



Weights of thoughts and counterweights of senses all compose the paradox of knowledge. What lies beneath that remarkable state called truth? How can it be found? With what criteria can one be sure of its certainty? What is the scion of pure comprehension and where does a thought goes when lost? The answers to those questions multiply and so do the questions, yet one thing according to Cartesius: uncertainty, the basis of a potential "certainty".

Cartesian philosophy, as the first philosophy which initiated the conversations concerning materialism, argues that matter accounts for the basis of nature, therefore the basis of humane civilisation. Its a form of philosophical monism, where the mind and consciousness are by-products or epiphenomena of material processes. All things having a start, that start, that beginning being material. Many philosophers were influenced by this kind of philosophy, such as Marx who based his ideology on these views and developed a theoretical political model where its bedrock was sensed matter. The incendiary fallacy which certifies the pre-existence of matter is false, as stated by Decartes.

Decartes tried to prove the primary certainty of existence, cognitively speaking, that being thoughts themselves. "Cogito ergo sum", "I think therefore I exist". He states throughout all of his philosophical research that his ability to think is an undisputable truth that nobody could say otherwise. Furthermore, taking the first part of that saying as a given reality, he continues his logical thinking and indirectly initiates the need for a God in order to prove his existence. As Russell controversially attacked about the personal pronoun "ego", he pointed out that nobody can validate this statement, because why should anyone believe it? If the expression was expressed differently, such as: Thoughts exist then an issue would not be addressed since there is no trace of subjectivity. That is why Cartesius needs a guaranteeing God since when he phrased his sentence as I think, he practically turned it into an introverted knowledge of which he cannot get out of. In order to escape this "loop" he entered, a big requirement is the necessity of a God who can allow existence as a solid argument, channeled by the thinking process.

Contrary to the philosophy of scepticism, cartesian philosophy views doubt as the urge to move forward and give multiple possible reasonings to the phenomena surrounding us and not as a dry excuse for our inability to go further taking our limiting humane nature into account. Kuhn names a civilisation consisting of many different beliefs and perceivings as "paradigm". Moreover when a view is sensed as catholic there is always the chance that someone else will at some point dispute it and resonates with a chance that it is not in fact true. that being the odd, the paradox in everything presented to us as a given reality. Thus, pragmatologically speaking the idea of pragmatic is fallible enough. However, how is one person capable of overcoming that fallacy? How is one person able to hold the answers for the infinity of questions bombardizing the deepest forms of the mind? In contrast with Decartes, Nietzsche-with whom Goethe agrees- proposes the existence of a superhuman who will function as a small God without a sepherd, trusting the inner power of each human.

In summation, the doubt and the questioning of the conventional truths presents the sole way to coming closer as possible to the vast, unknown reality of the universe, the vanity of which might be the source of creation for its products. The higher form of individualism is creativity after all.