

SPECIFICITY

This is a term first coined the Maltese philosopher and thinker Emmanuel George Cefai (1955 -).

Specificity is the process where the human mind expresses and – above all – *asserts* specific physical data objects and similia.

Cefai made an analysis of the faculties of the human mind and found out that the human mind had the following indubitable faculties namely (1) it has the general idea of the Idea of Infinity q.v. through which the human mind has knowledge of infinite spaces including the mentalist universe; and (2) the human mind has the faculty in it to have *perceptions* – whatever and however we doubt we cannot go further below this *minimum level* – even David Hume the skeptic par excellence could not go beyond this minimum level; and (3) Cefai discovered that we cannot change these perceptions at will – if these perceptions were ‘bundles’ as Hume asserted floating here and there like flotsam and jetsam – they would be at the control of the oars of the human will. That is if perceptions are ‘illusory’ and do not correspond to external objects our will has the faculty to add decrease or otherwise change them at will. This because such perceptions would be *merely internal* to the mind or *Humean perceptions* and the mind has full sovereignty over all its internal domains – as is proven by the Idea of Infinity – therefore the mind could change as it liked these merely internal perceptions at will if it so liked if these perceptions were simply ‘Humean perceptions’. (Cefai appears to distinguish perceptions into the following types : *merely internal* or *Humean perceptions* – these can be changed by the sovereign will of the percipient since these do not correspond to ‘external objects’ and *perceptions of specificity* which cannot be changed by the sovereign will of the percipient as they are ‘independent of him’ and indeed ‘correspond’ to ‘external objects’). But as an indubitable fact – proven by the same skeptical methodology of Cartesian *Cogito ergo sum* – the human mind cannot change the perceptions it receives. Therefore accordingly and in as direct proportion these perceptions are not of the type of ‘Humean perceptions’ and correspond to the ‘external objects’ so therefore (3) in specifying the perceptions that we see by *asserting them we assert things, existence, physicalist existence as it is*. Therefore accordingly and in as direct proportion we need no proof but simply assertion of things : *Assertion rather than proof* – and it is in this sense that this dictum has to be understood. These discoveries of Cefai about *specificity* are further strengthened by his implicit description of the physiological process of the introduction processing and subsequent expression of such perceptions. Thus in his article on Einstein in the *Malta News* of the May 25th, 1979¹ Cefai described how the perceptions enter through the apparatus of perception as mass; subsequently transform according to $e = mc^2$ in the brain organ as energy; and this re-transform (always through and in accordance with $e = mc^2$) to mass (from energy) in the images-perceptions actually seen and expressed - and being just asserted need no proof - their mere and sheer assertion is the proof of the existence of what is being asserted. Cefai’s arguments here however and not very clear and explicit and are rather inferred from his wording in that article.

¹ *Malta News* – Friday 25th May 1979 – p.12

