

1 **Belief Quotient as the Matrix of Doxastic Intelligence**

2
3 *Doxastic intelligence enables us to address phenomenological concerns and*
4 *make metaphysical claims, leading to belief formation. This existential*
5 *dialogue can be understood as the self (what is unique to each) speaking to*
6 *the soul (what is common to each). No matrix measures the decisions for or*
7 *against metaphysical claims leading to existential truths. As such, BQ*
8 *attempts to measure doxastic intelligence, as reflected in phenomenological*
9 *conjectures that necessitate intelligent decisions for or against metaphysical*
10 *claims. A belief is usually understood as an epistemic matter, but to believe*
11 *is an existential matter. In 2001/2007, I defined Belief Quotient as Justified*
12 *belief-decisions (JBD); now I would like to propose a comprehensive*
13 *definition and formulation of BQ. BQ is defined as the Matrix of Doxastic*
14 *Intelligence. IQ defines cognitive intelligence as a ratio of one's mental age*
15 *to one's chronological age. (Stanford–Binet Intelligence Scales, 1916), EQ*
16 *defines emotional intelligence as a measure of interpersonal and*
17 *intrapersonal competence. (Daniel Goleman, 1995). BQ measures doxastic*
18 *intelligence required to distinguish between belief and believing intelligently.*
19 *It extends beyond IQ by emphasizing that accurate intelligence lies not merely*
20 *in thinking but in believing intelligently. Epistemic truth deals with the*
21 *veracity of what we know; existential truth deals with the veracity of why we*
22 *choose to believe or disbelieve in what we know. While what we believe in*
23 *general can be based on empirical evidence, why we choose to believe or*
24 *disbelieve in God, freedom, and the self can be grounded only in*
25 *phenomenological conjectures or justification. Truths based on empirical*
26 *justification are mandatory, and truths based on phenomenological*
27 *conjectures are volitional. Establishing epistemic truth leads to the birth of*
28 *knowledge; establishing existential/metaphysical truth leads to the birth of*
29 *believers. BQ can be considered strong or weak. Strong BQ refers to those*
30 *who define and defend their decisions both in word and in life, and weak BQ*
31 *refers to those who don't see the need to define and defend their choices in*
32 *word or in life. This paper revisits Kierkegaard, Sartre, and Pojman.*
33
34

35 **Introduction:**

36 **Metaphysics provides the basis for Belief Quotient (BQ)**

37
38 The mind is the author of metaphysics and the creator of existential truths,
39 because it is both intelligent and a decision-making agent. As a decision-making
40 agent, it creates metaphysical or existential truths. What is fundamental to truth
41 is understanding the nature of reality. And what is fundamental to the
42 understanding of the nature of reality is the acceptance that the mind is
43 intelligent, intentional¹, volitional², and subjective³. Doxastic intelligence

¹Franz Brentano, "The Distinction between Mental and Physical Phenomena" in David J. Chalmers. *Philosophy of Mind*, (New York: Oxford University press, 2002) 479

²Jean-Paul Sartre. *Being and Nothingness, Tr. Hazel E. Barnes*, (New York: Washington: Square Press, 1977) 28.

³David Chalmers. *Philosophy of Mind*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002) 248

1 enables both comprehension and making phenomenological conjectures/
 2 decisions in belief formation. However, beliefs about God and the self are
 3 unfalsifiable conjectures that require intelligent decisions. Unfalsifiable does not
 4 mean these conjectures are not justifiable; only that justification is extra-
 5 empirical or non-reductive affirmations. In current thinking, reductive
 6 justification is considered mandatory; non-reductive justification is not⁴; hence,
 7 the debate continues. The attributes associated with God and the self are
 8 considered non-reductive. Do the attributes, such as intentionality, intelligence,
 9 and freedom, associated with God and the self, pertain to a particular substance
 10 or composition? If there is some substance because of which God or the self has
 11 these attributes, we are not aware of it. Regardless of whether such a substance
 12 exists, we assume that these attributes associated with God and the self are non-
 13 reductive. In the Quantum world, two possibilities exist until observed;
 14 similarly, in the existential world, two choices exist until a decision is made. As
 15 such, all believers are metaphysicians⁵. We are metaphysicians because of the
 16 two features of the mind, namely intelligence and freedom. Intelligence of the
 17 mind permits us to make the following metaphysical distinctions⁶, namely, the
 18 temporal/timeless beings, the contingent/necessary truth, the particular/universal
 19 entities, the essence/existence, and the reductive/non-reductive realities.
 20 Freedom of the mind, as a decision-making agent, considers these metaphysical
 21 distinctions and allows us to become believers who choose to believe or
 22 disbelieve in God, freedom, and the self. Reality and the nature of reality are
 23 metaphysical distinctions made possible because of the intelligent mind. While
 24 physics deals with what is⁷. Metaphysics deals with the nature of what is⁸.
 25 Metaphysics begins when we start to question and define the nature of reality in
 26 the context of phenomenological concerns.⁹ The acknowledgment of the
 27 intelligent, intentional, and indeterminate mind is the basis for metaphysics.
 28 However, the features of the mind, namely, intelligence, intentionality¹⁰,
 29 subjectivity, and freedom,¹¹ are not reductive properties; they are directional
 30 forces that orient an agent toward the world¹². These properties of consciousness
 31 as vectors are not only directional, but can also be thought of as a continuum, on

⁴Louis P. Pojman, “Believing, Willing and the Ethics of Belief” in *The Theory of Knowledge*, ed. Louis Pojman, (Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing company, 1993,) 527

⁵Dipanwita Chakrabarti, “The Kantian Notion of Categories and their origin” *Athens Journal of Philosophy* - Volume 3, Issue 3, September 2024 – Pages 149-162 <https://www.athensjournals.gr/philosophy/2025-4-2-2-Dobrowolski.pdf>

⁶Ibid.

⁷Willard Quine, *Word and Object* (Cambridge MA: MIT Press 2013) 23-72

⁸The essence/existence; Time/space, contingent/necessary, particular/universal, reductive/nonreductive, Why there is something instead of nothing—Leibnitz

⁹Paul Tillich, *Dynamics of Faith* (New York: Harper & Row, 1957), 1.

¹⁰Franz Brentano, “The Distinction between Mental and Physical Phenomena” in David J. Chalmers. *Philosophy of Mind*, (New York: Oxford University press, 2002) 479

¹¹Jean-Paul Sartre. *Being and Nothingness, Tr. Hazel E. Barnes*, (New York: Washington: Square Press, 1977) 28.

¹²Maurice Merleau-Ponty stretching -toward

1 a multidimensional scale, with each axis representing an increasing spectrum¹³
 2 from its origin. As such, there is a need to measure these metaphysical
 3 disparities. While IQ measures cognitive intelligence, BQ¹⁴ measures doxastic
 4 intelligence.

5 While traditional analysis of knowledge (TAK) defines knowledge as
 6 justified true belief¹⁵, TAK does not differentiate between empirical and extra-
 7 empirical justification. With the rise of logical positivism¹⁶, justification was
 8 restricted to empirical or verifiable grounds. If justification is restricted to what
 9 is empirical, then the acceptance of the truth of justified true belief becomes
 10 mandatory. Bertrand Russell, speaking about truth and falsity, seems to suggest
 11 that accepting truth or falsity does not involve consent¹⁷. However, it appears
 12 that there are two types of justifications, namely empirical and extra-empirical,
 13 that lead to justified true beliefs that are mandatory, and justified true beliefs that
 14 are volitional. In other words, there are beliefs we have to accept, and there are
 15 beliefs we must choose to accept¹⁸. That is because while all beliefs are either
 16 true or false, not all can be reductively affirmed as true or false. As such, the
 17 acceptance of verifiable and falsifiable beliefs/truths is mandatory. On the other
 18 hand, unfalsifiable beliefs require a decision, a justified belief-decision, as
 19 opposed to mandatory justified true beliefs. Since beliefs related to
 20 phenomenological conjectures cannot be verified as true or false, beliefs about
 21 God and the self are an either/or matter¹⁹. Either/Or matter does not mean that
 22 these beliefs are neither true nor false. It simply means they cannot be verified
 23 or falsified as true or false. Since the advent of positivism, empirical truths, what
 24 is considered verifiable and reductive, have been what mattered, hence
 25 mandatory²⁰. However, the acceptance of the veracity of existential or
 26 metaphysical truth is that its truth is considered non-reductive, hence non-
 27 mandatory/volitional. Since non-reductive metaphysical truths are considered
 28 unfalsifiable, confirmation or disconfirmation is not possible.

29 Attributes, namely intelligence, intentionality, freedom, and subjectivity
 30 associated with God and the self, are considered non-reductive because we do

¹³Dania Pandala, “Vectors of Consciousness” Burman University Undergraduate-Faculty Research Conference, March 14, 2024.

¹⁴Tennyson Samraj, *What is Your Belief Quotient*, (Lacombe: Monograph Publishers 2001) (Author house: 2007)

James Kay writes that beliefs in general control and shape us for better or for worse. (James Kay *The Belief Quotient* – 2017. Liza purports that certain beliefs sabotage or support ones success (Lisa Van Allan *Your Belief Quotient 2013*)

¹⁵Alwin I, Goldman, “What is justified Belief” in Michael F, Goodman and Robert A. Snyder, *Contemporary Reading in Epistemology* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Inc. 1993) 89-104

¹⁶Vienna circle of scholars 1920s–30s, included, Moritz Schlick (leader) Rudolf Carnap, Philip Frank, Otto Neurath, Hans Hah, Herbert Feigl

¹⁷Bertrand Russell, “Truth and Falsehood”, in Michael F, Goodman and Robert A. Snyder, *Contemporary Reading in Epistemology* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Inc. 1993),170.

¹⁸Louis P. Pojman, “Believing, Willing and the Ethics of Belief” in *The Theory of Knowledge*, ed. Louis Pojman, (Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing company, 1993,) 527

¹⁹Soren Kierkegaard, *Either/Or II* ed. Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong. Hong (New Jessy: Princeton University Press, 1987) 176

²⁰For some reason we have told ourselves that what is reductive should be mandatory and what is non-reductive should be non-mandatory. But why.

1 not know of any reductive substance that makes these attributes possible. What
 2 is important to note is that epistemic truth is different from existential truth.
 3 Knowing is different than believing. In empirical truth, to know is to believe, for
 4 belief is mandatory, but in existential truth, to believe is to know why we choose
 5 to believe, because belief is volitional. That is why, in existential truth, we can
 6 know but not believe; but we cannot believe and not know why we choose to
 7 believe. The question is not whether there is God and the self; the question is
 8 why we choose to believe in them. While epistemology deals with the truth of
 9 what is epistemic. BQ deals with the truth of what is existential. We cannot
 10 confirm whether God and the self exist, but we can affirm whether we believe in
 11 them. While the mind is the author of metaphysics, it is also a decision-making
 12 agent. As a decision-making agent, the nature of consciousness necessitates that
 13 we, as authors of metaphysics, make belief-decisions for or against metaphysical
 14 claims. BQ registers such decisions as justified belief-decisions. To believe in
 15 God, freedom, and the self as an either/or matter²¹; is a real, forced, and
 16 momentous decision²².

17 A central phenomenological concern is the origin of the universe. If there is
 18 a beginning to cosmology, then we must assume the need for a timeless
 19 conceiver²³, perceiver,²⁴ and observer²⁵ for its origin. While Schrödinger argued
 20 that to be is to be observed, we must go further, for once created, created things
 21 must be constantly observed to retain their properties.²⁶ All beings that have a
 22 beginning have their beginning in the beginning. However, the fundamental
 23 cause for all beings having a beginning itself cannot have a beginning; it must
 24 be beginningless. If there is a beginning for the universe, then there must be a
 25 conceiver, perceiver, or observer that exists without a beginning. What
 26 necessitates a conceiver, perceiver, and observer without a beginning?
 27 Beginning implies beings; being does not imply beginning; triangles as concepts
 28 can subsist without having a beginning or an end. The nonlocal mind²⁷ in whose
 29 cognition such timeless forms exist must be beyond being, becoming, and
 30 beginning, to house such realities.²⁸ As such, non-local consciousness is beyond
 31 space, time, and identity. In fact, space, time, and matter are only there because

²¹Soren Kierkegaard, *Either/Or II* ed. Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong. Hong (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1987) 176

²²William James. "The will of Believe", in *Philosophy of Religion*, Eds. William I. Row.

²³Berkeley *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*, 1713).

²⁴Alexius Meinong Theory of objects 1904—existent and non-existent objects. (Sandford Encyclopedia)

²⁵Schrödinger, Erwin. "The Present Situation in Quantum Mechanics." Translated by John D. Trimmer. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 124, no. 5 (1980): 323–338.

²⁶David L. Ryan "The Conscious Universe: Nonlocality and its Implications. *Journal of Psychiatry and Psychiatric Disorders*. Volume 8 Issue 3. 1. 98. Deepak Chopra. Local vs. Non-Local Realism, 1:30. <https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=62017147040479>

²⁷Exploring Non-local consciousness—The non-local consciousness 10:26-30 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N6OKfVQScs>

²⁸ChatGPT. (2025, November 26). *Response on the Nonlocal Mind as Absistent Ground, discussing its attributes, metaphysical argument, and implications*. OpenAI. <https://openai.com/chatgpt>. Unlike beings that exist in time (with beginnings and endings) or subsist (timeless but definable), the Nonlocal Mind absists, beyond all categories of being, becoming, and beginning.

1 of consciousness²⁹. It is fundamental to begin with. The attributes of the mind
 2 of God and the self, namely intelligence, freedom, intentionality, and
 3 self/subjectivity, are considered non-reductive features of consciousness; thus,
 4 ascribing identity to these features is difficult. We argue for the necessity of the
 5 timelessness of nonlocal consciousness, for the birth of the universe, in that the
 6 universe is not the result of algorithmic chance but of conscious choice. We also
 7 maintain that there is a link between local and nonlocal consciousness, even
 8 though their locality and causality are difficult to determine. What must be noted
 9 is that, while there are many studies on the origin of the universe, there are only
 10 a few on the origin of consciousness. The question is which comes first? Most
 11 studies state that the universe comes first, and consciousness appears later in its
 12 history. However, many studies now show that consciousness comes first, and
 13 the universe is a result of consciousness³⁰. Why is this important? Because there
 14 is a beginning, we can state that essence precedes existence, and that essence is
 15 non-reductive. Essence remains non-reductive or disappears when what is
 16 reductive is reduced to up and down quarks. So, if essence precedes existence
 17 and if everything is reducible to quarks, then the world of essence is the non-
 18 reductive world of intentionality or metaphysics.

19 Two fundamentals of reality are reductivity and locality. Two fundamental
 20 properties of consciousness are irreducibility and non-locality³¹. For George
 21 Wald, consciousness has no place or location.³² For Stuart Hameroff, since
 22 anesthetics can negate consciousness, it must be located somewhere in the
 23 brain³³. To Sartre, consciousness is real but not a thing³⁴, hence it does not have
 24 a place or location. Nonlocality is best illustrated in the essence/existence
 25 distinction. For, while what exists has a place or location, the essence of what is
 26 has no place nor location. While reducibility and locality are fundamental to
 27 what exists. Irreducibility and nonlocality are fundamental to essence. While the
 28 content of both local and nonlocal consciousness can be about what exists, what
 29 subsists, or what absists,³⁵ what each chooses to be intentional about is different,
 30 because we are free to choose what to be intentional about. Both can direct their
 31 thoughts to what exists concretely (like tables), and what subsists abstractly³⁶

²⁹Non-local consciousness

³⁰Consciousness May Have Created the Universe - This Is Very Strange 7: 07; 8:36; 9:42; 10:14; 10:26. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dP3XOwhozg> (Anthropic principle)

³¹Stuart Hameroff, Quantum Consciousness and the Origin of life. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XA9Q5p9ODac> 7:19.

³²George Wald, "Life and Mind the Universe", in John Pickering and Martin Skinner, *From Sentience to Symbols* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press)

³³Stuart Hameroff, Quantum Consciousness and the Origin of life <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XA9Q5p9ODac> 7:19.

³⁴Jean Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, 120.

³⁵*Alexius Meinong Theory of objects 1904—existent and non-existent objects. (Sandford Encyclopedia)* To absists is (1) to be without having a being; (2) to be that cannot have a being; (3) to be is to potentially have a being. We cannot have a feature that is not present in nonlocal consciousness

³⁶Does mathematical truths have a beginning. Some would say that mathematical truths begins with the beginning of matter, for once matter comes into being, there could be shapes, and numbers become relevant. However mathematical truths can also be argued as not having a beginning. Triangles are birthless and deathless.

1 (like mathematical truth), or what absists only mentally (like Pegasus). Further,
 2 the mind can create objects that involve contradictions, such as square circles;
 3 imagine strange objects like dragons; conceive ideas/inventions that do not yet
 4 exist; and then bring them into existence. However, what is most important to
 5 note is that, regardless of whether essence is related to what exists, what subsists,
 6 and what absists, our understanding of all essences is non-reductive and thus can
 7 have no place or location. Those who argue for a reductive basis for essence
 8 point to Gold or Iron as being defined by the number of protons each possesses.
 9 However, if or when Gold or Iron is further reduced to quarks, the essence of
 10 both Gold and Iron disappears.

11
 12

13 **Metaphysical distinction that provides the basis for belief in God and the** 14 **Self**

15

16 What is most important to note are three brute givens: (1) we are conscious,
 17 (2) we are conscious of the universe we find ourselves in, and (3) we are
 18 conscious of belief-decisions, for or against metaphysical claims. What is unique
 19 about the mind is consciousness. What must be noted about consciousness is its
 20 attributes, namely intentionality, intelligence, freedom, and subjectivity. What
 21 we share with each other and with God are these features. To deny these features
 22 leads us not only to negate the self but also our connection with God. What
 23 connects us to God are these features, which can be expressed along a continuum
 24 on a multidimensional scale. The question is whether these features are reductive
 25 or non-reductive. For many, the acceptance or rejection of God and the self
 26 depends on whether these features are considered reductive. Because of these
 27 features, the mind can make important metaphysical distinctions. To begin, it is
 28 the mind that makes the temporality/timelessness distinction. We know that the
 29 immaterial, intelligent, indeterminate, intentional mind or the self that appears
 30 at birth and disappears at death is temporal. Because of this, we can comprehend
 31 the need for a timeless mind that is immaterial, intelligent, indeterminate, and
 32 intentional. When we realize that without a mind we cannot comprehend
 33 timeless realities like triangles, we see the need for a timeless mind/
 34 consciousness in whose mind timeless realities eternally reside. Recognition of
 35 the temporal mind is the first metaphysical claim we can make before we can
 36 accept the need for a timeless mind. Only when we understand this distinction
 37 can we comprehend what we share with one another, namely, freedom,
 38 intentionality, and the immateriality of consciousness. That is why, before we
 39 can accept a timeless mind, we must accept the temporal mind or self. If we
 40 struggle to acknowledge the temporal self, we will also have difficulty accepting
 41 a timeless mind that postulates the timelessness of consciousness. Understanding
 42 the immateriality, indeterminism, intelligence, and intentionality of the local
 43 mind helps us grasp those of the nonlocal mind. The difference lies in the fact
 44 that local consciousness is temporal, whereas nonlocal consciousness is timeless.
 45 Furthermore, with nonlocal consciousness, freedom and intentionality are
 46 absolute, whereas with local consciousness, they are finite. God can be God only

1 to those who can acknowledge God as God. Shared consciousness is what allows
 2 God and humans to recognize who each is to the other, and to be aware of the
 3 creator-creature distinction. Knowing the distinction between temporal and
 4 timeless mind is the most important aspect of knowing and acknowledging God.
 5 What defines God as God is the timelessness of his being. As such, only those
 6 who share with God the same consciousness and understand God's timeless
 7 nature can choose to believe in God's existence.

8 What is important to note is that only those who share the same
 9 consciousness with God can claim God to be God. That is why Buber argued
 10 that God is God only to a believer. How can we need God if God did not need
 11 us?³⁷ The recognition of the temporal mind establishes the need for a timeless
 12 mind. The necessity of the timeless nonlocal/mind/consciousness provides the
 13 basis for understanding the origin of the universe. It is this timeless mind that
 14 provides the basis for the local mind to explore the concept of the universe's
 15 beginning. Temporality of the universe implies the timelessness of nonlocal
 16 consciousness. We can discuss the beginning of the universe only because we
 17 can comprehend the need for the timelessness of nonlocal consciousness.
 18 Sharing the same consciousness makes it possible to know who or what each is
 19 to the other³⁸. Both local and nonlocal consciousness share the same fundamental
 20 features of consciousness, namely intentionality, intelligence, and freedom,
 21 albeit to varying degrees or vectors³⁹. Only God and humans who possess a
 22 shared consciousness can understand the distinction between the temporal and
 23 the timeless. Only a conscious being that is aware of temporality can be aware
 24 of a timeless being. Further, only God and human beings share freedom because
 25 we share the same consciousness. If we share with God consciousness and
 26 freedom, then just as we can be surprised by what God chooses to conceive and
 27 create, God should be surprised by what we choose to conceive and create.
 28 Entanglement must operate both ways.

29 To affirm the attributes of consciousness, namely intentionality,
 30 intelligence, freedom, and subjectivity, is to affirm both belief in God and the
 31 self. However, to talk about these attributes of consciousness is to ask whether
 32 these attributes are reductive or nonreductive. Some argue that these attributes
 33 of consciousness are an irreducible form of matter⁴⁰. Can they be reductive, but
 34 we just are not aware of it? For many, the acceptance of God or the self depends
 35 on whether these attributes are reductive. Those who argue for a materialistic
 36 explanation would like to believe that these attributes are the highest form of
 37 matter, but matter nevertheless. Others would like to believe that these attributes
 38 are non-reductive brute givens. Both the nature of consciousness and the
 39 attributes associated with God, specifically immortality, are non-reductive. As
 40 long as the attributes of God's essence are considered non-reductive, the search

³⁷Martin Buber, *I and Thou*, trans. Ronald Gregor Smith, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1958) 82.

³⁸Acknowledging each other is possible because we share the same consciousness. Hence acknowledging nonlocal consciousness is more important than identifying nonlocal consciousness.

³⁹On the vector scale.

⁴⁰John Searle "The Irreducibility of Consciousness" in John Heil, *Philosophy of Mind*, (Oxford: Orford University Press, 2011) 708

1 for the identity of God's existence is meaningless. Similarly, as long as the
 2 features of consciousness are considered as nonreductive, the identity of the
 3 body/DNA cannot provide the identity of the self. Point in case, identical twins
 4 have two distinct selves. The immateriality of consciousness provides the non-
 5 reductive basis for both the nature of intentionality and the attributes associated
 6 with the self/God.

9 **God: An Ontological Necessity and Existential Choice**

11 We choose to believe in God's existence based on our understanding of
 12 God's essence. A Theist is not a Theist because he or she has seen God, nor is
 13 an Atheist an Atheist because he or she has not seen God. Comprehension of the
 14 essence of God is the basis for the birth of believers. We are not born as Theists
 15 and Atheists. We choose to be Theists or Atheists. Two reasons often cited for
 16 belief in God concern (1) the origin of the universe and (2) the need for a non-
 17 contingent being.⁴¹ Two reasons often cited for disbelief concern (1) the problem
 18 of evil/suffering⁴² and (2) the idea that God and human freedom cannot co-
 19 exist⁴³. As such, the real debate about God is not over God's existence but over
 20 God's essence. That is why Theists define and defend their belief-decisions,
 21 while atheists define and defend the reasons for their decisions⁴⁴. The question
 22 about God is not whether God exists. If that were the case, it could be easily
 23 answered when and if God decides to appear before us, if we demand so. Our
 24 requests for God's appearance rarely come true, because the proof of the
 25 existence of God is not a guarantee of belief in the essence of God. The real
 26 question is whether God necessarily exists and whether empirical proof can
 27 establish it. Proof for the existence of God cannot be proof for the essence of
 28 God. Without *a posteriori* specificity, the search for empirical proof for the
 29 existence of God is a meaningless exercise, because belief in God is based on
 30 the essence of God. We choose to accept or reject God, not on whether God's
 31 existence is verifiable, but because the essence of God is unfalsifiable. Perhaps
 32 a third option could be that belief in God as a wager⁴⁵.

33 We can talk about essence only if there is an ontological split between
 34 essence and existence, and if there is a mind to conceive the essence. In other
 35 words, talking about essence implies not only having a beginning, but also
 36 having a mind. For if there is an essence, it must not only precede existence but
 37 must be conceived as an essence in the mind of someone. If God has no

⁴¹Plantinga, *The Nature of Necessity* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974) 218

⁴²J. L. Mackie, "Evil and Omnipotence," *Mind* 64, no. 254 (1955): 200–212. (God is good and existence of evil cannot be true at the same time)

⁴³Jean Paul Sartre, *Existentialism and Humanism*, trans. Philip Mairet, (London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1949), 26

⁴⁴Sam Harris, (The End of faith, 2004) Christopher Hutchinson (*God is not Great 2007*) Richard Dawkins (*The God Delusion 2006*) Daniel Dennett (Religion as a Natural Phenomena 2006)

⁴⁵Ada, Prisco, Athens Journal of Philosophy - Volume 3, Issue 4, December 2024. – (Pages 215-222)

<https://www.athensjournals.gr/philosophy/2024-3-4-3-Prisco.pdf>

1 beginning, then it is impossible to define the essence of a being that has no
 2 beginning. God is a brute given. The *de re*⁴⁶ essence of God is inexplicable
 3 because, in the understanding of the nature of God, we cannot make an
 4 ontological split between essence and existence. With God, essence and
 5 existence are intertwined. As such, we cannot be sure whether the *de dicto*
 6 essence that God is immortal, love, and the creator are part of the ‘is’ of
 7 existence, or the ‘is’ of essence. For instance, if God is God before creation and
 8 not because of creation, how can creatorship be part of God's essence? God can
 9 be understood to exist, subsist, or absist⁴⁷. God can exist (within being, as in the
 10 Christian incarnation) in that God can be a reductive given with an identity; God
 11 can subsist (beyond becoming) in that God is timeless, as triangles are, and
 12 definable as immortal. God can absist (beyond being) in that God can be a being
 13 without having a being, that is not contingent on either existence or subsistence,
 14 but rather transcends both⁴⁸. As such, God is a transcendental being; God is
 15 beyond being, beginning, or becoming. Since God can manifest in any form God
 16 chooses⁴⁹, looking for some identification without any *a posteriori* specificity,
 17 for the ‘is’ of essence, or for the ‘is’ existence, is a meaningless task. In the case
 18 of water, we know it is H₂O. What we want to know is whether the ‘is’ of
 19 composition defines the ‘is’ of essence or the ‘is’ of existence/identity? As such,
 20 even if we discover the identity of God, what we want to know is whether it is
 21 related to the ‘is’ of essence, or the ‘is’ of existence.

22 We can define the *de dicto*⁵⁰ necessity of God, independent of knowing the
 23 *de re*⁵¹ identity of God. Because the *de re* identity of God is neither reductive
 24 nor a revealed given, belief in God is a belief-decision. God, like Gold, is
 25 definable, but God, unlike Gold⁵², is not identifiable. Ascribing identity to God's
 26 essence is impossible if God's essence is non-reductive⁵³. In Christian Scripture,
 27 God is defined as being invisible⁵⁴. The question is, what aspect of God is

⁴⁶(Latin: “*about the thing*”) means that a property, necessity, possibility, or belief is attributed to a specific object itself,

⁴⁷ From the German word *auberseiend* (outside of being) later rendered as *absistence*. God can exist in a body (spacio-temporal existence); God can subsist as being timeless, as in the concept of a triangle (abstract concept), and God can absist -not spatially located at all.

⁴⁸Samraj, T. (2025). *Existence, Subsistence, and Absistence: Three Modes of Divine Being*. ChatGPT (GPT-5) conversation, November 12, 2025. <https://chat.openai.com/> ChatGPT. (2025, November 21). *Explanation of the modes of divine being: existence, subsistence, and absistence*. OpenAI.

⁴⁹Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 1 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), 235. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* I, q. 3, a. 4:

⁵⁰(Latin: “about what is said”) marks a way of attributing a property or modality to a *statement or proposition*

⁵¹(Latin: “*about the thing*”) means that a property, necessity, possibility, or belief is attributed to a specific object itself,

⁵²Gold having 79 protons defines Gold as Gold

⁵³God's attributes cannot be quantified using biometric measures

⁵⁴1 Timothy 1:17 “Now to the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only God, be honor and glory forever and ever.

1 Timothy 6:16 “Whom no one has ever seen or can see.”

John 1:18 “No one has ever seen God...”

Colossians 1:15 “He is the image of the invisible God...”

1 invisible: is it the essence of God or the existence of God? It appears the essence
 2 of God cannot have any identity ascribed to it. because the essence of God,
 3 namely, immortality, creator, love, and truth, are all non-reductive attributes.
 4 The two main attributes of God, namely immortality and creator, do not have
 5 any reductive substance linked to them. As long as the attributes of God's
 6 essence are considered non-reductive, the search for the identity of God's
 7 existence is meaningless. All arguments for God's existence and all information
 8 from revealed sources do not provide any information about God's identity. Of
 9 course, the existence of God must have an identity. However, the question is not
 10 whether God has an identity; rather, whether we have any information about
 11 God's identity. We do not have any *a posteriori* information about God's
 12 identity⁵⁵. Should we encounter God, we would have to, in faith, choose to
 13 believe that what or who is before us is God. Establishing the *de dicto* necessity
 14 of God does not establish God's *de re* identity; without *de re* identity, we are left
 15 with only one option: we must choose to believe or disbelieve in God, regardless
 16 of whether we encounter God. The *de dicto* certainty that the fastest runner will
 17 win the race can be held without knowing the *de re* identity of the winner.
 18 Similarly, we can argue for the *de dicto* necessity of God even if we do not have
 19 the *de re* identity of God. For the existence of the universe demands the *de dicto*
 20 necessity of God, while God's essence demands the *de re* necessity of God. *A*
 21 *priori* necessity, causal necessity, and metaphysical necessity can establish
 22 ontological necessity, but none can establish the factual or *de re* necessity/
 23 identity of God⁵⁶. This leaves us with no choice but to accept God as a factual
 24 necessity. God is a brute fact, like the brute fact of the existential self. The factual
 25 necessity of God, why God cannot have a beginning, cannot cease to exist, or
 26 why God must exist, is inexplicable. So, while the physical eye can establish the
 27 'is' of existence, given *a posteriori* information, only the metaphysical 'I' can
 28 establish the 'is' of essence, regardless of whether we have information about
 29 God's *de re* identity. Obviously, anything that exists would have a reductive
 30 identity; the question is, can the identity of God's existence establish the identity
 31 of the essence of God, especially if the attributes of God are considered as non-
 32 reductive?⁵⁷ What is interesting about belief in God is that we can have *de dicto*
 33 certainty that God exists even without having *de re* identity.
 34

Exodus 33:20 "You cannot see my face, for no one may see me and live

⁵⁵We don't have any *a posteriori* necessity like Kripke famous line "Water is H₂O", to establish ontological identity. Without having a posterior identity searching for empirical is a meaningless task. Knowing that Canada has spies is does not mean one can identify one should we see one.

⁵⁶Richard Swinburne, *The Existence of God* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004), 95

⁵⁷Like the features of consciousness, namely freedom and intentionality, are non-reductive, the attributes of God, namely, immortality and creator, are considered to be non-reductive.

1 **The Existential Self: What appears at Birth and Disappears at Death**

2

3 Belief in the existential self involves a decision, a justified belief-decision.
 4 The existential self or subjectivity is an irreducible and invisible reality⁵⁸, like
 5 the emergent invisible reality of gravity.⁵⁹ We can argue for the immateriality of
 6 the self⁶⁰ because when self-consciousness ceases to exist, it does so, leaving
 7 every atom in one's body intact. This implies that the self is not only
 8 nonreductive but immaterial. To be is to be aware of the conscious, nonreductive,
 9 invisible self. How local consciousness, which is common to all humans,
 10 transforms into self-consciousness is a mystery. Or, how the soul (what is
 11 common in each), becomes the unique self is again a mystery. Local or self-
 12 consciousness appears at birth and disappears at death⁶¹. So, the self is
 13 undetectable, invisible, irreducible/nonreductive, and immaterial. While the
 14 features of local consciousness, namely intelligence, intentionality, and freedom,
 15 are the same in each human being, the memory of local self-consciousness will
 16 be different. MRI can only determine whether one is alive or dead, but cannot
 17 detect who is alive or dead, or detect one's BQ. MRI cannot detect or locate the
 18 self. In defining the human condition, the self does not exist (as the body does)
 19 nor subsist (as the mind does); rather, it functions as the irreducible condition for
 20 human experience. This is the "absistent" mode of being found in transcendental
 21 philosophy. That is why some accept the self, others reject the self, because
 22 while the body exists, the mind subsists, and the self absists.⁶² As such, belief in
 23 the existential self requires a decision, a belief-decision.

24 The correlation⁶³, contingency⁶⁴, or causation⁶⁵ of mental states to brain
 25 states can only establish the relationship between the brain and the mind; they
 26 cannot account for the existential phenomena of the self. However, to truly
 27 understand the self, we must recognize the connection between local
 28 consciousness and non-local consciousness. Socrates argued that death is not the
 29 death of anything—it is the separation of the soul from the body⁶⁶. As such, the

⁵⁸Kierkegaard, Søren. *The Sickness Unto Death*. Translated by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong. Princeton University Press, 1980, p. 13. "The self is a relation that relates itself to itself..."

⁵⁹Tennyson Samraj, Carbon-based Brain, Consciousness, and Choice: A Phenomenological Update on the Concept and Reality of Freedom as an Existential Mode of Existence in Human Praxis. 10th Annual International Conference on Philosophy, Athens, Greece May 25-28, 2015.

⁶⁰Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, Tr. Hazel E. Barnes, (New York: Washington: Square Press, 1977) 562, 650.

⁶¹Søren Kierkegaard, *The Concept of Anxiety*, trans. Reidar Thomte (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), 42–44. (On possibility as constitutive of the self.)

Another challenge is how under **anesthesia**, a person loses consciousness, or how the neural circuits are inhibited

⁶²<https://chatgpt.com/c/6989103f-f3c8-832d-a590-8674a2051b02>

⁶³David Chalmers. *Philosophy of Mind*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002) 248

⁶⁴D. M. Armstrong "Casual Theory of the Mind" in David Chalmers. *Philosophy of Mind*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002) -87

⁶⁵U.T. Place, "Is consciousness a Brain Process" in David Chalmers. *Philosophy of Mind*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002) 55-60.

⁶⁶Plato. *Phaedo*. Translated by G.M.A. Grube, revised by John M. Cooper. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1992. 9 "Death is simply the separation of soul and body; the soul being in a sense imprisoned in the body during life, and freed at death."¹

1 existential self, which appears at birth and disappears at death, leaves every atom
2 behind. This implies that consciousness is not only non-reductive, immaterial,
3 and indeterminate⁶⁷, but connected to the immortal non-local consciousness.

4 Regardless of whether mental states are a physical state, an emergent property⁶⁸,
5 a quantum phenomenon⁶⁹, a substrate-suffused given, a transduced given, or the
6 image of God, the question of how the self transforms into an individual person
7 at birth and disappears at death remains a challenge to explain. It is a brute given.
8 It appears that the self has no place or location. As such, we have to decide
9 whether to believe in the individual self. The question is not whether there is a
10 self, but why we choose to believe in an individual self. Again, how what is
11 common (be it the soul, consciousness, the Christian notion of the breadth of
12 God, or the Hindu notion of “Thou art That”)⁷⁰ becomes the individual self is
13 the mystery of solipsism⁷¹. As such, we must choose to believe that each one of
14 us is unique. Usually, people who deny the self also deny freedom and God. The
15 path to atheism seems to start with the notion that there is no self, then this leads
16 to the notion that there is no freedom, and ends by rejecting God.⁷² The opposite
17 holds true. Those who believe in the individual self also believe in freedom, and
18 this usually leads to belief in God. Since we can only see the physical eye that
19 sees, but not the conscious ‘I’ that sees, we have to make a decision for or against
20 the notion that we all have an undetectable, irreducible/nonreductive, and
21 invisible individual self. Although the self is understood as non-reductive, it is
22 associated with the individual's DNA. However, as long as the features of
23 consciousness are considered as nonreductive, the identity of the body/DNA
24 cannot provide the identity of the self. Point in case, identical twins have two
25 separate selves.

26 **Freedom: What is fundamental to the Nature of Consciousness/Intentionality**

27
28
29 Belief in freedom is a decision, a belief-decision.⁷³ Why does the
30 acknowledgment of freedom require a decision? Though freedom is associated

⁶⁷David Chalmers. *Philosophy of Mind*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 248-249

⁶⁸John Searle, “The Irreducibility of Consciousness”, in John Heil, *Philosophy of Mind* (Great Britain: Oxford, 2004) 700.

⁶⁹Roger Penrose, “Quantum Physics of Consciousness “*Closer to Truth*. Oct 8, 2020 (4:50-6:03)

⁷⁰“That thou art” (*Tat Tvam Asi*), *Chandogya Upanishad* 6.8.7, trans. Swami Prabhavananda and Frederick Manchester, in *The Upanishads* (New York: Harper & Row, 1957), p. 232.

⁷¹René Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy*, in *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, vol. 2, trans. John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff, and Dugald Murdoch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 17. The self is indubitable.

⁷²Richard Dawkins, *The God Delusion* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2006). Sam Harris, Daniel Dennett also reject both freedom and God

⁷³A Decision as a Bit —it can exist as two equally possible states, an either/or, an isometric state. A binary -one equal binary choice of certainty/uncertainty. Yes/No; True/ False; On/Off; 0 or 1; A **classical bit** can be only one of two states:

A decision as a Qubit or a quantum bit, it can exist as a superposition of states--can exist in a **superposition** of both states simultaneously. Qubit before measurement: Superposition. Qubit after observation. 0 or 1 (one definite state appears). <https://chatgpt.com/c/69adf3bc-d7d8-83e8-bede-65b76eab396d>

1 with the neural world of matter/consciousness, it is a non-reductive given; hence,
 2 accepting freedom requires a decision. The reality of freedom is best understood
 3 in the context of the nature of consciousness. The nature of consciousness is such
 4 that we cannot define consciousness independent of freedom, nor can we define
 5 freedom independent of consciousness. To choose is to be conscious, and to be
 6 conscious is to choose.⁷⁴ Brentano argued that all consciousness is about something.⁷⁵
 7 In that, while all consciousness is about something, consciousness itself is not a
 8 thing. But what is most important to note is that we are not only conscious of
 9 something; we can choose what to be conscious of. To be conscious is to choose
 10 what to be conscious of; to choose what to be conscious of is to be conscious. In
 11 Sartre's words, consciousness "is what it is not and is not what it is",⁷⁶ because
 12 to Sartre, the immateriality of consciousness is the basis for the indeterminacy
 13 of consciousness⁷⁷. Consciousness is real but not a thing. To be free is a brute
 14 given. The facticity of freedom⁷⁸ proposes that to choose is to have to choose.
 15 Freedom, Sartre argued, is the freedom of choosing and not a freedom of not
 16 choosing. But while one is not free not to choose,⁷⁹ one is free to choose not to
 17 choose.⁸⁰

18 The reality of freedom is an irreducible existential given, as such, non-
 19 reductive. The brain, which houses the mind, is 80 percent water, but we cannot
 20 excrete consciousness from a glass of water. Freedom is real, but not a thing⁸¹.
 21 It is non-reductive and intentional. It is metaphysical and a phenomenological
 22 given. If the essence of science is predictability, the essence of intentionality is
 23 creativity. Creativity is the strongest argument for freedom. And what is
 24 interesting about this phenomenon is that it allows us to choose what to be
 25 conscious of. That is the definition of creativity. To be free is to choose, to
 26 conceive, to perceive, or to observe whatever we want to think, believe, or enact.
 27 The argument for the freedom of consciousness is related to the nature of
 28 intentionality, in that we can choose what to be conscious of, be it of existence,
 29 of subsistence, or of absistence. For all consciousness is consciousness about
 30 concrete, abstract, or imaginary/mental objects. Concrete objects like tables,
 31 abstract objects like triangles, and imaginary objects like Pegasus, contradictions
 32 such as round squares, or ideas leading to inventions. To be is to be conceived,
 33 to be is to be perceived, to be is to be observed, to be is to be constantly observed.
 34 But most importantly, to be is to be free; free to conceive, perceive, or observe

⁷⁴Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, Tr. Hazel E. Barnes, (New York: Washington: Square Press, 1977)

⁷⁵Franz Brentano, "The Distinction between Mental and Physical Phenomena" in David J. Chalmers. *Philosophy of Mind*, (New York: Oxford University press, 2002) 479

⁷⁶Jean-Paul Sartre. *Being and Nothingness*, Tr. Hazel E. Barnes, (New York: Washington: Square Press, 1977) 28.

⁷⁷Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, .568

⁷⁸Jean Paul Sartre *Being and Nothingness*, 625

⁷⁹Jean Paul *Sartre Being and Nothingness*, 710

⁸⁰Jean Paul *Sartre Being and Nothingness*, 607

⁸¹Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, Tr. Hazel E. Barnes, (New York: Washington: Square Press, 1977) 568

1 what we choose to conceive, perceive, or observe. This freedom we cannot
2 renounce⁸².

5 **Morals: What is Existential**

7 Another existential truth arising from the mind's role as a decision-making
8 agent is morality. Moral stance involves a decision, a **justified belief decision**.
9 Believing in right and wrong requires taking a stance for or against a moral
10 position. Moral stance does not deal with empirical truths but with existential
11 truths. Truths that define individuals. So the question is not whether there are
12 moral absolutes, but whether there are individuals who hold them. Is right
13 conduct right because we say so, or do we say so because it is right? It is a
14 difficult question to address. This is like trying to address the question of whether
15 $2+2=4$ is true because we say so, or we say so because it is true. What is
16 important about moral truths is not only knowing whether something is right or
17 wrong, but also knowing why we believe it is right or wrong, and living by such
18 truths. Knowing thou "shalt not kill"⁸³ becomes relevant only when one affirms
19 "I will not kill". The existential claim "I will not kill" is the strongest argument
20 for the veracity of the statement thou shalt not kill. What we can answer is to
21 note why people choose to be moral or why they choose moral absolutes to live
22 by. As such, while we cannot answer the question of whether there are moral
23 absolutes, we can ask why people choose to live by moral absolutes. Marrying
24 once, marrying one at a time, marrying five at a time, all are moral options. If
25 Christians argue for monogamous relations because God said so, then Muslims
26 would be right if they marry more than one because God said so. If what is right
27 is what God said, and if God said we could marry many, how many would marry
28 many? God does not create us as good or bad people. We must choose to be good
29 or bad. To be moral is to choose to be moral. We were moral, we are moral, and
30 will be moral because we have the freedom to choose to be moral. So, the
31 question is not whether there are moral absolutes; it is whether we, as
32 individuals, choose moral absolutes. Life is a test only for those who choose to
33 uphold moral absolutes. To choose to have or not have an abortion is a
34 decision—a **justified belief-decision**. The question is not whether abortion is
35 right or wrong; the question is when and why it is considered right; when and
36 why it is considered wrong.

37 The first important moral option is the choice to live or die. To choose to
38 live is a decision to live a life of making choices. To choose to die is a decision
39 to end a life of making choices. Both birth and death are impositions; however,
40 the fact that we can choose to die rather than live means that while birth is an
41 imposition, life is not. The fact that we can choose to die before natural death
42 means that death is not an imposition. Both waiting to die and choosing to die
43 are choices. Only those who choose to live address how to live and whether to
44 believe in God, freedom, and the self. To Tolstoy, to choose to live is to believe

⁸²Jean-Jacques Rousseau in *The Social Contract* (1762), Book I, Chapter 4.

⁸³Exodus 20:13

1 in God, for only in those moments he believed in God, he wanted to live⁸⁴.
 2 Freedom to live or die is an ontological matter, granted only to creatures that are
 3 aware of both being and non-being. The liberty to live or die is a political matter
 4 in which citizens grant each other the liberty to choose to live or die. The right
 5 to live or die is a legal matter: when both to live and to die have de jure
 6 recognition, both rights carry expectations. If we have the right to life, we must
 7 provide civic services to one another. If we have the right to die, then society
 8 must provide such services as euthanasia. How we choose to live is determined
 9 not only by what we have to believe but also by what we choose to believe.

12 **IQ, EQ, and BQ**

14 While IQ measures cognitive intelligence, EQ measures social intelligence,
 15 and BQ measures doxastic intelligence. Doxastic intelligence provides for
 16 metaphysical decisions about beliefs that cannot be verified or falsified. As such,
 17 the BQ score assesses the extent to which an argument addresses fundamental
 18 questions and asserts metaphysical claims. So BQ deals with justified belief
 19 decisions. IQ is a ratio of mental age to chronological age that indicates one's
 20 cognitive intelligence relative to others. EQ, on the other hand, is a social scale
 21 or trajectory that defines how to have and maintain proper intersubjective
 22 relationships. BQ is the matrix of justified belief-decisions.⁸⁵ Why do we choose
 23 to believe what we choose to believe? The truth of what you choose to believe
 24 is important only in knowing why you choose to believe or disbelieve in God,
 25 freedom, and the self.⁸⁶ Belief decisions avoid cognitive dissonance. Authentic
 26 life involves BQ. The score itself can be considered as being strong or weak.
 27 Where strong BQ refers to those who address existential questions and define
 28 and defend their decisions for or against metaphysical claims in word or in life,
 29 Weak BQ refers to those who address existential concerns but don't define and
 30 defend their decisions in word or in life.

31 There is no matrix to ascertain the acceptance or rejection of metaphysical
 32 truth. The matrix of doxastic intelligence involves the dialogue of the existential
 33 self with itself over phenomenological concerns, such as the question of whether
 34 life has meaning. How does one develop a matrix to assess one's belief
 35 quotient—doxastic intelligence? It is argued that we need a trifold basis. (1)
 36 Ascertain and address fundamental questions that require answers. (2) Accept or
 37 reject the claims one finds and make decisions for or against metaphysical
 38 claims. (3) understand BQ in the context of both IQ and EQ. IQ measures
 39 cognitive intelligence, EQ measures social intelligence, and BQ measures
 40 doxastic intelligence. Doxastic intelligence deals with decisions for or against

⁸⁴Tolstoy, Leo. *A Confession*. Translated by David Patterson. (New York: W.W. Norton, 1983) 58-62

⁸⁵Tennyson Samraj What is your belief quotient 2001 and 2007

⁸⁶James Kay writes that beliefs in general control and shape us for better or for worse. (James Kay *The Belief Quotient* – 2017. Liza purports that certain beliefs sabotage or support ones success (Lisa Van Allan *Your Belief Quotient* 2013)

1 metaphysical claims. There are beliefs, and there are volitional, intelligent belief-
 2 decisions. Beliefs are either true or false. Belief decisions are an either/or matter.
 3 Either/Or does not mean that what is believed is neither true nor false; it simply
 4 means that we cannot verify or falsify whether what one believes is either true
 5 or false. Intelligent beliefs are those that require comprehension and choice to hold
 6 them as beliefs. BQ defines intelligence as the capacity to address fundamental
 7 questions and seek answers that must be accepted/ rejected/suspended.

10 The Matrix of BQ

11
 12 IQ is determined by answering a certain number of questions, and the score
 13 is divided by one's chronological age. Here, the Matrix of BQ attempts to
 14 measure doxastic intelligence in belief formation through our metaphysical
 15 engagements. For the mind is the author of metaphysics, and a decision-making
 16 agent that creates existential truth. How would such a matrix be defined?⁸⁷. Here
 17 is the Matrix for BQ.⁸⁸ Where M_i represents the metaphysical depth of our
 18 thinking, B_i represents the belief-decision coefficient, or the decisions made for
 19 or against metaphysical claims, and N represents the number of meaningful
 20 belief-decisions enacted in one's life. BQ is not measured by correctness, but by
 21 the integrity of the belief-decision (existential truth). BQ can be considered
 22 strong or weak. Where strong BQ refers to those who define and defend their
 23 belief-decisions in word or in life, and weak BQ refers to those who don't define
 24 or defend their belief-decisions in word or in life. As such, BQ postulates belief-
 25 decisions as a paradigm for living. Here is the AI-generated formula⁸⁹ or
 26 Summation, (Σ /capital Sigma) defined by AI and modified by me.

27 If IQ is cognitive (knowledge-based), then BQ is existential (decision-
 28 based). A possible structure for defining the BQ Matrix can be expressed as
 29 follows:

$$31 \text{ BQ} = \frac{\sum (P_i \times B_i)}{N}$$

$$32 \text{ BQ} = \frac{\text{Summation of (Phenomenological engagement} \times \text{Belief-decisions made)}}{\text{Existential truth}}$$

⁸⁷This formulation of the *Belief Quotient (BQ) Matrix* was developed in collaboration with OpenAI's GPT-5 model (ChatGPT) through an iterative philosophical dialogue on October 6, 2025. The model's contribution was to formalize the conceptual structure of BQ as the "matrix of doxastic intelligence," integrating coefficients for question depth, decision integrity, and reflective awareness. Source: ChatGPT (2025, October 6). *Definition and formalization of the Belief Quotient (BQ) matrix as the matrix of doxastic intelligence* [Large language model response]. OpenAI. <https://chatgpt.com/c/68e3d016-94ec-8326-8bf1-86ae9ba57bb6>

⁸⁸AI generated formula. Oct 6, 2025 (ChatGPT) <https://chatgpt.com/c/68e3d016-94ec-8326-8bf1-86ae9ba57bb6>

⁸⁹ChatGPT. (2025, October 6). *Definition and formalization of the Belief Quotient (BQ) matrix as the matrix of doxastic intelligence* [Large language model response]. OpenAI. <https://chatgpt.com/c/68e3d016-94ec-8326-8bf1-86ae9ba57bb6>

1 Here is a detailed formula

- 2 P_i = phenomenological engagement with Metaphysical distinctions,
 - 3 such as (a) temporal/Timeless beings. (b) Epistemic/Existential truth,
 - 4 (c) knowing/ believing difference, (4) Essence/existence distinction. Or
 - 5 with questions dealing with (a) Why does God not reveal his identity?
 - 6 (b) Does God have an ‘is’ of composition to identify the is of existence?
 - 7 (c) What is the is of existence, and the is of existence. (d) What is
 - 8 freedom? Does being free imply the freedom to think, believe, and act
 - 9 as one so desires? (e) What is the self? Why is it considered non-
 - 10 reductive, but existential, what appears at birth and disappears at death?
- 11 B_i = the Belief-decision coefficient — representing the degree of
 - 12 *volitional response* to a Phenomenological or metaphysical engagement
 - 13 (acceptance, rejection, or suspension of belief)
- 14 N = Existential truth. Total number of meaningful justified belief-
 - 15 decisions enacted in life. Justified-belief-decision (JTB) is fundamental
 - 16 both in belief-formulation and in determining how we choose to live.
 - 17 What determines behavior is not what we *have to believe* but what we
 - 18 *choose to believe*.

21 The Belief-decision Coefficient

22
 23 Since BQ is not measured by correctness but by the integrity of the belief-
 24 decision, B_i could be represented as:

Belief-Decision Mode	Symbol	Description
Acceptance	1	The individual accepts a belief after examination.
Rejection	1	The individual rejects a belief after examination.
Suspension	0	The individual suspends judgment, recognizing limits of knowledge.

26 These belief-decisions are “doxastic acts” — existential affirmations or
 27 negations.

28
 29 5. Weight of Phenomenological depth (P_i)

30 Not all engagements are equal.

31 Fundamental (existential or metaphysical) questions carry greater weight than
 32 factual or procedural ones.

33 For instance:

Type of Question	Example	Weight P_i
Empirical	“Is the Earth/Flat or round?”	1
Ethical	“Is killing/abortion ever justified?”	2

Type of Question	Example	Weight Pi
Existential	“I will not Kill” “Does life have meaning?”	3
Theological / Metaphysical	“Is there a God?—Does God have a known ID	4

1

2 The Meaning of the Quotient

3 Thus, the Belief Quotient reflects the integrity and awareness in belief-
4 decisions:5 $BQ = \text{Summation of (Phenomenological Depth} \times \text{Decision made)} / \text{Existential}$
6 truth.

7

8 Strong BQ means: The person faces fundamental questions, engages them
9 consciously, defines and defends their decisions in word or deed10 Weak BQ means: The person faces fundamental questions, makes decisions,
11 but does not define and defend those decisions in word or deed

12 The content of one’s BQ is one’s belief-decisions. Belief-decisions are the
13 basis for one’s belief formation or paradigm. One’s paradigm provides the basis
14 of how we live our lives. Life is a test only for those who have made belief-
15 decisions. We are constantly making belief-decisions, defining and defending
16 them in word or in life. Hence, BQ can be considered as being strong or weak.
17 Where strong BQ refers to those who define and defend their decisions in word
18 or in life, weak BQ refers to those who don’t define and defend their decisions
19 in word or in life. What really matters is dealing with questions and making
20 decisions about metaphysical claims, which, in turn, define us as individuals⁹⁰. I
21 think at one stage in one’s life, we have to address certain questions and be
22 intellectually honest in accepting or rejecting metaphysical claims. To that end,
23 we can be proud of our BQ. What must be noted is this. While IQ defines one’s
24 intelligence in terms of others, EQ defines one’s honest relationship with others.
25 BQ defines one’s honest relationship with oneself. Being intellectually honest
26 is being honest with oneself. If one is intellectually honest, there will be no
27 mental dissidence with oneself. BQ as the measure of one’s intelligence in
28 believing — the self’s ability to make conscious, free, and responsible belief-
29 decisions. It extends beyond IQ by emphasizing that true intelligence lies not
30 merely in thinking but in *believing intelligently*.

31

32

33 **Conclusion**

34

35 BQ is the Matrix of Believing Intelligently. So, while IQ and EQ refer to
36 one’s scores in cognitive and social intelligence, relative to others, Doxastic

⁹⁰On one end, we can question everything and believe in nothing, or on the other hand we can question nothing and believe in everything.

1 intelligence is a special faculty that enables the self to make justified-belief
 2 decisions in belief formation. BQ is a dialogue between the self and the soul. It
 3 is a dialogue of oneself addressing the phenomenological concerns of life.
 4 Doxastic intelligence is directly related to one's response to metaphysical
 5 concerns and decisions. All individuals make decisions for or against God,
 6 freedom, and the self in word or in deed. Hence, BQ can be considered as being
 7 strong or weak. Where strong BQ refers to those who define and defend their
 8 decisions in word or in life. Weak BQ refers to those who don't define and
 9 defend their decisions in word or in life. Individuals not only make belief
 10 decisions but also do so by defining and defending their decisions. So we can
 11 define BQ as the measure of one's intelligence in believing. It goes beyond IQ
 12 by emphasizing that true intelligence lies not merely in thinking but in *believing*
 13 *intelligently*. Because the nature of consciousness necessitates that we, as authors
 14 of metaphysics, make decisions for or against metaphysical claims, BQ
 15 postulates that we are the authors of belief decisions.

16 Doxastic intelligence enables us to comprehend and make
 17 phenomenological conjectures or decisions in belief formation. Beliefs about
 18 God, freedom, and the self are unfalsifiable conjectures that require intelligent
 19 decisions. Doxastic intelligence is a specialized form of intelligence that results
 20 in justified belief decisions leading to belief formation. Decisions as to why we
 21 choose to believe or disbelieve in God, the self, freedom, morals, and eternal
 22 life. Why we choose to believe in God, freedom, self, and morals are related.
 23 Those who believe in God also tend to believe in freedom and the self; those
 24 who do not believe in God tend not to believe in either. Belief and disbelief in
 25 God hinge on whether God necessarily exists. Belief or disbelief in free will
 26 hinges on whether consciousness is understood as being indeterministic or
 27 deterministic. Belief and disbelief in the existential self hinge on whether the self
 28 appears at birth and disappears at death. Belief and disbelief in morals hinge on
 29 whether we have a conscience to discern right from wrong. and the freedom to
 30 choose right or wrong. Theists see the need for a non-contingent being as the
 31 basis for belief in God. Atheists see God as non-contingent, involving a
 32 contradiction. As such, reject God. Libertarians see the nature of consciousness
 33 as the basis for free will. Determinists project a causal basis for choices and reject
 34 the notion of free will. The existentialists purport that the individual self appears
 35 at birth and disappears at death, and choose to believe in the unique self.
 36 Materialists maintain that nothing appears at birth and disappears at death, and
 37 therefore reject the reality of the self. What must be noted is that the nature of
 38 consciousness and the attributes of God are non-reductive. As long as the nature
 39 of consciousness, namely intelligence, intentionality, freedom, and subjectivity,
 40 and the two main attributes of God, namely immortality and creator, are
 41 understood as being non-reductive, belief in God and the self would be belief-
 42 decisions.

43 The features of consciousness, namely freedom, intelligence, intentionality,
 44 and subjectivity, are non-reductive properties; they are directional forces that

1 direct an individual towards the world.⁹¹ “Humans are intertwined with
 2 everything within the world.”⁹² While IQ concerns cognitive intelligence in the
 3 context of others, BQ concerns doxastic intelligence in the context of oneself. It
 4 is not about being honest with others but being intellectually honest with oneself.
 5 It is a dialogue one has with oneself. ⁹³BQ is linked with IQ in terms of what is
 6 common, namely, intelligence, but is constricted to metaphysical beliefs that
 7 require a decision for or against existential claims, because metaphysical/
 8 existential claims related to phenomenological concerns of life cannot be
 9 verified as true or false. For, phenomenological conjectures are non-reductive
 10 assertions. As such, what distinguishes BQ from traditional epistemology is that,
 11 while knowledge is defined as justified true belief (JTB), BQ defines
 12 existential/metaphysical knowledge as justified belief-decisions (JB-D).
 13 Individuals not only make belief decisions but also do so by defining and
 14 defending their decisions. Thus, the existential self does not simply exist; it
 15 exists as a believer, believing or disbelieving in God, freedom, and the unique
 16 self. The content of one’s BQ is composed of one’s belief-decisions. One’s
 17 paradigm provides the basis of how we live our lives. Life is a test only for those
 18 who make belief-decisions. We are constantly making belief-decisions, defining
 19 and defending them in word or in deed. How we choose to live is determined not
 20 only by what we have to believe, but by what we choose to believe. If truth were
 21 an epistemic/ontological matter, beliefs could be understood as true or false;
 22 however, if truth were an existential/ontological matter, it would be related to
 23 believing, not simply to knowing. Knowing is different than believing. In
 24 empirical truth, to know is to believe, for belief is mandatory, but in existential
 25 truth, to believe is to know why we choose to believe, because belief is volitional.
 26 To believe involves a decision, a justified belief-decision. That is why, while
 27 ‘Justified true belief’ results in the birth of knowledge, “Justified belief-
 28 decisions” result in the birth of believers. As such, there is a need to measure
 29 one’s metaphysical skill and claims. The mind, as the author of metaphysics and
 30 a decision-making agent, is the creator of metaphysical truth and existential
 31 truth. While IQ measures cognitive intelligence, BQ measures doxastic
 32 intelligence associated with belief formation leading to existential truth.

33
 34

35 **Bibliography**

36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41

- Armstrong, D. M. “A Causal Theory of the Mind.” In *Philosophy of Mind*, edited by
 David J. Chalmers, 87–102. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Augustine. Sermon 43.7.9. In *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 38, 258.
- Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologiae*, I, q. 3, a. 4.
- Berkeley, George. *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*. 1713.

⁹¹Eva Alerby, Erica Hagström, Susanne Westman The embodied classroom - A phenomenological discussion of the body and the room. *Journal of pedagogy* 1/201. DOI 10.2478/jped-2014-0001 JoP 5 (1): 13

⁹²Ibid: 13

- 1 Brentano, Franz. "The Distinction between Mental and Physical Phenomena." In
 2 Philosophy of Mind, edited by David J. Chalmers, 479–486. New York: Oxford
 3 University Press, 2002.
- 4 Buber, Martin. I and Thou. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith, 82. Edinburgh:
 5 T&T Clark, 1958.
- 6 Chalmers, David J., ed. Philosophy of Mind. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- 7 Chandogya Upanishad. Translated by Swami Prabhavananda and Frederick Manchester, 232.
 8 New York: Harper & Row, 1957.
- 9 ChatGPT. "Definition and Formalization of the Belief Quotient (BQ) Matrix." October
 10 6, 2025. OpenAI. <https://chatgpt.com/>.
- 11 ChatGPT. "Response on the Nonlocal Mind as Absistent Ground." November 26, 2025.
 12 OpenAI. <https://openai.com/chatgpt>.
- 13 Chakrabarti, Dipanwita, "The Kantian Notion of Categories and their origin" Athens
 14 Journal of Philosophy - Volume 3, Issue 3, September 2024 – Pages 149-162.
 15 <https://www.athensjournals.gr/philosophy/2025-4-2-2-Dobrowolski.pdf>
- 16 Consciousness May Have Created the Universe - This Is Very Strange. [https://www.](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_dP3XOwhozg)
 17 [youtube.com/watch?v=_dP3XOwhozg](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_dP3XOwhozg) (Anthropic principle)
- 18 Chopra, Deepak. "Local vs. Non-Local Realism." Video.
- 19 Dawkins, Richard. The God Delusion. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2006.
- 20 Dennett, Daniel. Breaking the Spell: Religion as a Natural Phenomenon. New York:
 21 Viking, 2006.
- 22 Dennett, Daniel. Elbow Room. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1984.
- 23 Descartes, René. Meditations on First Philosophy. In The Philosophical Writings of
 24 Descartes, Vol. 2, 17–25. Translated by John Cottingham et al. Cambridge:
 25 Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- 26 Harris, Sam. The End of Faith. New York: W. W. Norton, 2004.
- 27 Hitchens, Christopher. God Is Not Great. New York: Twelve Books, 2007.
- 28 James, William. "The Will to Believe." In Philosophy of Religion, edited by William
 29 L. Rowe. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- 30 Stuart Quantum, Hameroff. Consciousness and the Origin of life. [https://www.youtu](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XA9Q5p9ODac)
 31 [be.com/watch?v=XA9Q5p9ODac](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XA9Q5p9ODac)
- 32 Stuart Hameroff, Quantum Consciousness and the Origin of life. [https://www.youtube.](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XA9Q5p9ODac)
 33 [com/watch?v=XA9Q5p9ODac](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XA9Q5p9ODac) 7:19.
- 34 Kierkegaard, Søren. Either/Or II. Translated by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong,
 35 176.
 36 Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- 37 Kierkegaard, Søren. The Concept of Anxiety. Translated by Reidar Thomte, 42–44.
 38 Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- 39 Kierkegaard, Søren. The Sickness unto Death. Translated by Howard V. Hong and Edna
 40 H. Hong, 13. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- 41 Kripke, Saul. Naming and Necessity. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980.
- 42 Mackie, J. L. "Evil and Omnipotence." *Mind* 64, no. 254 (1955): 200–212.
- 43 Meinong, Alexius. "The Theory of Objects." 1904. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.
- 44 Pandala, Dania. "Vectors of Consciousness." Burman University Undergraduate Faculty
 45 Research Conference, March 14, 2024.
- 46 Parfit, Derek. Reasons and Persons, 260. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.
- 47 Penrose, Roger. "Quantum Physics of Consciousness." Closer to Truth. Video, October
 48 8, 2020.
- 49 Place, U. T. "Is Consciousness a Brain Process?" In Philosophy of Mind, edited by
 50 David J. Chalmers, 55–60. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

- 1 Plato. *Phaedo*. Translated by G. M. A. Grube, revised by John M. Cooper, 9–15.
 2 Indianapolis: Hackett, 1992.
- 3 Pojman, Louis P. “Believing, Willing and the Ethics of Belief.” In *The Theory of*
 4 *Knowledge*, edited by Louis P. Pojman, 527–540. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth
 5 Publishing Company, 1993.
- 6 Prisco, Ada, *Athens Journal of Philosophy - Volume 3, Issue 4, December 2024*. –
 7 (Pages 215-222)<https://www.athensjournals.gr/philosophy/2024-3-4-3-Prisco.pdf>
- 8 Quine, Willard Van Orman. *Word and Object*, 23–72. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press,
 9 2013.
- 10 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Social Contract*, Book I, chap. 4. 1762.
- 11 Ryan, David L. “The Conscious Universe: Nonlocality and Its Implications.” *Journal of*
 12 *Psychiatry and Psychiatric Disorders* 8, no. 3: 98–110.
- 13 Samraj, Tennyson. *What Is Your Belief Quotient*. Lacombe: Monograph Publishers,
 14 2001; AuthorHouse, 2007.
- 15 Samraj, Tennyson. “Delineating Consciousness and Freedom as an Ontological
 16 Entanglement and Existential Phenomenon.” *Athens Journal of Philosophy*, 2025.
- 17 Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Being and Nothingness*. Translated by Hazel E. Barnes, 28–710. New
 18 York: Square Press, 1977.
- 19 Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Existentialism and Humanism*. Translated by Philip Mairet, 26–50.
 20 London: Methuen, 1949.
- 21 Schrödinger, Erwin. “The Present Situation in Quantum Mechanics.” *Proceedings of*
 22 *the American Philosophical Society* 124, no. 5 (1980): 323–338.
- 23 Searle, John. “The Irreducibility of Consciousness.” In *Philosophy of Mind*, edited by
 24 John Heil, 700–712. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- 25 Swinburne, Richard. *The Existence of God*, 95–120. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004.
 26 *The Holy Bible*.
- 27 Tillich, Paul. *Dynamics of Faith*, 1–20. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.
- 28 Tolstoy, Leo. *A Confession*. Translated by David Patterson, 58–62. New York: W. W.
 29 Norton, 1983.