geometry and so on) and they all study the respective invariance under substitution. So we can take certain transformation as a kind of observocontrol mode, when people select a certain transformation, we can obtain a kind of geometry. That is to say, if people select n kind of transformation group, we can obtain n kind of geometry.

HUMAN NATURE AND ITS RELATED PROBLEMS

The view "Selfish" as the human nature has been wandering like a ghost in the theory circle around since the reforming and opening up. And the money worship has been prevalent from Pan Xiao’s view “subjective for themselves, the objective for the others” in 1980s to China began market economy, which were related to the human nature.

First, the essence of things is a "class" concept under the point of view of broad spectrum philosophy. For example, “Zhang San is a good man” is just judged from his morality. Here “Zhang San” is the individual, while "good man" is a concept of "class", because “Zhang San” is not only the "good man", but also “Li
Fig. 4: The classification between human and animal

"Si" is the "good man", maybe there are many people could be the "good man".

So, the essence of things is the common property among the same class things. When we talk about the different essences means that the two belongs to different "class". The following begins with the view of the "class" to examine the philosophical sense of "human nature".

Obviously, human nature is the classification of humans and animals.

People have to eat, drink, wear, live action, although one of these behaviors are different from animals, these are not fundamentally apart human and animals, there is only the social nature of man can achieve this point. Human social nature puts the human’s animal instinct socialization and which the animals do not have this property, for example people eat is not only the necessary for physiology, but also for the social communicative function. Figure 4 shows the characteristics of this classification.

Now, we answer several questions at the beginning.

First, “human nature is selfish”. If we do not count the nuances of terms, then “human nature” is "human nature". People who promote “human nature is selfish" often say that when the child was born and he knew nursing but when encountering hot things, he drew back immediately, it is not worth refuting, because the animal also have this instinct, this is the nature of billions of years evolution. "Selfish" is the product of private ownership, while private ownership is the product of insufficient development productivity. If there is no private ownership, the productive forces developed highly, people no longer have the" selfish" concept. The fault of promoting that human nature is selfish was not only extended emotional impact and awareness produced in the special product relations (a kind of social relation) of private ownership of to all mankind, but also denied the fact that in real life (difference between class and class), because even in the private ownership of the dominant society, there are some selfless, selfless people, the national hero of all times, the leaders of the advanced class is a typical example.

Second, the view of “subjectively for themselves and objective for others”. Obviously, this point of view (or gravity) is emphasized for oneself. Is it really "subjective for himself," then the "objective would be for the others"? When the resources (generalized) are limited, this view is absurd. There is only one space (generalized resource) on the bus, if you took possession of this seat, then others are exclude to share. You eat a piece of cake; others will eat less, it is not objective for others? This is the simplest addition and subtraction knowledge.

There is a principle in Western economics that if every business pursuit of profit maximization, then the profits of the society would up to maximize. This also requires a premise that economic resources are unlimited (virtually impossible).

"Ranch paradox" tells us that when the pasture area (limited resources) is determined, if each herdsman take dominant strategies, namely, each herdsman increase grazing livestock, catastrophe will fall on the head of each herdsman. This principle is extended to the international community to become" human development paradox": natural resources are finite in the earth, while each country takes dominant strategies to plunder of resources, soon the catastrophe will fall on all human beings. This is the reason why the United Nations called for sustainable development.

CONCLUSION

This study analyzes some controversial issues in Broad-spectrum philosophy and traditional philosophy. There were many vexed issues in the history of philosophy, such as, discussion on cognoscism and agnosticism, the division of one into two and more, the truth is unique or more. In our research, we get the result that it has undoubtedly great significance in deeply promoting the philosophical issues by clarifying these arguments under the view of Broad-spectrum philosophy.
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